

December 21, 2023

CITY OF WASHBURN PLAN COMMISSION MEETING

5:30PM Washburn City Hall

COMMISSION MEMBERS: David Anderson, Felix Kalinowski, Leo Ketchum- Fish, Mary Motiff, Nicholas Suminski

ABSENT: Michael Malcheski, Matt Simoneau

MUNICIPAL PERSONNEL: Scott Kluver-City Administrator, Tammy DeMars-Treasurer

Meeting called to order at 5:30 pm by Motiff, attendance as recorded above.

Approval of Minutes – November 16, 2023 Minutes – Motion by Anderson to approve the minutes of November 16, 2023, second by Suminski. Motion carried 5-0.

Public Hearing, Discussion & Recommendation on Zoning Map Amendment Request to Change the Zoning of Tax ID 32756 From R-2 Single Family Residential to R-6 Mixed Residential – Irene Blakely, 803 Third Avenue East, Petitioner Motion by Ketchum-Fist to open floor for public hearing, second by Anderson. Motion carried 5-0. No public comment. Motion by Ketchum-Fish to close the public hearing, second by Anderson. Motion carried 5-0. Discussion: this change is a very small portion, which would allow her entire property to be in the same zoning and allow her to better develop the property. Review of 7-5 (b) basis of decision; 1) Whether the amendment is consistent with the City’s Comprehensive plan, including future land use maps or similar maps. *Yes, it’s consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.* 2) whether the amendment is consistent with other planning documents adopted by the Common Council. *Not aware of any other planning documents.* 3) The extent to which the amendment will or will likely increase or decrease the number of nonconforming uses and structures. *Will not create any nonconforming structures and will allow future conforming development.* 4) Any other factor not specifically or generally listed but deemed appropriate by the Plan Commission or Common Council given this circumstance. *None.* Motion by Ketchum-Fish to recommend approval of Zoning Map Amendment to Change the Zoning of Tax ID to 32756 From R-2 Single Family Residential to R-6 Mixed Residential, seconded Suminski. Motion carried 5-0.

Discussion & Recommendation on Request to Vacate the Unopened Triton Avenue Between Grandview Blvd and Sunrise Ave.- Darren & Tera Miller 1404 Grandview Blvd, Petitioners – City Council has referred this to Plan Commission and asked the Commission to pay special attention of the Linear Park issue when reviewing this request. Kluver gives a brief history of what we know of the proposed Linear Park, in short, we are not sure when the idea of this purpose park came about but it was many years ago, possibly in the early 80’s. It is noted on the current and past comprehensive plans, but to the knowledge of the current staff for whatever reason there has never been any discussion or push to implement those plans. Kluver also pointed out that there would be two other possibilities the commission could consider that were discussed at City Council, if you decide to vacate you could require a recreational easement or move the trail. Darren Miller states he would like the road vacated so that he may put up a large garage and be able to meet setbacks. Neither he nor the neighbors he spoke with knew anything about Linear Park. People are currently using Highland Park Road for walking and biking; the road is already open and is ideal. Commission members discussed the fact that many of the streets in that area are vacated and this request is consistent with others. Anderson moves to recommend the vacation of Triton Avenue between Grandview Blvd and Sunrise Avenue adjacent to Lots 14 through 23 of Block 3 and Lots 1 through 10 of Block 6 of the DuPont Park Addition, second by Suminski. Discussion on utility easements and recommendations for Linear Park. Anderson amends motion to include that no utility easements need to be retained and the Linear Park should be re-routed to Highland Rd, Suminski 2nd amendment. Motion carried 5 to 0.

Suminski moves to recommend the Park Committee, look at recommendation to relocate Linear Park to Highland Road and have them update plan as they see fit, second by Ketchum-Fish. Motion carried 5 to 0.

Discussion & Action on Plan of Operation for A Dog Store and Site Plan Review for Work/Live Dwelling Unit, 30 E. Bayfield St. – David Sneed and Pamela Dahlheimer, Petitioner – Plan of Operation Review; The proposed project is to operate a general retail store, selling dog related items, as well as items for the dog owners such as clothing and gifts at 30 E. Bayfield Street. They would also like to have a Live/Work Dwelling Unit which is allowable use but does require site Plan Review. The Commission first reviewed the Plan of Operation using the guide lines outlined in 7-115 of the Zoning Code Basis of Decision: The Plan Commission must determine whether the project complies with all applicable standards as follows: 1) The nature of the land use with regard to the number of employees, nature, and extent of truck shipments to and from the site, hours of operation, use of hazardous substances, and other operational characteristics – *The Plan Commission determines that there are no known issues. There are no known hazardous substances or other uncommon operational characteristics.* 2) The nature and extent of anticipated positive and negative effects on properties in the area – *No known negative effects. Positive effect is additional business in town.* 3) Actions the applicant will undertake to mitigate the negative effects, if any, of the proposed land use – *No known negative effects.* 4) Any other factor that relates to the purposes of this chapter set forth in s. 1-5 or as allowed by state law – *None.* List of Conditions Imposed: *None.* Ketchum-Fish moves to approve the Plan of Operation for a Dog Store at 30 E. Bayfield, Street, second by Anderson. Motion carried 5 to 0. The Commission then reviewed the site plan for the Live/Work Dwelling Unit as outlined in section 7-75 of the zoning code Basis of Decision: Site Plan Standards: Effects of the project on traffic safety and efficiency and pedestrian circulation, both on-site and off-site - *Entrance is off Bayfield Street with on and off-street parking available.* 2) Effects of the project on the natural environment – *No known detrimental effects.* 3) Effects of the project on surrounding properties – *There is nothing out of the ordinary. Previously there were two businesses operating from this location, so traffic would not increase.* 4) Compliance with the site design principles enumerated in s. 8-163 – *No exterior modifications being made so project does not appear to be in conflict.* 5) Compliance with the design principles for parking lots enumerated in s. 17-3 – *This is in the Downtown Parking District, so there are no parking requirements, but the property does have off street parking and parking spaces in front of the building.* 6) Compliance with other applicable requirements contained in this chapter – *Dwelling unit door is separate from business entrance.* 7) Any other factor that relates to the purposes of this chapter set forth in s. 1-5 or as allowed by state law – *No other known factors.* 8) List of Conditions Imposed: *Deed restrictions required to be filed.* Moved by Suminski to approve the Site Plan for a Live/Work Dwelling Unit at 30 E. Bayfield St. with the condition a deed restriction must be filed, second by Anderson. Motion carried 5 to 0.

Discussion on Conceptual Ordinance to Modify Special Standards for Heavy Vehicle Sales and Service Use – At the October meeting, it was requested that a review of Zoning Ordinance 8-311 occur related to the 50 feet provision from a residential zoned property. As outlined in Kluver memo currently, the Heavy Vehicles Sales and Service use is allowed as a conditional use in the C-1, C-2, and I-1 districts. Nearly all the commercially zoned properties in the City are adjacent to residentially zoned properties. The rear yard setbacks for principal structures in the C-1, C-2, and C-3 districts are 10 feet, 25 feet and 8 feet respectively. Why the C-2, the middle commercial district, has a higher rear yard setback doesn’t seem logical. The Commission could recommend that the provision in 8-311 be reduced or eliminated. Motion by Anderson to change the C-2 Rear Yard Setback from 25’ to 10’ and amend section 8-311 requirement of a 50’ setback from a property in residential zoning district or a planned development district that allows residential uses to 30’. Motion carried 5 to 0.

Motiff adjourned the meeting at 6:42pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Tammy L. DeMars
Treasurer