

Altoona Board of Adjustment Hearing – March 7, 2023 – 6:30 PM

Members Present: Rullman, Hall, Downs, Simon

Members Absent: Forbes

Staff: John Shaw, Natalie Jacobson, Marina Smart

Guests: Aaron Quinn, Dave Saeugling

Chairman Rullman called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

1. Roll Call. Roll call was taken. Four commissioners were present at roll call.

2. Review and approve the February 7, 2023 meeting minutes.

Motion by Downs, seconded by Simon, to approve the minutes.

Vote: Yes – Downs, Simon, Hall, Rullman. No – None. Abstain – None. Motion approved, 4-0-0.

3. Consider a request for a conditional use permit to allow outside storage for Crescent Electric Supply Co. for the property at 2770 21st Street NW.

Chapter 168.14(3) lists outdoor storage as a permitted conditional use if fenced and screen properly.

Dave Saeugling presented the materials for the application.

Rullman tarts the discussion and inquires about the history of the fence. Saeugling responds that they, as the tenant, were unaware there was an ordinance requiring a conditional use permit for outdoor storage and went though the building owner to erect one.

Rullman comments on the current landscaping and states the landscaping to the north of the fenced area will need to have additional conifers planted to help screen the lot better. Rullman also mentions the contents of the storage area currently are stacked higher than the 6' fence currently provided. He mentions there are a couple options. One, would be to make the fence taller or two, to make the storage area larger. Saeugling comments they were unaware of the amount of inventory they would have on hand which is the cause for the stacking above the fence line.

Saeugling asked how much further out they would be able to go with the storage yard. Rullman responds with the question asking how high they plan on stacking the materials. Saeugling responds the max height they would be stacking materials would be 8'-10' and if they were to raise the fence it would be maxed at 10'. Rullman stated that the fence would not be able to exceed the height of the materials they currently have out there.

Saeugling asked the board how they would feel about allowing them to extend their current storage area out another 20'-25' to eliminate the need to raise the fence height. Downs asked if there was sufficient room to make that work and as to not restrict traffic movement through the site. Saeugling responds that it would stay between the ingress and egress doors to the west.

Rullman asked Shaw if there were any problems with that. Shaw responds that he is uncertain and would need to examine this new proposal closure as the closer they get to the trailer loading stall depth it may restrict truck access. Saeugling comments the length of a trailer is about 85' from front of the vehicle to the dock door. The storage area would only go about 75' if that out from the side of the building.

Downs asked Shaw if there are any restrictions on fence height. Shaw responded that 10' would be the maximum height allowed.

Rullman asked if they need to table the application if they were to explore the option to move the fence out further. Shaw responds that the staff would need to look closer at the area if the applicant chooses to go that route so yes.

Shaw asked Saeugling how far their leasing space extends. Saeugling responds they have just over two-thirds of the building under lease.

Shaw stated that since the hearing was published using smaller specs than what were being discussed, the applicant would have to come back for another meeting as a new public hearing notice would have to be published.

Quinn stated he would like to make the argument to set another public hearing date and come back with a new proposal to expanded the storage space versus raise the height of the fence to 10'. Rullman clarified that the height of the current fence would not be changed at all from the 6' fence height when they propose to expand the space. Quinn reassured Rullman that would be the case.

Downs asked Shaw if they would have to deny the application as proposed or make a motion to table the application until further notice. Shaw stated they should just table it until a new notice is published.

Saeugling asked if the application is tabled will they still be able to bring forth the proposal to raise the fence height if that is the cheaper option after getting quotes. Shaw stated they would be able to do that.

Motion by Downs, seconded by Simon to table the application as presented pending new publication and another request is made showing the extension of the area.

Vote: Yes – Downs, Simon, Hall, Rullman. No – None. Abstain – None. Motion approved, 4-0-0.

Meeting adjourned at 6:46 pm.

Respectfully submitted.

Natalie Jacobson

City Planner