

**CITY OF ISANTI
PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
JANUARY 8, 2013**

1. Meeting Opening.

A. Call to Order.

Stevens called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

B. Pledge of Allegiance.

Everyone rose for the pledge of allegiance.

C. Roll Call.

Members Present: David Englund, Kristi Gordon, Sue Larson, Cindy Lind-Livingston, Michael Streiff III, and Sean Stevens.

Members Absent: Steve Lundeen (gave prior notice).

Staff Present: Lisa Wilson, Planning and Parks Director.

D. Agenda Modifications.

Stevens stated that he would like to propose a modification to the agenda, given that there were members of the audience present for the public hearings listed on the agenda. Stevens stated that he would like to move 3E, 3F, and 3 G to follow the public hearings.

Joslin stated that he was fine with that modification.

Motion by Stevens, second by Larson to accept the Agenda with the noted modifications.
Motion was unanimously approved.

2. Welcome Council Representatives.

Stevens stated that Mr. Lundeen and Mrs. Larson were re-appointed as the Council representatives on the Planning Commission.

3. Organization of Advisory Bodies as per the City Code of Ordinance Chapter 8.

A. Oath of Office for new Planning Commission Members.

Wilson stated that two newly appointed members would need to rise and recite the Oath of Office.

Mr. Streiff and Mr. Englund recited the Oath of Office.

Wilson stated that they would need to sign and return the sheet to her.

B. Chair of Planning Commission.

Wilson requested nominations for the position of Chair of the Planning Commission.

Larson questioned if Mr. Stevens would still be interested in the position.

Stevens stated that he would be. Stevens questioned if there were any other members that would like to hold the position of Chair.

Motion by Lind-Livingston, second by Larson to nominate Mr. Stevens as Chair of the Planning Commission. Motion was unanimously approved.

C. Vice-Chair of Planning Commission.

Stevens stated that he was requesting nominations for Vice Chair of the Planning Commission.

Motion by Larson, second by Streiff to nominate Mr. Englund as Vice Chair of the Planning Commission. Motion was unanimously approved.

D. Secretary of Planning Commission.

Stevens stated that the next appointment would be that of the Secretary.

Larson stated that is always staff.

Motion by Englund, second by Larson to nominate Mrs. Wilson (city staff) as the Secretary of the Planning Commission. Motion was unanimously approved.

4. Approval of Minutes from December 11, 2013 Planning Commission Meeting.

Stevens questioned if there were any comments or changes on the minutes.

Motion by Larson, second by Stevens to approve the December 11th, 2012 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. Motion was unanimously approved.

5. Public Hearings.

A. Request from the City of Isanti for an Amendment to the Villages on the Rum Planned Unit Development, to include all property within any subsequent additions or phases, to eliminate the cove line setback requirement shown on approved plans and specifications and for an Amendment to the Villages on the Rum Third Addition, Phase 3 Planned Unit Development to reduce the side yard setback from fifteen (15) feet to ten (10) feet; in accordance with approved plans and specifications for the development.

Wilson presented the staff memo. Wilson provided information regarding both the cove line elimination throughout the entire development as well as the reduced side yard setback within a portion of the development. Wilson stated that she had received a couple of calls just prior to the meeting from property owners along Whiskey Road NW that were against the ten foot side yard setback. Wilson stated that those individuals felt that the ten foot setback would place a home too close to their property.

Stevens opened the public hearing at 7:10 p.m. Stevens stated that if there was anyone in the audience that wished to speak on these items they must approach the podium and provide their name and address for the record.

David Szynal, 711 Bergman Court NW, stated that there is a lot next to him that is vacant. Szynal stated that the lot is narrow and deep. Szynal stated that if you take off an additional five (5) on each of the side yards, he has concerns. Szynal stated that he is not sure how you would fit a home on that lot anyway. Szynal stated that he pays a lot for where he lives and having another home right on top of his property, he was not in favor of that.

Larson stated that from what she can remember from the initial discussion, because of the narrowness and depth of those lots, the people would have to set their homes back further so that homes would not be stacked upon each other. Larson stated that if the setback were decreased, people may try to shift their homes up further.

Szynal stated that he did not think it would be visually appealing to do that. Szynal stated that his driveway is 100 plus feet already. Szynal stated that you are either going to build a home in front or behind his house.

Wilson stated that Bergman Court already has a 10 foot side yard setback. Wilson stated that is what was approved for his portion of Villages on the Rum during the PUD approval. Wilson stated that the side yard setbacks they are reviewing this evening are for only a portion of the development located along Moline Loop and Robin Road. Wilson pointed the area out on the map. Wilson stated that the reason this area is coming before the Commission for an amendment is because the plans approved for this portion of the development show a 10 foot setback. Wilson stated that there are several homes that were constructed with that 10 foot setback; however, when you review the development agreement that outlines in writing the requirements, the document indicates that there should be a 15 foot side yard setback. Wilson stated that there are inconsistencies between the approved plans, homes constructed, and the development agreement that need to be addressed.

Stevens stated that we are talking about the newest portion of the Villages on the Rum development.

Szynal stated that the letter was confusing to him. Szynal stated that it indicated all phases, but also focuses on Phase 3. Szynal stated that he questioned why he was getting the letter.

Wilson explained why he had received the letter.

Szynal stated that the letter does not mention the cove line elimination review.

Wilson questioned if she could see the letter and she could discuss that with him.

Szynal presented the hearing letter.

Wilson discussed the item with the property owner.

Stevens stated that for clarification purposes, there are two issues that are being discussed this evening. Stevens stated that there is the broader issue regarding the cove line setback. Stevens stated that the side yard setback is the other issue for only a portion of the Villages on the Rum development. Stevens stated that the phase in question is east of Whiskey Rd NW and north of Isanti Parkway NW.

Larson stated that in the past the group had discussed with the shape of some of the lots, they would have to work to get a house within these areas. Larson stated that those lots are very challenging.

Stevens stated that the last property owner that had come forward had a challenging lot and with the cove line, the home would be placed on the drop-off area down to the river.

Larson stated that with some of those lots along the river, the Commission may be looking at each individually in order to determine how the home can be placed.

Lind-Livingston questioned if there was a real standard for how far a home can be setback.

Stevens stated that because the development was so mixed, there were a lot of different things that went into each of the phases. Stevens stated that we are now dealing with some of the inconsistencies that are between the different phases.

Lind-Livingston questioned if there were standard setbacks in the City that are used or are they all negotiated when a developer comes in to plat a property.

Wilson stated that each of the zoning districts has a specific setback requirement. Wilson stated that if you came in and wanted to plat an R-1 subdivision, you would be required to have a ten foot side yard setback and a 30 foot front and rear yard setback. Wilson stated that within Villages on the Rum, other setback requirements were used depending upon the lots, home/garage sizes, etc. Wilson stated that there is a phase or two, in which the garage can be five feet off the side lot line, but the home must be 10 feet.

Stevens questioned if with the two issues, is the Planning Commission clear about what is going on here.

Allyson Miller, 818 Golden Way NW, questioned the cove line.

Stevens stated that it was an imaginary line that was placed on some lots that placed the homes further back on the property. Stevens stated that with the curvilinear streets this was done for aesthetic reasons. Stevens stated that within the last few months, because lots were so skinny and deep, the cove line made building on some of these lots almost impossible. Stevens stated that the group has reviewed a few requests to push the cove line forward so that property owners have a buildable lot.

Miller questioned with her property being at 818 Golden Way, would the cove line affect her property.

Wilson stated that she did not believe the cove line affects the townhome development. Wilson stated that most of these areas have building pads that were platted within the common space. Wilson stated that in review of the plans, it appeared that the cove line applied mainly to certain single-family home lots.

Stevens stated that he did want to note that he does live within the Villages on the Rum development and received notice. Stevens stated that he is not within the phase dealing with the side yard setbacks. Stevens questioned if there would be a perceived conflict of interest.

Clark Joslin, City Attorney, stated that unless his property would be affected by the recommendation, then there should not be any conflict.

Jacob Berg, 802 Whiskey Rd NW, questioned what the time line would be for development of the property.

Stevens questioned who owned the property.

Wilson stated that the property was held by The Riverbank; however, there was a purchase on the property by a developer.

Stevens stated that with things in transition, it would be really hard to say.

Berg provided comment that could not be heard on the record.

Stevens stated that because he was in the notification zone, when he talked to his neighbors, no one seemed to want to give up that additional five feet. Stevens stated that was the flavor he was catching from most folks. Stevens questioned in all of the mixed-use is it consistent throughout Villages on the Rum that 15 feet is used.

Wilson stated that it is not. Wilson stated that most of the development has a 10 foot setback. Wilson stated that many of the bayhomes and townhome units allow a ten foot setback to the home, but a five foot setback to the garage. Wilson stated that within the zoning ordinance, the standard side yard setback is ten feet.

Larson stated that she thought they took each phase separately and looked at the plat to see what would make sense with the shapes of the lots. Larson stated that there was a lot of discussion and she thought that the 15 feet was the best solution.

Stevens stated that there were many long nights trying to get the developer to pull out a lot here and there. Stevens stated that he sided on the discretion that 15 feet seems like a consistent number that worked for them back then; and should work moving forward.

Lind-Livingston questioned when they approved the plat, it was 15. Lind-Livingston questioned how it changed to 10 feet.

Stevens stated that the first couple of phases were back by the river. Stevens stated that the lots were larger and required the 15 setback. Stevens stated that as the development moved eastward towards Third St, the lots became smaller and there was a real effort on the part of the developer to get as much housing as they could in there. Stevens stated that because the PUD does not have the same kind of restrictions that the desire was to get more homes in the area.

Wilson stated that what she has found was that the City approved plans with the side yard setback at 10 feet. Wilson stated that the City has approved plans for several homes in this area, which have been constructed to the 10 feet shown on the plans. Wilson stated that the only document that indicates a 15 foot side yard setback is the development agreement. Wilson stated that most areas of this development have a 10 foot side yard setback. Wilson stated that City staff was attempting to make all of the documentation associated with this portion of the development consistent.

Szymal questioned what happens to those homes that have currently been built to the 10 foot side yard setback requirement.

Wilson stated that they would be considered legal non-conforming.

Joslin stated that they would be grandfathered in as legal non-conforming. Joslin stated that evidently an error was made and those plans were approved despite the inconsistency with the development agreement. Joslin stated that we cannot make them tear their homes down because they are too close to the line. Joslin stated that they will be there as legal non-conforming just like would be the case if the regulations were changed to be more restrictive after construction of a house, which was built in compliance at the time when there were no regulations. Joslin stated that if this is approved at the 15 feet then each property would need to be looked at on a case by case basis to decrease the side yard setback. Joslin stated that each review would need to meet the necessary requirements for approval of the decreased setback. Joslin stated that the side yard setbacks could restrict the ability to build on those lots if they are in fact too narrow to place a home on the property.

Stevens questioned if the Planning Commission were to recommend and Council were to approve the 15 foot setback, if the developer was identified to develop those properties, would it need to be re-platted.

Joslin stated that they would not need to re-plat the development; however, the developer would need to construct a home that would fit on the lot meeting those setbacks and that may prove to be quite challenging.

Streiff stated that the original plans were put together with 10 foot setbacks and the text was put together using 15 feet. Streiff stated that everything that went through the Planning Commission and City Council for approval had a 10 foot setback. Streiff stated that what was later drafted in the development agreement referenced a 15 foot setback.

Larson stated yes.

Streiff stated that the PUD plans would have been put together at the time of the plat. Streiff stated that it was probably just a clerical error in the development agreement.

Joslin stated that someone did not catch the inconsistency. Joslin stated that why it would be 15 feet versus the 10 foot that is consistent with normal zoning standards is questionable.

Stevens stated that it is not the first time they have run into the differences. Stevens stated that PUD's are not normal residential development. Stevens stated that it is a developer and a community that want to allow for non-traditional things, such as a mix of housing units. Stevens stated that in a lot of communities there are some really cool things that can be done with a PUD, but this is not the first time with him sitting on the board that they have reviewed this type of inconsistency. Stevens closed the public hearing at 7:35 p.m.

Motion by Stevens, second by Larson to reject the request to amend the side yard setbacks to ten (10) feet and leave them at fifteen (15) feet.

Lind-Livingston stated that if she comes into the City and wants to build a home; are the setbacks 10 or 15 feet.

Stevens stated that they are normally 10 feet.

Lind-Livingston questioned if the City wide is 10 feet, why do we want to make this segment 15 feet.

Stevens stated that his reasoning is because the 15 feet is consistent with what is occurring in the other phases of the development. Stevens stated that one of his original concerns with this particular phase was that the area was really tight. Stevens stated that this will certainly create challenges for how homes are placed.

Lind-Livingston questioned how hard it would be to put a house on these lots with the 15 foot setback.

Wilson stated that these lots are smaller and there are home requirements. Wilson stated that it is going to be more than difficult, if not impossible.

Stevens stated that as they have seen with PUDs and with different lots and other things that were to be done in Villages on the Rum that with the housing downturn, we have been more creative and have created more parks. Stevens stated that in this area, there is going to be a wedge of the pie that is pulled out at some point, a lot that is not developed. Stevens stated that two neighbors may go in and share a lot for open space. Stevens questioned if there was a park planned in this area.

Wilson stated no.

Lind-Livingston stated that she is confused on why we would suddenly want to make this different than what is normally allowed under zoning. Lind-Livingston stated that it is going to cause some headaches with fitting the home on the lot.

Motion by Stevens, second by Larson to reject the request to amend the side yard setbacks to ten (10) feet and leave them at fifteen (15) feet. Motion move forward with no recommendation.
Ayes – Stevens, Larson, Gordon and Nays – Streiff, Englund, Lind-Livingston

Stevens stated that the Planning Commission is an advisory committee to the City Council. Stevens stated that a split vote will be sent to the Council on January 15th. Stevens stated that if audience members have other questions or concerns, they can certainly attend that meeting.

Stevens questioned if City staff had additional information regarding the cove line item.

Wilson stated no.

Lind-Livingston questioned if there were guidelines for how cove lines were set.

Wilson stated that she was not sure. Wilson stated that there is no documentation in the file regarding the cove line. Wilson stated that it was a line that was delineated on the grading plans

for portions of the PUD. Wilson stated that looking at the plans for each of the additions and phases, some lots are affected and others are not.

Stevens questioned 5.B. as addressing the drainage and utility easement.

Wilson stated that the Planning Commission needs to make a motion regarding the elimination of the cove line before they can move forward to the next hearing item. Wilson stated that the first motion only pertained to the reduced side yard setback.

Lind-Livingston questioned if the cove line was set by the developer.

Wilson stated that she can only assume so. Wilson stated that the plans for the initial Villages on the Rum development were completed by an individual prior to Mr. Iverson.

Stevens questioned this, as he thought Mr. Iverson was responsible for the PUD.

Wilson stated that eventually he was; however, there is documentation of a different individual being involved prior to Mr. Iverson.

Englund stated that Dave Clark owned it originally and it was sold to another individual. Englund stated that the company that originally did the plans would have placed the line.

Stevens stated that with the elimination of the cove line there would still be a front yard setback requirement.

Wilson stated that there is a 30 foot front yard setback requirement. Wilson stated that as mentioned by the Commission, the requirement for the size home, garage, other setbacks, and the configuration/size of the lot will determine where the home can be set on the property as well.

Stevens stated that the cove line was not most likely established as a functional metric, but was probably for aesthetic reasons. Stevens stated that given how long and narrow some of the lots are in these areas, it may be best for the builder to determine how to place the home rather than rely on the cove line.

Szynal questioned if all properties would be affected by this line.

Wilson stated that some properties have a larger cove line setback, while others appear to have the 30 foot setback.

Joslin stated that most of the cove line properties were those that ran back to the Rum River. Joslin stated that is part of how the cove line was determined. Joslin stated that the issue is here because it is shown on the plat as a building setback line. Joslin stated that he thinks it follows a line on the river bluff; and is probably there for aesthetic reasons. Joslin stated that the original developer or surveyor may have had that in mind when developing the line, but whether or not that holds true in practical development is another question. Joslin stated that when applied in practical development, in order to meet the cove line setback on some of the lots, you could end up with a home substantially smaller than the surrounding homes on lots in that neighborhood

because nothing else will fit. Joslin stated that this could bring up questions as to how the home was constructed.

Stevens stated that it wanders. Stevens stated that in some places it is forty feet, in some fifty, or maybe more.

Szynal did provided comments that could not be heard on the record.
Stevens stated that you would still have the 30 foot setback as the standard.

Wilson stated that the cove line would be eliminated from all of the Villages on the Rum PUD.

Streiff questioned if the cove line is beyond the 30 feet.

Wilson stated that in most instances it was.

Stevens questioned if there was an illustration of that PUD that we could show.

Wilson stated that she had some portions of the development. Wilson presented the grading plan for a portion of the development. Wilson pointed out the cove line on the various lots within that phase of the development.

Streiff stated that even if you pull the cove line out, the home is still going to have other requirements that have to be met that will keep that house back on the lot.

Stevens stated that the cove line established in the PUD as an aesthetic is not benefiting us because we still have other requirements in place. Stevens stated that it hinders developments in some areas.

Berg questioned if the side yards are reduced, then the home can be placed closer to the front.

Stevens stated that there is the potential to move the home closer to the street in these instances.

Szynal expressed concerns as to how this would affect his property, as he has a vacant lot next to his property. Szynal stated that he does not want to look out his front door to the left and see a large home. Szynal stated that if someone builds a new house that is narrow and meets all of the requirements, they will be able to pull the house forward and he has a problem with that.

Stevens stated that City staff needed to go back and pull the plans for the 5th Addition, so the Planning Commission can see if the cove line is shown on the plans for this addition.

Wilson stated that she would go in and find the plans. Wilson exited the Council Chambers to find the appropriate plans.

Wilson and Joslin reviewed the plans in the file for the 5th Addition.

Lind-Livingston stated that she does not make any sense out of why some properties have this line and others do not.

Wilson stated that the plans show the homes setback further on all of the lots; however, they do not show an actual line on the plans that would be considered the cove line.

Englund stated that within Mr. Szynal's area of the development, there is no cove line.

Stevens stated that he was glad that they could dig into it to see if it applied to him. Stevens questioned if there were additional comments or questions regarding the item.

Motion by Stevens, second by Larson to eliminate the cove line throughout the Villages on the Rum development. Motion was unanimously approved.

B. Request from the City of Isanti to Amend Ordinance No. 445 Zoning, Section 6 Residential Districts; Article 1 "R-1" Single Family Residential, Subdivision 6 Lot Requirements and Setbacks, (E) Driveway Requirements; Article 2 "R-2" Single Family Residential District, Subdivision 6 Lot Requirements and Setbacks, (E) Driveway Requirements; Article 3 "R-3A" Low Density Multiple Family District, Subdivision 7 Lot Requirements and Setbacks, (F) Driveway Requirements; Article 4 "R-3B" Medium Density Multiple Family Districts, Subdivision 7 Lot Requirements and Setbacks, (F) Driveway Requirements; and Article 5 "R-4" Multiple Family Dwelling District, Subdivision 7 Lot Requirements and Setbacks, (D) Driveway and Parking Lot Requirements to increase the driveway and parking area setback from three (3) feet to five (5) feet.

Stevens provided background information regarding the proposed amendment.

Wilson briefly outlined the information in the staff memo and the ordinance amendment.

Streiff questioned if someone had actually did this; and 10 years from now decided to replace their driveway, are they able to replace it or do they need to meet the new setback requirements.

Wilson stated that she believed if they are replacing the driveway, they would be able to do so. Wilson stated that if they wanted to expand upon the driveway, they could not do so.

Joslin stated that he agreed. Joslin stated that if the property owner were to place such an improvement and had to dig it up to replace or repair a utility, the property owner is responsible for the costs of replacement. Joslin stated that the amendment would ensure that property owners did not unwittingly construct a driveway over the easement and then get stuck with replacement costs if the area is torn up.

Stevens opened the hearing at 8:00 p.m. Stevens questioned if there were any comments.

Larson stated that she would like it stipulated that if they have already have it at 3 feet, yes they would be responsible for replacement if it was torn up for any reason. Larson stated that she did not want the City coming back and saying that you cannot replace it.

Stevens stated that it should only apply to new construction.

Larson stated that should be made clear, so that someone does not get stuck in that issue.

Streiff stated that if they have it today and they have to replace it, they are able to go to the 3 feet that they originally had.

Larson questioned if Mrs. Wilson understood.

Wilson stated yes.

Stevens stated he would close the hearing at 8:02 p.m.

Motion by Larson, second by Streiff to move forward with the amendment to Ordinance No. 445 with regards to the increased setback requirement for driveways and parking areas from three feet to five feet with the stipulation that this apply to new construction only. Motion was unanimously approved.

Wilson questioned if the Commission is going to review the conflict of interest policy at this time.

Stevens stated yes.

3.G. Review Conflict of Interest Policy

Clark Joslin, City Attorney, outlined the conflict of interest policy and the open meeting law. Joslin stated that if there were future questions from the commission members those could be directed to him; and he would be available to discuss those items.

3.E. Approve 2013 Planning Commission Meeting Dates.

Stevens stated that the next item was to approve the upcoming Planning Commission meeting dates. Stevens questioned if there were any Wednesday meetings in the schedule.

Wilson stated that she did not believe there would be any conflicts on Tuesday evenings this year that would force the meeting to a Wednesday evening.

Motion by Larson, second by Englund to approve the 2013 Planning Commission Meeting dates. Motion was unanimously approved.

3.F. Appoint Planning Commission Members to Business/Industrial Sub-Committee.

Stevens questioned if there were nominations for the Business/Industrial Sub-Committee. Stevens questioned if there was anyone on the commission that would like to be on the sub-committee.

Larson stated that Mr. Lundeen had expressed interest in doing so.

Englund stated that he is currently on the committee. Englund stated that the committee had not met in a while, but if needed in the future, there are two representatives from the Planning Commission.

Motion by Stevens, second by Streiff to nominate Mr. Englund and Mr. Lundeen to the Business/Industrial Sub-Committee. Motion was unanimously approved.

6. Other Business.

A. Review of Section 16 Signs of the Zoning Ordinance.

Wilson introduced the staff memo and the first issue that was outlined. Wilson stated that the group seemed to be divided at the last meeting as to the best avenue to take to review this section of the zoning ordinance. Wilson stated that in looking at the issues presented, the Planning Commission can make the decision to take a different review process if and when necessary. Wilson outlined the temporary sign issue and some draft language for discussion purposes.

Stevens questioned what duration is considered a time.

Wilson stated that it would be per calendar year. Wilson stated that would be from January 1st to December 31st. Wilson stated that you could pull a permit four times throughout the year and leave the sign up for 60 days at a time.

Stevens stated that he could pull a permit, place the sign for 60 days, remove the sign after 60 days; wait a day and put the sign back up.

Wilson stated that you could providing that you had pulled your second temporary sign permit before re-displaying the sign for an additional 60 days. Wilson stated that if you exceed your four chances within the first half of the year, you would not be able to place anything at the end of the year.

Streiff stated that technically in a calendar year, you could have signage up for 8 months out of that year.

Lind-Livingston questioned what the cost of a temporary sign permit is currently.

Wilson stated that she believed it was \$50 per year. Wilson stated that it would be up to Council as to whether or not they wanted to charge a different fee, should the City move to regulations that required someone to pull more than one permit a year.

Lind-Livingston questioned if that fee was for the annual permit.

Wilson stated yes. Wilson stated that the intention of outlining the issues this evening was for discussion purposes. Wilson stated that if the Planning Commission wants to be able to think about these items further, they could certainly do so, and discuss them at the next meeting.

Larson stated that there are so many businesses along County Road 5 that are using these temporary signs. Larson questioned with the economy the way it is, how would this affect their business. Larson stated that she knows they are depending upon using these signs to pull traffic from the street to their business.

Lind-Livingston stated that there has to be enforcement.

Wilson stated that City staff does check signs. Wilson stated that calls do come in regarding signs and their location from drivers.

Stevens stated that especially during the political season, County Road 5 just gets bombarded.

Larson stated that the intersection of Whiskey Rd and County Rd 5, on the gas station property, when there are homes for sale; this intersection is just full of signs and it becomes an issue.

Streiff stated that if you think of 95 in Cambridge, they are doing the same thing and that is not all cluttered with signs. Streiff stated that they have the same economic challenges as Isanti.

Lind-Livingston questioned if the people using temporary signs, is there an option for them to put up a permanent sign.

Wilson stated that they all have the option to place a permanent sign. Wilson stated that for many of the businesses located within a commercial center, they have a sign above the door as well as one located on a freestanding sign at the front of the center. Wilson stated that for most businesses, the temporary sign advertises a special or sale, so as to get people to come in off the street.

Stevens stated that there are a few businesses that need to have those extra little signs to get people into the business.

Wilson stated that staff is not against temporary signs. Wilson stated that there are concerns that there are loop holes and issues with the ordinance.

Larson stated that it is an issue. Larson stated that she would like to see a sub-committee that people can come in to discuss.

Englund stated that trying to get a sub-committee to meet is impossible. Englund stated that if you try to do it during the day, everyone is running their business. Englund stated that if you try for it at night, people have other things to do in the evenings. Englund stated that trying to meet is difficult. Englund stated that if you try to meet at 5:00 p.m. that is when most of the businesses are the busiest as they are getting people that are returning from work during the day. Englund stated that if you schedule something in the evening, people make a point to come to the first one or two meetings; and then participation drops off.

Larson agreed. Larson stated that she knows that most business owners could not afford to lock their doors and come to a meeting. Larson stated that different businesses experience their busy times at different times of the day; it depends upon the business.

Lind-Livingston questioned if staff had talked to other surrounding communities to see what they allow.

Wilson stated that most of them have limitations. Wilson stated that when other communities get our sign ordinance, when they are reviewing their ordinance, staff usually gets a call asking if it is a mistake in the ordinance.

Larson stated that even with the limitations provided in the draft that is pretty close to allowing a sign for a year.

Englund stated that if they did not have it up for a month in-between the permits, they would be good.

Streiff stated that you would be permitted to have a sign per quarter.

Stevens stated that for some of the businesses this could be a killer.

Larson stated that she did not want to run businesses out of this town. Larson stated that we need everyone that we have.

Englund stated that businesses could share the sign.

Stevens stated that we could encourage them to take up residence in a permanent sign.

Streiff questioned if there were regulations against the people that just stand on a corner, maybe they are holding a sign.

Wilson stated that currently this would not meet the definition of a sign. Wilson stated that there are some communities that are writing this into their sign ordinance and providing regulations for it.

Larson questioned how that would work if the Ambassadors had a car wash and were standing and holding a sign.

Stevens questioned if the Commission wanted to table the item for further discussion at the February meeting.

Commission members agreed.

Streiff requested that some other sign regulations from surrounding communities be brought back to the next meeting for review. Streiff stated that he would like to see what they are doing.

Wilson stated that staff could do so, but wants the Commission to focus on what regulations are best for Isanti.

Stevens stated that there may be a way to foster communication on this issue through the Chamber and get some input. Stevens stated that he would like to show the business community that they are trying to do something that will not hurt.

Larson stated that at the last committee meeting on signs, the discussion focused on temporary signs on County Road 5 and this is re-visiting that issue.

Motion by Stevens, second by Larson to table this item for further discussion at the February meeting. Motion was unanimously approved.

7. Discussion Items.

A. None.

8. Adjournment

Motion by Larson, second by Lind-Livingston to adjourn the January 8th, 2013 meeting of the Planning Commission. Motion was unanimously approved.

The meeting adjourned at 8:31 p.m.

Dated at Isanti, Minnesota this 12th day of February 2013.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa M. Wilson, AICP
Planning and Parks Director