

PROCEEDINGS OF THE ST. CLOUD PLANNING COMMISSION

A meeting of the St. Cloud Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, April 9, 2013, at 6 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers. Members present were Anderson, Andzenge, Ballantine, DeVine, Holtberg and Radaich. City Council representative Goerger was present.

Open Forum: No one was present to speak at the open forum.

Consent Agenda: Anderson moved to approve the consent agenda as follows:

Acceptance of staff reports for April 9, 2013 as part of the official record

Approval of minutes from the March 12, 2013 Planning Commission meeting

Approval of minutes from the March 14, 2013 Joint Planning Commission meeting

Approval of minutes from the March 14, 2013 Special Planning Commission meeting

The motion was seconded by DeVine and carried unanimously.

Dean Wick (Outsource Architecture)/Stanford Investment LLC Rezone to PUD: Matt Glaesman, Planning Director, explained a request to rezone the properties located at 1000 and 1010 9th Ave S from C2, Neighborhood Commercial District and R3A, General Residential and Lodging House District to Planned Unit Development (PUD). The request is related to the future of commercial use and continued investment on the site. The original site plan submitted attempted to maximize the off-street parking across the southern-most parcel to accommodate the existing building and also a possible expansion of the building. Staff raised concerns with the layout in terms of accessibility and the impact on the alley and adjacent street. The applicants submitted a number of other concepts to create a positive impact on the flow of the parking lot. The property owner has a long term vision for the property to reinvest in the building on the site. Staff is supportive of the idea that the property needs to expand, but there are a number of suggestions that are recommended. Holtberg asked if the applicant is in agreement with the conditions. Glaesman stated that the suggestions have been shared and, the applicant is present to address them.

Holtberg noted that a letter was received from Juliana Elchert (513 7th Ave S) stating her testimony in regards to the request. Holtberg opened the public hearing and invited testimony. The following persons testified:

- | | |
|---|--|
| Dean Wick
Outsource Architecture | He stated he was present to answer questions and to hear the concerns of the public. |
| Dori Anderson
1016 9 th Ave S | She lives to the south of the properties in question. She stated she is not in favor of filling the vacant lot with parking. She is not convinced of the need for the expansion of commercial zoning and would rather see a house on the lot. She believes that noise will be an issue. |
| Mary Hormann
1023 8 th Ave S | She stated that the current businesses afford vehicles to use the alley in the capacity of a road. She stated her concern for garbage in the neighborhood and the possibility of the space being used for people to congregate. The goal of the neighborhood is to bring back families. With the level of activity and noise caused by the businesses, the neighborhood may not be attractive to families. |
| Dori Anderson | She stated that her husband has made a number of comments regarding garbage on the vacant lot. The owners of the property have not done a good job at keeping the vacant lot attractive. |

There being no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed. Ballantine asked if noise is currently an issue. D. Anderson stated there are many vehicles that currently use the alley, and she is unsure if it will get worse. Anderson asked if there are plans to prevent vehicles from using the alley. Wick stated that the original plan consisted of 45° parking. The City asked for the plan to be redesigned to allow for traffic flow in both directions, which will allow vehicles to either exit through the alley or exit onto 9th Ave S. DeVine asked about the hours of operation for the business and the limitation to lighting. Glaesman stated there are no limitations to the business hours of operation, but the condition states that exterior lighting must be turned off from 11:00 p.m. until 6:00 a.m. Wick clarified that the businesses are open until 3:00 a.m. on some nights. DeVine commented that she understands the concerns of the neighbors. This project could be an improvement, and the new plan is much better than the original. She asked about the fence and if snow will still be a problem with the new fence. Wick stated he did not believe it would be a problem because there will be more room for snow storage than there is currently. DeVine expressed concern with the parking spaces on the north

side of the building. Glaesman stated that the issue of the University Drive access has not been resolved. Wick stated that it would be preferred to keep the University Drive access open and shift the 9th Ave S exit south as fuel trucks use each of these access points.

Glaesman noted that some details still need to be worked out, and staff would be comfortable going forward with the temporary parking plan with the understanding that items will be altered. Ballantine stated he is in support of the general cause; however, another concern would be the gathering of people after the bars close. Wick stated that there are cameras on site and shared with police on a regular basis. Holtberg asked if there has been discussion about closing off the alley to the parking lot. Glaesman stated there has been no discussion of closing the alley to the parking lot. Holtberg stated he is in favor of approving the temporary plan and that any change should come back for approval. Anderson commented that he is in general support of the long term plan, but there are some details that need to be worked out.

DeVine made a motion to approve the temporary plan, without expansion, subject to staff recommendations. Radaich seconded the motion to approve. Anderson stated that the motion is for a recommendation to City Council. If details are determined prior to the City Council hearing, it is possible for them to incorporate the long term plan. Holtberg called for a vote and the motion carried unanimously.

Amendment to Article 4, Section 4.2, D. Land Use Applications and Enforcement and Article 15, Section 15.5 Accessory Structures and Uses: Matt Glaesman, Planning Director, explained the request for two Land Development Code (LDC) amendments. The first request is to amend Article 4, Section 4.2, D. to include window well setbacks for potential administrative variances, and the second request is to amend Article 15, Section 15.5 to clarify the accessory structure requirements of the LDC. One change is to allow parcels over 20,000 sq. ft. to have 2,500 sq. ft. of accessory structure. Additionally, a 120 sq. ft. standard has been developed to address the issue of design. Structures less than 120 sq. ft. will be held to a lesser standard. Structures greater than 120 sq. ft. will be required to match in color while using materials that are similar to those used

