

**CITY OF ISANTI
PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MAY 11, 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, Sue Larson, Cindy Lind-Livingston, Ross Lorinser, Michael Streiff III, and Sean Stevens.

Members Absent: Steve Rask (no prior notice).

Staff Present: Lisa Krause, City Planner

D. Agenda Modifications.

Krause stated there were no modifications to the Agenda.

2. Approval of Minutes from April 13, 2010 Planning Commission Meeting.

Motion by Larson, second by Lorinser to approve the April 13th, 2010 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. Motion was unanimously approved.

3. Public Hearings.

A. Request from Minnco Credit Union for an Interim Use Permit to permit Temporary Motor Vehicle Sales on the properties located at 309 and 311 Credit Union Drive NE, legally described as Lot 1 and Lot 2; Block 1 Credit Union Addition.

Krause presented the staff memo and the recommendations.

Stevens opened the public hearing at 7:05 p.m.

Stevens questioned if the petitioner had the opportunity to review the memo and the conditions. Stevens questioned if they had any concerns.

Frank Wrzos, AutoFAQs, and Peggy Durkot, Minnco Credit Union, stated that they did not have any concerns regarding the conditions.

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

Motion by Larson, second by Englund to recommend approval of the request from Minnco Credit Union for an Interim Use Permit to permit Temporary Motor Vehicle Sales on the properties located at 309 and 311 Credit Union Drive NE, legally described as Lot 1 and Lot 2; Block 1 Credit Union Addition with the conditions as presented by City staff based upon the Findings of Fact and Conclusion as presented. Motion was unanimously approved.

B. Request from Premier Bank for Preliminary Plat Approval Amending the Planned Unit Development known as Villages on the Rum Third Addition, which is legally described to include: Parcel 1, Outlot A, Villages on the Rum Third Addition Replat, Isanti County, Minnesota; Parcel 2, Outlot B, Villages on the Rum Third Addition, Isanti County, Minnesota; and Parcel 3, The east 1090 feet of the North ½ of South ½ of NW ¼ of SE ¼ of Section 19, Township 35, Range 23, subject to existing road along the East boundary line thereof, Isanti County, Minnesota.

Krause presented the staff memo and the recommendations.

Stevens opened the public hearing at 7:13 p.m.

Stevens questioned if the development is being split into the 20 lot phases, would the phases begin closer to Outlot A or closer to Outlot D.

Krause stated that the phases would begin in phases closer to Third Ave as this is the general area in which the smaller home sizes would be permitted. Krause stated that with the market the way it is currently, it is anticipated that the smaller homes would sell first.

Stevens questioned the lots sizes shown on the plat, particularly Lots 1-4, Block 9. Stevens questioned the lot size consistency between these four lots and those directly to the south.

Krause stated that she was not sure how large the lots to the south were. Krause stated that they are probably fairly consistent in size.

Stevens stated that they are not radically inconsistent, but he questioned whether there should be three lots there rather than the four as shown on the plat.

Stevens questioned the little sliver that wanders into Outlot D.

Krause stated that it is an access easement for entrance into Outlot D. Krause stated that the wetland as well as storm water ponding would be located within that general area.

Stevens questioned why there are three access points. Stevens stated that there are two from Bellaire Blvd and from Whiskey Road.

Krause stated that she thought the area had rather steep slopes. Krause stated that there is also a wetland area, which may remain wet. Krause stated that the number and location of the access easements may relate to those items.

Lorinser stated that City staff could check with Mr. DeWolf.

Larson questioned who would be responsible for the maintenance of the wetland area.

Krause stated that the wetland would need to be maintained as wetland, more or less in its natural state.

Larson questioned the maintenance in the passive park area.

Krause stated that it will mainly remain natural area.

Lorinser stated that the park committee will be reviewing this item in the future. Lorinser stated that there would not be play equipment. Lorinser stated that there is some natural history in the area that may need to be reviewed as well.

Larson questioned if the City has discussed how they are going to regulate snowmobiles and ATVs that may run along the brook area.

Krause stated that the City would need to discuss and would need to delineate the area.

Larson stated that when you go further to the south where the lot lines to extend to the Rum River, this has been an issue.

Krause stated that the park rules itself do not allow for motorized vehicles of that nature, so that could be enforced.

Doug Schultze, Premier Bank, stated that the reason that the lots were pulled away from the brook was so that the area could be protected in its natural state.

Larson stated that she agreed that was a wonderful idea. Larson stated that it is already a problem and it should be addressed as we move forward.

Lorinser stated that the biggest issue with snowmobile and ATV education is stressing that if you ignore the rules, then communities will take action. Lorinser stated that many cities have banned the use in the City limits because of violators. Lorinser stated that people need to understand that they need to abide by the rules. Lorinser stated that we are not going to be able to put a cop back in the park on a snowmobile to enforce the rules. Lorinser stated that the best we can do is educate the public and hope that they abide by the rules. Lorinser stated that if they do not, then the issue will be dealt with.

Lorinser stated the outlots are private outlots. Lorinser questioned if the bank owns the outlots.

Schultze stated that currently they would own some of the future outlot areas.

Krause stated that most of the outlots within Villages on the Rum are owned by the City. Krause stated that the outlots shown would be owned by the City and maintained by the City.

Lorinser stated that the City had tried to move away from that.

Stevens stated that under ordinance, they should be privately held.

Krause stated that they would be City.

Lorinser stated that the City Engineer should verify.

Stevens closed the public hearing at 7:22 p.m.

Motion by Lorinser, second by Larson to recommend approval of the request from Premier Bank for Preliminary Plat Approval Amending the Planned Unit Development known as Villages on the Rum Third Addition, which is legally described to include: Parcel 1, Outlot A, Villages on

the Rum Third Addition Replat, Isanti County, Minnesota; Parcel 2, Outlot B, Villages on the Rum Third Addition, Isanti County, Minnesota; and Parcel 3, The east 1090 feet of the North ½ of South ½ of NW ¼ of SE ¼ of Section 19, Township 35, Range 23, subject to existing road along the East boundary line thereof, Isanti County, Minnesota with the conditions as presented by City staff. Motion was unanimously approved.

Larson stated that City staff should verify who would own and maintain the outlots.

Krause stated that she would verify before the Council meeting.

4. Other Business.

A. Non-Commercial Gardening and Community Gardens.

Krause outlined the items in the staff memo provided. Krause stated that Ms. Peterson, Isanti Area Chamber of Commerce was present to aid in the discussion.

Peterson stated that successful organizations are run by private organizations in cooperation with the City. Peterson stated that she has a commitment from the Master Gardener's Association to help to teach water conservation and gardening techniques to plot renters. Peterson stated that the Green Barn center stepped up and may donate some materials, along with Isanti Rental, Northland Landscaping, and she has semi-commitments from a couple of lumber yards. Peterson stated that there is a lot of excitement for this type of garden. Peterson stated that the location is perfect because she is there all the time.

Lorinser questioned if that was Chamber property.

Peterson stated yes. Peterson provided a description of the property.

Stevens questioned the size of the plots.

Peterson stated that plots are usually 10' x 10' or 10' x 20'.

Stevens questioned if that is what an individual would have.

Peterson stated yes. Peterson stated that they would be raised bed, so that they have some substance.

Stevens questioned how many total plots would fit.

Peterson stated that they could fit around 8 to 10 plots. Peterson stated that it will depend upon how it is designed.

Stevens stated that this would go back towards the alley, so items being transported to the site could be loaded or unloaded from the alley.

Lorinser questioned the water source.

Peterson stated that they have asked the City to help. Peterson stated that Cambridge did it all of last year and it only cost around \$50. Peterson stated that it is due to the water conservation techniques that they are taught. Peterson stated that oscillating sprinklers are not permitted.

Peterson stated that there is a water faucet at the back of the building. Peterson stated that they have kicked around a sand point well, but she has been unable to connect with the appropriate individual to discuss the options further. Peterson stated that she does not think water will be a breaking issue, as they will make it work one way or another.

Lorinser questioned what Cambridge does. Lorinser questioned if they just have a big plastic bin.

Peterson stated yes, but the City is drilling a well this year. Peterson stated that the City had filled a bin twice a week. Peterson stated that the land behind the chamber building is dandelions and wildflowers. Peterson stated that it has been mowed. Peterson stated that if there is some assurance that this will be allowed they would mulch and prepare for a community garden next year.

Lorinser questioned what staff was looking for.

Krause stated that staff is looking for direction. Krause questioned if the Planning Commission could foresee this use in all districts or just certain districts. Krause stated that there would need to be a definition drafted as well.

Lorinser stated that he would like to see it restricted to non-profit or there had to be a connection to this type of organization to ensure that they are maintained. Lorinser stated that the property should be privately owned. Lorinser stated that it would be limited. Lorinser stated that he was open to the type of district, but not the industrial. Lorinser stated that there would need to be regulations in place to ensure that rules are enforced.

Schultze stated that he lives in White Bear Lake and the issue that they have had is that some plants need shade, so gardeners were constructing shades out of sheets. Schultze stated that some of those shades were not removed over the winter, so it created an eyesore.

Lorinser stated that is why it needs to be joined with a group that can monitor what is being done on the property.

Englund stated that he brings up a good point.

Larson questioned if they would be able to put netting.

Peterson stated that it would be a good use for the space because it could be monitored.

Englund stated that the gardeners would need to be aware of the rules and regulations, which may determine what they would be able to plant in the space.

Stevens stated that he thought it was a good idea especially with the farmer's market.

Lorinser stated that the Green Barn had mentioned to him that they would love to do this type of garden here.

Peterson stated that the City may receive another request for potentially a larger area. Peterson stated that when creating an ordinance, the City should keep that in mind.

Lind-Livingston questioned how the gardeners would be determined.
Peterson stated that it would be first come, first serve.

Lind-Livingston questioned if the previous year would be grandfathered in.

Peterson stated that probably, especially if they follow the rules.

Stevens questioned if we had restrictions on greenhouses.

Krause stated that she does not recall seeing them within the code.

Peterson stated that Cambridge would be constructing a greenhouse this summer for the community garden.

Lorinser questioned if the Chamber was looking to start this year.

Peterson stated that they had tried. Peterson stated that they would be looking towards next year. Peterson stated that they just want to prepare the area for the following summer.

Krause stated that based upon the discussion, City staff will put a draft together for review at the next meeting.

B. August Planning Commission Meeting Date.

Krause stated that the August Planning Commission meeting was originally scheduled for August 10th; however, elections are to be held on that date. Krause stated that Council had approved moving the meeting to the August 11th date, but there is a conflict for City staff. Krause stated that staff is looking to see if there would be a quorum available, if the meeting were moved to Monday, August 9th instead.

Planning Commission members agreed and there was consensus for the moving the Planning Commission meeting to August 9th.

C. Residential Soil Requirements.

Krause stated that she was not present at the last Council meeting, so if there are questions, the Council representatives may be able to help. Krause stated that the City Council agreed with the Planning Commission to have an educational piece drafted; however, the City Council had made a formal motion to have a residential topsoil requirement of 4" of topsoil meeting Mn/DOTs specifications for Premium Topsoil. Krause stated that in order to move forward, the ordinance would need to be amended to reflect this change. Krause stated that staff is requesting that the Planning Commission call for a public hearing on this item to be held on June 8th.

Motion by Lorinser, second by Stevens to call for a public hearing on June 8th to amend the Zoning Ordinance for residential soil requirements.

5. Discussion Items.

A. None.

6. Other Communications.

A. Zoning Ordinance Amendments.

Krause stated that the amendments to the Ordinance had been provided to each member as a reference.

B. Planning Commissioners Journal, Spring 2010.

Krause stated that the Journal was included for their review at home.

7. Adjournment

Motion by Lorinser, second by Englund to adjourn the May 11th, 2010 meeting of the Planning Commission. Motion was unanimously approved.

The meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Dated at Isanti, Minnesota this 8th day of June 2010.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lisa M. Krause, AICP
City Planner