

the street, and the installation of curb and gutter. Since there are no other lots in the area with these improvements this wouldn't be practical. This is typically handled with a payment in lieu of these improvements before the permit is issued. This payment is placed in the improvement fund for the city and when a street improvement is going to take place the money is available. It's required to provide the estimate for the cost of widening the street, to collect the street standards, and the cost of curb and gutter. The city will then approve or disapprove that estimate. This pertains only to this side of the street and across the frontage. A Detailed Plan indicating exactly what is on this property, and what is being proposed is extremely vital. A sidewalk waiver is on file therefore; a sidewalk will not be required to be built at this time. Sometime in the future the owner may need to put in a sidewalk when the Board of Works determines it's necessary. The critical issue is being only 10' away from the property line. It's important to see how close this is to the ditch. This ditch will need to be maintained and 10' may not be adequate to allow for equipment. The Detailed Plan should include where the top of the bank is located, what the slopes are, and some elevations. These issues will need to be resolved.

Phillips stated that currently the existing building is not in compliance with the standards for the setbacks. The addition that's built will need to meet the setbacks or require variances in order to be built. The issue is that there must be a 25' minimum setback from the property line to the building edge on the rear. In addition, the total setbacks on the sides must equal 60' and currently there is 42' therefore; a variance will be needed. The drainage and setback issues as well as making sure the ditch is adequately protected will need to be resolved before a permit can be granted for the property. Information for the Board of Zoning Appeals meeting will need to be brought to City Hall by January 25th in order to be addressed at the February 19th meeting. The reason for the variance is because the property is too small for the proposed building. This property is more of a light manufacturing use however; it's located in the heavy manufacturing district. A defining factor is finding out who owns the easement, and what the easement is for. If they own the land that the easement sets on, this can count toward that setback calculation. The building can then be shifted to meet the setback requirements. Checking records from the county is important to get the information needed and this will determine if the variances will be required.

Pilarski questioned what will be discharged from the building into the sanitary sewer system. Musgrove said the existing bathroom will remain the same and the building will house 2 large machines that will stamp shirts. There are no floor drains and nothing will go into the sanitary sewer system. If a restroom were added in the future a Facility Plumbing Plan would be required. Contacting Ed Pilarski is recommended in regards to this.

Martinson said the planting of trees is favorable and to contact him for what is recommended and to avoid any invasive species.

ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED:

- Erosion Control Plan
- Detailed Site Plan
- Facility Plumbing Plan (if adding restroom)
- Backflow Prevention
- Site Improvement Permit
- State Design Release
- Possible Variance
- Zoning Clearance
- Detailed Ownership Information for Easement
- Building Permit