

**MINUTES**  
**CITY OF LONSDALE**  
**REGULAR PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**MARCH 18, 2010**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Joe Kodada, Jim Freid, John Duban, Ben Sticha, and Harold Vosejпка

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Scott Pelava and Dave Dols

**STAFF PRESENT:**

City Planner Benjamin Baker

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Kodada called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm in the Council Chambers at 415 Central Street West.

**2. AGENDA**

Kodada asked if anyone had any additions or deletions to the agenda.

A motion was made by Duban and seconded by Vosejпка to approve the agenda as presented. Vote for: Freid, Kodada, Duban, Sticha, and Vosejпка; Against: None. Vote: 5-0. Motion carried.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A motion was made by Duban and seconded by Fried to approve the minutes from the February 18, 2010 regular meeting. Vote for: Freid, Kodada, Duban, Sticha, and Vosejпка; Against: None. Vote: 5-0. Motion carried.

**4. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

**5. PUBLIC HEARING**

None

**6. GENERAL BUSINESS**

a. Discuss Residential Side Yard Parking Pad Setbacks

Baker stated that the City periodically receives requests for residential side yard parking pads. He mentioned that due to different circumstances parking pads have been constructed at different setbacks all around town. He said that the City is looking to set a

consistent setback distance to guide future parking pad placement. He said that Lonsdale's Standard Plate shows that driveways shall be setback a minimum of 10 feet away from the property line. He said that other places in the City Code suggest that five feet may be the standard according to similar language stated in the parking section, accessory uses section, and encroachment section. Baker mentioned that drainage and utility easements are typically 5 feet – 20 feet wide, but older neighborhoods do not have platted drainage and utility easements. He asked the Planning Commission to discuss and suggest an appropriate side yard parking pad setback for residential properties. Baker provided the Commission with pictures of many different residential parking pads around town and examples showing platted drainage and utility easements.

Freid recommended that the City require a parking pad permit to give City staff the opportunity to review setback, outside storage, and drainage issues. Vosejпка and Kodada talked about possible drainage problems that could occur by allowing parking pads. Vosejпка stated that the City should consider not allowing smaller side yard setbacks when reviewing future subdivision plats. The Commission discussed vehicles and objects that typically get parked or storage on parking pads, along with different screening measures that could help hide unsightly objects from neighboring properties. Duban suggested that parking pads should stay away from property lines and outside of the easement area except in older neighborhoods where easements do not exist. Baker explained the current rules for fencing inside of an easement area and within five feet of the property line, and he asked the Commission if parking pads should follow the same process as fences. The Commission discussed the issue further, and they directed City staff to see what surrounding communities required in terms of parking pad setbacks and screening of side parking and storage areas.

b. Discuss Industrial Park Building Design Standards

Baker stated that Lonsdale has two industrial areas in town that are currently zoned as I-2, Medium Industrial, including the future industrial area at Garfield Avenue and Hwy 19. He said that discussions regarding a new business/industrial park have taken place over the last couple of years and that discussions continue to take place. He said that Mayor Rud is optimistic that the project could still happen yet this year if the right businesses and funding line up.

Baker mentioned that the City has been meeting with several interested businesses that have shown interest in locating in the proposed business/industrial park. He said that in those conversations both the businesses and the land owner/developer have mentioned that strict regulations such as building aesthetics and landscaping requirements can scare interested parties away. Baker mentioned that they suggest letting prospective businesses decide what type of building is right for them and their business needs. He reminded the Commission that the City also needs to consider the concerns of neighboring properties

such as Trondhjem Lutheran Church and residential home owners. He said that the City may need to push for some type of screening such as a berming, trees, or fencing.

The Commission briefly went outside behind City Hall to look at the five different types of commercial buildings located along 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue NW including tip-up concrete panel and steel sided buildings. The Commissioners all described their thoughts on what buildings looked better than the others and why. The Planning Commissioners agreed that thicker eaves and soffits with greater overhangs made the steel sided buildings look good. They also mentioned that natural earth-toned colors also looked nice. The Commission stated that some steel sided buildings can actually look better than concrete buildings. Some of the Commissioners stated that their main concern with steel sided buildings is their durability and appearance after 20 – 30 years.

The Planning Commission meeting reconvened back in the Council Chambers. Baker asked the Commissioners to continue discussing building design standards from both a business owners standpoint and a community/neighbor's viewpoint. The Commission discussed screening methods, outside storage, frontage requirements, loading area locations, building placement, and building aesthetics. They agreed that the best zoning classification for the proposed industrial area may be a PUD combined with some I-2 standards. They also agreed that each new business application within the new industrial park will need to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis through the site plan review process. Baker thanked the Commission for their comments.

c. Review & Discuss Chapter 152, Subdivision Ordinance

Baker provided the Commission with Lonsdale's current Subdivision Ordinance, subdivision ordinance information from the League of Minnesota Cities, and Minnesota State Statute 462.358, relating to subdivision regulations and dedication of land. The Commission briefly reviewed the ordinance and related topics. Duban noted language relating to school district boundaries on page 30 and residential sidewalks on page 33. Vosejka stated that the City should have required 2<sup>nd</sup> Street SW to go through into Harmony Meadows Second Addition. Freid mentioned that Rayann Acres could use a few more street lights. Vosejka stated that some cities such as Lake Havasu, Arizona are not requiring street lights so that they can see the night stars better. Some of the Commissioners mentioned that less street lights may help save on costs for the City. Freid stated that he likes street lights in his neighborhood. After briefly discussing some subdivision related items, the Commission decided to discuss the ordinance in more depth at their next meeting.

**MISCELLANEOUS**

None

**7. ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made by Freid and seconded by Sticha to adjourn the meeting. Vote for: Freid, Kodada, Duban, Sticha, and Vosejpka; Against: None. Vote: 5-0. Motion carried. The meeting ended at 8:00 pm.

Respectfully Submitted:

---

Benjamin Baker, City Planner