

**CITY OF ISANTI  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
AUGUST 9, 2011**

**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, Sean Stevens, and Michael Streiff.

**Members Absent:** Nick Dimassis, who had provided prior notice of his absence.

**Staff Present:** Don Lorsung, City Administrator

**D. Agenda Modifications.**

Stevens questioned if there were modifications to the Agenda.

Lorsung stated there were no modifications to the items on the Agenda.

It was recognized that the applicants for Item 3.A. were not present at this time.

Motion by Lorinser, seconded by Larson to modify the agenda, placing Item 3.A. after 4. Other Business items since the applicants are absent at this time. Motion carried unanimously.

**2. Approval Minutes from the July 12, 2011 Regular Planning Commission Meeting.**

Motion by Larson, second by Lorinser to approve the July 12th, 2011 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. Motion was unanimously approved.

**4. Other Business.**

**A. Requirements for Residential Kennel Application**

Lorsung presented the staff memo, proposed language change to City Code 87-7, and a draft letter with comment form that staff had developed. All items had been reviewed with City Attorney Joslin. Stevens indicated that he desired that the waiver of objection language in the comment letter be included in the City Code amendment. He also questioned the need to send a stamped return envelope. If the parties informed felt strongly regarding the request, they could return the form to the City. Staff indicated that it would not be necessary to include that item. Lorinser asked about the next step in this process. Staff indicated that since this is a City Code amendment, it will next need to be considered by the City Council. If desired, the City Council could hold a public hearing on the amendment or have the Planning Commission hold the

hearing. Based on comments received tonight and if the Planning Commission recommends; staff will modify the draft City Code amendment and present it to the City Council for their consideration.

Motion by Lorinser, seconded by Larson to recommend approval of the amendment of City Code Chapter 87-7 as modified, and the letter with comment form as presented by staff. Motion was unanimously approved.

### **B. Variance Review Checklist**

Lorsung presented the staff memo and variance review checklist. The checklist would be reviewed for each variance request and based on the answers, would guide the Planning Commission in consideration of variance requests. Staff questioned whether the Commission's preference was to review the questions at the time of hearing or have staff review the questions during the staff review process. After discussion, it was indicated that staff should include a review and their recommendation of the questions to the Planning Commission for each variance request.

Motion by Stevens, seconded by Larson, to adopt the variance review checklist and have staff review and provide recommendations to the questions for each variance request. Motion was approved unanimously.

Stevens asked if there were any other discussion items. Lorsung stated that there were no other items.

## **3. Public Hearing**

### **A. Request from Greg Stankey and Danielle Holm for an Interim Use Permit to allow for a Residential Kennel at 813 Cedar Street SW.**

Lorsung presented the staff memo and recommended conditions provided by the Planning Review Committee. Staff had not received any public comments on this request. There have not been any animal control violations on the property.

Stevens opened the public hearing at 7:12 p.m. The applicants were not present at the public hearing. Anthony Olejar and Deb Nickels, 21370 S. Lake George Drive, Cedar, MN, identified themselves as the owners of 813 Cedar Street SW. The applicants are their tenants. They questioned the number of dogs that could be allowed. Staff indicated that 3 dogs could be allowed under this request and that any additional would require a amendment to the permit. Fencing was discussed. There is no agreement for a fence and the property owners do not know if there is an underground fence. The owners indicated that their observations are that the dogs are under control and that the house is maintained in good condition. They expressed concern about responsibility under this permit request. To comply with City code requirements, the applicants are responsible. Staff reviewed the process if complaints are received. There was discussion concerning the lease, need for a fence and whether the neighbors had received written notice. Staff indicated that notice per the zoning ordinance was given and it was verbally

suggested to the applicants that they contact their neighbors. The recommendation for a fence came from the Planning Review Committee, but it was not part of past recommendations regarding such kennel applications and it is not required.

Lind-Livingston indicated that condition #2 concerning the fence should be removed. There was discussion on this item.

With no further discussion, Stevens closed the hearing at 7:22 p.m.

Motion by Lorinser to recommend tabling this item until the city code is updated. Streiff discussed having the applicants present at the hearing to get information. There was further discussion regarding what notice was given to adjacent owners. There was discussion of the application process and that the 60 day rule runs out on September 6<sup>th</sup>. There was no second to the motion.

Motion by Lorinser, seconded by Streiff to recommend denying the application. There was further discussion by the Commission regarding the need for a fence, that the dogs have shock collars and are controlled, the length of occupancy in the home and that there are no complaints. Concerns were also expressed regarding conflicting information and the applicants not being present at time of hearing to answer questions of the Commission. Based on a 3-3-0 vote, the motion was not adopted.

Stevens stated that the next step is City Council consideration of the request at their next meeting, scheduled for 7:00 p.m., Tuesday, August 16, 2011.

**5. Discussion Items.**

A. None

**6. Other Communications.**

A. None

**7. Adjournment**

Motion by Englund, second by Larson to adjourn the August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2011 meeting of the Planning Commission. Motion was unanimously approved.

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Dated at Isanti, Minnesota this 10<sup>th</sup> day of August 2011.

Respectfully submitted,

Don Lorsung  
City Administrator