

**CITY OF ISANTI  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
JUNE 9, 2009**

**1. Meeting Opening**

**A. Call to Order**

Chairman 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:** Dave Englund, Sue Larson, Cindy Lind-Livingston, Ross Lorinser, Steve Rask, Sean Stevens, and Michael Streiff III

**Members Absent:** None

**Staff Present:** Lisa Krause, City Planner and Brad DeWolf, City Engineer.

**D. Agenda Modifications.**

Krause stated there were none.

**2. Approval of Minutes from May 12, 2009 Planning Commission Meeting**

Motion by Larson, second by Rask to approve the meeting minutes from the May 12, 2009 Planning Commission Meeting. Motion was unanimously approved.

**3. Public Hearings**

**A. Request from Doug Wynveen, on behalf of The River Bank, for Final Plat Approval of Villages on the Rum 2<sup>nd</sup> Addition, Phase 3 (Replat) for the property located at 600-610 Whiskey Road NW.**

Krause presented the staff memo. Krause stated that the Planning Commission had added a condition on the Preliminary Plat Approval that required the applicant to establish an easement or move the gazebo that is associated with the condo building. Krause stated that in response to that condition, the petitioner has moved the lot line, allowing for the gazebo to be on the same property as the condo building.

Krause had read into the record the letter provided by the Rum River Condo members, which read as follows:

“Enclosed you will find a petition of most of the owners of the Rum River Condos requesting that a buffer fence be installed between the condo building and whatever new buildings would be on the lot south of our building. The residents at Rum River Condos feel that a fence is necessary where our lots are so close together to give each lot some privacy. I ask that you put this petition with the Final Plat Approval (Replat) for 600-610 Whiskey Road NW (Villages on the Rum 2<sup>nd</sup> Addition, Phase 3. Thank you.”

Krause stated that the Planning Review Committee had recommended approval of the Final Plat with the following conditions: (1) there are dead trees located on the property. The dead trees

must be removed and replacement trees must be planted. Replacement trees shall meet the requirements of the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances. The property owner must water and maintain any new trees that are planted; and (2) at the southern end of Lot 2, Block 1; there is an easement that is shown around the floodway. The easement area should follow the boundary as shown on the FEMA maps, plus an additional 10-foot drainage and utility easement area shall be provided.

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

Lorsiner questioned if there could be a requirement that the petitioner add a buffer for the condo property.

Krause stated that this could be reviewed at the time of site plan approval for the vacant lot when it develops in the future.

Larson questioned if buffers consisted of landscaping in the past.

Krause stated that a buffer could be fencing, landscaping, or a mix of both types.

Lorsiner questioned if the petitioner was present.

Krause stated that Mr. Kyle Roddy was present on the petitioner's behalf.

Lorinser questioned if the bank had an issue with the fence.

Roddy stated that the bank felt the fence could be addressed in the future, once the property to the south develops.

Stevens closed the public hearing at 7:07 p.m.

Lorinser stated that he would like to see a condition placed on the approval that the petitioner work with the condo owners on a buffer. Lorsiner stated that he did not want to see the item forgotten about in the future when the property develops.

Stevens questioned where the proposed buffer would be placed.

Krause stated that the buffer or screening would be placed along the property line.

Stevens stated that the buffer or screening would affect the property owners on the southwest corner of the building, due to its close proximity to the neighboring lot.

Streiff questioned if the dead trees referenced within the staff conditions were part of a buffer.

Krause stated that she did not believe so. Krause stated that the trees were required per the development agreement and site plan. Krause stated that the trees have died and the City is requesting that they be replaced.

Motion by Lorinser, second by Larson to recommend approval of the Final Plat with the recommendations as presented by staff, based upon the Findings of Fact as presented, with an additional condition that upon site plan review of the vacant lot, the petitioner work with the

condo owners on establishing a buffer between the existing condo building and any potential new development on the property to the south. Motion was unanimously approved.

B. Request from TJ Development, LLC for Final Plat Approval of Fairway Greens Phase 6 to allow for the construction of a 36-unit apartment building on the property legally described as Outlot A, Fairway Greens Phase 5.

Krause presented the staff memo. Krause stated that the Planning Review Committee had recommended approval of the Final Plat with the following condition, that the applicant be allowed temporary access on to 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, as the current plan identifies, until such time as Wentlock Street NE is constructed. When Wentlock Street NE is constructed, the Applicant will be required to remove the existing entrance from 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and construct an access connected to Wentlock Street NE consistent with the City Engineering Design Standards and approved by the City Engineer.

Stevens opened the public hearing at 7:11 p.m. Stevens questioned if there was any public comment.

Stevens closed the public hearing at 7:12 p.m.

Lorinser questioned where Wentlock Street would be placed.

Krause pointed out the location of the proposed street on the map.

Lorinser questioned who would be building that street.

Krause stated that the City had worked with the petitioner to acquire the necessary right-of-way for the street extension. Krause stated that Woodland Development would be responsible for constructing the street, once they had moved forward with their commercial development to the west.

DeWolf stated that the plans for the Woodland Commerical Park do show the complete construction plans for the Wentlock Street. DeWolf stated that Woodland Development would be responsible for the construction of the street.

Motion by Larson, second by Lorinser to recommend approval of the Final Plat of Fairway Greens Phase 6 with the recommendations presented by staff, based upon the Findings of Fact as presented. Motion was approved unanimously.

C. Request from River City Ministries, also known as "The Fish House" for a Conditional Use Permit to allow for a religious institution with shared parking to be located on the property at 903A 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue Court NE, which is legally described as Lot 2, Block 1 Fairway Greens.

Krause presented the staff memo. Krause stated that the Planning Review Committee recommended approval with the following conditions: (1) The petitioner shall meet all of the requirements of the Building Code and shall obtain the appropriate permits from the Building Official; (2) A sign permit application shall be submitted and approved by City staff prior to placement of any signage on the property; and (3) The shared parking arrangement provided for on-site is permitted and would meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, based upon the existing use and the number of seats provided for by the petitioner at this time. However, should

the petitioner expand the facility in the future by adding additional seating within the largest assembly area beyond the 200 identified within the initial request, additional parking will be required to meet the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance. Such additional parking shall meet the Off-Street Parking and Loading requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

Stevens opened the public hearing at 7:18 p.m. Stevens questioned if there was public comment.

Larson questioned the number of vehicles and if the roadways entering TH 65 and County Road 5 would be able to accommodate the amount of traffic anticipated for this type of use.

DeWolf stated that with the improvements that have been completed and the turn lanes that have been added, the roadways should be able to accommodate the traffic volumes proposed.

Stevens questioned the Cajima intersection. Stevens stated that this intersection is a collection of people going straight, right and left. Stevens questioned what MnDOT had planned for the future of this intersection.

DeWolf stated that for the intersection to have signal lights, the intersection would have to meet 11 warrants established by MnDOT. DeWolf stated that traffic counts would have to warrant stopping traffic along 65. DeWolf stated that there is 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE as well as 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, which head to the south. DeWolf stated that people could take 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE to the south to CSAH 5. DeWolf stated that the upgrades to the TH 65 and County Road 5 would provide a safe crossing to the west.

Stevens closed public hearing at 7:21 p.m.

Motion by Stevens, second by Larson to recommend approval of the Conditional Use Permit based upon the Findings of Fact as presented and subject to the conditions presented by staff. Motion was unanimously approved.

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

##### **A. Multi-Modal Transportation Plan.**

Krause reviewed the staff memo and the request from city staff with regards to the multi-modal transportation plan. Krause stated that Mr. DeWolf will be preparing the plan and is present to outline the plan and answer questions from the Commission.

Larson questioned if the plan would have goals for when bike racks, etc would be provided.

DeWolf stated that the vision for the plan would be to encompass all forms of transportation. DeWolf stated that the plan will look at where these can best be incorporated into the community and look at the needs of the community and how the City can do so on a limited budget. DeWolf stated that the plan will look at how the items can be provided in 5, 10, or more years; depending upon the needs and funds necessary.

Larson stated that rail, park and rides, and busses would need to be coordinated with others around us. Larson stated that these modes are dependent on other entities as well.

DeWolf stated that the plan would need to take into consideration a more coordinated effort with the region.

Larson stated that the numbers associated with individuals using a park and ride or busing are going to be necessary to support rail in the future.

Stevens stated that he would like to be informed about the status of the light rail project, the pedestrian bridge, and attempts to centralize the core of downtown for not only vehicles but pedestrians as well.

Larson stated that maybe the updates would not be needed every meeting, but regularly to review the plan.

Lorinser questioned how thick the document would be.

DeWolf stated that the plan will have a lot of figures. DeWolf stated that the document should be user friendly for city residents.

Lorinser questioned the time frame for completing the document.

DeWolf stated that there is not an official schedule. DeWolf would like to have something pulled together within the next four months. DeWolf stated that every other Planning Commission meeting, the plan would be reviewed and discussed.

Lorinser wanted to be kept informed of the progress. Lorinser did not want to be slammed with one big document at the last minute. Lorinser stated that the plan should be brought in segments, similar to the Comprehensive Planning process.

Stevens questioned if there is a bigger picture purpose for the document beyond the 5-year terms.

DeWolf stated that the document will look at existing and proposed City infrastructure, well houses, lift stations; so the Council has an idea of what needs to be done for all infrastructure improvements within the community.

Larson stated that the Comprehensive Plan does not do complete justice for this type of planning and this document will go beyond the comprehensive plan.

Stevens stated that the Planning Commission has been successful with smaller chunks of the documents and sub-committee groups. Stevens stated that Ms. Larson has been very effective on these sub-committee groups and her knowledge base would be helpful.

Greg Owens, Community Pride Bank, stated that there was a transportation forum that many had attended within the community. Owens stated that businesses within the area would like to help in the process and concerned with the transportation issues within the area. Owens stated that a number of endorsement letters have been received regarding bringing rail into the area. Owens stated that he will be returning to the Planning Commission requesting a letter of recommendation that would be incorporated with the other 50 to 100 letters received to support the concept of rail. Owens stated that he hoped the Planning Commission could pass it along to the Council.

Stevens stated that sub-committees work well in these large projects. Stevens stated the commercial and industrial growth in the future will drive transportation needs. Stevens stated

that the Planning Commission would value the business communities' cooperation and assistance in preparing the plan.

Lorinser questioned if the group was leaning towards a sub-committee.

Larson stated that it should be open to the public to help work on this group. Larson stated that those attending the forum would be interested, representatives from TH 65, the Park and Recreation Board, ECRDC, etc. Larson stated that it would need to be an open public meeting. Larson stated that DeWolf could head this up with maps and group discussion.

Stevens stated that at the next meeting, staff could provide a status report of where the project is at and this is what needs to be identified to be done. Stevens stated that the background and details will help the Planning Commission to better determine the scope of the project and how they can help. Stevens stated that he would like to see updates on the various transportation projects that have been occurring.

Owens stated that the transportation forum had been videotaped, if the group would want to review that as part of the groundwork for the project.

Lorinser stated that the rail needs to be a big portion of this plan. Lorinser stated that Isanti needs to lay the groundwork to be able to have a stop. Lorinser stated that this could be a very key component to the City.

DeWolf stated that the plan would have different chapters that focus on the various types of items. DeWolf stated that there will be chapters dealing with public works, or street maintenance; however, there will be a chapter dealing with the multi-modal transportation planning for the future.

#### B. Use of Semi-trailers as Storage Facilities within Commercial and Industrial Districts.

Krause outlined the staff memo. Krause stated that staff had received ordinance language from other communities with regards to this item and those have been attached for Planning Commission review. Krause stated that a letter has been included from a local business that could not attend the meeting.

Stevens questioned if anyone from the audience wanted to speak.

Rask questioned how many complaints were made and by whom.

Krause stated that staff did not have an exact number. Krause stated that she had been unable to follow up with Mr. Wacha, as he has been out for personal reasons.

Lorinser questioned if anyone had spoken to the owner of the trailer behind the shopping center on CSAH 5.

Krause stated that they had received a letter. Krause stated that the trailer behind the shopping center on Credit Union Drive had been removed.

Rask did not feel that the item should continue, as the Commission did not know who was complaining and the number.

Krause stated that staff cannot disclose who makes a complaint.

Rask stated that the quantity of complaints mattered. Rask stated that these businesses are struggling to build their businesses and they do not have the funds to add on or build a building. Rask did not feel that the trailers should be roadworthy, as they are only used as storage.

Lorinser stated the City could look at an ordinance that would permit those that currently exist, but future businesses would not be permitted to have this type of storage. Lorinser stated that many cities have ordinances addressing this item. Lorinser stated that if an ordinance is in place, the City can do something in the future. Lorinser stated that the City does not want to tie businesses hands.

Larson stated that the businesses, both commercial and industrial, have stated that the storage facilities are necessary. Larson agreed that grandfathering the current uses that would be fine. Larson stated that decent maintenance of the trailers or screening should be considered.

Lorinser questioned if there were ordinances regarding parking trailers on grass.

Krause stated that she would look into the City Code.

Larson stated that the City Code has regulations for residential districts, but that does not include commercial and industrial areas.

Stevens questioned if that was enough information for staff.

Krause stated that she will look into these items and prepare a draft to be brought back at the next meeting.

Randy Polzin, Metal Coatings, stated the trailer getting complaints belongs to a business that has been there before the residential. Polzin stated that the City is listening to transient residents living near the center. Polzin stated that this is the only issue. Polzin stated that since the compliance officer has been ill, complaints have gone down, so it correlates. Polzin stated that if the City wants businesses to grow out of the City, they can move.

Stevens stated that the intention of all parties involved is to have an amicable solution to this issue.

Polzin stated that business people should get the entire memo and additional attachments.

Lorinser stated that the information is available at City Hall and the business owner can call and request the information. Lorinser questioned if the materials are available for review in City Hall.

Krause stated that a copy of the packet is available.

Polzin stated that he would take the information in print or e-mail.

Krause stated that the letter indicated, if there were questions, staff would be more than happy to forward along the information. Krause stated that the information is available for the public to obtain.

Polzin stated that the information should have been included in the letter. Polzin stated that the information should be provided up front.

Lorinser stated that the City is not required to even send the letter at this point. Lorinser stated that the City wanted to foster a discussion, so the letter was sent out.

Polzin stated that the Planning Commission is looking at ordinances from other cities and the businesses should be given that information as well.

Englund stated that the information is available at City Hall. Englund stated that the public is able to come into City Hall or call the City and request this information.

Larson stated that the notices next time should include a statement that additional information could be picked up at City Hall.

Polzin stated that he is in-tune to the process.

#### C. Awnings within the Central Business District.

Krause presented the staff memo. Krause stated that the item was forwarded to DAC. Krause stated that DAC forwarded the item to the Planning Commission to identify the process or materials that should be used. Krause stated that if the awnings meet requirements in the future, then the Building Official would be able to permit the awnings.

Stevens stated that the Planning Commission and City Council should not review each time.

Larson stated that pictures or examples from other communities may be helpful in determining the design. Larson stated that the Downtown Committee should review the item as well.

Lorinser agreed that the Downtown Committee should help to determine aesthetically what they would like.

Stevens stated that the text is not overly burdensome at this point. Stevens stated that a look standardized to the downtown core should be reviewed.

#### D. Amendments to Section 15: Fencing, Screening, and Landscaping.

Krause stated that staff had made changes based upon the Planning Commission's original recommendations. Krause stated that another issue had arisen, which was reviewed by DAC today. Krause stated that DAC had requested draft revisions. Krause stated that if the Planning Commission were to call for a public hearing on this portion, the amendments requested by DAC would not be included. Krause stated that rather than call for two public hearings on the same portion of the ordinance in two consecutive months; it would make more sense to table the item so all amendments can be reviewed at one time.

Stevens questioned what the DAC issues were.

Krause stated that on corner lots a 15 foot setback is required from the public right-of-way. Krause stated that question had arisen as to why the setback was necessary, if a chain-link fence would be required to be setback so far. Krause stated that DAC felt if the fence is more than 50% opaque, then the setback could be closer.



Motion by Larson, second by Stevens to table the item to the July Planning Commission meeting. The motion was unanimously approved.

E. Amendments to Section 7: Business Districts, Article 1 "B-1" Central Business District, Subdivision 4 Interim Uses to include Flea Markets.

Krause presented the staff memo regarding the item.

Lorinser questioned if this is more than a conceptualized idea.

Krause stated that staff believed so.

Stevens questioned if the markets were defined differently.

Krause stated that the zoning ordinance has more defined definitions for a flea market and a farmer's market.

Lorinser stated that he was under the impression that this was to be a farmer's market only.

Englund stated that the car show was supposed to be in conjunction with Jubilee Festival. Englund stated that the Chamber had started to look at this last year. Englund stated that the flea market had been added to get additional vendors.

Lorinser questioned if they could have a special event permit for the flea market, rather than an interim use permit through the zoning ordinance.

Krause stated that the zoning ordinance has specifically defined flea markets and farmer's markets, as they are repetitive on a property. Krause stated that these types of uses are established on the property year after year.

Lorinser stated that once the ordinance is changed, another company or individual could come in and ask for the same thing. Lorinser stated that if they met the requirements, the City would have to issue the permit.

Larson stated that flea markets should be a special event. Larson stated that the clean-up alone after a flea market takes a lot of man hours.

Stevens questioned if the item should be reviewed in a public hearing or if additional information is necessary.

Englund questioned what property would be used.

Larson stated that portable toilets should be necessary.

Lorinser stated that the decisions to change the ordinance matter long into the future. Lorinser stated that he does not want to just move forward and change the ordinance.

Stevens stated that there was a lot to consider with this type of request. Stevens stated that he had been in a community that was able to turn a small farmer's market into a much larger event that was helpful for the community.

Lorinser stated that he was not trying to prevent the event from happening. Lorinser felt that there must be a better way to accomplish this event.

Krause stated that the Planning Commission can call for a public hearing or they could table the item pending additional information.

Larson stated that she would prefer the item be tabled pending additional information.

Lorinser questioned the time line.

Krause stated that staff had met with Mr. Guthmueller. Krause stated that a specific timeline was not given. Krause stated that staff's impression that it was later this summer.

Englund stated that he thought the chamber was looking at August or September.

Lorinser questioned if anything needed to be done to the ordinance, if the Planning Commission determined that this was a special event.

Krause stated that the zoning ordinance has flea markets and farmer's markets as a specifically defined use. Krause provided information from the zoning ordinance.

Lorinser questioned if it could just be a special event.

Krause stated that staff would ask Mr. Joslin; however, the use is specifically listed in the zoning ordinance. Krause stated that allowing the use would be in violation of the zoning ordinance.

Lorinser questioned if this could just be dealt with at a public hearing.

Englund stated that if on City property, the group would need to get permission from the City Council to use the property first.

Lorinser questioned if the ordinance could be amended to include additional items at the public hearing.

Krause questioned what would be changing.

Lorinser stated that if the Planning Commission chose to add use standards could that be done at the public hearing.

Krause stated that if the Planning Commission were to request adding additional performance standards for the use at the public hearing, staff would need to re-publish as that section of the ordinance would not have been published for initially. Krause stated that publication of an ordinance amendment needs to reflect the actual amendment being reviewed at the meeting.

Stevens questioned if the use standards for farmer's markets could be expanded upon and be used for flea markets as well. Stevens stated that it is an option to look at. Stevens stated that the Planning Commission needs additional information before calling for a public hearing.

Motion by Lorinser, second by Stevens to table the item to the July meeting pending additional information.

**5. Adjournment**

Motion by Lorinser, second by to adjourn the June 9<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Planning Commission.  
Motion was unanimously approved.

The meeting adjourned at 8:24 p.m.

Dated at Isanti, Minnesota this 14<sup>th</sup> day of July 2009.

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Lisa M. Krause, AICP  
City Planner