

**CITY OF ISANTI  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
May 13, 2008**

**1. Meeting Opening**

**A. Call to Order**

Krause opened the meeting.

Members of the Commission voted unanimously for Commissioner Stevens to act as the presiding officer in Chairman Duncan's absence.

Commissioner Stevens called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**B. Pledge of Allegiance**

All rose for the pledge of allegiance.

**C. Roll Call**

**Members Present:** Ralph Johnson, Dave Englund, Sean Stevens, Jeff Kolb and Steven Rask

**Members Absent:** Ross Lorinser and Jeff Duncan

**Staff Present:** Lisa Krause, City Planner and Trudi Breuninger, Administrative Assistant

**D. Agenda Modifications.**

None.

**2. Approval of Minutes of April 8, 2008**

Motion by Kolb, second by Rask to approve Planning Commission minutes of April 8, 2008.

Motion carried unanimously.

**3. Public Hearings**

**3A. Conditional Use Permit request for Don Fiedler to permit the extraction, grading, or filling of land involving the movement of earth and materials in excess of twenty-five (25') cubic yards on the property located to the East and West of Penny Lane SE between Main Street East and Broadway Street SE.**

Krause presented the background of the petitioners request as stated in the memo. Krause presented the Planning Review Committee comments and staff recommendation.

Stevens opened the public hearing at 7:04 p.m.

Tom Aleckson, 212 Richard, stated that Fiedler had in the past said he would put Richard Ave through and obviously Richard Ave is not through, and as a representative of the neighborhood they are upset. Aleckson stated when he called the city and was told that Fiedler didn't want to pay for the road to go through at the time. Aleckson said he didn't have a choice and had to pay for the improvement. Aleckson expressed that he wanted the road through bad.

Fiedler stated that the road was to go through when the lot was developed. Fielder stated that there is an opportunity for him to obtain fill for the lot and would be used to fill in the low areas.

Kolb stated that there is an additional land owner that would have to be involved to get the road put it. Kolb stated that a developer would have to develop the land of both property owners in order to get the road through, unless it was done by eminent domain.

Aleckson questioned when does the city get involved to make sense of the streets in Isanti.

Stevens stated that eminent domain is taken very seriously and is used by cities as a last resort.

Kolb stated that Isanti just straightened out the streets on the east side of 65 and cost the city hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Aleckson stated his opinion is that the city is allowing the developers to run the city instead of vice versa.

Stevens said that when the lots get developed the street will go through. Stevens stated that the request is for fill.

Stevens closed the public hearing at 7:15 p.m.

Motion by Kolb, second by Stevens to approve the Conditional Use Permit for the movement and alteration of land on the property located at to the East and West of Penny Lane SE between Main Street East and Broadway Street SE, to allow for the filling of land on the property, with the following conditions:

1. The petitioner shall install silt fencing along the west property line.
2. The petitioner shall obtain the necessary NPDS Phase II permits, if more than one (1) acre of soil were disturbed on the property.
3. If the trees along Broadway Street are disturbed as part of the grading and filling project, the petitioner shall work with staff to relocate the trees.
4. The petitioner shall restore the area through the placement of sod within the disturbed area. The petitioner shall work with the City Engineer to determine the appropriate seed mix to be used on the site.
5. The petitioner shall meet any additional requirements or address any concerns stipulated by the City Engineer or City Administrator.

Motion carried unanimously.

3.B. Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan Review request for the City of Isanti to permit the construction of a Water Treatment Facility with Landbanked Parking on the property located at 601 East Dual Boulevard NE.

Krause provided background of the city owned property for the site of the Water Treatment Facility as well as a description of the building, landscaping and parking.

Krause stated that staff recommends approval of the conditional use permit and the site plan with the following conditions:

1. While the proposed roofing material (asphalt shingle) meets the code requirements, staff would to recommend that a different material (metal) be used in an effort to lower insurance and maintenance costs.

2. The Spruce trees proposed along the east side of the building be removed and relocated to another area on the parcel. Staff would recommend that the trees be placed within the northern portion of the site.
3. If additional parking is required in the future, the City shall construct the necessary parking as shown on the Site Plan.
4. Any additional concerns or requirements brought forth by the City Engineer or City Administrator shall be addressed.

Chair Duncan arrived and assumed Chair position and called the Public Hearing to order at 7:21 p.m.

Johnson questioned when the metal roof became a recommendation as he has been a part of the committee since day one. Krause stated that the members of the Planning Review Committee felt even with the additional cost a metal roof would last longer than asphalt shingles.

Oakley stated that the specs call for 30 year shingles which should last 20 years.

General discussion among the Commission on metal roofs versus asphalt shingles continued.

Oakley stated that it comes down to the cost; however, a metal roof would extend the life of the roof.

Johnson would like the metal roof to be bid as an option.

Oakley stated that the Public Works committee discussed the cost of the building and although it is an expensive project it was designed economically.

Stevens asked that Oakley give a brief explanation behind the need for a Water Treatment Facility.

Oakley stated the motivation behind doing the project is with radium levels in two of the Isanti wells (Well 2 and 3) are both in excess of the maximum allowable limit of radium. Oakley stated that Isanti gets by now by using well number 1 and blending it with water from wells 2 and 3. So currently there is not an issue with the water, however if Well 1 was to go down there would be. Oakley stated that there is not a reliable system for distribution of water to the residents. Oakley also stated that Isanti has also had a history of not providing an adequate amount of water that is why Well 3 was done in 2007. Oakley stated that because of the radium found in the water Isanti had to look at a step by step solution. First, get enough water and second would be the water quality. Water treatment is one of the ways to deal with the water quality. Isanti also has an issue with iron and manganese. Residents may not be able to detect the radium in the water but can tell when the iron and manganese is high. Oakley stated that the water treatment facility would remove iron and manganese below the standard as well as the radium level.

Stevens asked about the parking standards that Isanti holds applicants to and appears the city does not meet these standards. Johnson responded that during the design there was discussion about the parking in the horseshoe of the road and in the pump house parking areas would be shared. Johnson stated that generally there wouldn't be a need for parking at the facility, one-two employees would be working there at a time.

Oakley stated that it does meet the requirements of the city.

Krause verified that through the Conditional Use Permit process a reduction in parking or landbanked parking is permitted providing the petitioner meets certain requirements and demonstrates that the parking would fit on the site if needed.

Oakley suggested the Commission consider the landscaping of the project, mainly the trees on the east side of building. Oakley stated that the landscape architect suggested putting a planting area under and around the Blue Spruce trees by putting mulch under and around them to make it easier to maintain and mow the lawn or another option would be to move them to the north side of the property.

Johnson stated he would not recommend planting Blue Spruce trees and suggested putting in flowering crabs or maples.

Krause stated that the plan as shown does reflect the correct number of trees to meet the landscape ordinance. Krause stated that staff and Mr. Meyer's concern was mowing around the trees and he would like them to be moved.

Oakley asked if the trees should be replaced and if the placement was okay.

Kolb suggested oak or maple.

Johnson stated something that is hardy in the area. Johnson felt the placement was fine as long as it was easy to care for and mow around.

Johnson questioned the layout of the parking lot with respect to plowing.

Oakley stated there is a canopy that extends from the building and would have to go through a major re-design in order to eliminate the "concrete island". Oakley also mentioned that Meyer has reviewed the plan and never expressed concerns about the layout of the parking lot.

Duncan closed the public hearing at 7:47 p.m.

Motion by Stevens, second by Kolb to approve the Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan Review request for the City of Isanti to permit the construction of a Water Treatment Facility with staff recommendations also that the cost of the metal roof be broke out, the trees on the east side of the building be divided and three of them be moved to the north and the variety of tree be changed to one that is easy to care for as well as the remainder of staff's conditions. Motion carried.

#### **4. Other Business**

4A. An ordinance amending Ordinance No. 176: Zoning Ordinance, Section 4, 5 and as well as any other associated Sections to include provisions for Detached Accessory Garages.

Krause reiterated that the Commission held a public hearing on the issue and that the Housing Task Force with staff has reviewed and made recommendations on this issue as well. Krause stated that the group has proposed language changes to reflect such discussion. Krause stated since the Housing Task Force met additional staff have reviewed the changes such as

Community Development, Engineer and Building Official; they in turn also had some suggestions or concerns as follows:

(B.1.) In the Location section along with accessory structures not being located in easements but to add wetlands and storm water retention ponds as well.

(C.2.) In Size and Setback Requirements one item mentioned is the setback onto an alley shall be ten feet. Krause stated with regard to the foundation size of 240 square feet – Krause gave examples of homes and their sizes and sizes of accessory structures. Krause stated that in many instances what is proposed may not fit or may appear to be too tight for the site.

(C.6.) Single story only accessory structures, Krause stated the Building Official asked whether a 2 story structure would be allowed for mother-in-law apartments, game room or additional storage.

(F.1.) Separate driveway entrances for corner lots that have the accessory building off the adjacent street from where the attached garage and driveway face. Krause questioned whether the City wants to consider allowing another driveway for those lots?

Krause asked for additional clarification or comments on the green space. In researching staff had come up with 25% of the entire lot be green space. Krause questioned what green space should include: lawn, landscaped areas, patios, gravel, etc. Krause also questioned whether this 25% is too much or too little.

Johnson said that the 800 square feet originally was intended for those that don't have an attached garage and now it is being allowed for anybody who would have the space available. Johnson added that a double garage (24x24) is 576 square feet, if they have an attached double garage and then put up an 800 square foot accessory structure – is a structure that big the purpose of the amendment.

Duncan stated that a house has a single attached garage and is only allowed a 240 square foot and the neighbor with no garage can build an 800 square foot building, where is the balance.

Stevens mentally drew a picture of a house with garage and an accessory structure, how big does the lot have to be to allow for 25% green space?

Johnson stated there are very few lots that would allow for an 800 square foot building.

Krause cited some examples of lots currently in the city that has a house with an attached garage and accessory structure and has an easement in the back. Krause showed example surveys.

Kolb asked what other cities have done.

Krause stated some are limit the size to 500 square feet, some communities have a sliding scale that takes lot sizes into consideration.

Johnson and Kolb agreed that a sliding scale would be better. Kolb suggested getting examples from other cities.

Stevens requested that aeriels of properties be done on different lots to show the space available.

Krause offered another suggestion of calculating a percentage of the rear yard to determine how big the accessory structure can be; for example 15% of the backyard, omitting ponds and easements.

Motion by Johnson, second by Kolb to table this item until next month and instructed staff to get examples of sliding scales and take some properties randomly to determine accessory structure building size. Motion carried.

#### 4B. Zoning Ordinance Amendments: Central Business Transitional District and Public/Semi-Public District.

Krause stated the subcommittee proposed a Transitional District that attempts to blend existing residential uses with the downtown area without distracting from it.

Stevens asked if it is through uniformity of the structures to transition the districts.

Krause confirmed and stated the Mixed Use Designation currently shown on the map would no longer work without the support of a transit stop. Krause stated the Subcommittee is trying to react to the future land use plan and be conscious of that.

Krause stated the other issue is the dissallusion of the Public/Semi-Public Districts and be re-zoned to that of the adjacent property. The uses of the Public/Semi-Public Districts can be found as uses in all of the other districts.

Krause pointed out the Transitional District on the map stating it surrounds the downtown area.

As there were no other comments Krause stated that the Planning Commission would see it again at the Public Hearing for the Ordinance approval.

### **5. Discussion Items**

#### 5.A. Business-Industrial Subcommittee Update

Krause stated the Sub-Committee began looking at the parking issues in the downtown area and requested additional information from staff. They will meet again on Tuesday, May 20<sup>th</sup> at 8:00 a.m.

#### 5.B. Housing Task Force Update

The Task Force is focusing on the rules and regulations for Planned Unit Developments. They will meet again on Monday, May 19<sup>th</sup> at 4:30 p.m.

### **6. Adjournment**

Motion by Johnson, second by Kolb to adjourn Planning Commission meeting at 8:15 pm.

Dated at Isanti, Minnesota, this 13<sup>th</sup> day of May 2008.

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Trudi Breuninger  
Administrative Assistant