

MINUTES OF THE
AUSTIN CITY PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2001

Because of the quality of the tape this is an abbreviated recording of the minutes.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Glen Mair, Richard Bergstrom, Jack Rosenberg, Brian Johnson, Janet Anderson, and Sue Howard

MEMBERS ABSENT: Gordy Kuehne, Lois McConnell, and Susan Grove

OTHERS PRESENT: Craig Hoium, Planning & Zoning Administrator, Pat McGarvey, City Administrator, and Craig Byram, Hoversten Law Office

Planning Commission Chair Brian Johnson called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m., February 13, 2001, in the Austin City Council Chambers located at 500 4th Ave. N.E., Austin, Minnesota.

Correction was made to the minutes of the January 9, 2001 meeting; correction of the words "walk to" to "attend" in the last paragraph page 4, and correct the word "problem" to "concern" on page 5 paragraph 5. Motion was made by Commission Member Anderson to approve the December 12, 2000 minutes as corrected. Motion was seconded by Commission Member Rosenberg. Unanimous Ayes. Motion passed.

- 1.) **OPEN PUBLIC HEARING: Review of Repetitive Loss Plan addressing flood problems within the City of Austin, studies which have taken place analyzing past flooding in the community, measures taken to reduce flood damages, and the initial action plan the City of Austin is taking to reduce future flooding damage. This action is necessary for the re-certification of Austin in the Community Rating System that rates our community in activities which includes the monitoring of development activity in our floodplain, public awareness activities, and enforcement of our floodplain ordinance. This in turn provides a savings toward floodplain insurance premiums to those who carry flood insurance.**

Craig Hoium reviewed the Repetitive Loss Plan. This agenda item requires no action by the Planning Commission. The City of Austin is involved in a community rating system whereas the outcome and the regulations of the activities are rated by Insurance Service Office, Inc. The involvement of the activities are then rated as a community and the insurance premiums for flood insurance are then discounted hinging on how the community is rated. The City of Austin is now going through the process of being re-certified for this and one of the requirements is that a public meeting is held to review the Repetitive Loss Plan. If citizens have ideas or concerns they are implemented into the Loss Plan. The Plan is then brought to the City Council and a resolution needs to be approved for that. The plan includes the following information:

- Population of the community (estimated at 22,500)
- Flood problems (addresses Dobbins Creek, Cedar River, Turtle Creek, and all natural watersheds)
- Highest water elevations (March 26, 1961 flood up to July 10, 2000 flood)
- Non-structural flood damages
- Study initiated by the City of Austin in 1978-1979 listing damage in different subdivisions
- Floodplain management issues (floodplain ordinance and outreach activities)

The City of Austin has completed the first initial action plan to try to reduce damages during times of flooding. The City has applied for a grant through the State of MN to obtain just over \$1,000,000 to acquire various properties located in the floodplain. Being involved with this program there is currently an 18% savings passed on to the insurance carriers that have flood insurance. It is the hope of the City of Austin to achieve even more additional savings for flood insurance policy holders.

Commission Member Rosenberg is concerned with the temporary storage of snow behind Double K Specialty. Mr. Hoium said the City is limited as to snow storage, but City Engineer Jon Erichson is the person to talk to about this issue.

Commission Member Mair asked for the definition of a “critical facility” in the Loss Plan. Mr. Hoium said there are ratings of structures- such as a medical gas supply. In the floodplain there are two designated areas- a floodway and a flood fringe. Currently there are no structures in the floodway.

- 2.) **OPEN PUBLIC HEARING: To review a preliminary plat to be known as Lickteig’s 2nd Addition. Said plat is located southwest of the intersection of 16th St. S.W. and 22nd Ave. S.W. The plat consists of approximately 23.55 acres and will include four single-family lots, a 72 unit multi-family housing development, and a 15.2 acre outlot. (This matter was tabled for further review from the January 9, 2001 Planning Commission Meeting.)**

Mr. Hoium reviewed the development. In the attached memo to the packet material there was a traffic analysis. Richard Lickteig has filed an application for a preliminary plat review for approximately 6.4 acres of property that was just recently annexed into the City of Austin from Austin Township. This development consists of three separate categories; just north of the proposed extension of 22nd Ave. S.W. is platted for single-family lots for single-family development, there is Lot 1 which is actually 6.41 acres and is a proposed site for Thares Management of South Dakota consisting of a 72-unit rental housing development (40 units which are market rate rental apartments and 32 of the units will be designated as assisted care units). Lot 2 consists of approximately 15 acres as an Outlot. There are three wings in the proposed building along with a commons area. There is off-street parking and 24 garages for the market rate rental units. The detached garage facility would be 66’9” from the adjacent residential district. At the January meeting the discussion was lengthy, but Mr. Hoium highlighted some of the major issues.

Traffic impact this development would have on the adjacent residential neighborhoods. In this area of the southwest corner of the City of Austin there will be development at some point. This area has been designated by the future Land Use Plan as an area of residential nature or low density. If there is a recommendation tonight on this development, one thing that must occur prior to any action on the rezoning of this property is that there has to be a public hearing held that would amend this Future Land Use map.

Future Land Use Plan. (mentioned above)

Comprehensive Plan. Higher density housing needs to take place adjacent to the collectors. If normal growth continues in this neighborhood, then 22nd Ave. S.W. will become a collector. The nearest collector to this point is 16th Ave. S.W. which is approximately 2300 ft. north of 22nd Avenue.

Commission Member Johnson asked if Mr. Hoium expects 22nd Ave. S.W. to become a major arterial collector. Mr. Hoium said yes.

Commission Member Rosenberg asked if there was a “no left turn” sign on 16th St. S.W. would they be forced to use 22nd Ave. S.W. Mr. Hoium said that to go into an existing roadway system and try to regulate “no left turns” might cause more problems than what it would resolve. Jon Erichson, City Engineer, would have to make that decision.

Commission Member Anderson asked if 22nd St. S.W. would connect to 22nd Ave. S.W. Mr. Hoium said there was a “typo” in the map she was referring to. In the layout of the plat it shows a short future extension of 22nd Ave. S.W. At some point this road extension of 22nd Ave. will continue all the way to 31st St. S.W. Commission Member Anderson asked if there is a time frame for this. Mr. Hoium said improvements and/or extensions being made for sidewalks, streets, and that type of thing would be made after traffic counts warranted the improvements.

Is an R-2 District or development such as this compatible to the existing surrounding neighborhood.

Almost every R-2 District in the City are directly adjacent to an R-1 District.

Storm water management. Currently the agricultural land in this proposed development has surface drainage. There isn’t any storm water retention put into place. One of the requirements for this development would include a storm water management plan- calculations taken into consideration include roof area, hard surface parking area, type of fall on land, and storm water system, etc.

Commission Member Rosenberg asked about the elevation of the proposed development area. Mr. Hoium said that the south side is 1209 and that the area at the intersection of 22nd Ave. S.W. and 16th St. S.W. is 1216. The storm water runoff from this site should run to the southwest.

Commission Chair Johnson said regarding the Comprehensive Plan it is not in compliance- would the map have to be amended. Mr. Hoium said there would have to be a public hearing held to amend or change the future land use map. Commission Chair Johnson said one of the storm water concerns would be retention ponds and the safety of them. Mr. Hoium said there is no requirement that says retention ponds must be fenced off. There are some ponds that are and others that aren't. The preliminary designs of the ponds for this development are to be dry ponds, which at some times may have water in them.

Commission Member Bergstrom asked if there was a public hearing to amend the map for the Murphy Creek Addition- changing from an industrial to an R-2 District. Mr. Hoium said Murphy Creek was shown in the Comprehensive Plan as a high-density residential development area.

Mr. Hoium said that in looking at large areas of land in all quadrants of the City where there isn't any future transportation plans in place it is very difficult in outlying areas not to know where the roadway systems will be. It's hard to designate a land use not knowing the transportation plan. Mr. Hoium has made a recommendation to the City Council that they look at contracting with the consulting firm to provide the Planning Commission with a transportation plan especially in the northwest and southwest areas of the community to eliminate some of these issues.

Chad Shuman, of Yaggy Colby Associates, said that his role in this is to look at the area and determine the impacts the development in the area will have on the local street system. The first assumption he made is that this southwest area in Austin is going to be developed at some point. Mr. Shuman worked with Mr. Hoium and Charlie Fawver and obtained some layouts for the area that would be used to develop how many single-family residential units would be developed in the area if the Primrose Development were not constructed. This was compared with the area being developed with the Primrose Development. The areas of impact are 22nd Ave. and 24th Ave. S.W. onto 12th St. S.W. If this was developed with only single-family residential the amount of traffic increased on 22nd Ave. S.W. would be approximately 316 vehicles per day and 24th Ave. S.W. would be in the area of 200-275 vehicles a day. If Primrose development were constructed along with 15 acres of single-family residential the vehicle count on 22nd Ave. S.W. would be 246 and 306 vehicles on 24th Ave. S.W. during the day. Mr. Shuman says the two developments are very similar in regard to traffic and the impact it will have. The time of day that these trips are generated are quite different- if the area is developed entirely single-family residential it can be seen that quite a few trips are developed during the peak hour time periods of the day (9:00 a.m. peak hour and the 5:00 p.m. peak hour). With the Primrose development a lot of the trips would be generated throughout the day instead of concentrated at the 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. peak hours. Mr. Shuman felt there would be less impact on the pedestrians (children) going to and from school.

Mr. Hoium asked where the numbers come from and what guidelines are followed to create this type of report. Mr. Shuman said there is a book produced by the Institute of Transportation Engineers with many different land use codes in a table format to tell how many trips a certain type of development generally produces. The study takes into consideration all types of traffic coming to and from the site.

Commission Chair Johnson asked Mr. Shuman if this study looked at the commercial traffic and staff traffic created by this facility and the possible assumptions that might come out of this traffic count. Mr. Shuman said the study does not get into specifics as to what exactly is offered in the development- just generalizations from actual studies taken at these types of sites which come up with an average trip rate. Commission Chair Johnson corrected the actual count of single family lots using 24th Avenue as access from 32 to 34, which changed the daily trips from 306 to 325. Commission Chair Johnson came up with lower traffic numbers with single family development with his calculations. He pointed out that there are different ways to compare the results depending on the development of the 6.5 acres. Commission Chair Johnson also pointed out the type of Primrose traffic- seniors, visitors unfamiliar with the neighborhood, and commercial traffic. Commission Chair Anderson questioned what unfamiliarity of the neighborhood would have to do with driving to and from Primrose.

Chad Shuman spoke on the impacts of the travel of traffic and how it might impact the pedestrian movements in the area. Mr. Shuman said he observed deficiencies in the systems already as far as movement of traffic and children toward the school and on the return trip, because children are forced to walk on the streets to get to school- there are no sidewalks in some areas. On 14th St. S.W. the sidewalk comes down the street to a point two lots from the end where it joins 22nd Ave. S.W.- it would be beneficial for this sidewalk to be joined at this intersection. Mr. Shuman suggested that a study be done to determine what sidewalks need to be placed whether this development proceeds or not.

Commission Member Rosenberg asked what percentage of the cost of the sidewalk would the homeowner be responsible for. Mr. Hoium said the homeowner would be responsible for 100% of the sidewalk cost.

Mr. Shuman said that if there are any plans in the future to upgrade 22nd Ave. S.W. or widen it, it would be ideal at that time to install sidewalk the sidewalk along 22nd Ave. S.W.

Mr. Clark Thares of Primrose Development said that his development would be a benefit to the community because they are a tax paying entity and that they help to keep the seniors in the community and bring in seniors originally from Austin back to be closer to family.

Two and a half years ago letters were sent out to the surrounding homeowners of the proposed Mankato Primrose facility regarding the necessary re-zoning. There was also a meeting held like the meeting held here in Austin to share information. Mr. Thares read a letter he received from the Mankato homeowners stating that they are happy for the addition of Primrose to their neighborhood. They described the development as very quiet with very little traffic. Mr. Thares also read a letter from Indianhead Food Service regarding the earlier concerns of commercial traffic. The letter said that Indianhead makes a delivery once a week on Tuesday. Mr. Thares said that seniors have a very small amount of garbage to be picked up- one 6-yard container will be picked up one time per week. Mr. Thares wanted to address the concern of drivers- the MN Department of Public Safety says that with residential housing there is an increased chance of having young drivers and statistics show that fatal crashes or drivers in crashes are more than those of the 75-85 years of age category.

Commission Chair Johnson spoke with Mankato Planning & Zoning Administrator Paul Vogel. Chair Johnson said that two citizens visited the Mankato facility and said the area was commercial and not residential. Mr. Vogel said the Mankato Primrose is in an R-1 Residential District with commercial nearby. Mr. Vogel called it a transition area. Chair Johnson said there are 25% less units and half the parking spaces on a 2 acre larger parcel in Mankato.

Commission Member Rosenberg asked who described the Mankato area as a commercial area. Commission Chair Johnson said two citizens visited the Mankato site and called Chair Johnson. Mr. Vogel said the Mankato Primrose has a conditional use permit to be in the R-1 District with commercial being nearby. Commission Member Rosenberg questioned the word commercial.

Mr. Thares said the difference in the number of units and amount of garbage generated would be very small. Mr. Thares had a meeting with Mr. Vogel who said that the neighbors are very happy with Primrose. The requirement for the number of parking spaces is dictated by each City- he would not be opposed to a decrease in the number of spots- it would be cheaper for them. The Mankato facility does have a federally subsidized housing facility about 200 feet away, along with single family townhomes being built right across from Primrose.

Paul Jacobson, of 2302 14th St. S.W., said that his primary concern is the health and safety of his neighborhood and students. He feels the Primrose facility will cause an increase in traffic along with a concern with the type of traffic and the threat that it brings to the health and safety of the neighborhood. To put a 72 unit high density housing complex on 6 acres in a residential neighborhood that is not designed for it is not appropriate. He would like to keep the property zoned R-1. Mr. Jacobson is concerned that these type of developments would be approved and let expansion into an area like Southgate, and then worry about road improvements at a later date. He is also concerned about retention ponds- drainage and flooding in the Southgate area. Mr. Jacobson shared photos he took of the Mankato facility and the surrounding area. Mr. Jacobson feels if Primrose is built it will destroy the character of the neighborhood.

He feels that when a person moves to Austin, invests in the community, buys a home, and becomes a resident, they should have every expectation that their home and investment will be protected by existing zoning regulations. Who will protect the City of Austin if not the City Council and the Planning Commission. Mr. Jacobson feels that the zoning change from R-1 to R-2 and the construction of Primrose next to Southgate school does not meet the City's Comprehensive Plan for residential housing- it does not meet the criteria or the goals, nor does it follow the policies and recommendations to provide senior housing or protect established neighborhoods as on page 34 of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Allan Toov, of 1502 22nd Ave. S.W., is concerned with the safety of children in the neighborhood and with the best use of the development. He pointed out that this is the only land next to a school in Austin that is not developed.

Mike White, of 1303 22nd Ave. S.W., is concerned that this development will destroy everything they put into their house.

Collene Brunton, of 2206 14th St. S.W., visited Mankato and could not find too many single-family residents to speak with. She is concerned with the traffic study findings- she thinks the daily average number seems steep for their area. She feels traffic count for staff at the facility should be included to be at least 4 trips per day. She feels they don't need sidewalks in their area because of the amount of traffic.

Kathy Toov, of 1502 22nd Ave. S.W., said that she realizes that this area will be developed, but the appeal of the area to single family homes should be considered because of the school.

Dave Forman, of 1601 22nd Ave. S.W., said that if sidewalks are to be put in on 22nd Ave. S.W., that there are huge trees in their place right now. The facilities in town that presently exist for multi-family dwellings are on main arteries such as Picket Place and the Twin Towers, etc. He feels that 22nd Ave. S.W. would never be an artery or collector such as 16th Ave. S.W. would be, so he doesn't feel that 22nd Ave. S.W. is the proper type of artery for this type of facility. He feels there are assumptions in the traffic study and disagrees with the only two entrances into this development. He speculated that the attraction to this development, since this is not an artery, is because this land is cheaper. He doesn't feel this is a significant justification to build by Southgate.

Kim Jacobson, of 2302 14th St. S.W., said that she and others created a petition (that she read at the meeting) to be distributed in the area to be affected by this facility. 65 residents in the Southgate neighborhood were contacted and 60 of those people signed the petition against this development.

Jean Bittner, of 2400 14th St. S.W., said that this development would be in her backyard. She has lived in Austin 6 months. One of the reasons she bought this house is because it was in an R-1 district to be developed with single-family residences as in the Comprehensive Plan.

Jon Lenocho, of 1505 22nd Ave. S.W., said this will create more traffic on 22nd Ave. S.W., which is not needed, less safety, and they want this area to remain R-1.

Jim Thares, a partner of Primrose Development, said through fifteen years of research they have found that seniors like residential areas and they are good neighbors. He is bothered by the assumptions at the meeting, such as this land being cheaper. A lot of time was spent in Austin doing research to find a piece of property that was adequate to build the facility. They would like to come into Austin and spend several million dollars building a facility that will be on the tax rolls to provide a service to the residents of Austin. They held an informational meeting and invited everyone to see the facility. The Mankato facility has no commercial area adjoining the property. There is residential housing on three sides and on one side is a vacant lot. Mr. Thares said Primrose does not decide the issue of parking or retention ponds- this is done by the City. Mr. Thares said there is a retention pond for the Mankato Primrose a few blocks down the street. He felt that the present lack of a sidewalk on 22nd Ave. S.W. should be an issue when considering the safety of children. Commission Chair Johnson asked Mr. Thares if they looked at available R-2 property. Mr. Thares said because of the size and shape of his development those parcels are hard to find in Austin and other communities.

Lori Wischnack, of 1503 24th Ave. S.W., is concerned that this is not the neighborhood for this development.

Commission Member Rosenberg asked if this 6.4 acres is to become R-2 and Primrose did not build on it, would it stay R-2 or go back to R-1. Charlie Fawver said that the owner and developer would gladly make it a condition to revert back to R-1 if the Primrose development were not to take place. The R-2 is not for the whole parcel- it is just for the 6.4 acres

Patrick McGarvey, City Administrator, substituted for Mr. Hoiu for the continuation of the meeting. Mr. McGarvey said the addressing of the land use in the City's Comprehensive Land Use must come first under Minnesota Law. Then a recommendation would be made to the City Council who would then have to change the Comprehensive Plan on this parcel to multi-family. The consideration of re-zoning is really a matter to be tabled at this time.

City Council Member Pete Christopherson, of 1002 4th St. S.W., said that he visited Primrose. He and his wife were impressed with the facility. Mr. Christopherson asked an employee what neighbor concerns she was aware of if any when Primrose elected to build there. The employee who gave the tour said the neighboring residents were concerned- their basements were already flooding with heavy rains, but after Primrose was built their problems were solved. Mr. Christopherson was there at suppertime and said there was very little traffic leaving to go get supper. He said the development is three blocks from Madison Avenue- the main artery. He also felt that if safety meant putting sidewalks in the Southgate area where there aren't any, then it should be done.

Kim Jacobson questioned why the Comprehensive Plan was created and then looked at to be changed six months later. City Council Member Gloria Nordin said that the Comprehensive Plan was worked on for two years. When looking at a neighborhood there is a variety of things- schools, churches, parks, and even commercial, such as Casey's and Stivers Nursery to be considered. The best plans can be laid, and six months later better ideas can be found. Every year the Comprehensive Plan is reviewed because things change. So many things must be considered. The Comprehensive Plan does not mean things will not change.

Commission Chair Johnson said that the traffic study shows that with a single-family development it would be less than Primrose. He is also concerned with ambulances and commercial traffic. He feels the character of the neighborhood should stay the way it is.

Commission Member Bergstrom said that when looking at traffic by schools- Neveln and Banfield have more traffic than what will be by Southgate. Murphy Creek is a good example of the changes in the Comprehensive Plan- it was changed from B-1 Business District to R-2 Residential District. If this development proposal were to have come up six months ago it may have been changed to R-2 also. Kim Jacobson said she paid a lot of money for her house to live in that neighborhood and this right should not be taken from her. She said it is a perfect neighborhood. Commission Member Bergstrom said he is aware of the residents concerns that if this development goes through that there will be more multi-family to follow. Commission Member Bergstrom lives on 4th Ave. S.E. by Ellis. He said in talking to his senior neighbors he was told that they purposely refrain from driving by Ellis during the children's arrival and departure times.

A resident stood up to say that a lot of the residents in Southgate have invested almost \$200,000 in their homes and they would like to keep them at that value.

City Council Member Dick Chaffee said that the Council does consider recommendations of the Planning Commission in their final decisions. He said in this instance a farmer would like to sell his land to a private developer who would like to build a structure in Austin. The City has worked with Charlie Fawver on several construction projects and he has been excellent in his efforts to maintain the integrity of communities and neighborhoods. Developing housing has a ripple effect on the community with seniors leaving their housing to move into these developments and freeing up housing for those looking for it. This may not be the proper place for this development, but where then is the proper place. The Primrose developers have said they will do any number of things to be a good neighbor. Mr. Chaffee says he believes these people have an intent to keep the Southgate neighborhood with integrity that they would feel comfortable living with. For four

years we have been hearing that the private sector should be building, not the public sector, and now the private sector is ready to build.

Commission Member Rosenberg said that both sides have made assumptions. That fact is that Austin needs more housing for seniors. Not all seniors are able to live in and maintain their own homes. There is a need for assisted living also in this town and we have to start someplace. It costs about \$2,000 a month for assisted living in Primrose and Member Rosenberg said that is a bargain.

Commission Member Mair said that on page 31 of the Comprehensive Plan that the Comprehensive Plan is not a rigid set of rules, but a guideline. The Comprehensive Plan also addresses the need for housing in the City. Page 36 also says that the City needs to attract housing. He also does not think it is fair to classify seniors as less safe drivers. He felt the traffic study done by Yaggy Colby brought out some points of interest that should be reviewed by the City Engineer for safety. He thinks Primrose is a dependable developer who will stay with the project after it is built. He thinks the Primrose facility would be good for the community.

Motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson to recommend to the City Council denial of the requested preliminary plat on the basis that it is contrary to the Comprehensive Plan, it's detrimental to the public's health and safety, it is detrimental to the existing residents in the neighborhood, and there is no reason to forever change the existing residential character of the neighborhood. Motion was seconded by Commission Member Anderson. Two ayes. Three nays. Motion denied.

Motion was made by Commission Chair Johnson to table consideration of this preliminary plat and the request for R-2 rezoning for 60 days and direct the City staff to send appropriate letters to the petitioner in order to allow the Planning Commission to make an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. Motion was seconded by Commission Member Bergstrom. Unanimous Ayes. Motion approved.

- 3.) OPEN PUBLIC HEARING: To consider a request from Richard Lickteig, RR 3, Austin, MN, for the rezoning of approximately 6.41 acres from an "R-1" Single-Family Residence District to an "R-2" Multi-Family Residence District. This site is the proposed location of a 72 unit multi-family rental housing development.**

This item was tabled (see motion above)

- 4.) OPEN PUBLIC HEARING: To consider a request from Gregg Johnson, P.O. Box 452, Austin, MN, for the rezoning of approximately 70 acres from an "A-1" Agricultural, Recreation, and Conservation District. This property is located immediately west of the Municipal Airport and south of East Oakland Avenue.**

Pat McGarvey reviewed the request. This property is on the east side of Highway 218 between the highway and the Austin Municipal Airport. The property is currently zoned "A-1" Agriculture and in city limits. It is identified in the 2000 Comprehensive Plan to become Industrial "I-1". The property is roughly 70 acres. The City eventually will acquire 11 acres of the 70 acre total for the Airport Expansion Project. The majority of the property will remain private just adjacent to the east side Hwy. 218. If this is zoned "I-1" it eventually will be platted and improved by the petitioner to become a business use in the City.

Ann Hanson, of 2116 3rd Ave. S.E., lives directly across from the area being considered for rezoning. She questioned if there are any developers interested in this land- any plans being considered at this point. Commission Member Johnson said that this was identified in the Comprehensive Plan as a future industrial site.

John McMasters, of 2111 5th Ave. S.E., stated his concern regarding the industrial classification. He questioned why an industrial district would be considered right across from a residential district. Commission Chair Johnson read from the City Ordinance Section 11.50 regarding industrial districts: "it is the purpose of the "I-1" District to create industrial areas that will be acceptable within the City and will not adversely affect adjacent business or residential neighborhoods by permitting industrial establishments which are neither ones whose operations are relatively free from objectionable influences or (b) ones whose

objectionable features will be obviated by design and/or appropriate devices. In the interest of the general health and welfare, residential and certain institutional uses are not permitted within this district. This is the "lightest" classification of industrial use and is intended to be a good neighbor type of industrial.

Commission Member Bergstrom said this is a limited industrial district so there are limits placed on it. Commission Chair Johnson said City Ordinance 11.70 Subd. 2 states the principal permitted uses and talks about manufacturing, assembly, fabricating, etc. except any use which would be hazardous or objectionable and not in keeping with those purposes just read. It could not be used for warehousing, storage and distribution, minor fabrication or repair, etc.

Mr. McMasters asked why rezone before the use is decided. Commission Chair said that rezoning is stating what the allowable uses are. The Murphy Creek development went from industrial to multi-family so part of the process is to look for other ideas to identify and zone for industrial so that when businesses look at expanding or coming into Austin they have areas to look at. There is no specific business requesting this.

Ann Hanson asked if this rezoning will affect the streets along 218- there are a lot of dead ends- will they remain dead ends or will this create through streets. Mr. McGarvey said that there would not be entrance streets off the highway accessing this development. The access would most likely be off County Road 3.

Dennis Hanson, of 2116 3rd Ave. S.E., said he would like the area to remain agricultural because he feels there is already enough activity and noise in the area.

Commission Member Rosenberg asked if this would be considered a light industrial park. Mr. McGarvey said "I-1" means light industrial.

Commission Member Anderson said there is an auto repair business in the area.

Commission Member Bergstrom felt that having a light industrial area next to the expanding airport would be a positive.

Commission Member Bergstrom said that if a B-2 district were created there might be a desire for strip malls, motor marts, etc. A light industrial district would result in less traffic and keep it quieter than a business district. Commission Member Anderson said the ordinance states that noise is a consideration that must be avoided in an I-1 district.

Ann Hanson said that she likes not looking at a warehouse or building. She likes seeing deer and agriculture.

Gloria Nordin, City Council Member, felt that the industrial businesses attracted to this area would probably be connected with the airport.

Commission Chair Johnson said there would be height restrictions and other restrictions in this area in regard to the airport runways.

Motion was made by Commission Member Anderson to recommend approval of the rezoning request to the City Council to rezone this property to an "I-1" Industrial District which is in compliance with the 2000 Comprehensive Plan. Motion was seconded by Commission Member Mair. Unanimous ayes. Motion passed.

- 5.) **OPEN PUBLIC HEARING: To consider a request from Ronald & Karen Strick, 511 4th St. S.W., Austin, MN, for a variance to be issued pursuant to Austin City Code Section 11.30, Subd.5 and 11.01, 93, C, for a 3 foot variance governing the minimum 5 foot rear yard setback for accessory structures located within an "R-1" Single Family Residence District.**

Request withdrawn by petitioner. Will build a new garage 5' back from alley.

OTHER BUSINESS

ADJOURN

Motion was made to adjourn by Commission Member Mair. Motion was seconded by Commission Member Anderson. Unanimous Ayes. Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at 8:46 p.m.