

**CITY OF ISANTI
PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MAY 8, 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, Christopher McDonald (arrived at 7:02 p.m.), Michael Streiff III, and Sean Stevens.

Members Absent: Ross Lorinser (gave prior notice).

Staff Present: Lisa Wilson, Planning and Parks Director.

D. Agenda Modifications.

Stevens questioned if there were any changes to the Agenda.

Wilson stated there were no modifications to the Agenda.

2. Approval of Minutes from April 10, 2012 Planning Commission Meeting.

Stevens requested a motion regarding the minutes.

Motion by Larson, second by Englund to approve the April 10, 2012 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. Motion was unanimously approved.

3. Public Hearings.

A. Request from Minnco Credit Union for an Interim Use Permit to allow for Temporary Motor Vehicle Sales on the properties located at 309 and 311 Credit Union Drive NE.

Stevens presented the item and requested that the applicant approach the podium.

Peggy Durkot and Frank Wros were present to discuss the item with the Planning Commission.

Wilson presented the staff memo and the recommended staff conditions.

Stevens questioned if the representatives had the opportunity to review the staff conditions; and if so, did they have any issues or questions in regards to those conditions.

Wros stated that he had reviewed the conditions. Wros stated that the event is the same as last year; and he had no issues with the conditions.

Streiff questioned how many cars or vehicles were sold each year at the event.

Wros stated that with all vehicles, both cars and Larson's ATVs, they sold 35 to 40 units last year during the event.

Stevens stated that the event is rather successful. Stevens opened the public hearing at 7:05 p.m. Stevens stated that the record should reflect that no members of the public were present to speak on this issue. Stevens closed the public hearing at 7:06 p.m. Stevens asked if there were any additional questions from the Planning Commission.

Stevens questioned if City staff was aware of any issues with the event.

Wilson stated that staff has not received any complaints regarding the event in the past. Wilson stated that staff had no additional comments.

Motion by Larson, second by Streiff to recommend approval of the request from Minnco Credit Union for an Interim Use Permit to allow for a Temporary Motor Vehicle Sales Event on the properties located 309 and 311 Credit Union Drive NE with the staff conditions as presented based upon the Findings of Fact and Conclusion. Motion was unanimously approved.

B. Request from Pat Duncanson, on behalf of Pat's Small Engine LLC, for Site Plan/Building Appearance Approval and Vacation of a portion of the existing Drainage and Utility Easement to allow for the construction of a building addition to the existing structure located on the property at 680 E Dual Blvd NE.

Stevens presented the item. Stevens requested that the applicant approach the podium.

Pat Duncanson was present to discuss the item with the Planning Commission.

Wilson presented the staff memo and the recommended conditions.

Stevens opened the public hearing at 7:08 p.m. Stevens questioned if the petitioner had the opportunity to review the staff conditions; and if so, did they have any issues or questions in regards to those conditions.

Duncanson stated that he had reviewed the conditions and did not have issues with what was presented.

Stevens questioned what the addition would be used for.

Duncanson stated that it would be used as warehouse space. Duncanson stated that he would be able to get more pallets into the building, which would allow them to have more merchandise and parts on hand.

Larson stated that it was great to see a business expanding within Isanti.

Stevens questioned if there were any additional questions. Stevens stated that there were no members of the public present to speak on the item. Stevens closed the public hearing at 7:10 p.m.

Motion by Larson, second by Stevens to recommend approval of the Vacation of a portion of the existing easement area and the site plan/building appearance to allow for the construction of an

addition to the existing structure located at 680 E Dual Blvd NE with the staff conditions as presented based upon the Findings of Fact and Conclusion. Motion was unanimously approved.

C. Request from Bank Site Investment LLC for Preliminary Plat Approval for Bank Site Third Addition to allow for new commercial development.

Wilson presented the staff memo and the recommended conditions.

Stevens opened the public hearing at 7:12 p.m. Stevens questioned if it was normal to receive a commercial plat submittal in which the actual use for the site had not been specifically determined.

Wilson stated that it is common. Wilson stated that the Commission has received two such submittals in the past. Wilson referred to the Anlauf Commercial Area as well as the Woodland Commercial Park. Wilson stated that in both of these instances the developer was proposing to subdivide commercial areas into lots without having specifically designated what type of building and use would be provided on each property.

Streiff questioned if the building were to have more than one floor.

Wilson stated that at this time, while staff is aware of discussions for an intend use, the project is to remain confidential. Wilson stated that the Planning Commission would be receiving further information at a future meeting.

Englund questioned if the property was currently an outlot.

Wilson stated that the property was originally platted as an outlot. Wilson stated that the City does not allow for construction on outlots, so the area needs to be platted in order for development to occur on the parcel in the future.

Englund stated that the applicant was just trying to make a legal lot for development.

Stevens closed the public hearing at 7:16 p.m. Stevens stated that there were no members of the public present to speak on the item. Stevens questioned if any of the members had additional questions.

Motion by Larson, second by Englund to recommend approval of the request from Bank Site Investment LLC for Preliminary Plat Approval for Bank Site Third Addition with staff conditions as presented based upon the Finding of Fact and Conclusion. Motion was unanimously approved.

4. Other Business.

A. Subdivision Ordinance, Articles 7 – 11.

Wilson outlined the amendments to each of the Articles. Wilson questioned if the Planning Commission had comments or questions.

Stevens stated that on page 22, he questioned if curvilinear was a word. Stevens stated that this should be amended or a definition added.

Wilson stated that City staff can make the change.

Stevens questioned the Conservation Subdivision article. Stevens stated that it would appear to be a rather new section.

Wilson stated that this would give developers an added incentive to preserve areas of a site that may have natural amenities or to preserve area for open space within a residential development.

Stevens questioned how the City would control the amount of density that could be added within one of these designs. Stevens questioned what would deter a developer from trying to place as many residential lots as possible within one of these developments. Stevens stated that this has been an issue in the past.

Larson explained that there have been sub-committee discussions with City residents regarding this type of development in the past. Larson stated that it had always been just discussion, but this would open the City up to this type of development. Larson stated that there had been areas identified in which this would be acceptable.

Wilson stated that it would function similar to that of a development heading through the PUD process. Wilson stated that the underlying zoning would dictate the density that could be located within the development. Wilson stated that density bonus incentives would be given up to a certain level providing the developer was meeting specific standards or benchmarks.

Stevens questioned the sidebar comments within the Park Dedication section on page 38.

Wilson stated that during a staff discussion on the ordinance some questions were raised regarding how the park dedication fees could be calculated. Wilson stated that the City Attorney had been asked those questions.

Streiff stated that on page 38, under I.3., it should probably read that a certified real estate appraiser be hired versus a qualified.

Wilson stated that she would make the change.

Stevens questioned if City staff had received comments from the City Attorney on the draft.

Wilson stated that she had not. Wilson stated that Mr. Joslin had been made aware that the item was being discussed by the Planning Commission.

Stevens stated that he would like to see the amendments that had been discussed as well as obtain feedback from the City Attorney prior to calling for a public hearing.

Commission members agreed.

Wilson stated that she will work with the City Attorney, as this item does need to move forward through the process. Wilson stated that she would aim to have the amended copy ready for the next meeting so that a hearing could be called for the July meeting.

B. Amendment to Ordinance No. 445, Section 21 Administration and Enforcement, Article 2 Conditional Use Permits.

Wilson outlined the amendment that had been drafted by City staff and the City Attorney based upon comments and discussion at the February Planning Commission meeting.

Stevens questioned if this would affect someone that may have been issued a Conditional Use Permit, but for reasons beyond their control, they were not able to establish the use within the given time frame. Stevens questioned if they could still be issued an extension.

Wilson stated that this would not affect that particular circumstance. Wilson stated that individuals would still be able to come forward and request an extension for the establishment of a CUP if necessary. Wilson provided some examples of past extension requests that had been approved by the City. Wilson stated that whether or not future requests are granted would be up to the Planning Commission and City Council. Wilson stated that this Ordinance amendment would be for the CUP that was issued by the City; the owner established the use, the business was in operation for a period of time and then stopped. Wilson stated that after the one year mark had passed, the City would then have the opportunity to revoke the CUP through the necessary hearing process.

McDonald stated that the Ordinance amendment could not be applied retroactively.

Wilson stated that it was her understanding that it could only apply to CUPs that were issued after the adoption of the Ordinance. Wilson stated that we could not apply it to a CUP that was issued three years prior to this Ordinance amendment.

Stevens questioned if Mr. Joslin was more comfortable with the language.

Wilson stated that she did not want to speak for Mr. Joslin, but she thought he was more comfortable given that we were allowing the property owner due process. Wilson stated that findings would need to be made as part of the revocation process. Wilson stated that Mr. Joslin had indicated that the City could become the test case if a property owner were to formally object.

Stevens questioned the next steps.

Wilson stated that if the Planning Commission is comfortable with the Ordinance, they could call for a public hearing on the amendment. Wilson stated that the hearing would be held at the June meeting. Wilson stated that if the Planning Commission chose not to move forward with the amendment, then the item would not be reviewed any further.

Motion by Stevens, second by Larson to call for a public hearing on Tuesday, June 12, 2012, on an amendment to Ordinance No. 445, Section 21 Administration and Enforcement, Article 2 Conditional Use Permits. Motion was unanimously approved.

5. Discussion Items.

A. None.

6. Other Communications.

A. None.

Stevens questioned if staff or members of the Commission had anything further.

Wilson stated that she did not.

Lind-Livingston questioned the process for filling the vacant seat on the Planning Commission.

Larson stated that the Mayor would be appointing a new Council representative to the seat in June.

7. Adjournment

Motion by Englund, second by Stevens to adjourn the May 8th, 2012 meeting of the Planning Commission. Motion was unanimously approved.

The meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Dated at Isanti, Minnesota this 12th day of May 2012.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa M. Wilson, AICP
Planning and Parks Director