

City of Winsted
Planning Commission
Winsted City Hall - Council Chambers
Monday, May 8, 2017
6:00 p.m.

Planning Commission Members Present: Mr. Marvin Ebensperger
Ms. JoLynn Cafferty
Mr. Max Fasching
Mr. Mike Guggemos
Ms. Allison Moses
Mr. Mike Henrich, City Council Liaison

Staff Present: Mr. Daniel Tienter, City Administrator
Mr. Anthony Hammes, Assistant to the City Administrator

Also Present: Mr. John Anderson, Municipal Development Group, LLC

1) Call the Meeting to Order

Mr. Marv Ebensperger, Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

2) Approval of Minutes – November 29, 2016

Ms. JoLynn Cafferty made a motion to approve the minutes of the Planning Commission Meeting on November 29, 2016. Mr. Mike Guggemos seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

3) No Public Hearings.

4) Old Business

a) Planning Commission Resolution PCR-17-03 – Site Plan Review for Tetra Pak Processing Equipment, Incorporated

Mr. Dan Tienter, City Administrator, stated that there are modifications to the existing site plan application for Tetra Pak, Incorporated. He stated that they were significant enough, that he and Mr. John Anderson, Municipal Development Group, LLC would like the Planning Commission to reevaluate the site plan.

Mr. Anderson stated that the applicant has submitted a revised site plan and related drawings for review of a parking lot expansion and truck turnaround area along with all of the necessary grading, paving, curb and gutter, storm water management, landscaping, lighting and any additional components. The applicant had previously submitted a different layout that had a condition in which that McLeod County approval was received in regards to the proposed access points to Kingsley Street, which is a County road. Since that time, Mr. Anderson stated the applicant has met with City and County staff to discuss the issue and this is the latest version of the plan.

Mr. Anderson stated that a new access point is being proposed on the south end of the west side of the property.

Mr. Anderson explained the Shoreland Overlay District. He stated that a portion of the property in question is located in the Shoreland Overlay District for Winsted Lake. Because of this, the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources is afforded the right to review the site plan. The original plans were sent to the DNR and their comments were in regards to the impervious surface coverage. It was stated that if Tetra Pak exceed the impervious surface coverage in the shoreland, area they would be required to get a variance. In this case, with both parcels, there is about twenty-three (23%) coverage. In this case they, did not have any problems with the proposal since it is bettering the overall situation with the existing parcel.

Mr. Anderson stated that there are still some comments that need to be addressed with the County. He added that because this property abuts a County road, McLeod County will need to approve any access

related issues. As part of the proposal, the applicant has requested a new access to the County road. Below are the comments received from John Brunkhorst, County Engineer, McLeod County, on May 3, 2017:

Dan, below is a summary where the County is at regarding Tetra Pak's request for additional access on CSAH 9.

1/25/17 – County responded with the following language to Tetra Pak via our electronic permit: Currently there are 3 entrances/access points onto the adjacent County Roads. The two that are on CR 9 are 70' and 50' wide. The one on CR 85 is 55' wide. All of these are wider than current standards. 3 entrances is more than reasonable access for Tetra Pak. We will allow a total of 2 entrances along County Road 9 to access Tetra Pak. Entrances shall be a maximum width of 70'.

3/31/17 – After an onsite meeting on 3/1/17 with Tetra Pak the County responded with the following language to Tetra Pak via the electronic permit: This proposed 50' entrance will be granted contingent upon closing the current south entrance on CR 9 with a barrier or gate system. The intent of existing entrance is to only use it for access for emergency services or very infrequent specialized trips or loads that need to use current overhead door. Please provide information and location on plans regarding the barrier/gate system.

To date I have not heard any further communication from Tetra Pak or any of their contractors/engineers.

Mr. Anderson stated a condition of approval will be to satisfy any McLeod County comments and a permit will be required to be issued by the County prior to any new accesses being constructed or work within the County right-of-way.

Mr. Anderson stated that comments were received from the City Engineer regarding the storm water ponding. He stated that there is a condition that all City Engineer comments will have to be satisfied in regards to the site plan.

Mr. Anderson stated that all of the lighting does meet the standards of the ordinance. Two (2) types of lighting are proposed: A single head light and a double head light. Three (3) single head lights are proposed on the outside of the parking and turnaround area and four (4) double head lights are proposed within the parking lot area. Mr. Anderson state that these light poles are proposed to be thirty (30) feet in height. The City Engineer shall review and approve the lighting plan.

Mr. Anderson stated that as part of the Site Plan Review, parking requirements will need to be satisfied. In this case we have an existing structure with existing off street parking that is already in place. The applicant is constructing new off-street parking in addition to what has already been approved, so the parking will only need to meet the design standards.

Mr. Anderson stated that at this time a loading dock is proposed on the south side of the building. This area is proposed to be separated from the parking area.

Mr. Anderson stated that a grading plan has been submitted. Any grading or drainage permits such as a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit that may be needed, shall be the responsibility of the applicant. Any site drainage and/or grading will need to be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer.

Mr. Anderson stated that any signs that are proposed will need to meet the requirements of section 1501.023 Signs of the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Anderson stated that there is a time limit condition which states that from the time the applicant receives site plan approval from the City Council, the applicant must be issued a building permit within twelve (12) months from the site plan approval date. Failure to do so will require the applicant to obtain a new site plan approval, with appropriate fees, to receive a building permit. He added that the applicant may apply for one (1) six-month extension before the expiration date. Application for an extension is an administrative process.

Mr. Anderson stated that the following conditions are recommended to be included if the Planning Commission recommends approval of the site plan review. These conditions may be subject to modification depending upon the outcome at the Planning Commission meeting:

1. **Minor Subdivision.** That the two (2) parcels are combined as part of the review. Approval of the Minor Subdivision can be done administratively.
2. **Exterior Lighting.** The exterior lighting plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer.
3. **Landscaping.** That the landscaping is installed according to the approved landscape plan.
4. **Stripping.** All off-street parking stalls shall be marked with white or yellow painted lines not less than 4 inches wide.
5. **City Engineer Approval.** That the site plan and related documents shall meet all requirements and addresses all comments from the City Engineer prior to the issuance of any permits by the City of Winsted.
6. **McLeod County Approval.** That the site plan and related documents shall meet all requirements and addresses all comments from McLeod County prior to the issuance of any permits by the City of Winsted and that any required permits are granted by the county prior to construction.
7. **Signage.** All signs shall meet the requirements of section 1501.023 of the zoning ordinance and no signs shall be replaced, installed or constructed until the appropriate sign permits have been issued by the City of Winsted.
8. **Building Permit.** That all appropriate building permits are issued before construction begins.
9. **Time Limit from Site Plan Approval until Building Permit is Issued.** From the time the applicant receives site plan approval from the City Council, the applicant must be issued a building permit within twelve months from the site plan approval date. Failure to do so will require the applicant to obtain a new site plan approval, with appropriate fees, to receive a building permit. The applicant may apply for one (1) six-month extension before the expiration date. Application for an extension is an administrative process.

Mr. Fasching asked if striping of the parking area included arrows. Mr. Anderson stated that it could include arrows.

Mr. Tienter stated that Mr. Willers would have to communicate with his superiors to see whether or not the minor subdivision is allowable. The City is not aware if they have signed off on it, however if it is required by the City, Mr. Tienter recalled that Mr. Willers said in all likelihood he would move forward with it.

Mr. Dan Vos, Vos Construction, stated on behalf of Tetra Pak, that he was notified that Tetra Pak was not able to secure all of the funding for this project. He stated that Tetra Pak intends to build it as is, with the exception of the lighting and the asphalt. Mr. Vos stated that Tetra Pak is going to have to phase the project due to the lack of funding.

The Commission asked if the intention is to have a gravel parking lot in the meantime. Mr. Vos stated that their intent is to bring all of the aggregate to the bottom of the base and intend to asphalt it in 2018. Mr. Vos stated that they would do everything except the light standards and the asphalt. Mr. Anderson asked if the curb was going in, which was confirmed by Mr. Vos.

The Commission asked whether or not the gravel parking lot would create sediment issues with the ponding basing. Reese Sudtelgte, Project Engineer, I&S Group, stated that they will make sure the filtration basin will be adequately protected with silk fencing and potentially place some sod along the side slopes to block it off the best they can.

Mr. Anderson stated that the parking would have to be a dust-proof situation. Mr. Sudtelgte stated that the parking lot would be more of a Minnesota Department of Transportation Class 5 aggregate, which does create some dust. Mr. Anderson proposed that it could be treated to make it dust proof.

The question was brought up on how the new phases would affect the time limit on the site plan approval. Mr. Vos stated that the intent was to pave over the aggregate base next year. Mr. Anderson stated that timing could be spelled out in a development agreement.

Mr. Guggemos asked whether or not the parking lot was going to be lit. Mr. Vos stated that the lighting will be minimal. Mr. Anderson responded that there could be safety factors with minimal lighting and it is something that the Commission would need to talk about.

Mr. Tienter recommended that the Planning Commission table the site plan approval so that City staff and appropriate consultants can evaluate the phasing of the project along with the questions surrounding the dustless surface, lighting, and changes in landscaping. Mr. Tienter noted that it would delay the approval process for the project, which could affect the timeline for construction.

Mr. Guggemos made a motion to table Resolution PCR-17-03, until specific information is provided or until the next regular Planning Commission meeting. Ms. Cafferty seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

5) No New Business.

6) Other

a) Introduction of Assistant to the City Administrator - Tony Hammes

Mr. Tienter introduced the Assistant to the City Administrator, Tony Hammes and stated that Tony will be taking over the minute taking duties for the Planning Commission.

7) Adjournment

Ms. Cafferty made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Fasching seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

The meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

Daniel Tienter
City Administrator
City of Winsted

ATTEST:

Anthony Hammes
Assistant to the City Administrator
City of Winsted