

# **City of Cottage Grove Planning Commission April 23, 2007**

Pursuant to due call and notice thereof, a regular meeting of the Planning Commission was duly held at City Hall, 7516 – 80th Street South, Cottage Grove, Minnesota on the 23rd day of April 2007, in the Council Chambers and telecast on local Government Cable Channel 16.

## **Call to Order**

Chairperson Thiede called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

## **Roll Call**

Members Present: Shane Bauer, Ken Brittain, Tina Folch-Freiermuth, Tracy Poncin,  
David Thiede

Members Absent: Chris Reese (unexcused)

Staff Present: Howard Blin, Community Development Director  
John McCool, Senior Planner  
Mark Grossklaus, City Council

## **Approval of Agenda**

*Motion by Brittain, second by Bauer, to approve the agenda with the amendment.  
Motion approved unanimously (5-0 vote).*

## **Open Forum**

Chairperson Thiede asked if anyone wished to address the Planning Commission on any non-agenda item. No one addressed the Commission.

## **Chair's Explanation of the Public Hearing Process**

Chairperson Thiede explained the purpose of the Planning Commission, which serves in an advisory capacity to the City Council, and that the City Council makes all final decisions. In addition, he explained the process of conducting a public hearing and requested that any person wishing to speak should come to the microphone and state their full name and address for the public record.

## **Public Hearings and Application Reviews**

### **6.1 Geneva Avenue Rezoning – Case ZA07-024**

**The City of Cottage Grove has applied for a zoning amendment to change the zoning for a parcel of land at 8701 Geneva Avenue South from I-1, Limited Industry, to R-1, Rural Residential, to match the land use plan designation of Rural Residential. (Public Hearing)**

Blin summarized the planning staff report and recommended approval based on the findings of fact listed in the staff report.

Brittain asked if that parcel would be the only one rezoned. Blin responded yes. He explained that remaining property that is zoned I-1 but is guided rural residential could be rezoned when the comp plan update process is complete to bring the property into conformance. He stated that the Cognettas, owners of the subject property, are in favor of having their property rezoned but the pipeline company may not be.

***Thiede opened the public hearing.***

Marvin DeJear, Minnesota Pipeline Company, P.O. Box 67, Cottage Grove, 6483 – 85th Street South, stated that while they don't oppose granting the rezoning, they are concerned that the city may look at the possibility of rezoning the pipeline property in the future. He explained that the property provides a buffer and they utilize the land for pipeline maintenance projects such as hydro-tests where they flush the pipes with water and then need to treat and dispose of 700,000 to 800,000 gallons of water. He asked if they could work with the city prior to any rezoning consideration for their property.

Brittain asked where the pipeline property was located. McCool pointed out on the location map which parcels are owned by Minnesota Pipeline, noting that their property surrounds the property that is the subject of the rezoning.

Poncin asked if there are plans to change the use of the land. DeJear stated that he is not aware of any changes planned for the property.

Thiede asked if the water was being disposed of properly or should it go the water treatment plant. DeJear responded that they treat the water prior to disposing of it, explaining that they work with the various permitting agencies. He believes that the Cognettas do not have any issues with the current practices on the pipeline property.

Christopher Cognetta, 8701 Geneva Avenue, stated that they want to put an addition on the house. During his research he found the property was zoned light industrial and therefore the residential use was nonconforming so they could not expand the house. He stated that they like having the vacant land around their property.

***No one else spoke. Thiede closed the public hearing.***

Bauer stated asked which takes precedence, the zoning or the land use. Blin responded that the land use ultimately takes precedence.

***Brittain made a motion to approve the application, based on the findings of fact listed below. Folch seconded the motion.***

***A. The zoning is required by state statute to match the approved land use designation.***

***B. The Geneva Avenue road surface and right-of-way are insufficiently designed to accommodate industrial development.***

***C. The site is outside of the Metropolitan Urban Service Area (MUSA) and is inadequately served by public utilities that would support industrial expansion.***

***D. The City has an existing central and contiguous large active industrial park where the future industrial growth areas are planned for the community.***

***Motion passed unanimously (5-to-0 vote).***

## **6.2 Commercial/Industrial Architectural Standards – Case TA07-012**

**The City of Cottage Grove has applied for a text amendment to revise the architectural standards for commercial and industrial developments. (Public Hearing)**

McCool summarized the staff report and recommended approval. He referenced information that he handed out prior to the meeting that broke down materials and costs. He asked for feedback from the Commission as to whether institutional buildings should be covered by this ordinance amendment.

Folch noted that under the General Requirements section, on line 39 of page 2, it states, “This section applies to all commercial, office, industrial, institution buildings, additions, exterior remodeling and accessory structures,…” McCool responded that including institutional buildings would specify the percentage of materials that needed to be used for those buildings. Blin stated that if a new city hall was built, it should conform to the same standards the city is requiring everyone else to. He also noted that the institutional category includes religious institutions and schools.

Bauer stated that a lot of religious buildings are located in residential areas and asked if do we want more commercial or industrial looking buildings in a residential setting and if we included them, would the variance process be used so they would not be required to use those materials. Blin responded yes. Bauer believes institutional buildings should be included in this ordinance as long as the variance process can be used if they are located in specialized areas.

Brittain also agreed that institutional buildings should be required to follow the same standards as other commercial and industrial buildings. Poncin agreed with Brittain.

Thiede asked if the Commission had any adjustments to the proposed ordinance. Brittain stated that he would be in favor of clarifying the language in the ordinance to include institutional uses as suggested in the staff report.

Blin asked for the Commission’s direction on allowing concrete brick material. The ordinance is written that only brick is classified as a Class I material. The concrete product is included in a lower class of material.

Brittain asked if the color would be impregnated throughout the brick or only on the surface. Blin responded that it should be integrally colored throughout the product but there are questions as to how long that color will remain. A brick does not change color or fade, but integrally colored concrete can fade. Brittain stated that more research is needed on the long-term effects of fading and maintenance, but he would be in favor including concrete brick in the list of Class I materials if it is found to be as durable as brick. McCool clarified that the proposed or-

dinance includes the requirement that the pigment has to be impregnated all the way through the material and does include gray brick.

Thiede asked if Brittain wanted to table the ordinance until there is a greater clarification on the concrete brick material. Brittain responded no to tabling the ordinance, but he would require institutional buildings to be subject to the proposed ordinance. Thiede asked if Brittain if he had a specific location in the ordinance and language regarding the addition of institutional buildings. Brittain responded that staff should be directed to find the most appropriate locations in the ordinance for the language on requiring institutional buildings to meet the architectural standards.

Bauer asked Brittain if he was suggesting leaving the concrete brick as a Class II material until further research is done on its durability, at which point it could become a Class 1 material. Brittain responded that was correct.

***Brittain made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed ordinance amendment revising the architectural standards for commercial and industrial developments with the inclusion of institutional buildings as directed in the staff report. Bauer seconded. Motion passed unanimously (5-to-0 vote).***

## **Discussion Items**

None.

## **Approval of Planning Commission Minutes of March 26, 2007**

***Being that there were no corrections or additions to the March 26, 2007, minutes, they were approved as sent.***

## **Reports**

### **9.1 Recap of April City Council Meetings**

Blin reviewed the items discussed by the City Council at their April 4 and April 18, 2007, meetings.

### **9.2 Response to Planning Commission Inquiries**

Blin stated that last month during the Open Forum, there were comments about real estate and for lease signs in commercial areas. Staff will present some options at next month's meeting for the Planning Commission to consider to better regulate those signs. He asked for direction from the Commission. Thiede suggested looking at possible time limits for what are considered temporary signs. He also noted that he has seen signs in residential areas that don't meet current ordinance requirements. Brittain stated that he would like to discourage the large plywood signs with a two-by-four base. He believes that owners of businesses should be able to advertise space for lease, but the signage should be aesthetically pleasing. Bauer would also like to see time limits for those types of signs and to address sign location.

### **9.3 Planning Commission Requests**

Brittain asked about the monument sign for the new liquor store by Target, noting that there is a lot of signage on the building itself; the gas station on 80th and Hadley has a wooden fence shielding their ground utilities on the rear of the building and he thought that all screening for utilities needed to be the same type of material as the building; Bonngard's Family Meat store has a plastic storage building between their dumpster and the building, which looks as though it is storing mechanical equipment of some kind; and the electronic lottery sign in the window at the Phillips 66 station at Almar Village.

### **9.4 Adoption of 2007 Planning Commission Rules**

Thiede asked if there had been any changes to the rules. Blin responded that they are identical to the rules adopted in 2006. Folch asked for clarification on attendance and resignation. She stated that the language is not clear regarding whether only unexcused absences would be counted against the Commissioner or if excused absences also counted. Blin responded that his understanding was that they were unexcused absences, but staff would clarify the language in the rules based on city ordinance requirements. It was the consensus of the Commission to postpone approval of the rules to the May meeting for clarification on the issue of attendance.

### **Adjournment**

***Bauer made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Brittain seconded. Motion passed unanimously and the meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.***