

**CITY OF ISANTI  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
FEBRUARY 10, 2009**

**1. Meeting Opening**

**A. Call to Order**

Vice Chairman Rask called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

**B. Pledge of Allegiance**

Everyone rose for the pledge of allegiance.

**C. Roll Call**

**Members Present:** Sue Larson, Cindy Lind-Livingston, Ross Lorinser, Steve Rask, Michael Streiff III, and Sean Stevens (arriving at 7:05 p.m.)

**Members Absent:** Dave Englund

**Staff Present:** Lisa Krause, City Planner

**D. Agenda Modifications.**

Krause stated there were none.

**2.(A&B). Oath of Office for new Planning Commission Members**

Krause administered the oath of office to Ms. Cynthia Lind-Livingston and Mr. Michael Streiff III.

**3. Approval of Minutes from January 13, 2009 Planning Commission Meeting**

Motion by Larson, second by Lorinser to approve the meeting minutes from the January 13, 2009 Planning Commission Meeting. Motion was unanimously approved.

**4. Public Hearings**

**A. Request by George Harris, to Amend Ordinance No. 445: Zoning Ordinance, to include provisions for Recreational Vehicle Repair and Outdoor Storage.**

Krause provided information from the staff memo to the Planning Commission. Krause stated that the petitioner is looking to open a Recreational Vehicle Repair Facility. Krause stated that the vacant parcel would be a holding area for the campers that are awaiting repairs or parts. Krause stated that the petitioner would be storing items within the building.

Krause stated that the Planning Commission is reviewing the text amendment only at this time. Krause stated that the sketch provided by the petitioner is for discussion purposes only and pending the recommendation and final outcome from the City Council, the petitioner would need to go through the planning process and receive additional approvals if necessary. Krause also stated that the property would need to be brought into conformance with the zoning ordinance and if the petitioner could not meet those requirements, would be required to apply for a variation from the ordinance.

Krause provided a description of the current property as well as the surrounding uses. Krause stated that there are definitions for motor vehicle repair and recreational vehicles. Krause stated

that there are also performance standards for this use. Krause outlined the intent of the various districts in which these types of uses are currently located as well as the intent of the Central Business District.

Krause outlined the text amendment process and the requirements on which the Planning Commission has to review the text amendment against. Krause requested that the Planning Commission review the request against these items and formulate a finding of fact.

Krause provided the Planning Review Committee concerns. Krause also outline potential text language that the Planning Commission could review. Krause stated that the petitioner was present if the Commission members had questions.

Stevens opened the public hearing. Stevens called Mr. Harris to the podium.

George Harris, 11 Pinto Lane, Isanti.

Stevens questioned if Mr. Harris had anything to add.

Harris stated that he had none.

Lorinser questioned if the vehicles were going to be campers only.

Harris stated that there are ten campgrounds within the area that he would service. Harris stated that the building would warehouse parts. Harris stated that he would do on-site repairs at the campgrounds. Harris stated that there may be vehicles brought to the property for repair as well. Harris stated that the vehicles would mostly be pop-ups. Harris stated that would be replacing furnaces, etc. Harris stated that the building appears to be defunct, but is actually structurally sound.

Rask agreed that the building is solid.

Harris stated that the accessory structure that was on the site plan was the old blacksmith shop and the home that was there has been removed. Harris stated that the parking would not be crossing the sidewalk. Harris stated that there is a concrete pad near the area.

Streiff questioned how many vehicles would be in the holding area.

Harris stated that would probably have about 3 or 4 campers within the holding area. Harris stated that he is not around much, so he will need to have employees. Harris stated that he is likes old cars and he wanted to preserve what the building used to be.

Streiff questioned if a camper would need to be held overnight, if there was space in the building.

Harris stated that there is only a ten foot high door, so he is limited on what could brought into the building. Harris is concerned about having an area to store his parts.

Lorinser questioned if all storage of parts would be inside.

Harris stated that parts storage would be indoors and that the only items outside would be customers campers. Harris stated that he wanted to design the lot next door to have for rent a few pop-ups or sell a few golf carts.

Lorinser questioned if he was into sales as well.

Harris stated that he does everything.

Lorinser questioned where the sales would be.

Harris stated that most items would be for sale in the building. Harris stated that if it was nice and there would be sidewalk sales in the area, there is concrete near the front of the fence line that abuts Main Street and he could display there. Harris would like to extend this concrete area further back on the property.

Stevens stated that as a Planning Commission member he is in a difficult position. Stevens stated that the petitioner has a positive prospect of bringing something to downtown. Stevens stated that there are problems with the proposed use because the City goes through and looks at what types of uses belong where and the City envisions a character for an area. Stevens stated that there are four issues that the Planning Commission needs to consider. Stevens stated that the Comprehensive Plan would appear to be incompatible with the intent of the use as well as some incompatibility issues with the neighboring district and uses. Stevens stated that it would be hard to forward with recommendations to the Council. Stevens stated that it is something he would want to do but it may not be the place to do it.

Harris stated that when he purchased the building from the County there was nothing brought up about what he could or couldn't do. Harris stated that he provided the use information up front before he purchased the building and everyone was on board.

Rask stated that there was a need to find a niche for the building. Rask stated that the use needed to fit the building.

Larson stated that when it was Miller Automotive, the use did not deter away from downtown activities. Larson stated that it would be nice to maintain the building and keep someone in there. Larson questioned if the text amendment went by the property owner or if it went to the district.

Krause stated that the language would be added to the Central Business District regulations. Krause stated that another individual wanting to do the same thing within the district would have the opportunity to do so, providing the property was able to meet the requirements for the Conditional Use Permit.

Lorinser questioned if another automotive use could locate within the area based upon the proposed text. Lorinser questioned if there were ways to say no to large scale car places or large scale motor vehicle repair facilities.

Krause stated that the definition is broad. Krause stated that if we use the definition as identified, then uses fitting this definition would be permitted as well, providing that they could meet the requirements for the conditional use.

Stevens questioned the requirements.

Krause stated that the current requirements are listed within the staff memo for motor vehicle repair.

Stevens questioned if the findings should be based upon the fact that the proposed use met the definition requirements.

Krause stated that when reviewing a text amendment, the Planning Commission's findings should be based upon the items identified within the ordinance for text amendments and if the use met the intent of the Comprehensive Plan and the district itself. Krause stated that the findings and recommendation would move forward to the City Council.

Lorinser stated that the petitioner would be repairing only recreational vehicles. Lorinser stated that the definition would be open to all motor vehicles.

Harris stated that he would not be working on engines and would not be doing oil changes.

Lorinser questioned if Harris would be using large air compressors or noisy equipment like those used in motor vehicle repair facilities.

Harris stated that he would not be utilizing any of this type of equipment.

Lorinser stated that the definition should be modified to include only what the petitioner is proposing. Lorinser stated that this would limit the other types of motor vehicle repair facilities that may be inconsistent with the district.

Krause stated that her understanding from the group was that the definition should be more specific.

Lorinser stated that the definition should include camper or recreational vehicle repair and sales, non-motorized. Lorinser questioned if this would still be a conditional use.

Krause stated that if that was what the Planning Commission was recommending, it would be forwarded as such to the City Council.

Larson questioned if there would be a motor home brought on site that may need a furnace replaced.

Harris stated that would be an option. Harris stated that the item would not be able to be brought into the building.

Larson questioned if the vehicle would be within the holding area and would have a motor.

Harris stated yes.

Larson stated that it would be screened.

Harris agreed.

Lorinser questioned if there would be fueled changes.

Harris stated the only fluid changes would be winterizing anti-freeze.

Streiff questioned if the definition could state motorized or non-motorized recreational vehicles, so as not to confuse the definition with motor vehicles. Streiff questioned how many vehicles would be in the holding area.

Harris stated that he would like to see the area filled, but he did not anticipate anything more than four vehicles at one time.

Larson stated that the area would be screened.

Harris stated that he wanted to focus on small pop-ups to maintain and rent out.

Larson questioned the text amendment process. Larson questioned how the amendment affects the City in the future.

Krause stated that if the definition is tailored for Mr. Harris' use and the use is listed as a conditional use with performance criteria, the proposed text would be given to the City Council for review and approval. Krause stated that once the language is approved, Mr. Harris would be able to apply for the conditional use permit for the property.

Krause stated that Mr. Harris would need to come through the planning process to obtain the conditional use permit. Krause stated if approved, Mr. Harris would be permitted to have the use. Krause stated that anyone else wanting to have this type of use within the Central Business District would be able to apply for a conditional use permit as well.

Krause reiterated that if the language were to be approved by the City Council, the text would be added to the Zoning Ordinance.

Streiff stated that he understood where the petitioner is coming from; however, he has concerns regarding what is actually taking place on the property. Streiff stated that there will be a lot going on and a lot of comings and goings. Streiff stated that there are concerns regarding how the use fits the downtown district and the petitioner will need to be conscious of what the City wants within the District. Streiff stated that the area behind the building would need to be clean. Streiff stated that if there were sales, those vehicles would need to be setback off the public sidewalk.

Larson stated that what would be on-site is going to be tailored to customer needs.

Harris stated that does not do motors or transmissions.

Stevens asked for additional questions or comments.

Larson questioned hours of operation.

Harris stated that the business would be open from 9 to 5, six days a week.

Ralph Johnson approached the podium for comment. Johnson lived here for 36 years and knows what the building has been used for in the past and knows there is a Comprehensive Plan. Johnson stated that he did not understand why the use wouldn't fit. Johnson stated that the business would not be a dirty business. Johnson stated that the vehicles would have to be parked on impervious surface. Johnson felt that this is a B-1 District use. Johnson made reference to Isanti Tire and stated that the City should not be turning away businesses. Johnson stated that the use would fit in well and the building had been for repairs and sales in the first place.

Stevens asked for other public comments. Stevens closed the public hearing.

Stevens requested additional comments or questions from the Planning Commission.

Lorinser stated that the use should be under a conditional use permit process. Lorinser stated that a maximum number of vehicles should be prescribed. Lorinser stated that the City wants businesses here, but the City did state what it wanted within the downtown.

Stevens questioned the text amendment on the staff memo. Stevens questioned if the performance standards could be adopted for this particular use.

Krause stated that the Planning Commission could recommend such standards.

Larson stated that the property would need to be brought into compliance, screening should be included, and a maximum number of vehicles be considered. Larson stated that the use is similar to the past use and such use had worked well. Larson stated that the sports shop is located across the street and is similar. Larson stated that the use would fit into the block. Motion by Larson to recommend approval, second by Rask.

Streiff stated that the definition should be revised.

Krause asked for clarification. Krause questioned if the Planning Commission wanted to limit the definition. Krause stated that the definition would be for recreational vehicles both motorized and non-motorized only.

Stevens questioned if this would be a text amendment addition to the B-1.

Krause stated that is correct.

Larson stated as long as the definition does not exclude recreational vehicles with motors.

Streiff stated the definition would allow for either one.

Stevens questioned a previous CUP authorized for a project and whether the number of vehicles outside was limited.

Krause stated that a limited number of boats with motors were permitted on the impervious surface in the front and a certain number of trailers were permitted along the south side of the property on the pervious surface area.

Stevens questioned parking requirements.

Krause stated that within the Central Business Districts, only half of the parking is required. Krause stated that this would be looked at during the CUP process and variations may be necessary. Krause stated that parking is an issue within the downtown, as there is limited area in which to accommodate parking spaces.

Stevens concurred that the text amendment is consistent with current properties and with the perception of a bustling downtown Isanti. Stevens stated that the quantity of stored vehicles be limited to four (4) given the lot size. Stevens stated that the regulations listed in Section 13 should also be included based upon agreement between the petitioner and City.

Stevens questioned if there were any additional amendments.

Motion by Larson, second by Rask to recommend approval of the text amendment with additional comments as stated. Motion carried (6 – 0 – 1), with Lorinser abstaining.

Stevens stated that the City Council will review the item at their upcoming meeting. Stevens stated that the City Council has the final vote.

Harris questioned when it would go before City Council.

Krause stated that it would be on the February 17<sup>th</sup> Agenda.

B. Request of the City of Isanti, to Amend Ordinance No. 254: Subdivision Ordinance, Section II Administration and Enforcement, to include requirements for the Certification of Taxes Paid as part of the application process.

Krause presented the staff memo. Krause stated that the ordinance amendment would ensure that property owners have paid their taxes prior to making application through the subdivision ordinance.

Larson stated that the City should be consistent.

Stevens opened public hearing and called for comments.

Having no comments, Stevens closed public hearing.

Motion by Larson, second by Streiff to recommend approval of the amendment to Ordinance No. 254 to include requirements for the Certification of Taxes Paid as part of the application process. Motion was unanimously approved.

C. Request of the City of Isanti, to Amend Ordinance No. 445: Zoning Ordinance, Section 6 Residential Districts, to include regulations and provisions for state licensed residential facilities (group homes) or housing with services establishments registered under Chapter 144D, state licensed day care facilities, and state licensed group family day care.

Krause presented the staff memo. Krause stated that the amendment would bring the City's Ordinance into conformance with State Statutes. Krause stated that Mr. Joslin has reviewed the ordinance language.

Stevens opened the public hearing and requested comments.

Having no comments, Stevens closed the public hearing.

Motion by Larson, second by Rask to recommend approval of the amendments to Ordinance No. 445 to include regulations and provisions for state licensed residential facilities (group homes) or housing with services establishments registered under Chapter 144D, state licensed day care facilities, and state licensed group family day care. Motion was unanimously approved.

## **5. Other Business**

### **A. Ordinance Interpretation for Northside Sports Paintball.**

Krause presented the staff memo. Krause provided the definition to the Planning Commission for Commercial Recreation. Krause stated that staff is looking for an interpretation from the Commission. Krause stated that the business owner had provided some additional information for the Commission to review regarding the proposed use. Krause stated that the business owner was present to answer questions.

Krause stated that if the Planning Commission felt the use met the intent of the definition; then a text amendment should be made to the ordinance.

Larson questioned if the business owner had a parcel in mind near TH 65. Larson stated that the use would be good fit, but she is unsure if it should be right along the highway where it is visible.

Jeff Iverson, 204 18<sup>th</sup> Lane, Cambridge, MN, approached the podium to answer questions.

Lorinser questioned if they had a parcel picked out.

Iverson stated that they did not, but they wanted to do some research as to whether this was something the City was interested in or even allowed.

Lorinser questioned the location of the business in Ramsey.

Iverson stated that it was located along Hwy 10 near the campground sales. Iverson stated that they have 160 acres in Hinckley.

Stevens stated that he applauded the petitioner for coming to the City first and planning out the strategy.

Lorinser questioned the type of screening.

Iverson stated that there would be netting, so as to capture the paintballs.

Lorinser questioned if you could see through the nets.

Iverson stated that it provides shading but you can see through.

Stevens stated that the task of the Planning Commission was to determine if the proposed use was similar to those already listed. Stevens stated that in reading through the uses listed, the paintball facility would be considered similar.



Lorinser questioned if Commercial Recreation was a conditional use.

Krause stated that the use was listed as a conditional use and would need to go through the necessary planning process.

Stevens stated that if the language were amended and approved, then properties within the B-2 district would be open to the use. Stevens stated that the use would need to obtain a conditional use permit.

Motion by Stevens, second by Larson that the text be amended to include paintball in the definition of Commercial Recreation. Motion was approved, with Lorinser abstaining.

## **6. Discussion Items**

### **A. Business / Industrial Sub-Committee Update.**

Krause stated that the sub-committee would be meeting to begin their study on the use of semi-trailers, etc. as storage facilities within Commercial and Industrial Districts. Krause stated that the initial meeting has been set for Tuesday, February 24<sup>th</sup> at 8:00 a.m. at City Hall.

Stevens questioned the item.

Krause stated that Code Enforcement had received some complaints regarding the use of semi-trailers as “storage facilities”. Krause stated that the Planning Commission had reviewed written comment and listened to verbal comments from the business community and as a result, the Planning Commission referred the item to the Business Committee for further review and study.

Stevens questioned if Mr. Lorinser would be abstaining from all Council business.

Lorinser stated that he would be abstaining from items that he felt would be a double voting issue. Lorinser stated that general business items, he would vote.

Stevens questioned if there were staff issues or if this created quorum issues.

Krause stated that she would check with Mr. Joslin on the legalities.

Stevens questioned what would happen if they were short members or if voting was uneven.

Lorinser stated that if there were quorum issues, then he could vote. Lorinser stated that he believed Council should not vote twice. Lorinser stated that if something were unanimous, then it would not matter.

Stevens stated that he would be voting on the items at Council anyway.

Lorinser stated would vote at Council then.

Stevens questioned if this was a directive from Council.

Lorinser stated this was a personal belief.

**7. Adjournment**

Motion by Lorinser, second by Rask to adjourn the February 10<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Planning Commission. Motion was unanimously approved.

The meeting adjourned at 7:52 p.m.

Dated at Isanti, Minnesota, this 10<sup>th</sup> day of March 2009.

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Lisa M. Krause, AICP  
City Planner