

**CITY OF ISANTI
PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
JULY 12, 2016**

1. Meeting Opening.

A. Call to Order.

Duncan 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: Jeff Duncan, Paul Bergley, Steve Lundeen, Wayne Traver, Greg Cesafsky, and Jim Kennedy.

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Community Development Director, Roxanne Achman

Others Present: None

D. Agenda Modifications.

Achman stated she wanted to 5.A. to discuss the concept of an overlay district along the Highway 65 corridor.

2. Approval of Minutes from June 14, 2016 Planning Commission Meeting.

Duncan questioned if there were any comments or changes to the minutes.

Motion by Lundeen second by Kennedy to approve the June 14th, 2016 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. Motion was unanimously approved.

3. Public Hearings.

A. Request from Bobby and Chad Bunes for an Interim Use Permit to allow for a pet grooming salon to be located within the Dual Square Mall located at 401 East Dual Blvd NE, Suite 114.

Duncan read the item into the minutes.

Achman presented the staff memo.

Duncan opened the public hearing. There was no one to speak on the matter. The public hearing was closed.

Motion by Lundeen second by Bergley to recommend approval of the request from Bobby and Chad Bunes for an Interim Use Permit to allow for the establishment of a pet grooming salon on the property located at 401 East Dual Blvd NE, Suite 114 based on the Findings of Fact and Conclusion with the following conditions:

1. The petitioner shall make application for and receive approval of any appropriate additional permits (building, plumbing, etc.) from the Building Official related to the business operation.
2. The petitioner shall obtain any necessary County or State licenses for the business; and copies of such shall be provided to the City.
3. The premises in which the animals will be kept and groomed shall be kept in a clean, sanitary, healthful, and humane manner at all times; and shall be open to inspection by the Animal Warden or other person charged with the enforcement of Chapter 87 of the Isanti City Code or any other health or sanitary regulation of the City at reasonable times. Failure to do so shall constitute grounds for the revocation of the Interim Use Permit.
4. Dogs shall be leashed at all times coming both to and from any vehicle arriving for an appointment.
5. The property shall be kept clean. All dog feces shall be picked up and removed from the property on a daily basis.
6. The Interim Use Permit is granted to Bobby and Chad Bunes for the property located at 401 East Dual Blvd NE. The Interim Use Permit shall terminate upon the occurrence of any of the following events; whichever comes first: (1) the sale or lease of the property to another renter or owner; (2) the use has been discontinued for one year; or (3) the City Council suspends or revokes the Interim Use Permit upon failure of the interim use to comply with the conditions of approval and/or the property or use is found to be in violation of other City Ordinances.

Motion carried unanimously.

4. Other Business.

- A. Resolution and Ordinance to Amend Zoning Ordinance No. 445, Section 7 Business District, Subdivision 3 Conditional Uses to Correct an Inadvertent Omission of Motor Vehicle Sales.

Duncan read the item into the minutes.

Achman presented the staff memo.

Duncan asked if Motor Vehicles Sales were listed as a Condition Use in the B-2 District prior to the rewrite.

Achman confirmed that it was.

Motion by Bergley second by Cesafsky to recommend approval of a Resolution and Ordinance to Amend Zoning Ordinance No. 445, Section 7 Business District, Subdivision 3 Conditional Uses to Correct an Inadvertent Omission of Motor Vehicle Sales. Motion carried unanimously.

5. Discussion Items.

- A. Discussion on a Highway 65 Overlay District.

Duncan read the item into the minutes.

Achman stated that with recent development occurring along Highway 65, staff has been discussing the importance of an overlay district. The overlay district would have enhanced requirements to ensure a nicer look along 65. Maybe the district only extends 500 feet out on each side of the highway and those properties need to have a certain type of façade, increased

landscaping, and certain uses typically allowed in the B-2 may not be permitted along this corridor. Maybe we prohibit businesses such as car dealerships and focus on retail/commercial and office along 65. Staff is requesting that the Planning Commission give some consideration to an overlay district.

Lundeen stated he doesn't want to see the City start limiting businesses on what they have to build. He stated he doesn't want to deter businesses from coming to Isanti. He agreed that he doesn't want to see them look trashy, but doesn't think stipulations should be placed on businesses and how they look. Lundeen felt this discussion was stemming from the Coborn's building and how blah it is. He further stated that the building was not constructed as shown in their drawings that were submitted to the City and approved. Lundeen stated he doesn't want to see the City put any stipulations on the buildings. He said he could understand some landscaping. The City already stipulates that it can't be a steel building or a pole structure. That's understandable, but he doesn't want to see the City start forcing decorative building.

Bergley asked if it was staff's intent to start forcing buildings to have a certain type of brick.

Achman stated the B-2 District currently has requirements for what can be on the exterior of a building; however, there are not limitations on the amount of material that can be used. For example, a building could have an exterior material of EFIS. It could span for 100 feet with nothing on it and meet our requirements. The overlay district would require that every 50 feet of building would need to be broken up to give the building more dimension and create a more visually pleasing structure. It could be broken up by windows or architectural features to break up the blank space. Landscaping could be included with this as well. The City currently has an overlay district in the downtown. Overlay districts are not uncommon along main corridors in many communities. It would also provide the City with the opportunity to discuss what uses may or may not fit along the corridor. The uses need to be appealing to people driving through the City.

Bergley asked if this discussion stemmed from Coborn's.

Achman stated that it's a number of projects. The city is getting more and more inquiries about properties along the Highway 65 corridor. There is a lot of land available. If the City wants to make a change and wants the City to look a certain way, now is the time to make some changes.

Lundeen stated that he doesn't want to tell people that they have to do something. He stated he thinks they get regulated enough. As business come into town they don't want to be told they have to put another \$30,000 into their business just to be on 65.

Duncan stated that the question at hand seems to be whether the City wants special overlay restrictions or additional requirements along Highway 65 as opposed to the B-2 District.

Achman clarified that the B-2 District would remain the underlying zoning district. The corridor overlay would have special requirements in addition to the B-2 requirements.

Cesafsky asked if there were any more specifics on this type of overlay district. He asked if there were landscaping, or green space requirements, or is it specifically exterior materials.

Achman indicated she felt there could be more specific landscaping requirements. The current requirements are minimal and the City relies on the applicant to supply a landscaping plan verses the City giving the applicant an idea of what the City really wants. Overlay districts typically cover the amount of signage, which is already covered in code, the visual effects of the building, setbacks- the building should be closer to the road and parking behind, breaking up long spans of the building, screening loading doors, etc. It creates a more visually pleasing corridor.

Bergley asked if cost is taken into consideration when creating an ordinance like this.

Lundeen and Kennedy concurred that creating a better looking building costs more.

Duncan asked for clarification on where else in town there are properties zoned B-2.

Achman stated that there are a lot of B-2 properties along Heritage and within the Anlauf Commercial Park where the clinic is being built. She further stated that if an overlay corridor were created, it should only extend a certain distance out from Highway 65 so that it's only affecting properties directly on 65.

Traver questioned how important it was to have an overlay district. Do people really notice these things when they are driving? Can it just be dressed up with some landscaping?

Achman stated that it would be noticeable.

Lundeen made an example out of the O'Reilly Auto store in Cambridge, where people didn't seem to notice it being built even though it's on a main corridor.

Cesafsky asked if staff was referring more to appearance. He provided an example of how when Siren, Wisconsin was rebuilt after a tornado, most of the structures were rebuilt with a log appearance. He stated he assumed that wasn't all by choice. Cesafsky asked how many businesses already in place wouldn't meet the requirements of the corridor overlay.

Achman stated that the city wouldn't go to the extreme that we are choosing a specific look for our city as Siren, WI did. Staff is interested in holding a slightly higher standard that would prevent a bland building and would create more of an inviting feel to the City.

Lundeen stated he didn't think there were many lots remaining along Highway 65 that would affect the appearance of the corridor. He felt there would only be two or three more buildings.

Achman stated that she felt there were more than ten available sites remaining on Highway 65.

Lundeen stated that businesses everywhere are tired of being regulated. Businesses are going to go where they aren't regulated such as the townships.

Duncan felt that another approach would be to improve some of the requirements in the B-2 district rather than creating an overlay district.

Achman stated that the biggest obstacle with that is there are a number of uses allowed in the B-2 District that are not necessarily ideal to be placed along the Highway 65 corridor.

Cesafsky asked if the goal was to have more control over what type of business can be built there. Achman stated that was correct.

Duncan asked for examples those types of businesses.

Achman indicated that businesses such as auto sales or storage facilities wouldn't necessarily be the most desirable along the corridor.

Cesafsky stated that it would be good for the city to have more control over the premium pieces of property that are available in Isanti.

Lundeen indicated that he didn't think businesses like that would spend the money to purchase those locations. The price and taxes would make it cost prohibitive for some businesses to build there.

Cesafsky stated that with the development along the corridor; with the clinic and Coborn's; the corridor only has so many parcel of premium land and to have some control over what goes along the corridor isn't a bad thing.

Lundeen stated he would be more open to regulating what can and cannot be built along the corridor, rather than what the building needs to look like. He further stated that a discussion on façade gets into forcing someone to build something that goes over budget.

Achman stated she didn't think the requirements would be much different than what is in place now.

Duncan stated that it would be more about breaking up the long horizontal spans of the building.

Achman suggested bringing some ideas back to the Planning Commission to give them a better idea of what staff has in mind for a corridor overlay district.

The Commissioners agreed that staff is to bring back ideas to the next Planning Commission meeting.

6. Adjournment

Motion by Bergley second by Lundeen to adjourn the July 12th, 2016 meeting of the Planning Commission. Motion was unanimously approved.

The meeting adjourned at 7:23 p.m.

Dated at Isanti, Minnesota this 12th day of July 2016.

Respectfully submitted,

Roxanne Achman, AICP
Community Development Director