

**CITY OF ISANTI
PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
APRIL 10, 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: David Englund, Sue Larson, Cindy Lind-Livingston, Ross Lorinser (arrived at 7:04 p.m.), Christopher McDonald, Michael Streiff III, and Sean Stevens.

Members Absent: None.

Staff Present: Lisa Wilson, Planning and Parks Director.

D. Agenda Modifications.

Wilson stated there were no modifications to the Agenda.

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

Stevens requested a motion regarding the minutes.

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

3. Public Hearings.

A. None.

4. Other Business.

A. Subdivision Ordinance, Articles 1 – 6.

Wilson outlined some of the amendments to the existing Ordinance. Wilson questioned if the Planning Commission members had questions or concerns regarding any of the changes that had been proposed.

Stevens questioned the term for metes and bounds.

Wilson stated that metes and bounds is a legal description for property. Wilson stated that these descriptions tend to be longer. Wilson stated that this type of description uses degrees, minutes, etc. to describe the location of the property. Wilson stated that the City has tried to move away from using these as a legal description for property. Wilson stated that there are exceptions to when this type of description would be allowed to continue and instances when they would need to be re-platted.

Stevens questioned the strike through the land divisions title. Stevens questioned if that was the old title to the section.

Wilson stated that it was.

Stevens questioned if re-subdivision was a previous designation.

Wilson stated that most likely it was a re-plat. Wilson stated that the City has seen re-plats of formerly approved plats in the past.

Stevens questioned if any of the other members had questions.

Lind-Livingston questioned the definition of a caliper inch.

Wilson stated it is the measurement used for determining the diameter size of a tree.

Streiff questioned if the metes and bounds definition is more associated with parcels with acreage.

Wilson stated that is true. Wilson stated that some of the older lots within the downtown area that also have a metes and bounds description.

Stevens stated that page 15, item (E), there is a 60 day notation that has been removed. Stevens questioned if this was sufficient or if further clarification was necessary.

Wilson stated that upon receipt of a complete application, the clocks starts ticking. Wilson stated that with a preliminary plat, the City is allowed some additional time per statute. Wilson outlined the language and how it would affect the City's review time.

Stevens questioned how that time was created and if it is the difference between E and H.

Wilson stated that the City was using the 60-day rule, rather than what was in statute for plats. Wilson stated that the proposed language makes better sense, then what had originally been in place.

Stevens stated that if the Planning Commission must rule upon a complete application, then we would get to it as quickly as possible. Stevens stated that in H, the City Council would have 120 days. Stevens questioned if we were trying to buy Council more time.

Lorinser stated that having a longer time period would allow the Council to send things back to Planning Commission too.

Stevens questioned if both marks are under state regulations. Stevens stated that he understands setting a target for being quick. Stevens questioned why set ordinance so that we have to review an item quicker than is required by statute.

Wilson stated that this would not do that. Wilson stated that the City Council has to approve or deny the plat within that 120 day mark. Wilson stated that when an application comes in, City staff has 10 days to review the application and make the applicant aware of any missing items. Wilson stated that once the application is deemed complete, the review clock starts ticking. Wilson stated at that point, the plat would need to go through the Planning Commission and the Council would need to make a decision by the end of the specified time period.

Stevens stated that within E, the language does not reflect how we will do business.

Lorinser stated that if we have more time, then we could use that time. Lorinser stated that the City was placing itself on a shorter clock.

Wilson stated that statute does not care if we get the process completed well ahead of schedule, just as long as we have made our decision within that time period presented.

Streiff questioned the Performance Bond section. Streiff stated no securities are FDIC insured. Streiff stated that this would need to be reviewed for accuracy.

Wilson stated that City staff can review that section.

Streiff stated that he is unsure if the City is thinking about cash. Streiff also questioned if the cash deposit would be with the City or with a bank.

Lorinser stated that almost all other deposits have been with the City in the past. Lorinser stated that the letter of credit is held with a bank, but the City has the ability to draw upon it.

Streiff stated that it should read a letter of credit to the City of Isanti.

McDonald stated that maybe it should be reworded to state that a letter of credit be from an FDIC insured bank to the City of Isanti.

Streiff stated that it just needs to be further spelled out.

Stevens questioned if there were institutions that are not FDIC insured.

Streiff stated that there are some. Streiff provided some examples.

Wilson stated that City staff would work on the language.

Stevens questioned if there were other questions or comments.

B. Review of Zoning Ordinance – District Uses and Provisions.

Wilson outlined the proposed amendments provided by City staff. Wilson stated that when it came to the B-2 District, there would need to be a different district of some sort. Wilson stated that to make those amendments, they would apply to the entire general business district; and that is not the intent.

Lorinser stated that it would be over TH 65 and the Industrial District.

Wilson stated that it would just be along the TH 65 corridor. Wilson stated that it appears that the City wanted to create a different type of characteristic along the corridor.

McDonald questioned where the B-2 zone was located.

Wilson pointed the area out on the zoning map.

Lorinser questioned the R-1 section on the south side. Lorinser questioned the streets that border the area.

Wilson provided the street names.

Lorinser questioned if there were homes there now.

Wilson stated that there was a portion that had large single family lots. Wilson stated that the larger portion near the highway was vacant with a large wetland complex.

Lorinser questioned why it is zoned residential.

Wilson stated that, if she remembers correctly, the discussion at the comprehensive plan meetings was this could be a PUD residential development that could use the wetland as an amenity.

McDonald questioned the location of the existing religious institutions in the area.

Wilson pointed out where the existing churches were located. Wilson stated that there would only be one that should be affected.

Streiff questioned how office corporate was different from telemarketing.

Wilson explained the potential differentiation between the two types of uses.

Lorinser questioned what Spirit River was zoned.

Wilson stated it was B-2.

Lorinser questioned how that would affect them.

Wilson stated that if it was along the TH 65 corridor only, it would not affect them at all.

Stevens stated that what had been presented made sense. Stevens stated that when it came to restaurants, they should remain as a conditional use. Stevens stated that while it would ease some development issues, the lack of review could be a problem.

Lorinser stated that the layer of approval is not a big deal. Lorinser questioned the cost and time period for review.

Wilson stated that CUP's are currently \$325. Wilson stated that if it is a new restaurant, then it can be reviewed at the time of site plan approval. Wilson stated that once the CUP is in place, another restaurant can use the site as a restaurant without obtaining additional approvals, providing they meet the conditions of the original CUP. Wilson stated that if they cannot, then they could request an amendment.

Lorinser stated that a restaurant is a pretty volatile business anyway. Lorinser stated that it is not a guaranteed business in your town. Lorinser stated that you can be left with an empty building within a few years.

Strieff stated that the average lifecycle of a restaurant is 5 years.

Lorinser stated that while he understands Mr. Sullivan's argument, he feels that they should be kept as a CUP. Lorinser stated that seats and parking are connected. Lorinser stated that a restaurant can continue to grow and suddenly we have parking issues. Lorinser stated that the added layer of review is needed.

Commission members agreed.

Wilson stated that staff will work on some amendments to the ordinance.

5. Discussion Items.

A. None.

6. Other Communications.

A. Ordinance Amendment – Advisory Board Absences.

Wilson read through the new ordinance requirements.

B. Zoning Ordinance Amendments

Wilson stated that the most recent zoning ordinance amendments were approved by the City Council. Wilson stated that revised sections have been provided for the Commissioner's copies. Wilson stated that for the Council members, the amendments would be included within their code books when they were delivered to City Hall.

7. Adjournment

Motion by Englund, second by McDonald to adjourn the April 10th, 2012 meeting of the Planning Commission. Motion was unanimously approved.

The meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

Dated at Isanti, Minnesota this 8th day of May 2012.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa M. Wilson, AICP
Planning and Parks Director