

WABASHA PLANNING COMMISSION

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88606497016>

May 11, 2021 6:00 PM

MEETING AGENDA

- 1) Call to Order
- 2) Approval of Minutes-
 - a) Minutes January 12, 2021
- 3) Changes or Additions to Agenda
- 4) Public Comment
- 5) Public Hearings
- 6) Old Business
- 7) New Business
 - a) Comp Plan Update
- 8) Board of Adjustment Business
 - a) Minutes BOA 3-9-2021
- 9) Other Business
- 10) Next Regular Meeting Date - June 8, 2021
- 11) Adjourn

Planning Commission

2) a)

Meeting Date: 05/11/2021

SUBJECT: Minutes 1-12-2021

DEPARTMENT: Planning & Zoning

TITLE:

Minutes January 12, 2021

PURPOSE:

Attachments

Minutes 1-12-21

DRAFT

WABASHA PLANNING COMMISSION

January 12, 2021 6:00 PM

MEETING MINUTES

Commission Members: Tim Wallerich, Chair Sara Carrels, Vice Chair
 Scott Durand, Sharon Burke
 Ozzie Goodman Jeff Sulla
 Kris Kruse

Present: Scott Durand; Chair Tim Wallerich; Sharon Burke; Vice Chair Sara Carrels; Jeff Sulla; Ozzy Goodman

Absent: Kris Kruse

Also Present: Harry Davis, Contracted City Planner; Wendy Busch, City Clerk

1) Call to Order

Chair Wallerich called the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting for January 12, 2021 to order at 6:02pm.

2) Election of Officers

Motion made by Jeff Sulla, seconded by Vice Chair Sara Carrels to nominated Tim Wallerich as the Chair of the Planning Commission for 2021.

Vote: 7 - 0 Adopted - Unanimously

Motion made by Chair Tim Wallerich, seconded by Scott Durand to nominate Sara Carrels as the Vice Chair of the Planning Commission for 2021.

Vote: 7 - 0 Adopted - Unanimously

3) Approval of Minutes-

1) Approval of Minutes 11-10-2020

Motion made by Vice Chair Sara Carrels, seconded by Jeff Sulla to approve the minutes provided from November 10, 2020.

Vote: 6 - 0 Adopted - Unanimously

Other: Kris Kruse (ABSENT)

Commissioner Kruse was absent from the Minutes motion due to loss of connection with Zoom. She joined the meeting again after the motion was made.

4) Changes or Additions to Agenda

5) Public Comment

6) Public Hearings.

7) Old Business

8) New Business

9) Board of Adjustment Business

Chair Wallerich recessed the Planning Commission meeting at 6:06 pm.

Chair Durand opened the Board of Adjustment meeting at 6:07 pm.

Motion made by Sharon Burke, seconded by Ozzy Goodman to nominate Scott Durand as Chair and Kris Kruse as Vice Chair of the Board of Adjustments.

Vote: 4 - 0 Adopted - Unanimously

Other: Chair Tim Wallerich (ABSENT)

Jeff Sulla (ABSENT)

Kris Kruse (ABSENT)

Chair Durand closed the Board of Adjustment meeting at 6:08pm.

Chair Wallerich reconvened the Planning Commission meeting at 6:08pm.

1) Election of Officers (*Non-Council Members)

10) Other Business

1) Deadline for Submission/Planning Commission Meetings for 2021

The deadline for submission document was provided by City Clerk Busch. This provides the dates of the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meetings as well as the deadline for those who wish to submit applications for the agenda. City Clerk Busch will add the document to the City's Website for public reference.

11) Next Regular Meeting Date - February 9, 2021.

The next Planning Commission meeting is set for Tuesday, February 9, 2021.

12) Adjourn

Motion made by Scott Durand, seconded by Sharon Burke to adjourn the meeting at 6:09pm.

Vote: 6 - 0 Adopted - Unanimously

Other: Kris Kruse (ABSENT)

Respectfully submitted by: _____
Wendy Busch, Planning & Zoning Assistant

Adopted Date

Planning Commission

7) a)

Meeting Date: 05/11/2021

SUBJECT: Comp Plan Update

DEPARTMENT: Planning & Zoning

TITLE:

Comp Plan Update

PURPOSE:

Attached is a memo from City Planner Harry Davis regarding the Comp Plan update.

Attachments

Memo from Harry Davis



Real People. Real Solutions.

2900 43rd Street NW
Suite 100
Rochester, MN 55901

Ph: (507) 208-4332
Bolton-Menk.com

MEMORANDUM

Date: May 4, 2021
To: Wabasha Planning Commission
From: Harry Davis, AICP
Subject: Planning Memorandum on Updating the Comprehensive Plan
City of Wabasha
Meeting Date: May 11, 2021

Background

During the early part of 2021, Harry Davis met with City Clerk Wendy Busch to discuss the comprehensive plan and desired updates in order to devise the scope of the requested update. We determined that instead of devising a scope and subsequent fee for City Council's April meeting, we would offer a memorandum and ask the council for direction on the scope of the update.

At the April 6 City Council meeting, the City Council generally agreed that a comprehensive plan update is worth pursuing and it should include some public engagement. Mayor Durand highlighted the importance of including current and potential projects and updating particular sections of the plan. Administrator Gregerson also noted that demographics can be updated with new census data. The City Council have asked the Planning Commission to provide input regarding a comprehensive plan update.

For this May Planning Commission meeting, staff is asking for specific information on what should be included as a part of a comprehensive plan update. We offer the below evaluation of the current plan with some recommendations on sections to update.

Comprehensive Plan Update Evaluation

As an overall approach to a 5-year comprehensive plan update, we would recommend including projects or concepts introduced or completed within the past few years and those the city is actively pursuing in the future. These are the most important elements to include as they will affirm the plan's direction or acknowledge any shifts. It is important for a city to check in on its own plans regularly, but it should be noted that Wabasha is not required to update its comprehensive plan.

Bolton & Menk and the City Clerk have identified the following chapters and topics that can or should be considered in a comprehensive plan update:

Overall

- *Update demographics and household information*
- *Identify completed action items*
- *Propose action items to further goals and policies of plan*

Chapter 5 – Parks & Recreation, Open Space, and Environmental Quality

Name:

Date:

Page:

- *Update with proposed changes to current Athletic Fields with rerouting of Highway 60*
 - *Note: Currently a project competing with other submittals at a national level- Representative Angie Craig is advocating for the project in Congress*
- *Update with references to ongoing Parks Master Plan update*
 - *Potential to include forestry initiatives and use programming of parks*

Chapter 6 – Transportation & Circulation

- *Conduct a policies and practices evaluation for ADA accessibility and recommend policies*
- *Inclusion of regional and county transit options*
 - *Note: There is discussion amongst SE MN cities to create bus/van routes in the region*
- *Highway 60 reroute*
 - *See above*

Chapter 7 – Economic Development & Historic Preservation

- *Update with future port proposal along river*
 - *New port location northwest of St. Elizabeth's*
 - *Short-term goal to provide a point to offload dredge material; long-term goal to be a port for goods*
- *MN Futures concept*
 - *Reroute of Hwy 60 and repurposing athletic fields; see above*

Chapter 8 – Land Use & Zoning

- *Update map and chapter for:*
 - *Proposed port*
 - *Athletic Fields reuse/MN Futures*

The original comprehensive plan did include a public outreach and engagement process. City Council, Mayor Durand, and Administrator Gregerson all agree that the update should include a new round of public engagement to reaffirm city efforts or account for new directions. Public engagement can include one or a combination of:

- Open house(s)
- Survey(s)
- Workshop(s)

Staff's understanding is that the Planning Commission will act as the steering committee for the update, so the project scope will include work sessions with the Planning Commission.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Planning Commission review the comments above, discuss an approach to updating the comprehensive plan, and provide guidance on how staff should proceed with developing the scope for the project.

Planning Commission

8) a)

Meeting Date: 05/11/2021

SUBJECT: Minutes BOA 3-9-2021

DEPARTMENT: Planning & Zoning

TITLE:

Minutes BOA 3-9-2021

PURPOSE:

Attachments

Minutes BOA 3-9-2021

DRAFT

WABASHA BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

March 9, 2021 5:30 PM

MEETING MINUTES

Commission Members:

Scott Durand
Ozzie Goodman
Kris Kruse

Sara Carrels
Sharon Burke

Present: Scott Durand; Sharon Burke; Kris Kruse; Sara Carrels; Ozzy Goodman

Also Present: Harry Davis, Contracted City Planner; Wendy Busch, City Clerk

- 1) Call to Order
The Board of Adjustment meeting was called to order by Chair Durand at 5:30 p.m. The meeting was conducted via video conference. Board Member Burke joined the meeting at 5:35 p.m.
- 2) Changes or Additions to Agenda
There were no changes or additions to the agenda.
- 3) Public Comment
There was no public comment relating to items not listed on the agenda.
- 4) Public Hearings
 - a) Variance to Front Setback for an Accessory Structure at 227 Coffee Mill Drive
City Planner Davis provided background information relating to a request for a 5-foot variance to the front setback for a detached 3-car garage. He noted that the property under discussion, located at 227 Coffee Mill Drive, is zoned R-2. He described the area and stated that the applicant is requesting the variance due to an approximately 10 percent slope in the area of the proposed garage. He stated the applicant's position that building the garage closer to the property line would allow the applicant to avoid the higher costs of fill and foundation work associated with building the structure farther back and may negate some of the water diversion requirements.

City Planner Davis reviewed the practical difficulty factors that would be required to be met in order to grant a variance:

- 1) Reasonableness.

- 2) Uniqueness.
- 3) Essential character.

City Planner Davis summarized information that was included in the variance request.

City Planner Davis reviewed the public notification procedures and reported that no public comments were received prior to the Board of Adjustment meeting.

City Planner Davis reviewed the process of determining practical difficulty, as distinguished from mere inconvenience. He reviewed the findings as documented in the staff report, which indicate that staff does not feel there is a determination of practical difficulty in this situation. He noted that the applicant is using an aesthetic and cost-based or economic reasoning in their argument, the combination of which does not demonstrate substantial practical difficulty. He noted that the topography of the property does not appear to meet the standard of uniqueness that would require a variance in terms of placement of the structure within the front setback. He clarified that economic considerations alone cannot constitute practical difficulty. He stated that the proposed accessory structure does not appear to alter the essential character of the neighborhood and would not be a detriment to adjacent properties or the public. He noted that if the Board of Adjustment grants the variance, a condition of approval relating to the time frame could be included.

City Planner Davis summarized the findings listed in the staff report, noting that staff does not recommend approval of the variance request, citing that practical difficulty has not been demonstrated by the applicant. He referenced other supporting information that was included in the staff report.

Clarification of the findings as listed in the staff report was requested, and City Planner Davis provided additional information in this regard. The topography of the area was discussed. The applicant pointed out the proposed location of the detached garage using his camera feature. The visibility of the foundation was discussed.

City Planner Davis reviewed the property, the contour lines, and the proposed location of the garage on a map. Water diversion and the aesthetic appearance of the garage structure were discussed.

Chair Durand opened the public hearing at 5:56 p.m. Board of Adjustment members introduced themselves. The applicant, Jim Perry, introduced himself and provided additional background information and rationale for the variance request. He referenced the aesthetic value of the proposed location of the garage in relation to the existing house, noting that the front of the garage would still be 43 feet back from the pavement. He relayed comments he has received from neighbors in support of the proposed variance. He stated that the proposed structure would enhance the value of the property and the neighborhood. He requested that the Board of Adjustment work with him to resolve this issue. He described how the view from his home toward the golf course would be blocked if the garage is moved farther back.

No one else spoke during the public hearing. The public hearing was closed at 6:10 p.m.

Chair Durand summarized the discussion to this point and referenced the findings listed in the staff report. He suggested that the Board discuss logic or past precedent for potentially approving this type of variance. City Clerk Busch provided a past example, noting that there was no other place for the applicant in that case to construct the garage due to the steep grade of the property behind the home.

Board Member Burke provided the example of a past variance that was granted to add an additional floor to a condo development in the historic Downtown district. She suggested working with the homeowner to make the best use of this property. Board Members commented that the property under discussion is not in an area where the houses are in close proximity to each other. The location of the proposed garage was clarified. Concerns about setting a precedent were raised, noting that the variance request does not represent a true hardship. Chair Durand commented that the property is

unique in terms of it being a standalone residential property, with there being some hardship involved in the homeowner having to build a more complicated structure.

City Planner Davis cautioned against setting a precedent in terms of considering economic and aesthetic hardships as reasons to grant a Board of Adjustment variance, which could create legal challenges in the future. He recommended that a variance request pass all three parts of the practical difficulty test.

Mr. Perry commented that every variance request should be considered individually. He suggested considering the fact that none of the neighbors have expressed opposition to the proposed garage. He referenced the economic hardship and reasonableness factors.

It was suggested that the property owner provide more information to justify the practical difficulty. City Planner Davis detailed the variance application review process and the 60-day timeline. He stated that a decision could potentially be tabled in order to provide the applicant more time to provide information relating to the hardship or practical difficulty of constructing the garage farther back. Mr. Perry requested that the Board of Adjustment make a decision during the current meeting in order to begin construction in May. He summarized his reasoning for the variance request.

Chair Durand asked Board of Adjustment members to consider whether the challenge of the topography substantially meets the practical difficulty test in order to grant a 5-foot variance to the front setback for an accessory structure. City Planner Davis reiterated the three practical difficulty factors that need to be met in order to grant a variance. Board Member Burke suggested consulting the City Attorney regarding this issue.

Motion made by Kris Kruse, seconded by Sara Carrels to deny the variance request, due to the lack of practical difficulty. A roll call vote was conducted.

Vote: 3 - 2 Adopted

NAY: Ozzy Goodman
Sharon Burke

5) Adjourn

Motion made by Sara Carrels, to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 6:36 p.m.

Vote: 5 - 0 Adopted - Unanimously

Respectfully submitted by: _____
Wendy Busch, City Clerk

Adopted Date