

**CITY OF HANOVER  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
FEBRUARY 23, 2015 - OFFICIAL MINUTES**

**Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance**

Chair Kolasa called the February 23, 2015, Planning Commission Meeting to order at 7:00 pm. Members present were Chair Stan Kolasa, Jim Schendel, Reid Rabon, Michelle Armstrong, and Dean Kuitunen. Also present were City Council Liaison Doug Hammerseng, City Administrator Brian Hagen, City Planner Cindy Nash, and Administrative Assistant Amy Biren. Also present were members of the public Lynnae Karsten and John Ganfield.

**Oath of Office**

Dean Kuitunen took the oath of office swearing to uphold the duties of a Planning Commission member.

**Selection of Chair and Vice Chair**

**MOTION** by Jim Schendel to nominate Stan Kolasa as Planning Commission Chair, seconded by Michelle Armstrong. **Motion carried unanimously.**

**MOTION** by Reid Rabon to nominate Jim Schendel as Planning Commission Vice-Chair, seconded by Armstrong. **Motion carried unanimously.**

**Approval of Agenda**

**MOTION** by Armstrong to approve the agenda as presented, seconded by Schendel. **Motion carried unanimously.**

**Approval of Minutes from the October 27, 2014, Regular Meeting**

**MOTION** by Armstrong to approve the October 27, 2014, minutes as presented, seconded by Rabon. **Motion carried unanimously.**

**Citizen's Forum**

None

**Public Hearing**

**Ordinance 2015-01 Amendments to Chapter 10**

Kolasa closed the regular meeting and opened the Public Hearing at 7:03 pm. City Administrator Brian Hagen reviewed the ordinance sections open to amendment and clarified that agricultural accessory buildings do not need a permit, but that the City requests the owner give a written explanation of what the use of the building will be. Hagen continued with explaining the driveway ordinance and the minimum requirements for having two driveways. He stated that there had been discussion about whether or not the driveway should lead to a structure and whether it should lead to a door or if a parking pad would be acceptable.

Armstrong stated that she thought just having a parking pad would be an invitation to junk storage and sees it as a potential problem.

Dean Kuitunen asked how setbacks would figure in because a parking pad right next to the road would not be desirable. Hagen explained the setbacks and how setback requirements would prevent this.

Doug Hammerseng asked about the required distance between the two driveways if any. Hagen replied the closest distance between the two would be 10 feet. City Planner Cindy Nash also said that it would

need to be put into the ordinance carefully so that neighboring lots would not be affected. Nash mentioned the option of only allowing two driveways if a property owner had two frontages, i.e., a corner lot. Hagen said that having a minimum frontage size would allow this if a property owner did not have a corner lot.

Nash went on to say that if a circular driveway was desired, the ordinance would need to be worded to include an increased amount of space between the driveways rather than the 10 feet.

It was asked whether or not the second driveway could be gravel. Armstrong stated that the ordinance has the driveways need to match, but what was being match? Was it the existing driveway or the road? Hagen responded that this could be clarified with it stating it had to match the existing driveway.

Kolasa stated that he would like the second driveway to lead to a structure whether or not it goes into the structure. Hammerseng said that the ordinance language needed to define the size of the structure as not to allow the second driveway lead to a small shed.

Lynnae Karsten, a member of the audience, asked whether the definition of an accessory building have any bearing on the second driveway. Nash replied that it may be possible to use the definition of the accessory building as descriptor of where a second driveway leads.

Rabon inquired whether an agricultural building can go past the front of the house. Hagen replied that the agricultural buildings still have to follow the guidelines outlined in City code, but the owner does not have to file a permit with the City.

Armstrong stated that she would like to see the ordinance amendments fully written before sending it to the Council.

Rabon raised the issue about the distance between the two driveways in conjunction with the neighboring lot such as a distance of 100 feet between the neighbor's driveway and 150 feet between all three of the driveways.

Nash reviewed what the Planning Commission had discussed in order to write the ordinance amendment.

Schendel asked about how the amendment would affect owners that shared a driveway. Nash replied that she didn't know of many combination driveways in existence and knows that new ones are not platted. She seemed to think that a combination driveway would be able to follow the ordinance amendments just as a single driveway.

Karsten inquired about the driveways along County Road 19 and Hagen said those driveways have to follow county guidelines.

Kolasa closed the public hearing at 7:35 pm and reopened the regular meeting.

### **Unfinished Business**

None

### **New Business**

#### **Home Extended Business**

Hagen gave a brief history of the current situation with a possible home extended business in Hanover. John Ganfield would like to have a business which buys and sells boats. Ganfield would like to be a licensed dealer and the DNR requires a second physical address/mailbox be attached to the business on

the property. As the City creates addresses, the question was raised to Council. The Council felt that this was a Planning Commission matter. Staff made the recommendation that since an accessory building was involved and the current ordinance prohibited a business in one, the matter should be brought before the Planning Commission.

Nash stated that there would need to be an amendment to the current ordinance as it is currently not allowed (Section H: No accessory building may be used for operations, display of goods or storage of equipment or materials used in the Home Occupation.) and there have been issues in the past related to this. She did say that some home occupations that had been grandfathered in.

Hammerseng asked about Section K: Retail is not a permitted home occupation. Nash said that this a gray area and that the ordinance must be followed carefully.

When asked if a variance would be a solution, Nash replied that everyone needs to be treated equally without having conditions or exceptions to the rules. She also said that it would not be possible for the condition to pass the variance test and it would be more efficient to amend the ordinance.

Nash reviewed why the changes were made in the past recodification and what the previous requirements were for home occupation businesses, particularly the need for a permit.

Hagen asked if it is worth looking into regulating accessory buildings on certain lot sizes. Nash said that it would need to be looked at carefully as there have been issues in the past. She continued saying that it could turn into a situation where the accessory building becomes the principle structure on the property with the house becoming secondary. Also there are different building standards for an accessory building versus a storage building versus a building and that the original building may not be up to code for the current use.

Kuitunen said that it sounds like the current ordinance is protecting everyone right now.

**MOTION** by Schendel to table the topic, seconded by Armstrong. **Motion carried unanimously.**

### **Reports and Announcements**

#### **Planning Commission:**

None

#### **Liaison Report:**

Hammerseng asked when will the Planning Commission become part of the development discussion and asked Hagen to update the Planning Commission on what has been happening at Council Meetings.

#### **Staff Reports**

Hagen told the Planning Commission that he has been talking to developers that are “kicking tires” about developing areas in Hanover. There are three areas in Hanover and each needs to get the right developer. He will also be reaching out to the Rutgers to see how they want to market their plat since it is now recorded and official. Once there is an official development, then the Planning Commission will get involved.

Hagen and Nash talked about the Comprehensive Plan that was done in 2008 and that reviewing it and possibly changing it is one of the goals of the EDA for 2015. Extending water and sewer needs to be part of the plan as well, particularly when looking at areas that have been annexed.

The townhome lots in the Bridges at Hanover have all been sold. The developer would like to build a little larger home than what was approved in the past. Staff is looking into what was approved in the past and having Nash review it.

The final grant agreement for the Historic Bridge is signed. The next step is to bid the design and then have construction start early this summer.

Hagen updated the Planning Commission on the status of the Wright County Trail and indicated that the City and City Engineer were working with the contractor after the trail failed to pass State inspection. There is also a pending agreement for the Hennepin County trail after meeting with the groups involved. Plans are for construction to start this summer.

Schendel asked if there was anything happening with Dunnick's Pit and Hagen replied that this was another goal of the EDA to contact the property owner and see what the intended plans were to be.

Rabon asked about the Hanover Athletic Association and the 10-acre parcel. Hagen said that this was being revisited and that Council was deciding what would be the best use of the 10-acre parcel.

Hagen said that with his new position as City Administrator, the new Administrative Assistant, Amy Biren, would be attending the Planning Commission meetings. He plans to come to the March meeting along with Biren and then have her come alone in April.

Kolasa reminded everyone that the Harvest Festival German Dinner is Saturday, February 28<sup>th</sup>.

#### **Adjournment**

**MOTION** by Armstrong to adjourn at 8:27 pm, and seconded by Rabon. **Motion carried unanimously.**

#### **ATTEST:**

---

Amy L. Biren, Administrative Assistant