

**CITY OF ISANTI
PLANNING COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
OCTOBER 25, 2010**

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, Cindy Lind-Livingston, Michael Steve Rask, Streiff III, and Sean Stevens.

Members Absent: Sue Larson and Ross Lorinser (both gave prior notice).

Staff Present: Lisa Wilson, City Planner

D. Agenda Modifications.

Wilson stated there were no modifications to the Agenda.

2. Public Hearings.

A. Request from Kevin Johnson, Managing Partner acting on behalf of Banksite Developer, for Preliminary Plat Approval of Banksite 2nd Addition. Such property is legally described to include: Outlot A, Bank Site, Isanti County, Minnesota.

Wilson presented the staff memo and the recommended conditions.

Stevens questioned if the petitioner was current on all City fees.

Wilson stated that they were current.

Stevens questioned if the property holder had issues with any of the conditions outlined by the Planning Review Committee.

Wilson stated that the staff memo was forwarded to the petitioner prior to the meeting for review. Wilson stated that she had not received any comment or concerns from the property owners.

Stevens opened public hearing at 7:03 p.m.

Stevens questioned the access control label.

Wilson stated that there is to be a notation in the legend for the plat regarding the access control. Wilson stated that she was unfamiliar with what they were referring to. Wilson stated that Mr. DeWolf agreed that it should be placed on revised plans.

Stevens questioned if that was a traffic control item.

Wilson stated that she believed it to be.

Stevens questioned if there were any other questions.

Streiff questioned if a condition can be made that the tax remain current at all times.

Wilson stated that as part of Ordinance, they must show proof with a land use application that the taxes on the property are current. Wilson stated that if they are not current, the land use application is considered incomplete until such time as this application/ordinance requirement is met.

Streiff questioned what happens if the next round of taxes comes due and they do not pay them in the future. Streiff questioned if they have to be in compliance at all times.

Wilson stated no.

Streiff questioned if a condition of approval could be that the taxes have to be current at all times moving forward.

Wilson stated that she did not believe that they could add such a condition.

Stevens closed the public hearing at 7:06 p.m.

Motion by Stevens, second by Rask to recommend approval of the Preliminary Plat for Banksite 2nd Addition with City staff's conditions based upon the Findings of Fact and Approval as submitted. Motion was unanimously approved.

B. Request from Prairie Senior Cottages of Isanti LLC to Amend Ordinance No. 445 Zoning Ordinance, Section 7 Business Districts; Article 2 "B-2" General Business District (GBD) to include senior residential care facilities as a conditional use.

Wilson presented the staff memo. Wilson stated that the Planning Commission must review the request against the four (4) factors as defined by the Zoning Ordinance, so as to formulate a Findings of Fact and Conclusion for the request.

Stevens questioned if we were looking to further define assisted living and memory care facilities and we do not feel that health care facilities defines that.

Wilson stated that there are two different definitions for senior care facilities and health care facilities. Wilson provided examples of each. Wilson stated that there is a definition for Senior Residential Care Facilities, of which this definition includes the types of facilities that the petitioner is looking to locate within the B-2 District. Wilson stated that the Planning Commission needs to evaluate the request that senior residential care facilities be added to the B-2 District in general, as a conditional use.

Stevens stated that it did not seem to him that the use fits the intent of the district. Stevens stated that it does not meet the definition of what a B-2 is. Stevens stated that if we are talking about residential living facilities, we have a place for them and it is fairly clear that it is not in this district.

Englund questioned the units that are across from the college in Cambridge.

Wilson stated that the area being referred to Cambridge would appear to cater to a wide range of senior housing options. Wilson stated that some may be assisted / memory care facilities.

Stevens questioned the number of residents that would be housed in the facility.

Wilson stated that there were two buildings proposed, of which there would appear to be 18 rooms for residents. Wilson presented the drawings provided by the petitioner.

Lind-Livingston questioned if this would be south of Landmark Bank.

Wilson stated that was correct.

Rask questioned if there would be a possible expansion in the future.

Wilson stated that on-site, that would be difficult beyond the two buildings that had been proposed. Wilson stated that the southern portion of the lot is mainly wetland area.

Englund stated that it is the front half of Lot 1, Block 1 on the Preliminary Plat. Englund stated that it would be directly south of the bank and along TH 65.

Lind-Livingston questioned where the nearest residential area was located.

Englund stated that there is residential to the east, but everything in front of it is business district.

Lind-Livingston questioned if the elevations were similar to that of the Shade Tree building.

Stevens stated that the day care and fish house building is a straight rectangular box like building. Stevens stated that the design for this facility is clearly residential.

Englund stated that if this is opened up at this location, then it opens up the entire district to this type of use.

Stevens stated that beyond that, the proximity to the highway is not a fit for this kind of facility. Stevens stated that it is a great project and senior care and alder care is going to be a huge issue. Stevens stated that it is a great opportunity for whoever is managing this project, but this is the wrong spot. Stevens stated that this is not what was envisioned for this district or area.

Englund questioned what happens if someone were to get out of that building and cross the highway. Englund stated that in the past when other similar types of projects were brought forth, the doomsday scenario was looked at.

Stevens questioned if the petitioner had looked at other property in town.

Wilson stated that she was not sure if other properties were considered.

Stevens questioned if a person was to drive along County Road 5 heading east across TH 65, the multi housing on the left as you bend around the corner towards Spectacular Events, what is that zoned.

Wilson stated that the area is zoned Planned Unit Development Residential. Wilson stated that much of the area north of this particular development is also zoned residential.

Lind-Livingston questioned which residential districts would currently allow for this type of facility.

Wilson stated that the R-3A, R-3B, R-4, CBT-1, and CBT-2 Districts all permit such a facility with a conditional use permit.

Commission members requested that staff show such locations on the zoning map.

Wilson pointed out the location of these districts on the map.

Stevens questioned the R-3A by the school on the east side of 65. Stevens stated that this type of area would be perfect for this type of facility, as the area is already developed for residential and there would be a buffer and transition area for this type of use.

Streiff questioned why they would want to locate a facility on TH 65 at this location.

Stevens stated that he is guessing because it is on TH 65 and has good visibility. Stevens questioned if the price of this parcel would be any less than others in the community.

Englund stated that this facility is to be set-up for memory care patients or those with dementia. Englund questioned if that was correct.

Wilson stated that was correct.

Rask did express safety concerns for the residents living in this area.

Stevens opened the public hearing at 7:24 p.m.

Stevens questioned if Mr. Sullivan has been working with these people.

Wilson stated that she believed he has held a number of discussions with the petitioner.

Stevens stated that they want the project here, but do not want the project at this location. Stevens stated that the City Council is going to be looking at this item and he hopes they will take this discussion into consideration. Stevens stated that he would sure like to have them in town.

Stevens closed the public hearing at 7:25 p.m.

Motion by Stevens, second by Rask to recommend denial of the request to Amend Ordinance No. 445 Zoning, Section 7 Business Districts, Article 2 "B-2" General Business District (GBD)

to include Senior Residential Care Facilities as a Conditional Use. Motion was unanimously approved.

3. Adjournment.

Motion by Englund, second by Streiff to adjourn the October 25th, 2010 Special Meeting of the Planning Commission. Motion was unanimously approved.

The meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

Dated at Isanti, Minnesota this 9th day of November 2010.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa M. Wilson, AICP
City Planner