



**MONTROSE
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
AGENDA**

**Wednesday, October 14, 2020
7:00 PM**

**Montrose Community Center
200 Center Avenue South
Montrose, Minnesota 55363**

1. Call to Order
 2. Roll Call
 3. Pledge of Allegiance
 4. Approval of Agenda
 5. Approval of Minutes
 - A. August 12, 2020 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes
 6. Resignation from Planning and Zoning Commission – Ms. Tracy Gurneau
 - A. Ms. Tracy Gurneau’s Resignation from the Planning and Zoning Commission Effective September 30, 2020
 - B. Chair
 - C. Vice-Chair
 7. Old Business
 8. New Business
 - A. Discussion Regarding Beekeeping in Residential Districts
 - B. City Planner Updates
 9. Next Meeting
 - A. November, 2020 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting To-Be-Determined
 10. Adjournment
- * * Please note that a quorum of the City Council may be present
at the Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting. * ***

City of Montrose
 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting
 Montrose Community Center
 200 Center Avenue South
 Wednesday, August 12, 2020
 7:00 P.M.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Pursuant to call and notice the Montrose Planning and Zoning Commission met in Regular Session on Wednesday, August 12, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.

Planning and Zoning Commission Chair, Ms. Tracy Gurneau, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioner Tracy Gurneau
 Commissioner Justin Emery
 Commissioner Sylvia Henry
 Commissioner Mike Scanlon
 Commissioner Shawn Cuff
 City Council Liaison Lloyd Johnson

Staff Present: Ms. Wendy Manson, Deputy Clerk
 Mr. Steve Grittman, City Planner
 Mr. Daniel Elder, City Planner

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIENCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was taken.

4. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Commissioner Emery motioned to approve the August 12, 2020 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting Agenda. Commissioner Henry seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

A. July 8, 2020 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Henry motioned to approve the Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting minutes of July 8, 2020. Commissioner Scanlon seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Consider A Planned Unit Development Amendment – Forest Creek – R Homes – CONTINUATION

Commissioner Gurneau closed the Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting at 7:02 p.m. and opened the Public Hearings at 7:03 p.m.

BACKGROUND

Mr. Steve Grittman was present and explained options that R Homes has submitted for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) Amendment for property located along Breckenridge Lane. Mr. Grittman explained that different options such as style, size and even color do not set a precedent, as each property is unique and the PUD is set for each specific property, not all properties in general. Mr. Jay Roos from R-Home Land Development was also on hand to answer questions or concerns over (PUD) Amendment in question.

Commissioner Scanlon and Commissioner Cuff asked about the design of the house. Mr. Gritman stated that he can see the design of the house being used in a typical housing district; however, the proposed lot size and having the common area would be unique to this project.

Commissioner Scanlon again shared his concerns about setting a precedence for future housing developments if the Planning and Zoning Commission recommends approval of the PUD for the smaller lot size in Forest Creek.

Council Member Johnson shared his concerns about the residents not being able to park their boats and campers on the driveways of the proposed smaller lots and there would also not be enough room for the installation of a parking pad to park their recreational vehicles.

The Commission Members again reviewed the proposed amendment for ten (10) lots on the north side of the Forest Creek Plat.

Commissioner Gunneau closed the Public Hearing at 7:29 p.m. and reopened the Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting at 7:30 p.m.

After much consideration it was decided NOT TO ALLOW (PUD) Amendment to pass.

Commissioner Emery motioned NOT TO ALLOW (PUD) Amendment. Commissioner Cuff seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

7. NO OLD BUSINESS.

8. NEW BUSINESS.

A. Sid Chantland and Gail Wright - Cool Java Coffee Shop Parking Deferment Request

Ms. Wright and Mr. Chantland addressed the Commissioner's to submit a request to defer parking requirements and cost for Cool Java Coffee Shop until a later date. After 2.5 years of financial setbacks, State regulation and Covid-19, owner Mr. Chantland would like to defer the expense of \$25,000 - \$30,000 to bring current parking lot up to code with the Off-Street Parking and Load Requirements for the City of Montrose, until a later date with final completion to be set no later than July 1, 2022. City Planner, Daniel Elder suggested that a Development Agreement be made to hold Mr. Chantland to the agreement of 6 (six) parking spaces to be paved, painted and striped with 1 (one) to be ADA parking stall, and the remaining 6 (six) parking spaces to be completed by July 1, 2022. Also, Mr. Chantland would have to submit a new sketch of the first 6 spaces to be completed along with the application. Commissioner's agreed with Mr. Elder and granted Mr. Chantland the parking lot deferment.

Commissioner Henry made a motion to grant Mr. Chantland and Ms. Wright to Open Cool Java Coffee Shop, contingent upon a signed and executed Development Agreement. Commissioner Scanlon seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

B. City Planner updates

1. Old Casey's Building

City Planner, Daniel Elder is currently trying to follow up with current owner of the property.

2. Commercial lot on East side of town has had some interested party looking into the possibility of opening up a trucking company.

3. Inquiry of 135 Center Avenue, City Planner will talk to prospect early next week.

9. NEXT MEETING

A. Wednesday, September 9, 2020 to be held at the Montrose Community Center – 7:00 p.m.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Emery motioned to the adjourn the Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting at 7:53 p.m. Commissioner Henry seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

Tracy Gurneau
Chair
City of Montrose

ATTEST:

Heidi Dahlin
Administrative Assistant
City of Montrose

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: Montrose Planning Commission
FROM: Daniel Elder
DATE: October 7, 2020
RE: Montrose – Beekeeping Information

NAC FILE: 20.02

The City has been approached by residents who are inquiring about the allowance of beekeeping in the community. Currently, the zoning ordinance definition of farm animals includes bees, meaning that beekeeping would only be allowed in areas of the community that allow farming or other agricultural activities, essentially, just the UR, Urban Reserve District.

Residents are concerned about the keeping of bees in residential areas, citing the distance to neighbors and the dangers of allergic reactions.

Some cities have accommodated beekeeping in residential areas, although the majority do not. Minneapolis is often cited as an example. However, zoning authority in Minneapolis is different than in Buffalo and other smaller communities. Minneapolis is a “first class” city under the state’s classification system, and allows various land use decisions to be made at the neighborhood level. In the case of bees, the City retains the authority for approval, but permits all neighbors a “veto” vote.

This type of neighbor approval process is not permitted outside of Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth. As such, the City must decide whether beekeeping would be allowed, and is not permitted to require neighbor approval.

The common issue raised by opponents is the potential for stinging and the fact that between 5% and 10% of the population is allergic to insect stings. Because bees are not able to be controlled on a single property, the impact to neighbors is a potential issue.

With regard to honey production, the National Honey Board estimates that an average bee colony will produce about 60 pounds of honey per year, while the average consumption of honey is about 1.3 pounds per person in the U.S., or less than 5 pounds per household.

A common beehive frame would be just under 20 inches long, by 12 inches high, by 10 inches wide.

While honeybees are not commonly aggressive, they spread throughout the neighborhood in search of nectar-producing flowering plants. We are aware of issues that have arisen in residential areas with conflicts between and there is potentially areas where residents' allergies have been an issue. As noted above, it is not possible to contain the bees within a single residential property.

Options to consider would be as follows:

1. Retain existing code language, restricting beekeeping to Agricultural areas.
2. Allow beekeeping in typical residential areas, but limit bee colonies to a single hive.

Because we are not permitted to treat similarly zoned single family properties differently, we cannot limit beekeeping to one per block, or any similar distance.

To accomplish option 2, an amendment would need to be made to the zoning ordinance allowing beekeeping in those zoning districts and establishing the regulations appropriate to manage the use. In the cities that allow beekeeping, beekeepers are required to register their activity in the event of complaints or other issues.

Staff will be available at the Planning Commission meeting to answer and questions and continue this discussion.

Pc: Deb Boetler