

**MINUTES**  
**CITY OF LONSDALE**  
**REGULAR PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**NOVEMBER 19, 2009**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Gary Skluzacek, Jim Freid, Dave Dols, John Duban, and Joe Daleiden

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Harold Vosejka and Joe Kodada

**STAFF PRESENT:**

City Planner Benjamin Baker

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

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

**2. AGENDA**

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

A motion was made by Duban and seconded by Skluzacek to approve the agenda as presented. Vote for: Skluzacek, Freid, Dols, and Duban; Against: None. Vote: 4-0. Motion carried.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A motion was made by Duban and seconded by Fried to approve the minutes from the October 15, 2009 regular meeting. Vote for: Skluzacek, Freid, Dols, and Duban; Against: None. Vote: 4-0. Motion carried.

**4. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

**5. PUBLIC HEARING**

None

**6. OLD BUSINESS**

a. Review and Discuss "Original Industrial Park" Zoning Regulations

Baker said that at the October Planning Commission meeting, the Commission briefly discussed the Original Industrial Park area in regards to existing zoning regulations and non-conforming and unbuildable lot status. He said that over the last couple of years the

City has received several questions related to zoning regulations on vacant lots and the expansion to existing buildings within the Original Industrial Park area, the industrial area in between Delaware and Florida Street SE.

Baker provided a table showing existing zoning regulations and the non-conforming status of the Original Industrial Park. The Commission reviewed the existing regulations and non-conforming status of the Original Industrial Park lots. He also provided three other tables comparing the existing regulations to three proposed districts: the “I”, “I-1A”, and “I-2A”. The Commission reviewed and compared each of the proposed new districts and discussed the non-conforming percentage affects of each proposed lot/setback requirement.

Baker also detailed other relevant information pertaining to the Original Industrial Park area including average building sizes, building types, parking surfaces, uses, plat status, and vacant/un-built lots remaining. He asked the Planning Commission to consider the current status of the Original Industrial Park area and think about potential builders and existing property/building owners in terms of variances that would be needed to make a project go through. He also mentioned that financial agencies and property owners alike could benefit from amendments that would make their lots conforming or less non-conforming. The Commission reviewed the information and discussed the issue further. The discussion continued on to the next agenda item.

## **7. NEW BUSINESS**

### **a. Review and Discuss Creating a New Industrial Park**

Baker provided the Commission with the following maps to review: the Lonsdale Industrial Park Addition plat, building sizes map, uses map, lot area map, lot frontage map, lot depth map, and setbacks map. He also provided the Commission with the entire I-1 and I-2 sections to review. He said that at the October Planning Commission meeting, the Commission directed City staff to create a new district that would best represent the Original Industrial Park into one district. Baker presented a table showing a new “I – Industrial” district compared to the exiting I-1 and I-2 districts. The table showed proposed “I – Industrial” lot regulation and setback standards along with non-conforming percentages. Baker noted that 100 and 108 Florida Street SE are neighboring properties with the same owner, and that the two lots could be combined to make the lot(s) more conforming.

Duban and Dols agreed that one district similar to the proposed “I – Industrial” makes the most sense. Dols stated that the Original Industrial Park area should be rezoned into one industrial district. The Commission went through and discussed each proposed “I” regulations on the table. The Commission agreed on the following “I” regulations: lot area – 10,000 sq. ft., lot frontage/width – 70 ft., lot depth – 100 ft., lot coverage – 80%,

height – 40 ft., front yard setback – 25 ft., rear yard setback – 15 ft., and side yard setback – 15 ft.

Skluzacek posed the question: if the City did amend the zoning ordinance/map by approving a new industrial district based on the proposed “I” lot regulations and setbacks, would the applicants of V1.2009 (variance request for 120 Florida Street SE) be able to request their variance application fees be refunded because their lot/building would then be conforming. Dols said that the applicants were made aware that the Planning Commission was beginning discussions on the possibility of rezoning and amending the regulations for the Original Industrial Park area and they decided to proceed with a variance application. Skluzacek said that he doesn’t mind possibly changing the regulations for the Original Industrial Park area, but he questioned the whole timing. Dols explained that some requests and applications, such as Land Use Application V1.2009, draw attention to zoning issues that should get addressed and spur on appropriate review and action. Daleiden provided some examples and insight on past recommendations that the Planning Commission decided upon that were reversed by the Council for various reasons.

Freid mentioned that the new proposed “I – Industrial” regulations look good. The Commission agreed and directed City staff to create an entire “I- Industrial” section, based on the earlier established “I” lot regulations and setbacks, for review at their December meeting. Baker said that the basis for a new industrial district is to create less non-conforming lots/buildings and more realistic standards in the Original Industrial Park area. He said that the proposed new “I” zoning district will create more sensible restrictions and hopefully promote more businesses in that area of town. Baker asked the Commission to review the current I-1 and I-2 district uses and requirements for the next meeting.

The issue was tabled until the next meeting.

b. Discuss rezoning 900 Ash Street NE (Outlot B, Harvest Pond 2<sup>nd</sup> Addition) from B-3, Central Business to B-2, Highway & Business Service

Baker said that at their October meeting, the Planning Commission directed City staff to research the possibility of rezoning 900 Ash Street NE from B-3 to B-2. He provided the Commission with a comparison table showing the B-3 and B-2 district lot requirements and setbacks. He said that the owner of 900 Ash Street NE said he would be reviewing and comparing the pros and cons of each district over the next month and providing comments to the City. Baker also provided a table comparing the permitted uses in each district. The Commission reviewed and discussed each district’s setbacks and permitted uses. Freid stated that it was important to protect the surrounding neighbors from uses that are associated with night-time noise. Daleiden suggested that the B-2, Highway and Business Service District, is more appealing than the current B-3 standards and uses.

The issue was tabled until the next meeting.

**8. MISCELLANEOUS**

Skruzacek said that he stopped into City Hall earlier in the day to ask if the property owners of 120 Florida Street SE had obtained a permit because he did not see a permit posted on the site. Baker said that the property owners did pick up their permit in the afternoon and posted it on-site. Dols asked City staff to research if permits are needed for soil borings, soil samples, and minor excavation work. Skruzacek said that due to the questionable soil conditions in the Original Industrial Park area, the City should inform anyone constructing structures in that area to obtain soil borings or samples.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made by Freid and seconded by Duban to adjourn the meeting. Vote for: Skruzacek, Freid, Dols, and Duban; Against: None. Vote: 4-0. The meeting ended at 8:07 pm.

Respectfully Submitted:

---

Benjamin Baker, City Planner