



CITY OF
GRAND RAPIDS
IT'S IN MINNESOTA'S NATURE

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Monday, October 18, 2021

4:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER: Pursuant to due notice and call thereof a Special Meeting of the Grand Rapids Planning Commission will be held on Monday, October 18, 2021 at 4:00 PM in City Hall Council Chambers, 420 North Pokegama Avenue, Grand Rapids, Minnesota.

CALL OF ROLL:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. Consider approval of the minutes of the September 2, 2021, 4:00 pm regular meeting.

Motion by Commissioner Goggin, second by Commissioner Hubbes to approve the minutes from the September 2, 2021 regular meeting. The following voted in favor thereof: Johnson, MacGregor, Goggin, Hubbes, Gothard. Opposed: None, passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

2. Conduct a public hearing to consider the preliminary plat of Hawkinson Commercial Development.

Commissioner Kachinske joined the meeting at 4:08 p.m.

Zoning Administrator Trast provided the background information.

A preliminary plat entitled “Hawkinson Commercial Development” was submitted by Hawkinson Construction Company, Inc., and developer Mark Hawkinson, Round 2 Development, and filed with the City on September 7, 2021. The property included within the preliminary plat is 22.28 acres in area and generally located south of Home Depot & Applebee’s, north of 29th Street SE (of which primary access to the lots will be gained), and also fronting on Hwy. 169 South.

The property, proposed for subdivision, is located within the GB (General Business) zoning district. A request for a Zoning Map Amendment, for any of the proposed lots, is not anticipated, or necessary, for the proposed uses at this time.

The plat petitioner has indicated that the six proposed lots will be developed as follows:

- Lot 1, Block 1: (1.14 acres) Future development undetermined at this time.

- Lot 2, Block 1: (3.02 acres) Convenience Store & Gas Station.
- Lot 3, Block 1: (1.46 acres) Car Wash
- Outlot A (9.75 acres) Future development undetermined at this time.
- Outlot C – east side of 2nd Ave. SE (2.23 acres) Future development undetermined at this time.
- Outlot B – east side of 2nd Ave. SE (2.10 acres) Stormwater retention pond, currently established, proposed to be enlarged.
- 29th Street SE right-of-way (north half) will be dedicated within the subject plat. The street was established through a perpetual easement granted to the city in 2006.
- 2nd Avenue SE right-of-way will be dedicated within the subject plat. The avenue was established through a perpetual easement granted to the city in 2006.

The staff review committee, consisting of the Director of Public Works/City Engineer, Fire Chief, Grand Rapids PUC, Director of Parks and Recreation, and Community Development Department, has reviewed the preliminary plat for technical standards and found that it substantially complies with the City's subdivision requirements. However, there are a few comments identified by the review committee that should be addressed. Those items are as follows:

- PUC Electric Department- Commented that an existing electric line on the very SW corner of the platted property crosses into non-easement proposed piece of the property.
- Community Development Department- Commented that there is Lot Line Easement duplication from Lot 3, into the infrastructure/access easement.
- Public Works/Engineering Department-
 - o Some of the lots have a 10' drainage and utility easement around the perimeter, and others do not or only have it on some lot lines. Why not on all?
 - o The SE corner where the kiosk is located. I see the plat is adjusted for this. Is there an easement for the remaining piece? Who owns this?
- Staff determined this piece would be part of the 2nd Ave. SE R-O-W and not a very small remnant lot.
- The Subdivision Agreement, to be considered at the final plat approval, shall incorporate a parkland dedication fee, in lieu of dedication of land and in accordance with Section 30-266, as requested by the Parks and Recreation Department.

Chair MacGregor stated the public hearing scheduled was to consider the preliminary plat of Hawkinson Commercial Development. Recorder Groom noted all required notices, according to law, had been met and there was correspondence received by Mr. Gary Lillesve.

Motion by Commissioner Johnson, second by Commissioner Goggin to open the public hearing. The following voted in favor thereof: Gothard, Hubbes, Goggin, Kachinske, MacGregor, Johnson. Opposed: None, passed unanimously.

There was no public comment

Motion by Commissioner Kachinske, second by Commissioner Johnson to close the public hearing. The following voted in favor thereof: Johnson, MacGregor, Kachinske, Goggin, Hubbes, Gothard. Opposed: None, passed unanimously.

The Commissioners reviewed the considerations for the record.

1. Has there been a change in the development policies of the community?
No, this is in keeping with the comprehensive plan.
2. Was there a mistake in the original zoning ordinance?
No, there was no mistake.
3. Is the Zoning Ordinance up to date?
Yes, it is up to date.
4. Is the proposed subdivision compatible with adjacent land uses?
Yes, the surrounding area is retail.
5. Will the proposed subdivision cause undue traffic congestion?
No, traffic may increase but there will be a private drive to alleviate any congestion.
6. Will the proposed subdivision affect public utilities?
No, the utilities have been addressed by public utilities.
7. Will the proposed subdivision be detrimental to public health, morals, or general welfare? No, it will not.
8. Will the proposed subdivision impede orderly development of other property in the area?
No, it may enhance orderly development.
9. Will the proposed subdivision cause a decrease in value of adjacent property?
No, the new development may increase the value of adjacent property.
10. Will the proposed subdivision increase tax revenues?
Yes, the new development will increase tax revenues.
11. Will the proposed subdivision impose an excessive burden on parks and other public facilities? No, it will not.

12. Is the proposed subdivision consistent with the Comprehensive Plan?

Yes, it is.

Motion by Commissioner Gothard, second by Commissioner Goggin 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 preliminary plat of Hawkinson Commercial Development; (Contingent upon the applicant making the following corrections/clarifications):

- Those changes suggested by the Review Committee

The following voted in favor thereof: Gothard, Hubbes, Goggin, MacGregor, Kachinske, Johnson. Opposed: None, passed unanimously.

GENERAL BUSINESS:

3. Consider a recommendation to the City Council regarding the rezoning of 8.68 acres of land from R-1 (One-Family Residential) to R-4 (Multiple-family Residential- high density).

The St. Joseph's Catholic Church filed an application for a Zoning Map Amendment with the City on September 7, 2021. The application requests the City's consideration of the rezoning of the following described properties from their current R-1 (One-Family Residential) designation to that of R-4 (Multiple-family Residential- high density).

The petition submitted by the Church involves 8.68 acres of land (four outlots, platted in 2010), and is generally located west of the St. Joseph's Catholic Church and School site: 315 SW 21st Street (see map #1). Additionally, map #1 illustrates the subject properties in relation to the existing zoning in the area: RR (Rural Residential) adjacent to the west and south, R-1 (One-Family Residential) to the north and east.

The Zoning Map Amendment, if approved and described by the petitioner in their application, and in addition to the extension of 21st Street SW and public infrastructure, west to Horseshoe Lake Road scheduled for 2022, would make the subject Outlots accessible for the development of various types of multi-family housing options.

The Commissioners reviewed the considerations for the record.

1. Will the change affect the character of neighborhoods?
Why/Why not? No, it will enhance the neighborhood.
2. Would the change foster economic growth in the community?
Why/Why not? Yes, it will allow for more housing development.
3. Would the proposed change be in keeping with the spirit and intent of the ordinance?
Why/Why not? Yes, it is orderly development.
4. Would the change be in the best interest of the general public?
Why/Why not? Yes, more housing is needed.

5. Would the change be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan?

Why/Why not? Yes, it is.

Motion by Commissioner Johnson, second by Commissioner Goggin 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 Zoning Map Amendment, as petitioned by St. Joseph's Catholic Church, described within the Staff Report and as shown in the maps presented here today, from the current R-1 (One-Family Residential) zoning designation to that of R-4 (Multiple-family Residential- high density);

The following voted in favor thereof: Gothard, Hubbes, Goggin, MacGregor, Kachinske, Johnson. Opposed: None, passed unanimously.

4. Consider a recommendation to the City Council regarding amendments to the Zoning Ordinance that would add the *Automotive/Recreational Vehicle (Repair/Service)* use, as a use permitted with restrictions, within the CBD (Central Business District) zoning district.

On October 6, 2021, Keith Still, d.b.a. Jack's Auto Service, submitted a petition requesting a text amendment to the Zoning Ordinance that would allow Automotive/Recreational Vehicle (repair/service), as a permitted use, within the CBD (Central Business District) zoning district.

As stated within his application, Mr. Still desires to add a 2,248 sq. ft., addition to his auto repair/service business located at 403 NW 3rd Avenue. The addition would accommodate two additional service bays, equipment and inventory storage space, office space, and employee breakroom. The project may ultimately add three employee's to the business.

The current auto repair/service business was originally established in the early 1960's at this location, having auto repair services, fueling stations, and car wash services over the years. The subject business/property is located within the CBD (Central Business District), and the existing use is not permitted within the CBD per Section 30-512 Table-1 Permitted Uses.

This use, along with two other long standing auto repair/service businesses in the CBD, is considered a grandfathered Class 1 nonconforming use (Those where the use of the building or land does not conform to the district use regulations of division 4 of this article) which is outlined in Section 30-458 Nonconforming uses of the Municipal Code. As such, the Class 1 nonconforming use may not be structurally altered or enlarged unless the resultant altered or enlarged building or use shall conform in terms of usage to the provisions of this article.

The Commissioners read their considerations for the record.

1. Will the change affect the character of neighborhoods?

Why/Why not? No, it will improve the existing property.

2. Would the change foster economic growth in the community?

Why/Why not? Yes, it could create additional jobs.

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

Why/Why not? Yes, it will foster orderly development.

4. Would the change be in the best interest of the general public?
Why/Why not? Yes, it will allow for development and growth.
5. Would the change be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan?
Why/Why not? Yes, it is.

Motion by Commissioner Kachinske, second by Commissioner Hubbes 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 the draft text amendment adding repair/service under the "Automotive/Recreational Vehicle" subheading, as a use permitted with restrictions within the CBD (Central Business District) zoning district: Section 30-512 Table-1 (Permitted Uses), and that the CBD zoning district is added to the established restriction within subpart (c) of Section 30-564 Uses with Restrictions

The following voted in favor thereof: Johnson, Kachinske, MacGregor, Goggin, Hubbes, Gothard. Opposed: None, passed unanimously.

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.

REPORTS/ANNOUNCEMENTS/UPDATES:

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 5:09 p.m.

NEXT REGULAR MEETING IS SCHEDULED FOR NOVEMBER 4, 2021 AT 4:00 PM.

Hearing Assistance Available: This facility is equipped with a ready assistance system.

ATTEST:

Aurimy Groom, Recorder

Eric Trast

From: Rob Mattei
Sent: Monday, October 18, 2021 8:45 AM
To: Eric Trast
Subject: Fwd: Hawkinson Development

Rob Mattei
Director of Community Development
City of Grand Rapids
Office: (218) 326-7622
Mobile: (218) 244-2924

Begin forwarded message:

From: Gary Lillesve <gary.lillesve@gmail.com>
Date: October 17, 2021 at 11:27:30 PM CDT
To: communitydev@cityofgrandrapidsmn.com, police@cityofgrandrapidsmn.com
Subject: Hawkinson Development

We have lived in our present location in the Don-Al Addition for the last forty years, and have seen the development of the south part of Grand Rapids grow in leaps and bounds. The traffic even now is very heavy, especially with the US 2 and Enbridge pipeline construction, but it will still be heavy when those two projects are completed.

Presently Pokegama avenue has a posted speed limit of 40 mph until just south of the entrance to our addition, but most of the traffic seems to not pay any attention to the posted limit. Even with the traffic signal at 29th Street, it is very difficult to enter Pokegama Avenue from our addition, and it will only get worse with the proposed Hawkinson development. I often walk to Super-One, Home Depot, and Walmart, and I never use the pedestrian crossing at the traffic light, as I have seen many vehicles running the red light on a daily basis. Is difficult to cross the street because

the traffic in general is speeding over the posted 40 mph limit. The traffic lights turning green to the stopped southbound traffic are like the lights at the beginning of a standing 1/4 mile time trial, often with two vehicles racing each other. More likely than not, the two vehicles are pickups with young males driving them and have little if any exhaust noise abatement on their vehicles.

I would like to have the city consider asking the state to extend the forty mph speed limit further south, and especially, start enforcing the speed limit. I don't think it would take too much police presence to get people to start slowing down. That would allow easier access for our addition onto Pokegama Avenue.

I am sure with this proposed new development, the traffic in our area will only get worse, exacerbating a bad situation. Please consider doing something before there are any injuries or deaths due to the expected changes.

My wife and I are definitely planning to attend the upcoming public hearing tomorrow.

Thank you,

Gary J. Lillesve
2904 SW 1st Avenue
Grand Rapids, MN
218-481-5614