



City of Blaine Anoka County, Minnesota Minutes

Blaine City Hall
10801 Town Sq Dr NE
Blaine MN 55449

Planning Commission

The Planning Commission is an advisory body to the City Council. One of the Commission's functions is to hold public hearings and make recommendations to the City Council. The City Council makes all final decisions on these matters. Blaine City Ordinances require that certain documents and information be included in applications. The Planning Commission may postpone consideration of an application that is incomplete and may, for other reasons, postpone final action on an application. For each item the Commission will receive reports prepared by the City staff, open the hearing to the public, and discuss and act on the application.

This meeting will be a hybrid of Zoom and in-person. The Mayor has signed a declaration allowing members of the commission, staff, and the public to attend meetings remotely via Zoom as has been done during the pandemic. The council chambers will have limited seating, with audience chairs being set up at least six feet apart. There will be an overflow area where the meeting can be watched in the Cloverleaf Farms Room, also with chairs set up at least six feet apart.

Public comment options prior to the meeting must be received by 4:30 PM on Monday, April 12. Email comments to: probinson@BlaineMN.gov or phone 763-785-6180.

Zoom is for members of the public who want to comment remotely during the meeting on an agenda item. Join Zoom Webinar at <https://blainemn.zoom.us/j/94500982387>

Ways to watch if not commenting on an agenda item: BlaineMN.gov/Video or North Metro TV on Comcast, Apple TV, or Roku

Questions? Email - Communications@BlaineMN.gov

Tuesday, October 13, 2020

7:00 PM

Council Chambers

1. Roll Call

The Blaine Planning Commission met in the City Hall Chambers on Tuesday, October 13, 2020. Chair Ouellette called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM Due to the COVID-19 pandemic this hybrid meeting was held both virtually and in person.

Staff Present: Lori Johnson, City Planner
Elizabeth Showalter, Planning/Economic Development Technician
Chris Nelson, City Attorney

Present: 6 - Chair Ouellette, Commissioner Homan, Commissioner Goracke, Commissioner Olson, Commissioner Halpern, and Villella
Absent: 1 - Deonauth

2. Approval of Minutes

2.-1 Approval of September 8, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes

Attachments: [Unapproved Minutes 090820](#)

Motion by Commissioner Halpern to approve the minutes of September 8, 2020, as presented. Motion seconded by Commissioner Homan. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed 6-0.

Aye: 6 - Chair Ouellette, Commissioner Homan, Commissioner Goracke, Commissioner Olson, Commissioner Halpern, and Villella

3. Old Business

None.

4. New Business

4.-1 Public Hearing Case File No. 20-0032 // City of Blaine

The city is proposing a code amendment to the R1-B (Single Family) zoning district to allow accessory buildings up to 120 square feet with various locational and design criteria.

Attachments: [Attachments](#)
[PC Approved Minutes 101320](#)
[Ordinance 20-2456 - No Buffer Requirement](#)
[Ordinance 20-2456 - Buffer Requirement](#)
[Additional Public Comment](#)

The report to the Planning Commission was presented by Lori Johnson, City Planner. The public hearing for Case File 20-0032 was opened at 7:15 PM

Chair Ouellette noted a comment the Commission received from the public noting the resident was indifferent, but did not appreciate the fact a non-response defaulted to a yes vote.

City Planner, Lori Johnson reported this language had been clarified within the survey.

Katrina Sayler, 2830 108th Lane, stated she was one of the homeowners that

pursued the petition. She reported she had a shed that was under 120 square feet. She indicated she spoke to her neighbors regarding the placement of her shed. She explained she was not aware of the fact she could not have a shed. She reported she worked closely with City Planner Johnson on the petition. She discussed why the no response was originally considered a yes within the survey. She described her efforts to get all neighbors to respond to the survey. She commented that over 50% of the responses were supportive of the petition. She reported her goal would be to allow her neighbors to have a shed that matched their house, increased property values and offered additional storage space.

Becky Anderson, 2690 105th Avenue NE, explained she has lived within the Sanctuary for the past 15 years. She noted there were three ponds within her neighborhood and her property backed up to a pond. She did not believe there was room to have sheds in rear yards, nor did they belong. She encouraged the Commission to uphold the original zoning requirements because this was keeping in line with the covenants that were in place.

Andrea Welch, 2781 103rd Court, commented she received a letter from the city regarding her shed. She reported she was not made aware of the covenants from her builder. She explained her shed matched her home and was located under her deck. She indicated her shed had been in place since 2014. She stated she had worked really hard this summer on the petition. She discussed the timeline on when she began receiving letters from the City of Blaine. She reported the first letter was sent to her neighbors around the 4th of July. She noted her goal had been to receive as many responses as possible from the neighbors. She read a “no” response she received from a neighbor that explained there were a large number of homes that were violation with the covenants.

Todd Grugal, 2814 108th Lane NE, stated he has lived in the Sanctuary for the past 10 years. He noted he did not vote. He explained his neighbor has a shed and he has worked with them on this issue. He commented he would have voted “no” because he did not want to see the rear yards changed. He understood the covenants were not being enforced but indicated without an HOA it would be difficult to pursue. He encouraged the city to grandfather in the four sheds, but to not allow future sheds.

Jake Roe, 2825 108th Lane, indicated he moved into the Sanctuary neighborhood a year ago. He stated this was a very nice neighborhood where the residents take pride in their property. He explained over the past year he has had several trees die and had to be removed. He reported he did not have a shed at this time, but may require one in the future. He supported the city allowing sheds in the rear yards of the homes within the Sanctuary.

Margaret Jones, 2726 104th Lane, stated she built her home in 2014 and she understood the covenants would not allow sheds. She commented she had wetlands behind her home and she did not want to see a dozen different sheds. She explained the homes in the neighborhood have three and four car garages. She indicated if people needed more space than this, they probably had too much stuff. She reported she had enough space within her three car garages for her things and two cars. She expressed frustration with how the survey was conducted, along with the misleading information that was sent to the neighbors.

Doug Pederson, 2690 105th Avenue NE, stated he purchased his lot in 2005 and was told that no sheds were allowed through the covenants. He explained he voted no. He did not want to see sheds across the pond and encouraged the city to support the existing covenants.

Tim Blank, 10502 Yancy Court, reported he built his home in 2006 when he built a custom house for his wife who lives in a wheelchair. He commented in 2006 this was the height of the housing market which meant he paid a premium for his home. He stated in 2008 his home was devalued due to the economy. He explained he regarded his neighbors highly however he would like to see the covenants upheld. He indicated ignorance of an ordinance or covenants was not an excuse for violating them. He did not believe it was right for residents to be able to violate the law and then request a change in the future. He stated this was not a good precedent for the city to follow. He believed there was value in the covenants because they assisted in maintaining property value. He expressed his disappointment with staff for delegating their duties back to the residents who have a self-interest in the outcome of this matter. He stated he could only support this code amendment if a variance were pursued by each resident requesting a shed.

Dave Putnam, 10483 Xylite Street, explained he appreciated the comments from his neighbors. He stated the homes in his neighborhood have three and four car garages. He indicated the people that require additional storage beyond this may have too much stuff. He agreed that if neighbors have already built a shed, they should not just be grandfathered in.

Dana Putnam, 10483 Xylite Street, reported there was a storage facility located 1.3 miles from the Sanctuary neighborhood. She commented neighbors with too much stuff could store their extra items at this facility.

Chris Hildrum, 10507 Alamo Street NE, stated he has one of the four properties with a shed. However, he clarified he received approval from the city twelve years ago to build a playhouse. He explained he was fully aware of the covenants and went through the proper channels in order to build his playhouse. He indicated his playhouse was well maintained and should not be considered a shed. He stated he

understood both sides of this issue. He encouraged the city to go with the majority of the neighborhood and allow sheds going forward.

The public hearing was closed at 7:47 PM

Commissioner Goracke requested further information from staff regarding the differences between covenants and city ordinances.

City Planner, Lori Johnson explained ordinances are approved by the city council and guided development in the city. She reported staff does not have the ability to do anything other than what is written in city ordinance. She stated covenants were set up by a homeowners' association and may differ from city ordinance. She suspected in the Sanctuary there were differences in the types of homes that are built or landscaping requirements because of what covenants have previously allowed, compared to what city ordinance requires.

Commissioner Goracke asked why the city did not complete the survey.

City Planner, Lori Johnson reported this was a neighborhood issue and was not a city issue. She knew that there were people both for and against this proposal, which is why staff did not automatically present the code amendment without further support of the neighborhood. She explained it was staff's job to bring recommendations to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Homan questioned who established the no shed ordinance.

City Planner, Lori Johnson stated this was recommended by the builder.

Commissioner Homan inquired who was meant to enforce the no shed ordinance.

City Planner, Lori Johnson reported the city was meant to enforce the no shed ordinance. She commented this development began over 25 years ago and over the years people have had to remove their sheds.

Commissioner Homan asked if there were instances where the city council had changed an ordinance for a neighborhood.

City Planner, Lori Johnson indicated she was not aware of this taking place.

Commissioner Homan questioned who was responsible for making property owners aware of the covenants.

City Planner, Lori Johnson reported the property owners are responsible for

knowing what is allowed on their lot.

Commissioner Villella stated he lived in this neighborhood and would be abstaining from voting on the matter.

Commissioner Olson explained she came from a real estate background and she understood covenants were not at all uncommon. She reported a title search identifies if covenants are attached to a property. She suggested this matter be handled through a variance request or conditional use permit amendment and that the existing code remain in place.

City Planner, Lori Johnson commented the ordinance was not set up for a conditional use permit amendment. She noted the ordinance would have to be amended. She provided further comment on the process that has to be followed in order to approve a variance. She explained there was nothing special about these lots, nor are there any hardships for the homeowners that would allow staff to recommend approval of any variance for a shed. She did not recommend the Commission proceed in this manner. She stated the only way to address this matter would be to amend the ordinance. She reported she made it very clear to the neighbors that an ordinance amendment was not guaranteed.

Communications Manager, Ben Hayle reported there was one additional person that wished to speak to this matter.

Dan Savaloja, 10762 Coral Sea Street NE, explained he lived in the Sanctuary neighborhood. He commented when the sheds that were built, these property owners did not request a building permit from the city. He indicated the city did not have the resources to go around and dictate what does and does not “match” a home. He stated there were 190 homes within the Sanctuary and these homeowners did not sign up to have sheds in the rear yards. He commented the vote that occurred was very close to 50/50 because several properties were counted twice. He reported this was a family neighborhood and he did not want to see critters living under these sheds. He reiterated that these sheds were built in violation of city ordinance and the vote to the neighbors was not properly presented.

City Planner, Lori Johnson clarified the people who voted yes or no were not counted twice if they had multiple properties within the Sanctuary. She reported there was a denotation within the survey regarding this matter.

Chair Ouellette commented that people who wish to build a shed that was less than 120 square feet do not have to have a building permit from the City of Blaine.

City Planner, Lori Johnson reported this was the case noting building permits were not required for sheds less than 200 square feet.

Chair Ouellette stated the Planning Commission had very little latitude regarding this matter.

Commissioner Halpern appreciated the efforts of the neighborhood. He explained the matter that was before the Commission was a city code change and not just a neighborhood change. He stated he did not want to persuade votes one way or the other, but noted covenant information was available through title searches prior to purchasing a home. He agreed that ignorance should not be an excuse to ignore the rules that were in place. He asked if the Sanctuary was the only R-1B neighborhood in the City of Blaine.

City Planner, Lori Johnson reported the Sanctuary and one other small cul-de-sac development were zoned R-1B in Blaine.

Motion by Commissioner Olson to recommend the city council deny a code amendment to the R1-B (Single Family) zoning district to allow accessory buildings up to 120 square feet in Planning Case 20-0032, recommending the city code remain as is. Motion seconded by Commissioner Homan. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed 3-2-1 (Commissioner Halpern and Chair Ouellette opposed) (Commissioner Villella abstained).

Aye: 3 - Commissioner Homan, Commissioner Goracke, and Commissioner Olson

Nay: 2 - Chair Ouellette, and Commissioner Halpern

Abstain: 1 - Villella

Chair Ouellette noted this would be on the agenda of the November 2, 2020 city council meeting.

4.-2

Public Hearing Case File No. 20-0035 // Allen Ofstehage (Larson Properties LLC) // 1801 Radisson Road NE

The applicant is requesting a rezoning from I-2 (Heavy Industrial) to I-2A (Heavy Industrial)

Attachments: [Attachments](#)

The report to the Planning Commission was presented by Lori Johnson, City Planner. The public hearing for Case File 20-0035 was opened at 8:18 PM

The public hearing was closed at 8:19 PM

Paul Kangas stated he was here as a representative for Larson Properties. He reported he served as the Chair of the Planning Commission for the City of Dayton.

He appealed to the Commission's common sense regarding this rezoning. He explained the denial of this request would not eliminate truck and trailer storage in this area. He discussed the context of this request and provided the Commission with a presentation regarding Citi Cargo's location. He understood some uses were not always pretty but were necessary for the city's tax base. He noted Citi Cargo wants to be a good neighbor in Blaine and they were willing to make investments in this property if a rezoning were allowed. He reviewed photos with the Commission addressing the topography and visibility of the Citi Cargo site. It was noted adjacent buildings and trees block much of the site. He reiterated that truck and trailer traffic were allowed at neighboring properties. He stated if a rezoning were denied this business would have to be terminated and employees would have to be laid off.

Chair Ouellette asked how many trucks come in and out of this site on a daily basis.

Mr. Kangas reported he did not have a representative present from Citi Cargo but explained trucks and trailers were brought to this site for repair and storage. He questioned why a neighboring use allowed for an even more intense truck and trailer use than Citi Cargo. He requested the city not take a successful business and put them out of business at this time. He asked if other parcels in the city were being subjected to cease and desist operations.

City Planner, Lori Johnson reported staff was aware of the operations that were occurring on the other properties in this area. She explained the uses were considered legal nonconforming which differentiates from this parcel, which was illegal nonconforming.

Mr. Kangas indicated this one property would not create a large enough parcel where redevelopment was possible. He stated if the business were forced to cease operations, the site would sit vacant, be sold and there was no guarantee the next owner would be any better from a visual standpoint. He commented he was uncertain where the complaints were originating from. He reported the owner of the property was willing to make improvements to mitigate the objectionable views.

Chair Ouellette questioned what improvements the property owner was willing to make.

Mr. Kangas reported the property owner was willing to complete the suggested improvements from staff, which included site improvements, stormwater management, landscaping, screening and fencing. He explained this property was surrounded by successful businesses that were not blighted.

Commissioner Homan questioned why this property illegal.

City Planner, Lori Johnson discussed the historical operations that have occurred on this property. She reported the property ceased having the trucking use after the code amendment was in place in 1998. The property was then to be used as a contractor's yard and not a trucking facility. Because the site was being used as a trucking facility this made the property an illegal nonconforming use.

Commissioner Homan asked what the difference was between this property and the adjacent property.

City Attorney, Chris Nelson, explained the difference would be the continuity of use. He reported the adjacent site had been used for that use prior to the code amendment in 1998 which prohibited that use. He stated the adjacent property was able to maintain that use until they cease. He indicated the truck and trailer use on this subject property ceased in 1998 and trucks and trailers were not stored on the site for seven years. When the use resumed in 2006, this was deemed an illegal nonconformity.

Mr. Kangas discussed the operations on the neighboring property. He stated to his knowledge there was no way for the city to step in and stop truck and storage operations. He explained QB Trucking could be there for decades. He reported Citi Cargo would also like to operate in the City of Blaine for decades. He did not believe the visual impact of the Citi Cargo property was detrimental to the neighborhood when compared to the adjacent properties. He questioned why this property was all right from 2006 to 2020. While he understood the Planning Commission was a recommending body, he believed it was counterintuitive to require Citi Cargo to cease operations at this time, when a neighboring business was operating in the same manner.

Commissioner Vilella questioned who the complaint came from.

City Planner, Lori Johnson stated she could not divulge that information. She reported she could provide this information to the applicant per data privacy requirements.

Commissioner Vilella asked how this business has been able to operate and function for the past 14 years in violation with city code.

City Planner, Lori Johnson discussed the history of this property and noted the city requested the property owner to present to the Council their case for a rezoning. She explained the applicant never followed through with a rezoning request. She reported the city recently received a complaint and staff had to follow through with city ordinance requirements.

Commissioner Homan commented when Citi Cargo assumed the property, they began using the property illegally.

City Planner, Lori Johnson stated this was correct.

Ryan Symatic, attorney for the applicant, reported his primary role was to help educate the Commission and gain clarity from staff. He discussed the trucking operations that were occurring on this property noting operations focused on repairs and storage. He addressed the visibility concerns and questioned how staff characterized measured visibility from Highway 10.

City Planner, Lori Johnson explained this area was close to Highway 10 and was deemed visible from Highway 10. She indicated this was for the subject property and the surrounding properties.

Chair Ouellette commented the property would be more visible in the winter months than in the summer months.

Mr. Symatic asked how the city deemed the Citi Cargo property should not be rezoned because of its visibility from Highway 10.

City Planner, Lori Johnson explained the entire area was considered, was found to be close to Highway 10 and was deemed visible from Highway 10. She indicated this was for the subject property and the surrounding properties. She reported the property was more visible in the winter than in the summer.

Mr. Symatic questioned what adjacent properties were a concern to staff for visibility purposes.

City Planner, Lori Johnson reported any of the adjacent properties were a concern, along with the adjacent roadways and the traveling public.

Mr. Symatic stated he understood this property was within a business park.

City Planner, Lori Johnson commented this was the case.

Chair Ouellette asked if there were any other I-2A properties in the vicinity.

City Planner, Lori Johnson reported there were no other I-2A properties in the area.

Mr. Symatic commented this was true but noted the adjacent uses were legal

nonconforming. He understood it made for clean maps to have the entire business park be in the same type of zoning, but noted this may not be good planning when considering the context of the overall area. He reported outdoor truck storage would remain in this area for the foreseeable future regardless of the approval or denial of this application. He questioned how likely it was that the traveling public would be entering a business park without being a worker, owner or customer of these businesses.

City Planner, Lori Johnson reiterated her comments regarding driving on Highway 10 and Radisson Road.

Chair Ouellette requested clarification on the type of work that occurs at Citi Cargo.

Mr. Symatic reported the site was used for truck and trailer storage, maintenance and repair. He commented on the history of this property noting truck, trailer or semi storage from 1998 to 2004, which led to the parcel losing its grandfathering status. He asked why this statement was made by staff.

City Planner, Lori Johnson explained she relied on aerials from that period of time, property records and knowledge of the conditional use permit application that was made by Zappa and Sons Excavating.

Mr. Symatic questioned where the aerials came from.

City Planner, Lori Johnson stated the aerials were from city and county GIS information.

Mr. Symatic inquired if these aerials were made a part of the staff report.

City Planner, Lori Johnson reported they were not made a part of the staff report, but she would be forwarding this onto Mr. Symatic per his data request.

Mr. Symatic asked if there were other suitable locations in Blaine available for purchase or lease for Citi Cargo.

City Planner, Lori Johnson stated she was aware of one property that was available for purchase or lease. She noted this property was located on Radisson Road and 101st Avenue next to the airport.

Mr. Symatic questioned if this property was presently vacant.

City Planner, Lori Johnson commented this property had a tenant that would be

vacating the site on November 30th.

Mr. Symatic inquired if staff had made any evaluations as to whether or not this parcel would be suitable for Citi Cargo's business needs.

City Attorney, Chris Nelson asked if there would be a presentation, or if Mr. Symatic would be interviewing staff.

Mr. Symatic explained a presentation has been made. He believed it was fair to the Commission that if claims are made in the staff report that the Commission should be informed as to the basis for these claims. He understood he may be long-winded and noted he would be comply with the Commission if he was directed to be done. He questioned if staff could tell the Commission how this property is guided in the Comprehensive Plan.

City Planner, Lori Johnson reported the property is guided Heavy Industrial.

Mr. Symatic inquired if there was any distinction in the Comprehensive Plan between I-2 Heavy Industrial and I-2A Heavy Industrial as it pertains to this property.

City Planner, Lori Johnson stated she could not answer this question without looking at the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Symatic questioned if the Comprehensive Plan has any distinction between the classifications for Heavy Industrial.

City Planner, Lori Johnson indicated she would have to look at the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Symatic asked if there were any other document's he could consult that states the historical, current and envisioned use for this property.

City Planner, Lori Johnson reported there were none she could think of at this moment.

Mr. Symatic commented this parcel was included as part of a redevelopment zone and was identified as an opportunity versus a priority.

City Planner, Lori Johnson explained she could not answer this question without looking closer at the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Symatic questioned what the redevelopment plans were for this property.

City Planner, Lori Johnson stated she could not answer this question without looking closer at the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Symatic asked if there was a timeline for the redevelopment of this property.

City Planner, Lori Johnson commented she did not know.

Mr. Symatic inquired if the city intended to assemble the parcels included in this redevelopment area.

City Planner, Lori Johnson stated there have been no discussions about the city assembling these properties for redevelopment.

Mr. Symatic questioned why Citi Cargo was allowed to continue to use the property as it is being used for 14 years without staff intervention.

City Planner, Lori Johnson explained the applicant never made a request to rezone the property and the city received no complaints. For this reason, the property was not on the city's radar.

Mr. Symatic asked if any enforcement action was taken against the Citi Cargo property between 2006 to the present.

City Planner, Lori Johnson stated no enforcement activity occurred during this time period.

City Attorney, Chris Nelson reported a letter was sent to the property owner in 2006 noting the site was out of compliance with the zoning ordinance.

City Planner, Lori Johnson explained this was true.

Chair Ouellette asked if this property was rezoned would the site have to have an office with restrooms and breakrooms.

City Planner, Lori Johnson reported if the Council elects to rezone the site the applicant would have to apply for a conditional use permit to allow the use onsite. The conditional use permit would then allow the city to bring the site into conformance with all zoning ordinance requirements. She stated if a building does not meet current building codes, this would have to be addressed.

Chair Ouellette asked if another option was to allow for truck repair.

City Planner, Lori Johnson stated the I-2 zoning district does allow for truck repair, but this use would limit this facility to having no more than three trucks onsite.

Commissioner Villella questioned if the eyesore/visibility was the biggest concern.

City Planner, Lori Johnson reported the biggest concern was that the use was an illegal nonconforming use that does not meet city ordinance requirements at this time.

Commissioner Villella commented he had a hard time shutting this business down given the fact they have been operating as is for the past 14 years. He questioned if there was a statute of limitations regarding this type of matter. He reported the adjacent uses looked very similar to this use. He stated he was very sympathetic to the applicant's argument.

City Attorney, Chris Nelson reported there was not a statute of limitations regarding enforcement of the zoning ordinance.

Chair Ouellette reported cases have come before the city in the past 5, 10 or 15 years after a property was nonconforming.

Commissioner Villella stated he was interested in learning what sparked this planning case.

City Planner, Lori Johnson explained the city received a complaint regarding the visibility.

Commissioner Homan questioned who was at fault for operating the property not in compliance with city code.

City Planner, Lori Johnson reported the purchaser of the property should understand how the property can be used.

Commissioner Olson commented she was struggling with the fact the neighboring property could continue to operate a truck and trailer use, indefinitely.

City Attorney, Chris Nelson reported this use could continue.

Commissioner Olson explained this parcel owner could not operate a truck and trailer operation because they did not go through the proper conditional use permit process. She believed this was not fair and both properties were not being weighed equally. She commented if the complaint was with visibility, the adjacent property should also be a concern. She questioned how the city could force this business to

cease and desist while the other businesses could remain.

Chair Ouellette reported all of this property was zoned I-2 and over time the requirements changed. With these requirements changing, the properties were now considered nonconforming uses. This property became an illegal nonconforming use because the truck and trailer use did not occur for a period of five or six years.

Commissioner Olson feared that the city was spot zoning in the opposite way.

Commissioner Villella commented if the business were forced out, the surrounding properties would not look any better. He believed the city had to use common sense with this request and being a stickler for the rules would not improve the overall area.

Commissioner Goracke stated there was the letter of the law and the heart of the law. He explained he was struggling with the amount of time this business has been operating in the city of Blaine. He indicated some people would get hurt if this business were forced to cease and desist.

Chair Ouellette reported if this property were rezoned, the site would be required to complete substantial improvements in order to be in compliance with the I-2A zoning district. He asked if rezoning this property would set a precedent.

City Planner, Lori Johnson commented this would set a precedent and it would open up the possibility for the other properties to request the same change. She reported the city did not pick this property out of hat, but rather staff received a complaint and was enforcing city ordinance.

Commissioner Halpern reported the visibility concern brought about a noncompliance issue that was 14 years old. He addressed the 2040 Comprehensive Plan and noted the future plan for Blaine was to locate these types of businesses elsewhere in the city. He indicated there was one other property in Blaine where this business could relocate.

Chair Ouellette commented he visited the property and noted some of the trailers on the site appear to have been sitting on the site since 2006.

Mr. Symatic indicated he could not speak to the length of time the trailers have been onsite.

Motion by Commissioner Homan to recommend denial of Planning Case 20-0035 based on the following rationale:

Case 20-0035:

1. When the 1998 code amendment removed truck and semi-trailer storage in excess of dock or bay doors from the I-2 zoning district, the city council elected not to rezone 1801 Radisson Road to the I-2A district due to the visibility of the site and the desire to keep trucking uses in a more suitable location and clustered in a different area within the city. To rezone the site at this time would be a reversal of what was historically and currently envisioned for the site.
2. The city's 2040 Comprehensive Plan has identified this parcel, and several surrounding parcels, as a redevelopment area due to the unsightly nature of these parcels. Rezoning this property would be in direct conflict with the city's comprehensive plan and the redevelopment goals of the city.
3. While the site is not as visible in the summer months due to leaves on the surrounding trees, the site can be seen from public roadways. Given the elevations of Highway 10, in the winter months, this site is visible to the traveling public.
4. There are other I-2A zoned parcels in the city that would be suitable for the outside parking of trucks in excess of dock and/or bay doors.
5. 1801 Radisson Road is not operating as a truck and semi-trailer storage facility as a legal nonconformity, and the property owner has been aware that its use of the property is contrary to the Blaine zoning code since at least 2006.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Halpern. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed 4-2 (Commissioner Goracke and Commissioner Villella opposed).

Aye: 4 - Chair Ouellette, Commissioner Homan, Commissioner Olson, and Commissioner Halpern

Nay: 2 - Commissioner Goracke, and Villella

Chair Ouellette noted this would be on the agenda of the November 2, 2020 city council meeting.

Adjournment

Adjournment time was 9:18 PM

Motion by Commissioner Goracke to adjourn the Regular Planning Commission meeting. Motion seconded by Commissioner Villella. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed 6-0.

Aye: 6 - Chair Ouellette, Commissioner Homan, Commissioner Goracke, Commissioner Olson, Commissioner Halpern, and Villella