CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS

NOTICE OF MEETING PLANNING COMMISSION



Meeting Agenda Full Detail

Thursday, June 16, 2016 4:00 PM

Council Chambers

Planning Commission

COUNCIL CHAMBERS CITY HALL - 420 N. Pokegama Ave. Grand Rapids, MN 55744

Call To Order

Call of Roll

Setting of Agenda - This is an opportunity to approve the regular agenda as presented or add/delete an agenda item by a majority vote of the Commissioners present.

Approval of Minutes

16-0384 Consider approval of the May 5, 2016 Planning Commisssion Meeting Minutes

Attachments: Minutes-Final10-May-2016-11-09-55

Public Hearings

16-0383 Conduct a public hearing to consider the preliminary plat of Hartley Addition to Grand

Rapids.

<u>Attachments:</u> PC Staff Report Hartley Add. Minor Subd.

Hartley Add. SUB-Map

16-260 Preliminary Plat 5-23-16(1)-UPDATED

Combined Hartley Addition Application
Hartley Add. Review Committee Comments

Subdivision Considerations

Public Input

Individuals may address the Planning Commission about any non public hearing item or any item not included on the Regular Meeting Agenda. Speakers are requested to come to the podium, state their name and address for the record and limit their remarks to three (3) minutes.

Miscellaneous\Updates

Adjourn

NEXT REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING IS SCHEDULED FOR: [Enter Date Here]



CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS

Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: 16-0384 Version: 1 Name:

Type: Agenda Item Status: Passed

File created: 6/10/2016 In control: Planning Commission

On agenda: 6/16/2016 **Final action:** 6/16/2016

Title: Consider approval of the May 5, 2016 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Sponsors:

Indexes:

Code sections:

Attachments: Minutes-Final10-May-2016-11-09-55

DateVer.Action ByActionResult6/16/20161Planning CommissionApproved

Consider approval of the May 5, 2016 Planning Commisssion Meeting Minutes

Background Information:

(Draft minutes are attached)

Staff Recommendation:

Review and approve the May 5, 2016 Planning Commisssion Meeting Minutes



CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS

NOTICE OF MEETING PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes - Final Planning Commission

COUNCIL CHAMBERS CITY HALL - 420 N. Pokegama Ave. Grand Rapids, MN 55744

Thursday, May 5, 2016 4:00 PM Council Chambers

Call To Order

Call of Roll

Present 5 - Commissioner Mark Gothard, Commissioner Charles Burress,
 Commissioner Lester Kachinske, Commissioner Susan Lynch, and
 Commissioner Paula Johnson

Absent 2 - Chairperson Julie Fedje-Johnston, and Commissioner Tasha Connelly

Setting of Agenda - This is an opportunity to approve the regular agenda as presented or add/delete an agenda item by a majority vote of the Commissioners present.

Approved As Presented

Approval of Minutes

Approve the minutes of the April 7, 2016, 4:00 pm regular meeting.

Motion by Commissioner Lynch, second by Commissioner Burress to approve the minutes of the April 7, 2016 regular meeting. The following voted in favor thereof: Johnson, Lynch, Kachinske, Burress, Gothard. Opposed: None, passed unanimously.

General Business

Consider a recommendation to the City Council regarding the vacation of portions of platted Houghton Avenue and Third Street S. right-of-way adjacent to Block 65, Town of Grand Rapids.

Community Development Specialist Trast provided the background information. Ms. Lola Pohl submitted a valid petition on April 7, 2016 requesting the vacation of portions of public right-of-way. The right-of-way vacation request, if approved, would help to provide a clear title to the single family dwelling (property) for future sale, located at 318 SW 3rd Avenue. The dwelling, purchased by the current owner in 1976, is located within the platted (but, unimproved) right-of-way which was Houghton Avenue, within the Plat of Town of Grand Rapids. There were no concerns or objections expressed, regarding the petitioned partial right-of-way vacations, from the staff review committee which consists of: Public Works Department, Engineering Department, Community Development Department, Fire Department, Police

Department, and the Grand Rapids Public Utilities Commission.

Motion by Commissioner Lynch, second by Commissioner Johnson that, based on the findings of fact presented here today, and in the public's best interest, the Planning Commission does hereby forward to the City Council a recommendation to approve the vacation of public right-of-way described as;

Parcel 1: That part of Houghton Avenue as dedicated in Grand Rapids, according to the recorded plat thereof, Itasca County, Minnesota which lies 80.00 feet westerly and adjacent to Lots 20-24, Block 65, of said plat.

TOGETHER WITH Parcel 2: The westerly 53.00 feet of the south 40.00 feet of Third Street, as dedicated in said plat, lying northerly and adjacent to said Block 65.

AND TOGETHER WITH Parcel 3: That part of Houghton Avenue and/or Third Street, as dedicated in said plat which lies 40.00 feet northerly and adjacent to said Parcel 1 and which lies 80.00 feet westerly and adjacent to said Parcel 2.

The Commissioners reviewed the following considerations for the record:

- Is the easement needed for traffic purposes?
 Why/Why not?
 No, the road that was originally platted is no longer there.
- Is the easement needed for pedestrian purposes?Why/Why not?No, again there is no longer a road there.
- Is the easement needed for utility purposes?
 Why/Why not?
 No, the staff review committee determined it was not needed for utility purposes.
- 4. Would vacating the easement place additional land on the tax rolls? Why/Why not? Yes, potentially the land acquired would go on the tax rolls.
- 5. Would vacating the easement facilitate economic development in the City? Why/Why not?

Yes, a healthy real estate market is part of economic development and vacating this land would help facilitate a real estate transaction.

The following voted in favor thereof: Johnson, Lynch, Kachinske, Burress, Gothard. Opposed: None, passed unanimously.

Consider a recommendation to the City Council regarding amendments to the Zoning Ordinance that would update and amend multiple sections of Chapter 30 *Land Development Regulations*.

Mr. Trast reviewed the staff report with the Commissioners. Over the past year, staff had accumulated a short list of sections within Article VI (Zoning) of Chapter 30 (Land Development of the Municipal Code that could use review, and if deemed necessary, updating due to inconsistencies, duplication, need of further clarification, or simply being outdated.

On April 7, 2016 the Planning Commission formally initiated this review process, and formed a subcommittee of three Commissioners to work with staff on further developing potential amendments to the text of the Zoning Ordinance, which would then be presented to the full Planning Commission for review and recommendation to the City Council.

Generally, the Planning Commission initiated amendments pertained to the following areas/sections of the Zoning Ordinance:

- Section 30-563. Supplementary use regulations. Subparts 2 (garages) and 3 (tool sheds)
- Section 30-564. Uses with restrictions. Subpart 34 (outdoor storage)
- Section 30-592. Supplementary height regulations. Subpart a. (permitted exceptions)
- Review and discussion of the "roomer" use within the single and two family zoning districts

Motion by Commissioner Burress, second by Commissioner Lynch that, based on the findings of fact presented here today, and in the public's best interest, the Planning Commission does hereby forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council regarding draft amendments, which update and amend multiple sections of Chapter 30 Land Development Regulations, as depicted in Exhibits "A" – "D".

The Planning Commissioners reviewed the following considerations for the record:

1. Will the change affect the character of neighborhoods? Why/Why not?

The change will be beneficial to the neighborhoods it will make it orderly.

2. Would the change foster economic growth in the community? Why/Why not?

It could allow possible rental income for homeowners.

3. Would the proposed change be in keeping with the spirit and intent of the ordinance?

Why/Why not?

Yes, it cleans up housekeeping items.

4. Would the change be in the best interest of the general public? Why/Why not?

Yes, it updates the the items that were concerns of the public that needed to be addressed.

5. Would the change be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan? Why/Why not?

Yes, the Comprehensive Plan calls out the need for having different housing opportunities and this would allow for that.

Public Input

Miscellaneous\Updates

Adjourn

Adjourn

This record is currently unavailable.				











