# MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING MINNEHAHA COUNTY & SIOUX FALLS PLANNING COMMISSIONS January 27, 2020

A joint meeting of the County and City Planning Commissions was scheduled on January 27, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. in the Commission Room of the Minnehaha County Administration Building.

COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Bonnie Duffy, Becky Randall, Mike Ralston, Doug Ode, Ryan VanDerVliet, and Jeff Barth.

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Sean Ervin, Larry Luetke, John Paulson, Sharon Chontos, Kurt Johnson.

#### STAFF PRESENT:

Scott Anderson, David Heinold, and Kevin Hoekman - County Planning Donna Kelly – States Attorney Albert Schmidt – City Planning

The County Planning Commission was presided over by Commissioner Bonnie Duffy. The City Planning Commission was chaired by Sean Ervin.

Chair Duffy called the joint City of Sioux Falls and Minnehaha County Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT.

Commissioner Duffy opened the floor for public comment and nobody moved to speak.

#### **Consent Agenda**

Commissioner Duffy read each item on the consent agenda.

A motion was made for the County by Commissioner Barth and seconded by Commissioner Ode to **approve** the consent agenda consisting of Items 1 and 2. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made for the City by Commissioner Johnson and seconded by Commissioner Chontos to **approve** the consent agenda consisting of Items 1 and 2. The motion passed unanimously.



# ITEM 1. <u>Approval of Minutes</u> – October 28, 2019

As part of the consent agenda, a motion was made for the County by Commissioner Barth and seconded by Commissioner Ode to **approve** the meeting minutes from October 28, 2019. The motion passed unanimously.

The same motion was made for the City by Commissioner Johnson and seconded by Commissioner Chontos to **approve** the meeting minutes from October 28, 2019. The motion passed unanimously.

# ITEM 2. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT #20-04 to exceed 10,000 square feet of commercial building area on the property legally described as the Portion of Lot AB, Lot H3 lying adjacent & Lot A, Lot 3, Husky Oil Tract 1, SE1/4, Section 25-T102N-R50W.

Petitioner: Clayton Haug

Property Owner: Dave Petersen

Location: 5104 N. Harvestore Rd. Northwest Sioux Falls

Staff Report: Kevin Hoekman

# **General Information:**

Legal Description - Portion of Lot AB, Lot H3 lying adjacent & Lot A, Lot 3, Husky

Oil Tract 1, SE1/4, Section 25-T102N-R50W

Present Zoning – C-Commercial

Existing Land Use – Warehouse/contractor lot

Parcel Size – 2.44 acres

**Staff Report:** Kevin Hoekman

#### **Staff Analysis:**

The property is located in a small commercial zoned development at the northwest intersection of Interstate 29 and W. 60<sup>th</sup> Street North. The development is within county jurisdiction and surrounded by city limits on all sides. Many of the properties in the development are used for warehousing and contractor lots (uses more typical of light industrial zoning district). Roads within the development are gravel surfaced.

The property currently has a shop building with office space on the lot, and the property owner wished to expand the use with a 104 feet by 60 feet addition to the existing building. Commercial zoning in the Joint jurisdiction allows warehousing as a special use if there is no outside storage, not storage of regulated substance, and the building contains 10,000 square feet of area or less. The addition will make the structure larger than 10,000 square feet, and the large size of building requires a review through the conditional use permit process. The application states that the additional space will be used for equipment storage.

The petitioner submitted a detailed site plan of the building with a perspective rendering of the addition. The detailed plans are useful since a large portion of the property is located within the regulatory floodplain. County staff used GIS to calculate the distance from the existing building to the flood plain as approximately 139 feet. The proposed building addition is 104 feet long for a 35 feet difference between the two. Comments from planning staff for the City of Sioux Falls include that a floodplain development permit should be required prior to the to the addition to the building. The requirements for a floodplain development permit is different for the City of Sioux Falls than for the County. County planning staff finds that no floodplain development will be needed with the proposed building not reaching the mapped floodplain. The Joint Planning

Commission may add a condition to meet the standards for floodplain development for the City of Sioux Falls.

The property and building is operated jointly with the parcel immediately south of the site. The properties share a driveway and outdoor storage area. A common fence also surrounds the outside lot.

# **Conditional Use Permit Criteria:**

1) The effect upon the use and enjoyment of other property in the surrounding area for the uses already permitted, and upon property values within the surrounding area.

The predominant land use of the area is other warehousing and outdoor storage, and the proposed use of the property for warehousing will fit well with neighboring uses. The property is adjacent to Interstate 29 and a large retail fireworks store is located a few parcels south. The road servicing the property is gravel surfaced and added traffic may add wear onto the gravel surface.

2) The effect upon the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding vacant property for uses predominant in the area.

The small commercial area in which the proposed building is located is nearly built out on all properties. Most future growth in the development will take place as additions to existing uses and changes in use of operations. The small pocket of county jurisdiction is also surrounded by the City of Sioux Falls. Future development will likely remain similar to the request until annexation takes place.

- 3) That utilities, access roads, drainage, and/or other necessary facilities are provided. The request is to allow an expansion of an existing building utilities, access roads, and other necessities are already present on the site. The addition will not significantly change the drainage of the site.
- 4) That the off-street parking and loading requirements are met. Industrial uses and warehousing requires two off street parking spaces for every 3 employees on

the maximum shift. A loading space of 12 feet by 20 feet is also required for the building. The proposed structure has several overhead doors and the property is large enough to accommodate off street parking for many vehicles. No on street loading and unloading should take place.

5) That measures are taken to control offensive odor, fumes, dust, noise, vibration, and lighting (inclusive of lighted signs), so that none of these will constitute a nuisance.

The proposed building, and the development area around it, are generally set up in an industri

The proposed building, and the development area around it, are generally set up in an industrial fashion. The property is surrounded by a chain link fence with protective barbed wire on top. The driveway is gated. City planning staff requested in the comment letter for the property to have a screening plan. Screening also is a common requirement for outdoor storage within rural industrial and commercial areas. Screening would be helpful to bring the property into common

standards for outdoor storage for the county and the city. Slats placed within the existing fence is an acceptable form of screening.

Since the property is operated jointly with the neighboring parcel, screening placed on the southern lot may be counted for screening of the subject property.

## 6) Health, safety, general welfare of the public and the Comprehensive Plan.

The proposed building expansion will enlarge an existing use within an already built out commercial/industrial development. The expansion will have minimal changes to the health, safety, and general welfare of the public. Allowing the proposed expansion will meet the comprehensive plan goal to promote the retention/expansion of job creation in the county.

#### **Recommendation:**

Minnehaha County staff recommends **approval** of Conditional Use Permit #20-04 with the following conditions:

- 1.) The property shall adhere to the submitted site plan.
- 2.) A building permit is required prior to the construction of the new addition. Plans must be reviewed and approved by the Minnehaha County Building Inspector.
- 3.) All portions of the building must be constructed outside of the regulatory floodplain.
- 4.) Outdoor storage must be screened from view. A screening plan must be submitted and approved by County Planning Director. The plan must be implemented and screening installed prior to November 1<sup>st</sup>, 2020.
- 5.) That the Planning & Zoning Department reserves the right to enter and inspect the site at any time, after proper notice to the owner, to ensure that the property is in full compliance with the conditional use permit conditions of approval and the Minnehaha County Zoning Ordinance.

#### **Action:**

As part of the consent agenda, a motion was made to **approve** Conditional Use Permit #20-04 with the staff recommended conditions for the County by Commissioner Barth and seconded by Commissioner Ode. The motion passed unanimously. The same motion was made to **approve** Conditional Use Permit #20-04 with the staff recommended conditions for the City by Commissioner Johnson and seconded by Commissioner Chontos. The motion passed unanimously.

Conditional Use Permit #20-04 – Approved



# Regular Agenda

Old Business None.

New Business None.

# <u>Adjourn</u>

A motion was made for the County to **adjourn** by Commissioner Barth and seconded by Commissioner Ode. The motion passed unanimously. The same motion was made for the City to **adjourn** by Commissioner Luetke and seconded by Commissioner Johnson. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:05 pm.