

Memorandum

To: Sunfish Lake Mayor Dan O'Leary and City Council Members

From: Lori Johnson, City Planner

Date: June 7, 2022

Re: Sunfish Lake – Planner's Report for the June 7, 2022, City Council Meeting
WSB Project No. 019575-000

There was no Planning Commission meeting in May due to lack of applications. There will be a Planning Commission meeting in June.

May Planning Updates

1. 300 Salem Church Road: This is a hold over item from last month. No news to report. From May report: *There are no updates on this unpaid escrow and I will need to know how to proceed with collection of this escrow. The outstanding amount is \$2,709.35.*
2. June 16 Planning Commission meeting: The Commission will be reviewing an application for major site plan review and a conditional use permit for 15 Sunnyside Lane. The applicant is proposing to construct a new home with a pool and a walkway to the lake. You may remember that there were some drainage concerns on this site and more information was needed to move the item forward as of the last City Council meeting. Another on-site meeting was held to determine if the drainage issues could be rectified. Mayor O'Leary, the City Engineer, the City Forester and I met with the property owner, applicant and contractors on site to discuss the proposed drainage system. The adjacent property owner to the south was advised of the drainage plan prior to the onsite meeting. Based on the outcome of that meeting and some additional adjustments on the plan set, staff feels comfortable moving forward with the application at the June meeting.

The tentative date for the onsite meeting for Planning Commission members, City Councilmembers, neighbors and others is June 16 at 5:15 p.m.
3. Zoning Ordinance Update: I will be working with the mayor in the next few months to work through the zoning ordinance update. This will be a time-consuming effort but will hopefully provide the city with a better framework for moving forward with land use applications.

With regard to the zoning ordinance update and all previous escrow and fee related work that has been completed to date, WSB will be bringing forward a Council item in July to discuss a potential budget for the ordinance and escrow work. These items are outside the normal scope of work that has typically been provided by the Planner and our company wants to be clear with cost expectations for this work.

4. 345 Salem Church Road: The future property owner of the site has been asking many questions about altering the nonconforming structure on site. He has indicated he may

add a second floor to the structure or demolish the building. You may have received messages from him in the past month or so regarding his plans. If you have questions please let me know at the meeting, but as of this date, no formal applications have been submitted.

5. 410 Salem Church Road: Tim and Kristal Barber have submitted a site plan for preliminary review for the addition of an indoor sport court and an attached garage on their property. After the first review I determined that the previous planners have interpreted the definition of a side yard incorrectly, and the Barber's proposed addition did not meet the side yard setbacks. The Barber's home appears to be nonconforming with the current ordinance. Given that it is nonconforming, the City Attorney and I looked at various options in the ordinance that would provide the Barber's with an option for expanding a nonconforming structure. The City Attorney and I have determined that the nonconforming structure can be modified to increase livability with the approval of a major site plan review. I have directed the Barbers to make such application and proceed with their plans.
6. 2184 Charlton Road: The property owners, Michael and Suzanne MacDonald, along with their architect, Pat Mackey, have submitted a variance application to allow for a third stall garage to be added to their existing garage. This lot and all buildings on the lot are nonconforming since they were constructed prior to current ordinance requirements. This situation is much like the Barber's situation in that the property owners are trying to increase the livability of their nonconforming lot. The ordinance does allow for this addition if the nonconforming structure is amended to increase the livability of the structure. Therefore, I have called this application incomplete and have asked that the applicant and property owners revise their request to include a minor site plan review. They also need to submit all site development plans, which were not included in the first submittal. This item may be coming before the Planning Commission in July if the proper materials are submitted.