

**CITY OF ISANTI
PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
DECEMBER 11, 2012**

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: Dave Englund, Kristie Gordon, Sue Larson, Cindy Lind-Livingston, Steve Lundeen, and Sean Stevens.

Members Absent: None.

Staff Present: Lisa Wilson, Planning and Parks Director.

D. Agenda Modifications.

Stevens questioned if there were any modifications to the agenda.

Wilson stated that there were none.

2. Approval of Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from November 13, 2012.

Stevens requested a motion regarding the minutes from the November 13th meeting.

Motion by Larson, second by Lundeen to approve the November 13, 2012 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. Motion was unanimously approved.

3. Public Hearings.

A. None.

Stevens stated that the record should reflect that there are no public hearings scheduled for this evening's meeting.

4. Other Business.

A. Amendments to Ordinance No. 445 Zoning, Section 6 Residential Districts; Lot Requirements and Setbacks, Driveway Requirements.

Wilson presented the staff memo and provided background on the reason for the proposed amendment.

Stevens questioned if with the proposed language would be addressing only those properties that have utilities running along the property line or would this be addressing all properties.

Wilson explained that every lot within the City when it is platted is required to maintain a 5 foot drainage and utility easement along each side lot line. Wilson stated that it will affect everyone. Wilson stated that it is her understanding that we have kept these concrete pads out of this

drainage and utility area. Wilson stated that the language is reflecting what is happening in the field.

Larson questioned if there were cases in which a property owner would not be able to put a pad in, if they cannot go into the drainage and utility easement area.

Stevens stated that you could not at his house.

Larson stated that it is a substantial cost to the homeowner, so if the homeowner is willing to sign off that they are okay with being responsible for those costs, she would not have a problem with them entering this area.

Stevens questioned if we get into emergency vehicle issues. Stevens stated that he remembers seeing a request a few years ago that the homes were so close together that they were unable to construct a deck onto the home. Stevens stated that he did not believe it helps us to have the applicant sign a waiver stating that they are aware of the easement and that they are responsible.

Lundeen stated that they could always ask for a variance if they wanted to do so. Lundeen stated that he did not see how the language would affect anything. Lundeen stated that he knows he would need a variance for certain things on his property, if he wanted to do them.

Larson questioned the cost of the variance application.

Wilson stated that she believed the fee was currently set at \$325.

Stevens stated that it costs a lot less than ripping up a concrete pad.

Lundeen stated that he thought the language was fine.

Motion by Lundeen, second by Larson to call for a public hearing for an amendment to Ordinance No. 445 Zoning Section 6 Residential Districts; Lot Requirements and Setbacks, Driveway Requirements. Motion was unanimously approved.

Larson questioned how the public would be informed of this item, should residents have comments to make at the public hearing.

Wilson stated that with a general text amendment there is notice provided within the City's official paper as well as postings made at the post office and city hall. Wilson stated that City staff is unable to send a letter to everyone in the city.

Larson stated that she thought there would be people that would be interested in this item.

Lundeen stated that there will be word of mouth. Lundeen stated that if you are interested in things changing in the City, you are going to keep an eye out for things like this.

B. Review of Section 16 Signs.

Wilson reviewed the items that had been identified within the staff memo. Wilson questioned if the Planning Commission members would like to you tackle all of the items identified and any additional ones that could be identified by City staff.

Stevens questioned what the type of signs was coming in under the MNDOT regulations.

Wilson stated that we have had the black signs with the changeable colorful letters. Wilson stated that many of these signs are off-premise signs. Wilson stated that a representative from MNDOT had stopped in to briefly discuss the signs and to get owner information for the signs. Wilson stated that any off-premise sign along TH 65 requires a MNDOT permit as well. Wilson stated that she had requested more information regarding these permits.

Wilson identified a few additional issues that had been noticed within Section 16 of the Zoning Ordinance. Wilson stated that city staff could put together a list of the issues and have some options that they can begin to discuss at the next meeting.

Lundeen stated that he is in favor of addressing all of the issues now. Lundeen stated that we need to fix these areas and move on.

Stevens stated while he agrees with taking on all the issues, there will be more that surface in the future.

Lundeen stated that he knows there will be changes later as new things arise. Lundeen stated that when talking about a temporary sign, it is sign that is on wheels and can be pulled out of there. Lundeen stated that there will be new technology that will require new regulations, but we can look at those as they come in. Lundeen stated that it will be easier to make future changes, if we have a set policy in place.

Stevens stated that in the past we have had issues that have gone through sub-committee groups. Stevens questioned if we wanted to take that route or if we wanted to work the issues through the planning commission.

Wilson stated that we could go either process.

Lundeen questioned if there are some examples from other cities.

Wilson stated that staff did have some examples. Wilson stated that the League had sent a copy of the City of Hopkin's ordinance.

Lundeen stated that something should be brought forth by city staff to review and discuss. Lundeen stated that he did not feel a sub-committee is necessary for this process. Lundeen stated that a recommendation can be made and the council can decide.

Stevens stated the benefit is that we get citizens input and have more voice to the issue.

Lundeen stated that there will be a public hearing and those that are interested can be in attendance to state their opinion. Lundeen stated that the only people really affected by this will be businesses. Lundeen stated that the discussion regarding a new sign for the community center has been brought to the center. Lundeen stated that it is a necessary sign, but should be done correctly. Lundeen discussed an example of sign pollution seen in Hawaii. Lundeen stated that sign pollution is not just a billboard; it is how the signs are presented.

Larson stated that with the sub-committee that was used for the past discussion for signs on County Rd 5, a lot of citizens were pulled in. Larson stated that those individuals felt an ownership in the ordinance because they were part of the process and their ideas were being used. Larson stated that if we are talking about signs in general, the process through the planning commission may be okay. Larson stated that if we are talking about a certain area, then bringing those individuals affected by changes into the process may be necessary. Larson stated that she did not see how they could have done things differently with the County Rd 5 area.

Lundeen stated that he thought they could do this through the Planning Commission and public hearing process.

Larson questioned if the signs should be renewable every year. Larson stated that she thinks of temporary signs as signs that are placed for a limited period of time, when a business is open.

Lundeen stated that he did not feel that is what we were talking about here.

Larson stated that the rodeo association does the signs on the trailer that are up for a month or two and then are removed. Larson stated that these are temporary signs.

Lind-Livingston questioned if businesses are continually coming in for that renewable permit.

Wilson stated that there are quite a few businesses in town that constantly renew the annual temporary sign permit.

Lind-Livingston questioned the rationale behind this.

Wilson stated that it is probably cheaper than the purchasing and constructing a permanent sign.

Stevens questioned if the majority of the commission is okay with the public hearing process only.

Wilson stated that city staff will put something together for review and discussion in January. Wilson stated that once the Planning Commission has reviewed the issues, if they would like to establish a different review method, we can discuss that further at that time.

Commission members agreed.

6. Discussion Items.

A. None.

Stevens stated that there were no discussion items.

7. Other Communications.

A. Zoning Ordinance Amendments.

Stevens stated that approved zoning amendments had been included for the Planning Commission. Stevens questioned if there was anything further for discussion.

Wilson stated that she did not have anything additional.

8. Adjournment

Motion by Lundeen, second by Larson to adjourn the December 11th, 2012 meeting of the Planning Commission. Motion was unanimously approved.

The meeting adjourned at 7:23 p.m.

Dated at Isanti, Minnesota this 8th day of January 2013.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa M. Wilson, AICP
Planning and Parks Director