

**CITY OF HANOVER
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
MARCH 25, 2013 – OFFICIAL MINUTES**

Call to Order/ Pledge of Allegiance

Dawn Sprauangel called the March 25, 2013 Planning Commission Meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. Members present were Jim Schendel, Julie Smola, Dawn Sprauangel, Reid Rabon, Chris Zanetti, Liaison Doug Hammerseng, and Councilor Wendy Pinor. Also present were City Administrator Bob Derus, Administrative Intern Brian Hagen, and City Planner Cindy Nash. Guests present were Lynnae Karsten and Ed Sjolín.

Approval of Agenda

Administrator Derus asked if a discussion on building entitlements could be added under new business as item 6.a.

MOTION to approve amended agenda by Schendel, seconded by Zanetti. Motion carried unanimously.

Approval of Minutes

MOTION to approve the Minutes of February 11, 2013 Planning Commission as presented by Schendel, seconded by Smola. Motion carried unanimously.

Citizen's Forum:

Lynnae Karsten asked if she could give input to the Zoning Ordinance discussion. She was on the Planning Commission previously. Planning Commission members were OK with this because she had been on the Planning Commission when much of the proposed ordinance was drafted.

Public Hearings:

None

Unfinished Business:

Review Proposed New Zoning Ordinances

City Planner Nash explained that she has reviewed the City's Zoning Ordinances. She first explained the notion of brick or better on buildings within Hanover. She stated this is a good concept to reach because the city does have a cleaner look to it when the businesses have nice stone work facing the streets. However, she explained this notion of brick or better cannot happen quickly. She suggested to the Planning Commission that they revise the requirement of what materials are used on the exterior of buildings. Members stated they did not want to give up on what they have been working on for so many years. They want to have Hanover offer a nice area to establish a business and a home. City Planner Nash suggested that in order to get to the brick or better standard, they should consider taking small steps in order to get there. She stated a first step may be to change the requirements and include more commonly used materials, but still require a certain color scheme. Businesses would still be encouraged to use brick or better on their buildings. Administrator Derus explained it is better in the case of an existing business, to make incremental improvements, as opposed to having them decide to move out of the City.

City Planner Nash next discussed the parking requirements for businesses. She explained that currently businesses are required to offer parking in the rear of the buildings. In Hanover, especially with the river, rear parking is difficult to incorporate. Members thought this was already addressed in the past and felt they agreed to eliminate that requirement. City Planner Nash was advised to eliminate the discrepancies of the parking requirements. City Planner Nash also informed the Planning Commission that currently new businesses must hold a public hearing for their site plans on new construction. She stated this can slow down the process considerably. She stated that the zoning ordinances lay out specific requirements when building a structure or adding an addition, etc. City Planner Nash suggested that unless a variance is being applied for, then a public hearing should not have to be held as long as the site plan meets all requirements as laid out in the zoning ordinance. Members advised her to go ahead and eliminate the public hearing requirement. City Planner Nash also noticed that Hanover's Zoning Ordinance allows agricultural animals in any zone as long as there is a minimum of 3.5 acres. She stated this is best to only be allowed in the Residential Agriculture Zone. She was advised to change the ordinance.

Questions by the members were then asked of City Planner Nash. Member Sprauangel asked why the design guidelines were being omitted. City Planner Nash explained the design guidelines were specific, the omission

would allow the ordinances to be condensed and be more suggestive instead of specific. Discussions lead into Conditional Use, Special Use, and Interim Use Permits. Councilor Pinor stated the city should attempt to eliminate Conditional Use Permits that are no longer operational. She feels there are many permits that are transferred with the sale of the land that could be eliminated. Administrator Derus agreed with Councilor Pinor and explained that if the different boards for the city wanted staff to enforce these permits then it will be less time consuming if the permits were condensed. Councilor Hammerseng asked if it should be formalized to make conditions in new permits state that old permits be relinquished. City Planner Nash stated she can start adding them if the boards want her too.

There was a discussion about the minimum lot size in new residential developments with sewer and water. Currently, the ordinance requires a two and one half acre minimum lot size. However, the density can be increased to 1.6 units per acre; provided a developer dedicates up to ½ the property as open space. Administrator Derus and Planner Nash expressed the concern that this ordinance is not likely economically feasible. It led to a lengthy discussion. Planning Commissioners were generally uninterested in any revision due to the amount of time and money invested in the ordinance and because they believe it represents a vision of a city which is very different than others in the area.

New Business:

Building Entitlements

Interim Administrator Derus presented a memo in which he explained a deficiency due to the City's inability to definitively answer the question how many entitlement rights a given parcel has. He proposed the following policy changes and/or clarifications:

Staff is recommending the City adopt the following procedures for defining and tracking building entitlements:

1. It is assumed that every parcel of record has at least one building entitlement, as long as the site meets the minimum requirements for setbacks, septic systems, and other minimum site conditions and there is public access.
2. For parcels larger than 40 acres, there is a one parcel/40 acre rule, and the calculation is rounded to the nearest 40 acres; i.e. under 60 rounds to 40, translating to one entitlement. 60 acres and greater rounds to 80 (or two entitlements) until 100 acres and over which rounds to three... and so on.
3. The City will set up a data base to track the creation of lots and the underlying entitlements for every large parcel in the City.
4. When a new parcel is annexed into the city, the parcel is considered undeveloped for the purpose of this calculation regardless of the number of lots created while under the Township's jurisdiction.

The Planning Commission was not able to come to a consensus on the matter, so no action was taken.

Reports of Commission Members and Staff

None

Adjournment

MOTION to Adjourn by Schendel, seconded by Rabon. Motion carried unanimously. Adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

ATTEST:

Bob Derus, Interim City Administrator