



**PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
ANOKA CITY HALL
Wednesday, July 6, 2016
7:00 P.M.**

AGENDA

1. Call to Order.

2. Approval of Minutes:

- a. Approval of June 7, 2016 Regular Meeting Minutes
- b. Approval of June 21, 2016 Work Session Meeting Minutes

3. New Business:

- a. None

4. Old Business:

- a. None

5. Public Hearings on Applications:

- a. A2016-14
Zoning Ordinance Amendment
Chapter 74, Article V, Division 1
Section 74-192 Planned Unit Developments
- b. A2016-15
Zoning Ordinance Amendment
Chapter 74, Article IX, Division 1
Section 74-492 Accessory Structure Administrative Site Plan Approval

6. Miscellaneous:

- a. Upcoming meetings:
Work Session - Tuesday, July 19 at 6:00 pm
Regular Meeting – Tuesday, August 2 at 7:00pm

7. Adjourn.



Auxiliary aids for handicapped persons are available upon request at least 96 hours in advance. Please call the City Manager's office at (763) 576-2710 to make arrangements.

NOT APPROVED
**ANOKA PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
ANOKA CITY HALL
TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 2016
7:00 P.M.**

CALL TO ORDER:

The regular meeting of the Anoka Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Planning Commissioners present: Chair Don Kjonaas, Peter Rech, Sandy Herrala, James Cook, Karna Brewer, and Borgie Bonthuis.

Planning Commissioners absent: Commissioner Manley Brahs.

Staff present: Associate Planner Darnell

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- a. Approval of May 3, 2016 Regular Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Brewer referred to page two of the minutes, end of the first paragraph, and stated the word “imperious” should read “impervious”.

MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER BONTHUIS, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BREWER, TO APPROVE THE AMENDED REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF MAY 3, 2016

6 ayes – 0 nays. Motion carried.

- b. Approval of May 17, 2016 Work Session Minutes

MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER BONTHUIS, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BREWER, TO APPROVE THE WORK SESSION MINUTES OF MAY 17, 2016

6 ayes – 0 nays. Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS:

None.

OLD BUSINESS:

None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON NEW APPLICATIONS:

a. A2016-10, Variance, 1423 Fourth Avenue

Associate Planner Darnell reported the applicant, Alan Untereker, is requesting a variance to allow for the construction of a new deck at 1423 Fourth Avenue that will result in a rear yard setback that is smaller than the minimum rear yard setback. The property is located in the R-1 Single Family Residential zoning district.

Associate Planner Darnell reported the minimum rear yard setback in the R-1 zoning district is 25 feet. Decks are allowed to encroach into a front or rear yard setback area by a distance of six feet, therefore any deck must be located at least 19 feet from a rear property line. The deck that is being proposed would be located only 15.5 feet from the rear property line.

Associate Planner Darnell reported the applicant had a deck on the property in a similar location, but it was removed because it was in poor condition. That deck was nonconforming, as it was located only 17.5 feet from the rear property line. The applicant would like to expand the size of the deck to create a more functional space, which is resulting in the variance request for the smaller rear yard setback. The lot dimensions are 116 feet wide and 83 feet deep. The previous deck setback from the rear property line was 17.5 feet and the proposed deck setback is 15.5 feet.

Associate Planner Darnell summarized the findings of practical difficulty. Staff concluded: 1) The deck that is being proposed would be considered a reasonable use of the property; 2) The unique size of the lot and the existing configuration of the home provides physical circumstances unique to the lot not created by the property owner and results in the need for a variance; and 3) The proposed new deck is not drastically different than the previous one and will not alter the essential character of the locality.

Associate Planner Darnell stated staff believes that the applicant's arguments could be considered to meet the criteria required to grant a variance based on the findings. There could also be an argument that a variance is not required because the applicant has the ability to reconstruct the deck in its previous location, based on the previous deck's nonconforming status.

Associate Planner Darnell stated staff believes that the unique size of the lot, specifically the lot depth that is much smaller than the normal depth required for a single family lot, creates a difficulty in the applicant meeting the rear yard setback requirements. If the Planning Commission agrees with the applicant's arguments as described above, the granting of the

variance would meet the criteria and would not cause any negative impacts on surrounding properties or the character of the locality.

Associate Planner Darnell advised if the Planning Commission does not agree with the applicant's arguments and recommends denial of the variance, a finding could be that the applicant has the ability to reconstruct a nonconforming structure and have a deck on the property without the need for a variance. However, if the Planning Commission recommends approval, staff recommends that approval be contingent on the following conditions:

1. The deck shall be constructed to be consistent with the plans submitted on April 18, 2016.
2. The deck shall be constructed to be setback 15.5 feet from the rear property line.
3. The applicant shall obtain a building permit prior to construction.

Commissioner Rech asked if there was a reason the lot on Third Avenue was twice as deep as it should have been. Associate Planner Darnell stated it was originally platted as two lots that were combined into one parcel. The lots slope down to a low point in that area as well. The proposed additional two feet on the new deck is not encroaching on a livable structure.

Chair Kjonaas asked if there was a variance granted for the first deck. Associate Planner Darnell stated he could not find anything on record. Chair Kjonaas stated it is then approximately a three-and-a-half-foot variance, not a two-foot variance.

Commissioner Rech asked if the deck will require a building permit. Associate Planner Darnell stated the applicant has already submitted a building permit, which is how this issue was discovered, and it is a condition of approval.

Chair Kjonaas opened the public hearing at 7:10 p.m.

Mr. Alan Untereker, 1423 Fourth Avenue, applicant, stated he is trying to make his deck a little bigger to do his gardening on it. He stated it will add value to his property and has letters from the surrounding neighbors in support of it.

Commissioner Bonthuis commented there was not a letter included from the person who resides behind him. Mr. Untereker stated the people who reside there do not own the home and there have been some issues with them in the past. Associate Planner Darnell confirmed the property is a rental property, he tried to reach out to the owner, but did not hear back from them.

Mr. Steve Setterberg, 324 Washington Street, neighbor, commented he agrees an extension on the deck is not going to negatively impact anyone living in that area. A new deck will be better and safer than the old deck.

Ms. Jill Untereker, 1423 Fourth Avenue South, stated due to their small lot size, the deck is what they use for a yard.

Chair Kjonaas closed the public hearing at 7:21 p.m.

Chair Kjonaas stated it makes sense to allow this deck to be built.

MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER BONTHUIS, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER HERRALA, TO APPROVE APPLICATION A2016-10, VARIANCE, 1423 FOURTH AVENUE, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. The deck shall be constructed to be consistent with the plans submitted on April 18, 2016.
2. The deck shall be constructed to be setback 15.5 feet from the rear property line.
3. The applicant shall obtain a building permit prior to construction.

6 ayes – 0 nays. Motion carried.

Associate Planner Darnell advised this will go before the City Council on June 20, 2016.

b. A2016-11, Preliminary Plat and Site Plan Review, Green Haven Parkway Addition/1 Vista Way

Associate Planner Darnell reported on the background of the application. The applicant, AD Center, LLC - property owner at 1 Vista Way, proposes to replat private and city-owned land that is located on the northeast corner of Thurston Avenue and Highway 10. The land that will be replatted encompasses the property that is addressed 1 Vista Way, one additional lot, and two surrounding outlots. The City of Anoka currently owns the two outlots that are included in the area that is being replatted. The name of the plat will be Green Haven Parkway Addition.

Associate Planner Darnell explained the purpose of the plat is to create a development parcel in the center of the existing property, and plat other areas as right-of-way and outlot to allow for the construction of Green Haven Parkway and required stormwater management infrastructure in the future.

Associate Planner Darnell stated the property owner has also submitted an application for site plan review to construct a 61,000 square foot building expansion on the north side of the existing office/warehouse building. The property is located in the M-2 General Industrial zoning district, and office and warehouse uses are both permitted in that zoning district.

Associate Planner Darnell reported on the preliminary plat analysis. The plat encompasses 24.11 acres and encompasses four existing properties. The properties within the plat are Torrens. Torrens properties are properties that have been registered with the county recorder. City code

requires every proposed subdivision to be submitted to the City in the form of a preliminary plat for Planning Commission and City Council approval. If the preliminary plat is approved, the applicant must submit a subsequent (or concurrent) final plat application for City Council review and approval.

Associate Planner Darnell reported the plat contains the lots described as follows:

Lot 1, Block 1:

Size: 19.22 acres

Existing Use: Warehouse/office building

Future Use: Continued use as warehouse/office building with a 61,000 square foot expansion

Outlot A:

Size: 1.97 acres

Existing Use: Vacant land owned by the applicant and the City of Anoka

Future Use: Will be used for shared stormwater management facilities to serve the future building expansion and the future construction of Green Haven Parkway

Right-of-Way:

Size: 2.92 acres

Existing Use: Vacant land owned by the applicant and the City of Anoka.

Future Use: Will be preserved for the future construction of Green Haven Parkway, which is the first phase of the Anoka Solution plans and is scheduled for construction in 2017

Associate Planner Darnell reported the preliminary plat contains four easements which are described as follows:

- 1) 10-foot drainage and utility easement along the west, south, and southeast property lines of Lot 1. These easement areas will remain as they were recorded on the previous plat for this area (Eniva Addition).
- 2) 25-foot drainage and utility easement along the north property lines of Lot 1. This easement follows the south and west side of the Green Haven Parkway right-of-way.
- 3) 10-foot drainage and utility easement along the east property line of Lot 1. This easement follows the west side of the Green Haven Parkway right-of-way.
- 4) 20-foot sanitary sewer easement through the center of Lot 1. This easement will remain as it was recorded in Document Numbers 52890 and 55052.

Associate Planner Darnell reported the Engineering Department has identified four other easements that should be identified on the final plat, which have all been included as conditions of approval. Those easements are as follows:

- 1) A 10-foot drainage and utility easement shall be identified on the final plat along the south lot line of Lot 1, which is measured as 257.24 feet.
- 2) Outlot A shall be covered by a drainage and utility easement.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

June 7, 2016

Page 6 of 13

- 3) The drainage and utility easement along the south and west side of the Green Haven Parkway right-of-way shall include sloping in the easement description on the preliminary plat.
- 4) A 20-foot drainage and utility easement shall be identified on the final plat to be centered over the existing public watermain along the west side of the parcel.

Associate Planner Darnell reported on the streets, access, and traffic associated with the application. The plat includes the dedication of right-of-way (ROW) to the City of Anoka to allow for the future construction of Green Haven Parkway. The access to the site currently is directly onto Thurston Avenue, as well as onto West Garfield Street on the east side of the property. Direct access will be maintained onto Thurston Avenue in the interim, with access being diverted to Green Haven Parkway once that roadway is constructed. The site will maintain access onto West Garfield Street.

Chair Kjonaas asked if there will be access to Thurston Avenue off Green Haven Parkway. Associate Planner Darnell replied Green Haven Parkway will extend and connect to Thurston Avenue.

Associate Planner Darnell reported on the site plan analysis. The proposed 61,000 square foot building addition is located on the north side of the existing building. The building addition will be a single story. The building addition will be 2' taller than the existing building, due to the grade sloping upwards on the northern portion of the site.

Associate Planner Darnell reported the exterior materials of the building addition will be precast concrete units with surfaces that have been treated with stone to provide for a decorative texture. The exterior finish will not include a raked texture. Precast concrete units with applied decorative material are a permitted type of exterior wall finish in the M-2 General Industrial zoning district. The exterior materials of the building addition will be colored so as to best match the existing building.

Associate Planner Darnell reported on the zoning requirements. The proposed building will become a corner lot with the construction of Green Haven Parkway. It will have a front yard setback of 40 feet and side yard setback of 226 feet, both meeting the minimum requirement for an M-2 General Industrial zoning district. The property will have two front yards on the north and west sides of the property, and two side yards on the east and south sides of the property. The maximum building height allowed by City Code is 50 feet, and the total height or the proposed building addition is 24 feet. The impervious surface coverage for the proposed building is 32.73% and is 76.29% for the proposed lot. These are both within the maximum allowable impervious surface coverage.

Associate Planner Darnell reported on access and circulation of the development. The access points on to Thurston Avenue will be maintained. Circulation through the site will be facilitated

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

June 7, 2016

Page 7 of 13

by a new access drive on the north side of the site, which will eventually connect to Green Haven Parkway. Truck traffic will use the north access drive to enter the property from Green Haven Parkway, and will enter a secure loading bay area on the east side of the building. Standard vehicles will enter and exit the property from West Garfield Street, as they do today, to access the main parking area that is located on the southeast portion of the site.

Associate Planner Darnell reported, in the future if the Thurston Avenue interchange is constructed at the intersection of Thurston Avenue and Highway 10, the access directly onto Thurston Avenue on the west side of the site may be severed. At this point in time, the applicant may construct a drive from the parking areas on the west side of the building to the new access drive on the north to provide access from the west side of the building onto Green Haven Parkway. This future drive is shown on the site plan and the applicant would be pre-approved to construct this drive in the future if necessary.

Associate Planner Darnell reported on parking requirements. Anoka City Code requires that office uses in the M-2 zoning district provide a minimum of one parking stall per 250 square feet of floor area. The office portion of the building is 57,855 sf. in size, which equates to a requirement of 231 parking spaces. Anoka City Code also requires that warehousing uses in the M-2 zoning district provide a minimum of one parking stall per 2,000 square feet of floor area. The warehousing portion of the building is 237,218 sf. in size, which equates to a requirement of 118 parking spaces.

Associate Planner Darnell stated in total, a minimum of 349 parking spaces are required on the site, including the building addition. The plans currently show 281 exterior parking spaces on the property. The site plan also identifies a bituminous area on the southeast portion of the site to be used for overflow trailer and car parking. A condition of approval a proof of parking area will be identified in the overflow area that could accommodate an additional 68 spaces if the City deems necessary.

Associate Planner Darnell reported on landscaping. All areas of the site around the building addition and parking areas that are not used for building or parking will be seeded to provide for green space, without providing irrigation. Landscaping exists around the south side of the building and around the entrances to the office portion of the building. These areas will be maintained, and the property owner plans to enhance these areas further as they are the most visible from Thurston Avenue and Highway 10.

Associate Planner Darnell reported lighting will be consistent with the performance standards in the M-2 zoning district. Any lighting used to illuminate the off-street parking area shall be arranged as to reflect the light away from any adjacent properties, streets, or highways.

Associate Planner Darnell reported the waste enclosure is not located on the exterior of the building, so will not be visible on the property. There is no open storage associated with the use

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

June 7, 2016

Page 8 of 13

of the property, other than the parking of trucks and trailers in the designated areas on the east side of the site.

Commissioner Brewer asked about the proposed stop light at the intersection of the new road and the road that goes to the college. Associate Planner Darnell explained the first phase of the City's plan is to construct Green Haven Parkway. If an interchange were to happen, Thurston Avenue would go over Highway 10 and at that time a stoplight would go in at the intersection of Greenhaven Parkway and Thurston. The roads would be realigned to line up with the stoplight.

Commissioner Rech advised there is a diagram of the proposed Anoka Solution on the City's website and it shows the entrance road for the college parking lot lining up with Green Haven Parkway.

Commissioner Brewer asked if there were any other options considered for cars entering the site so that they do not have to go through the area that is for trucks. Associate Planner Darnell stated the engineers designing Green Haven Parkway had concerns with having another access point in that location when there will be a stop light there in the future.

Commissioner Bonthuis asked about landscaping on the north side of the building. Associate Planner Darnell replied there is no landscaping proposed other than seeding. There will be some landscaping on the south side that is visible from Highway 10.

Chair Kjonaas asked how the new facility will affect an increase in traffic, employees, and number of trucks. Associate Planner Darnell stated it was reviewed by the engineer and they had no traffic concerns with the expansion.

Mr. Duane Lund, manager of AD Center, LLC, stated currently there are 180 employees. After the renovation, there will be an additional 100 employees at the site, but they operate in two shifts. There are currently 15 to 20 trucks going in and out each day and with the expansion, it will increase to approximately 30 trucks.

Commissioner Brewer expressed concern with trucks entering on to Thurston Avenue from the site, since it is across from the college. Mr. Lund stated the trucks currently turn right onto Thurston and can turn into the property into two different access point. When they exit, they turn left out of the property onto Thurston. Associate Planner Darnell stated the intersection will be completely reconstructed at the time the interchange is constructed. Until then it will be a stop sign with access on to Thurston Avenue.

Chair Kjonaas opened the public hearing at 7:45 p.m.

Chair Kjonaas closed the public hearing at 7:46 p.m.

Associate Planner Darnell summarized the conditions of approval of the preliminary plat for Green Haven Parkway Addition. The conditions are as follows:

- 1) The applicant shall complete the transfer of land with the City of Anoka, to be consistent with the lots and right-of-way as shown on the preliminary plat.
- 2) A 10-foot drainage and utility easement shall be identified on the final plat along the south lot line of Lot 1, which is measured as 257.24 feet.
- 3) Outlot A shall be covered by a drainage and utility easement.
- 4) The drainage and utility easement along the south west side of the Green Haven Parkway right-of-way shall include sloping in the easement description on the preliminary plat.
- 5) A 20-foot drainage and utility easement shall be identified on the final plat to be centered over the existing public watermain along the west side of the parcel.

Associate Planner Darnell summarized the conditions of approval for the site plan for 1 Vista Way. The conditions are as follows:

- 1) The completed site must be consistent with the site plan documents dated June 1, 2016 and all conditions stated herein.
- 2) The applicant shall obtain all necessary federal and state approvals and permits for the use of the site prior to construction.
- 3) The applicant shall obtain Lower Rum River Watershed Management Organization and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits, and the completed site improvements must be constructed to be consistent with any conditions of approval included on those permits.
- 4) All necessary building and sign permits shall be obtained.
- 5) The applicant must provide a performance guarantee in the amount of 1.25 times the estimated cost of grading, parking lot improvements, landscaping and other exterior or public improvements, as authorized by Anoka City Code, Chapter 74, Article II, Section 74-38(e).
- 6) The developer must submit an as-built survey of the property to the City of Anoka Engineering Department upon completion of the project.
- 7) The applicant, AD Center, LLC, shall enter into a development agreement with the City of Anoka prior to construction. The development agreement should identify staging considerations between the development work to be completed as shown in the site plan and the City road project to be constructed in 2017.
- 8) The applicant, AD Center, LLC, shall construct a stormwater pond located in Outlot A to account for the stormwater needs for the development site and Green Haven Parkway.
- 9) Any future city-owned infrastructure to be constructed in the Green Haven Parkway right-of-way must meet current city standards.
- 10) All private utilities and infrastructure, including but not limited to the existing loop road, pump house, concrete around pump house, and light poles, shall be removed from the Green Haven Parkway right-of-way and Outlot A.
- 11) The applicant, AD Center, LLC, shall submit a schedule for the use of the future drive, and if desired, the drive will need to be used temporarily to provide truck access from

Thurston Avenue to the truck parking area before and during the construction of Green Haven Parkway in 2017.

- 12) All grading and site work shall be coordinated with the City of Anoka to ensure compatibility with the future construction of Green Haven Parkway in 2017.
- 13) The final design and location of the new private drive that will access Green Haven Parkway shall be reviewed and approved by the Engineering Department prior to construction.
- 14) The trailer parking area shown as Class V shall be upgraded to bituminous, concrete, or a similar surface as required by Anoka City Code, Chapter 74, Article V, Division 4, Section 74-257 (e)(4)(d).
- 15) ~~An additional 68 parking spaces shall be identified within the overflow trailer and car parking area to meet the minimum parking requirement of 349 spaces.~~ The applicant shall identify a proof of parking area in the overflow area that could accommodate an additional 68 parking spaces if the City deems it necessary.
- 16) Any new lighting ~~used to illuminate the off-street parking area~~ added to the site shall be arranged as to reflect the light away from any adjacent properties, streets, or highways. Lighting shall not exceed 0.5-foot candle at nonresidential property lines measured on a vertical plane.
- 17) In the future, allow for a curb cut access on the east side of the site, upon City approval.

Commissioner Brewer advised the owners that in the past, people tend to use their property as a cut through to avoid the traffic on Highway 10.

Chair Kjonaas commented he counted over 100 trailers parked on the lot. Mr. Lund explained there is a surplus of product that is stored in trailers at the site, which is the reason for the expansion. After the expansion, the outdoor storage will go away, and the trailers will no longer be there.

Commissioner Bonthuis asked how close the warehouse is to the parkway and if there was room to plant some trees. Associate Planner Darnell stated the landscape proposal the applicant submitted meets City requirements.

Mr. Lund asked if the City will put in trees along the walkway when they put in Green Haven Parkway next summer. Associate Planner Darnell stated it has not been designed yet, but generally some trees are included.

Commissioner Brewer suggested in lieu of having trees planted be a condition of approval, create an understanding that shows in the future as parkway is completed, the applicant will cooperate with the City in beautifying the area.

Commissioner Rech asked if trucks will be allowed to turn right out on to Green Haven Parkway or will there be weight restrictions. Associate Planner Darnell stated he will discuss it with the Engineering Department.

Chair Kjonaas stated a parkway is not intended for large trucks and faster traffic. Mr. Lund stated it is not their intent to turn right and drive through a neighborhood to avoid traffic on Highway 10.

MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER COOK, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BREWER, TO APPROVE APPLICATION A2016-11, PRELIMINARY PLAT, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1) The applicant shall complete the transfer of land with the City of Anoka, to be consistent with the lots and right-of-way as shown on the preliminary plat.
- 2) A 10-foot drainage and utility easement shall be identified on the final plat along the south lot line of Lot 1, which is measured as 257.24 feet.
- 3) Outlot A shall be covered by a drainage and utility easement.
- 4) The drainage and utility easement along the south west side of the Green Haven Parkway right-of-way shall include sloping in the easement description on the preliminary plat.
- 5) A 20-foot drainage and utility easement shall be identified on the final plat to be centered over the existing public watermain along the west side of the parcel.

6 ayes – 0 nays. Motion carried.

MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER COOK, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER RECH, TO APPROVE APPLICATION A2016-11, SITE PLAN REVIEW, GREEN HAVEN PARKWAY ADDITION/1 VISTA WAY, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1) The completed site must be consistent with the site plan documents dated June 1, 2016 and all conditions stated herein.
- 2) The applicant shall obtain all necessary federal and state approvals and permits for the use of the site prior to construction.
- 3) The applicant shall obtain Lower Rum River Watershed Management Organization and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits, and the completed site improvements must be constructed to be consistent with any conditions of approval included on those permits.
- 4) All necessary building and sign permits shall be obtained.
- 5) The applicant must provide a performance guarantee in the amount of 1.25 times the estimated cost of grading, parking lot improvements, landscaping and other exterior or public improvements, as authorized by Anoka City Code, Chapter 74, Article II, Section 74-38(e).
- 6) The developer must submit an as-built survey of the property to the City of Anoka Engineering Department upon completion of the project.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

June 7, 2016

Page 12 of 13

- 7) The applicant, AD Center, LLC, shall enter into a development agreement with the City of Anoka prior to construction. The development agreement should identify staging considerations between the development work to be completed as shown in the site plan and the City road project to be constructed in 2017.
- 8) The applicant, AD Center, LLC, shall construct a stormwater pond located in Outlot A to account for the stormwater needs for the development site and Green Haven Parkway.
- 9) Any future city-owned infrastructure to be constructed in the Green Haven Parkway right-of-way must meet current city standards.
- 10) All private utilities and infrastructure, including but not limited to the existing loop road, pump house, concrete around pump house, and light poles, shall be removed from the Green Haven Parkway right-of-way and Outlot A.
- 11) The applicant, AD Center, LLC, shall submit a schedule for the use of the future drive, and if desired, the drive will need to be used temporarily to provide truck access from Thurston Avenue to the truck parking area before and during the construction of Green Haven Parkway in 2017.
- 12) All grading and site work shall be coordinated with the City of Anoka to ensure compatibility with the future construction of Green Haven Parkway in 2017.
- 13) The final design and location of the new private drive that will access Green Haven Parkway shall be reviewed and approved by the Engineering Department prior to construction.
- 14) The trailer parking area shown as Class V shall be upgraded to bituminous, concrete, or a similar surface as required by Anoka City Code, Chapter 74, Article V, Division 4, Section 74-257 (e)(4)(d).
- 15) ~~An additional 68 parking spaces shall be identified within the overflow trailer and car parking area to meet the minimum parking requirement of 349 spaces. The applicant shall identify a proof of parking area in the overflow area that could accommodate an additional 68 parking spaces if the City deems it necessary.~~
- 16) Any new lighting ~~used to illuminate the off-street parking area~~ added to the site shall be arranged as to reflect the light away from any adjacent properties, streets, or highways. Lighting shall not exceed 0.5-foot candle at nonresidential property lines measured on a vertical plane.
- 17) A curb cut for access from the east side of the property onto Green Haven Parkway will be allowed in the future, upon approval from the City.

6 ayes – 0 nays. Motion carried.

MISCELLANEOUS:

Next work session will be Tuesday, June 21, 2016 at 6:00 p.m.

Follow-up discussion on Home Occupation and Accessory Structures

Update on Walker Methodist Building

Next regular meeting will be Wednesday, July 6, 2016 at 7:00 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER BONTHUIS, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER COOK, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING.

6 ayes – 0 nays. Motion carried.

Time of adjournment: 8:06 p.m.

Submitted by Chuck Darnell, Associate Planner

DRAFT



**DRAFT MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION
ANOKA CITY HALL COMMITTEE ROOM
Tuesday, June 21, 2016
6:00 P.M.**

CALL TO ORDER:

The Work Session of the Anoka Planning Commission was called to order at 6:02 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioners present: Chair Don Kjonaas, Borgie Bonthuis, Manley Brahs, Sandy Herrala, Peter Rech, Karna Brewer and James Cook.

Commissioners absent: None.

Staff present: Chuck Darnell, Associate Planner, and Doug Borglund, Deputy Community Development Director.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

1. Discussion – Home Occupations in Accessory Structures

Associate Planner Darnell introduced the topic, reviewing the conversations that took place at the last Planning Commission work session when this topic was originally discussed. Associate Planner Darnell reminded the Commissioners of the various arguments that were made for and against allowing home occupations in accessory structures at the last meeting.

Chair Kjonaas stated that he had been the one that had requested that the item be postponed at the last meeting, as he had thought that the City should consider allowing some types of home occupations to occur in accessory structures. He stated that he had changed his mind, and no longer thinks they should be allowed. He stated that he had concerns about how the use of accessory structures for home occupations would impact surrounding properties.

Commissioners Bonthuis, Brahs, and Rech agreed with Chair Kjonaas, in that they thought that home occupations should not be allowed in accessory structures.

Commissioner Brewer stated that some home owners in her neighborhood provide services

for other neighbors, such as fixing cars and helping with other household improvements. She also stated that she would not want the City Code language to drive people to hide these types of activities.

Commissioner Rech stated that there is a difference between neighbors helping other neighbors with household and small improvements, and someone operating a business in their garage. Commissioner Rech also stated that an actual business would have much more activity, with someone spending much more time conducting the occupation and possibly having customers coming and going.

Commissioner Brewer stated that property owners that have hobbies should not be prevented from conducting them in their accessory structure.

Associate Planner Darnell stated that a home owner with a hobby, such as woodworking or automobile repair, would not be as intense of a use as an actual home occupation would be. A hobby would likely be conducted for small periods of time and would not include frequent deliveries of materials or customers.

Commissioner Cook stated that the City could request a tax identification number from any home owner that is suspected of operating an actual business in their accessory structure, and that the definition of business could be updated to include the tax identification number.

Commissioner Bonthuis stated that if home occupations were allowed in accessory structure, it could lead to home owners renting out garages for other people to conduct occupations in. Associate Planner Darnell stated that staff had encountered that issue in the past, and it would be difficult for staff to enforce those types of situations.

Commissioner Brewer suggested that the code state that home occupations be conducted primarily with the home, instead of stating that they be conducted entirely in the home. Associate Planner Darnell stated that this would also be difficult to enforce.

Chair Kjonaas stated that he didn't have a concern with a home owner's hobby and related activities occurring in a portion of a garage, but that including that language in the code would allow for home occupations to be conducted in an accessory structure and would create a difficult situation for staff to enforce.

Associate Planner Darnell proposed that the code language be changed to not allow home occupations in accessory structures, and the Commissioners directed staff to make proposed changes and bring them forward at a future regular Planning Commission meeting.

2. Update – Walker Plaza Gardens Landscaping

Associate Planner Darnell provided an overview of the Walker Methodist Plaza Gardens project and the construction activities that have occurred. Staff also shared some updated landscaping information that had been provided by the developer, which resulted in some minor changes to the original landscape plan.

Associate Planner Darnell explained that much of the originally proposed landscaping is being preserved, but some changes are being proposed due to the siting of infrastructure that was required for the building and to better utilize the site for patient activities. Also, the City Council, Housing and Redevelopment Authority, another private property owner, and Walker are all working together on a property swap that will result in Walker obtaining the parcel on the southwest corner of their site. This is causing some of the changes to the landscaping plan, as the developer wishes to better integrate this new parcel into the overall development and landscaping of the site.

Associate Planner Darnell shared an updated landscape plan that incorporated the new parcel that Walker will be obtaining, and explained the changes that have occurred or are being proposed to the landscaping on the north, east, and south sides of the building. Staff also explained that the developer is proposing to add 44 additional trees on the south side of the site, which will serve as screening to the adjacent residential properties to the south. 33 of these trees will be 10' coniferous trees, with 21 other coniferous trees ranging in height from 11' to 18'.

Commissioner Brewer stated that she was concerned about visibility and the changes that were proposed on the northeast corner of the site. Staff explained that some of those changes were necessary due to the fact that the alternate drive aisle, which was approved as an alternate to the original site plan, was constructed and impacted the northeast corner of the site. Staff also explained that the City will be putting in boulevard trees around that area as part of the street reconstruction.

Commissioner Bonthuis stated that the parking lot and drive aisles had changed, and therefore she had no concerns with the landscaping changing slightly. Commissioner Bonthuis also stated that the south side of the site will be much improved with the additional trees and lot being added to the site.

Chair Kjonaas stated that the changes that are being proposed make sense, and were necessitated by construction of the building. The changes that are being proposed are not based on financing, and actually the developer is adding a considerable amount of landscaping on the south side of the site to better screen the areas to the south.

Chair Kjonaas also stated that the developer had made some concessions and agreed to other landscaping items requested by the City. Associate Planner Darnell stated that the developer

had agreed to reduce plantings in some areas less so than they had original proposed, to add wildflowers to the natural seeded areas of the site for more variation, and to add planters in areas that will serve as patio space for residents.

The Commissioners discussed that the changes were minimal and the plans still met the original intent of the original landscape plan.

3. Update – Temporary Family Healthcare Dwellings Opt-Out Ordinance

Deputy Community Development Director Borglund introduced the topic and explained the law that created the regulation of temporary family health care dwellings. Staff explained that the state law allows landowners to place mobile residential dwellings on their property to serve as a temporary family health care dwelling up to 300 square feet in size with temporary utility service. People who may call this type of unit home on a temporary basis must be a mentally and/or physically impaired person requiring assistance with two or more instrumental activities of daily living signed by a physician, a physician assistant, or an advanced practice registered nurse licensed to practice in this state.

Staff stated that after consideration, staff will be recommending to the City Council to opt out of those regulations, which is allowed by state statute. Some reasons for the City of Anoka opting out are that there are small lots in the City of Anoka that would cause issues in trying to accommodate additional dwelling units, and that the regulations would be difficult for city staff to enforce.

Commissioner Cook asked for a clarification on the size that would be allowed. Staff stated that the temporary dwellings would be allowed to be up to 300 square feet in size.

Chair Kjonaas stated that he had concerns with allowing the temporary units because it could lead to requests for more permanent types of accessory dwelling units.

Commissioner Brahs asked whether other cities were opting out of the regulations. Deputy Community Development Director Borglund stated that he believes so, and that the League of Minnesota Cities actually prepared a model ordinance for cities to use to opt out.

Chair Kjonaas asked if the opt out would be permanent. Staff stated that it would be permanent.

Commissioner Cook stated that recreational vehicles would be allowed and could be parked in front yards or driveways and be exempt from certain elements of the local zoning regulations if the City did not opt out. Chair Kjonaas agreed that this would be a concern, especially due to the small lots in Anoka.

Commissioner Brewer asked whether people could live in recreational vehicles currently. Staff stated that code only allows for one dwelling unit per lot in the single family residential zoning district. Commissioner Rech stated that often times, a standard is in place to allow for temporary residency in a recreational vehicle to allow for visitors with recreational vehicles to stay for short periods of time. Staff stated that they would investigate this further.

Commissioner Cook stated that he was against these regulations and supported the opt out.

Commissioner Brewer asked what the other options would be for people requiring this type of housing. She also stated that she believed that there were other options that people could pursue, and that there may be a need for some type of temporary housing but the current regulations that have been created may not be the best solution.

Chair Kjonaas stated that if health issues arise with a family member, an accessory building would be a difficult place for them to stay and still allow for other family members to provide care. Commissioner Brewer agreed.

Chair Kjonaas asked the other Commissioners of the general consensus on this topic, and the Commissioners stated that they were supportive of the opt out. Chair Kjonaas directed to staff to include in the recommendation to the Council that the Planning Commission was supportive of staff's decision and recommendation.

Time of adjournment 6:55 p.m.
Submitted by: Chuck Darnell, Associate Planner

STAFF REPORT



Application A2016-14
Zoning Ordinance Amendment
Chapter 74, Article V, Division 1
Section 74-192 Planned Unit Developments

BACKGROUND

Over the past few months, the City has been considering drafting an ordinance amendment regarding the minimum size required for planned unit development districts. The current zoning ordinance requires that the minimum district area be not less than five acres. This intent of including this size requirement was likely to meet the purpose and intent of the planned unit developments and to take advantage of large-scale site planning. However, the five acre minimum size no longer accurately reflects the types of development and redevelopment sites that are available in the City of Anoka.

The Planning Commission discussed this item at the May 17, 2016 work session meeting, and recommended that staff bring forward proposed amendments to the zoning ordinance regarding the minimum size required for planned unit development districts.

It is important to understand the purpose and intent of a planned unit development, as defined by City Code, which is as follows:

1. To provide for various types and combinations of land uses that take advantage of large-scale site planning.
2. To allow diversification of land uses as they relate to each other in a physical and environmental arrangement, while insuring compliance with the provision of this Code.
3. To encourage and permit unified planning to achieve a compatible mixture and variety of land uses within the planned unit development district and with the existing and anticipated development in the surrounding area.
4. To promote economical and efficient land use, an improved level of amenities, appropriate and harmonious variety, creative design and sensitivity to the natural environment. Planned unit development districts may be established where tracts suitable in location, area, and character will be planned and developed on a unified basis. Suitability of tracts for the development proposed shall be determined with reference to the existing and prospective character of surrounding development.
5. The procedures established in this section are intended as a substitute for strict application of the underlying zoning district standards in recognition of the fact that traditional density, bulk, spacing and use regulations, may impose inappropriate and unduly rigid restrictions upon the development or redevelopment of parcels which lend

themselves to an individual, planned approach. In addition, a development plan should be designed to ensure that the following general goals will be achieved:

- a. The design of the proposed development promotes achievement of the stated purposes of the City community plan (comprehensive plan);
- b. The proposed development efficiently utilizes the available land while protecting and preserving the natural features;
- c. The proposed development provides for harmonious and coherent site and building design that creates a sense of place;
- d. The proposed development provides greater densities and variety in the type of environments available to City residents; and
- e. The proposed development provides transitions in land use in keeping with the character of adjacent land uses.

Based on the purpose and intent of the City's planned unit development districts, the size is only one of the factors that should be considered when evaluating the overall qualities of any proposed planned unit development.

As a community that is almost fully developed, much of the development and redevelopment that will occur in the City of Anoka will be at a scale smaller than five acres. The City has compiled marketing information for a number of city-owned and private sites currently available for development, and many of the development sites are much smaller than five acres. Of the 24 sites that are currently available for development, 18 are smaller than five acres and would not be eligible for a planned unit development.

Staff believes that the minimum district area could be reduced to better reflect the development opportunities that exist in the City of Anoka, and is proposing that the minimum district area be reduced to two acres in size. If the minimum size was reduced to two acres, 14 of the 24 development sites mentioned above would be eligible for a planned unit development district.

Staff is also proposing that the zoning ordinance allow for flexibility in allowing planned unit development districts at smaller sizes if certain criteria are met, such as demonstrating that a project of superior design can be achieved or that greater compliance with comprehensive plan goals and policies or adopted master plans can be attained through the creation of a planned unit development.

In summary, the development sites that would be eligible for a planned unit development currently and with the proposed reduction in minimum size are as follows:

Available Development Sites in Anoka	
Total Number of Sites	24
Number Smaller than 5 Acres	18 (75%)
Number Smaller than 2 Acres	10 (42%)
Sites Available for PUD Currently	6 (25%)
Sites Available for PUD if Size Reduced	14 (58%)

PROPOSED AMENDMENT

The proposed ordinance language is as follows:

(5) Minimum district area. ~~The minimum total district area shall be not less than five acres.~~ Planned unit development districts (PCD, PID, PRD, PTOD), which may consist of a parcel or contiguous parcels of land, shall be not less than two acres in size. Tracts of less than two acres may be approved only if the Applicant can demonstrate that a project of superior design can be achieved or that greater compliance with comprehensive plan goals and policies or adopted master plans can be attained through the creation of a PUD district.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that you review the proposed ordinance amendment, propose and discuss any additional changes, and recommend approval of the proposed ordinance amendment to the City Council.

COMMISSION ACTION

- The Commission may recommend approval of proposed ordinance as presented.
- The Commission may recommend approval of proposed ordinance with changes.
- The Commission may recommend denial of the proposed ordinance.
- The Commission may postpone the item in order to receive additional information.

Chuck Darnell
Associate Planner

CHAPTER 74. ZONING

ARTICLE V. District Regulations

DIVISION 1. Generally

Section 74-191. Uses and activities restricted to specific districts.

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this chapter:

- (a) *Charitable gaming.* Establishments on which charitable gambling licensed by the state pursuant to Minnesota Statutes Chapter 349 shall not be located only in a residential district.

Section 74-192. Planned unit developments.

- (a) *Application and short name.*
 - (1) *Application.* This section shall apply to planned unit development zoning districts.
 - (2) *Short name.* The term "planned unit development" may be referred to as PUD in this Code.
- (b) *Purpose and intent.* Planned unit development districts are designed to achieve the following purposes:
 - (1) To provide for various types and combinations of land uses that take advantage of large-scale site planning.
 - (2) To allow diversification of land uses as they relate to each other in a physical and environmental arrangement, while insuring compliance with the provision of this Code.
 - (3) To encourage and permit unified planning to achieve a compatible mixture and variety of land uses within the planned unit development district and with the existing and anticipated development in the surrounding area.
 - (4) To promote economical and efficient land use, an improved level of amenities, appropriate and harmonious variety, creative design and sensitivity to the natural environment. Planned unit development districts may be established where tracts suitable in location, area, and character will be planned and developed on a unified basis. Suitability of tracts for the development proposed shall be determined with reference to the existing and prospective character of surrounding development.
 - (5) The procedures established in this section are intended as a substitute for strict application of the underlying zoning district standards in recognition of the fact that traditional density, bulk, spacing and use regulations, may impose inappropriate and unduly rigid restrictions upon the development or redevelopment of parcels which lend themselves to an individual, planned approach. In addition, a

development plan should be designed to ensure that the following general goals will be achieved:

- a. The design of the proposed development promotes achievement of the stated purposes of the City community plan (comprehensive plan);
- b. The proposed development efficiently utilizes the available land while protecting and preserving the natural features;
- c. The proposed development provides for harmonious and coherent site and building design that creates a sense of place;
- d. The proposed development provides greater densities and variety in the type of environments available to City residents; and
- e. The proposed development provides transitions in land use in keeping with the character of adjacent land uses.

(c) *Definitions.* The following definitions shall apply to planned unit developments:

Density means the number of residential dwelling units per acre.

Dwelling unit means one or more rooms in a dwelling designed for occupancy by one family for living purposes and having its own permanently installed cooking and sanitary facilities.

Dwelling, attached (group, row or townhouse) means a dwelling joined to one or more other dwellings by a party wall or walls.

Dwelling, detached means a dwelling unit entirely surrounded by open space.

Integrated design means a harmonious selection of uses in groupings of buildings, services, parking areas, traffic and pedestrian circulation and open spaces, all planned and designed as an integrated unit.

Intensity means the extent of development considering such factors as land coverage by buildings, the number of stories, the floor area ratio, the bulk of the buildings, the proximity of buildings on a site in relation to each other, etc.

Planned commercial development (PCD) means a planned development to accommodate retail, service, commercial, or office uses, or a combination of such uses, and appurtenant common areas and accessory uses incidental to the predominant uses.

Planned development means an area of a minimum contiguous size, as specified by ordinance, to be planned, developed, operated, and maintained according to plan as a single entity and containing one or more structures with appurtenant common areas.

Planned industrial development (PID) means a planned development consisting of primarily of industrial uses, but may include retail service uses as well as recreational facilities to accommodate the work force.

Planned residential development (PRD) means a planned development containing one or more residential structures or planned unit residential clusters; appropriate commercial, public, or quasi-public uses may be included if such uses are primarily for the benefit of the residential development.

Planned transit-oriented development (PTOD) means a planned development containing one or more residential clusters and one or more areas of retail, service and office uses or industrial uses or a combination of such uses designed to accommodate area mass transit services and including appurtenant common areas and accessory uses incidental to the predominant uses.

Planned unit development (PUD) means an area of minimum contiguous size, as specified by ordinance, to be planned, developed, operated, and maintained as a single entity and containing one or more residential clusters or planned unit residential developments or one or more public, quasi-public, commercial, or industrial areas in such ranges or ratios of nonresidential uses to residential uses as specified in the ordinance.

Open space, common means land within or related to a development, not individually owned or dedicated for public use, that is designed and intended for the common use or enjoyment of the residents and their guests and may include such complementary structures and improvements as are necessary and appropriate.

Open space, private means common open space, the use of which is normally limited to the occupants of a single dwelling or building or property.

Open space, public means open space dedicated to the City and maintained by it for the use and enjoyment of the general public.

Original district means the zoning district from which land is proposed to be rezoned to a planned unit development.

Street, private means a street on the interior of a development which is jointly owned, constructed and maintained by the developer or homeowner's association, is designed and constructed in conformance with the specifications determined by the City engineer, and is not an essential part of the circulation plan of the City.

Street, public means a street which is dedicated to and maintained by the City.

Unified control means property in single ownership or under the management and supervision of a central authority, or otherwise subject to such long-term leases or other ownership controls as the Council deems necessary.

(d) *General regulations.*

- (1) *Effect of planned unit development district approval.* Approval of a planned unit development district shall constitute an amendment to the zoning ordinance and zoning map. PUD approval affecting lands within the Mississippi River Critical Area Corridor or the Rum River

Management District is contingent upon approval by the Department of Natural Resources in accordance with legal procedures. Designation of a property as one of the types of planned unit development districts in accordance with an approved development plan shall supersede all existing overlay districts such as the Mississippi River Critical Area Corridor, the Rum River management District, the Floodplain Management District, or the Shoreland Management District. Such property shall, for zoning purposes, be identified by the letters for the appropriate planned unit development district, followed by an identifying number.

- (2) *Departure from original zoning district regulations.* Except for lands within the Mississippi River Critical Area Corridor, the Rum River Management District, the Floodplain Management District, or a Shoreland Management District, the various zoning regulations and requirements (e.g. use, building setback, height, etc.) which may apply to the original zoning district may be considered as guidelines only and may be departed from in the approval of a planned unit development. More restrictive zoning regulations and requirements for the lands within the Mississippi River Critical Area Corridor, the Rum River Management District, the Floodplain Management District, or the Shoreland Management District shall apply, except as approved by the Department of Natural Resources.
- (3) *Design and unified control.* All planned unit developments shall include integrated design and shall be developed under unified control.
- (4) *Coordination with subdivision regulations.* Subdivision review of this Code shall be carried out simultaneously with review of a proposed planned unit development.
- (5) *Minimum district area.* ~~The minimum total district area shall be not less than five acres.~~ Planned unit development districts (PCD, PID, PRD, PTOD), which may consist of a parcel or contiguous parcels of land, shall be not less than two acres in size. Tracts of less than two acres may be approved only if the Applicant can demonstrate that a project of superior design can be achieved or that greater compliance with comprehensive plan goals and policies or adopted master plans can be attained through the creation of a PUD district.
- (6) *Uses and densities permitted.* The development plan shall specify, both for the project as a whole and/or for subareas within the project, those principal and accessory uses and development densities that are to be permitted. The City Council may include or exclude uses from the development plan or include uses with attached conditions as determined appropriate to achieve the intent of this section. In making the determination of the uses and development densities to be permitted within the planned unit development district, the Council shall consider the compatibility and relationship of uses within the project, the compatibility and relationship of permitted uses adjoining or in proximity to the planned unit development district, the appropriateness of permitted uses for the area in general and their overall impact on the community, and the consistency of the permitted uses with the City community plan and other adopted plans and policies.

STAFF REPORT



Application A2016-15
Zoning Ordinance Amendment
Chapter 74, Article IX, Division 1
Section 74-492 Accessory Structure Administrative Site Plan Approval

BACKGROUND

Recently, the Minnesota State Building Code was amended to allow for buildings of 200 square feet or less to be constructed without a building permit. Previously, buildings of 120 square feet or less did not require a building permit, and the City of Anoka had not previously reviewed or permitted buildings smaller than 120 square feet in size.

With the change in the State Building Code, the City can no longer require that a building permit be obtained for accessory buildings smaller than 200 square feet in size. Therefore, the City has no way to monitor the placement of these types of buildings for compliance with zoning code requirements. Proposed buildings larger than 120 square feet were previously reviewed by staff to ensure that they complied with height, setback, impervious surface coverage, and size/number of accessory structure requirements.

Staff has been discussing the addition of an accessory building review process to the City Code. This review process would be specifically for accessory structures less than 200 square feet, as any building larger than 200 square feet would require a building permit and would be reviewed by both planning staff and the building official. The Planning Commission discussed this item at the May 17, 2016 work session meeting, and recommended that staff bring forward proposed amendments to the zoning ordinance regarding a review and approval process for these types of accessory structures.

One option that had been discussed was to have an accessory structure permit requirement. This would require a permit to be pulled for the placement of any accessory structure less than 200 square feet in size. This permit would allow for staff to complete a zoning review to ensure that the placement of the accessory structure meets zoning requirements.

Upon further review, staff is proposing that the review and approval of these structures be completed in the same manner that an administrative site plan approval would be completed. This would not require an actual permit, but would require written approval by the zoning administrator. An applicant would be required to submit a site plan showing the proposed location of the accessory building, a narrative describing how the structure will be used, a signed statement by the applicant stating that they are aware that Anoka City Code prohibits residential occupancy and home occupations in accessory structures, and any other information requested by staff in order to review the application.

Staff is also proposing that the fee for requesting the accessory structure administrative approval be \$25, which is the same as the fee required to apply for a fence or sign permit. This lower cost

would not be burdensome for applicants and would be equivalent to the amount of staff time required to review and investigate any applications.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT

The proposed ordinance language is as follows:

Section 74-492. Accessory Structure Administrative Site Plan Approval Required.

- a) For the purpose of enforcing this Chapter, an accessory structure site plan approval shall be required of all persons intending to erect, alter, or move any building or structure that is otherwise exempt from needing a building permit under MN Statute 1300.0120, Subp. 4, A.(1) .
- b) The accessory structure site plan review shall be approved by the zoning administrator or their designee upon a written finding that the proposal meets the requirements of the applicable zoning district and is in compliance with the relevant ordinance standards.
- c) Administrative site plan approval shall be processed according to the procedures and criteria set forth in City Code Chapter 74, Section 74-38 (g).
- d) Application materials. The person seeking site plan approval must fill out and submit to the zoning administrator a completed application. The review fee shall be established by the City Council and recorded in the Anoka Fee Schedule. The applicant shall submit the following information as part of the application:
 - (1) A site plan showing the following information:
 - a. Location and dimensions of lot lines, buildings, driveways, off-street parking spaces, sidewalks, patios, or other forms of impervious lot coverage as determined by the zoning administrator.
 - b. Distances between buildings.
 - c. Front, side, and rear lot lines with dimensions.
 - d. Principal buildings and accessory buildings.
 - e. Location of any easements or underground utilities.
 - f. Other information deemed necessary to determine compliance with City Code.
 - (2) A narrative describing how the structure will be used.

(3) A signed statement by the applicant stating that they are aware that Anoka City Code prohibits residential occupancy and home occupations in accessory structures.

(4) Any other information requested by the zoning administrator in order to allow a reasonable review of the requested proposal.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that you review the proposed ordinance amendment, propose and discuss any additional changes, and recommend approval of the proposed ordinance amendment to the City Council.

COMMISSION ACTION

- The Commission may recommend approval of proposed ordinance as presented.
- The Commission may recommend approval of proposed ordinance with changes.
- The Commission may recommend denial of the proposed ordinance.
- The Commission may postpone the item in order to receive additional information.

Chuck Darnell
Associate Planner

Sections 74-492. Accessory Structure Administrative Site Plan Approval

- (a) For the purpose of enforcing this Chapter, an accessory structure site plan approval shall be required of all persons intending to erect, alter, or move any building or structure that is otherwise exempt from needing a building permit under MN Statute 1300.0120, Subp. 4, A.(1) .
- (b) The accessory structure site plan review shall be approved by the zoning administrator or their designee upon a written finding that the proposal meets the requirements of the applicable zoning district and is in compliance with the relevant ordinance standards.
- (c) Administrative site plan approval shall be processed according to the procedures and criteria set forth in City Code Chapter 74, Section 74-38 (g).
- (d) Application materials. The person seeking site plan approval must fill out and submit to the zoning administrator a completed application. The review fee shall be established by the City Council and recorded in the Anoka Fee Schedule. The applicant shall submit the following information as part of the application:
 - (1) A site plan showing the following information:
 - a. Location and dimensions of lot lines, buildings, driveways, off-street parking spaces, sidewalks, patios, or other forms of impervious lot coverage as determined by the zoning administrator.
 - b. Distances between buildings.
 - c. Front, side, and rear lot lines with dimensions.
 - d. Principal buildings and accessory buildings.
 - e. Location of any easements or underground utilities.
 - f. Other information deemed necessary to determine compliance with City Code.
 - (2) A narrative describing how the structure will be used.
 - (3) A signed statement by the applicant stating that they are aware that Anoka City Code prohibits residential occupancy and home occupations in accessory structures.
 - (4) Any other information requested by the zoning administrator in order to allow a reasonable review of the requested proposal.

Sections 74-493 - 74-505. Reserved.