

**BIG LAKE PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

**MAY 7, 2014**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Vice-Chair Ketti Green called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**2. ROLL CALL**

Commissioners present: Ketti Green, Seth Hansen, Patricia May, David Schreiber, and Clay Wilfahrt. Commissioners absent: Doug Hayes and Scott Marotz. Also present: Planning Consultant Ben Wikstrom, Interim City Administrator Jessica Green, and Administrative Assistant Sandy Petrowski.

**3. ADOPT AGENDA**

Commissioner May moved to adopt the agenda. Seconded by Commissioner Wilfahrt, unanimous ayes, agenda adopted.

**4. OPEN FORUM**

Vice-Chair Green opened the Open Forum at 6:31 p.m. No one came forward for comment. Vice-Chair Green closed the Open Forum at 6:31 p.m.

**5. APPROVE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 2, 2014**

Commissioner Hansen motioned to approve the April 2, 2014 Meeting Minutes with the minor change to the first paragraph of page 3 as discussed. Seconded by Commissioner May, unanimous ayes, Minutes approved.

**6. BUSINESS**

**6A. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING: VARIANCE – LOT LINE ADJUSTMENTS (991 LAKESHORE DRIVE)**

Wikstrom provided an update on the continued public hearing for a variance for lot size and width from the City's standards, which was opened at the April 7, 2014 Planning Commission meeting and tabled to this meeting due to a notification error.

Wikstrom also discussed whether or not the DNR would allow a variance due to the proposed square footage of the parcels, noting that staff had discussed this issue with the DNR representative for Big Lake who stated that the DNR would trust Sherburne County's records on square footage and that the DNR would be okay with this variance request moving forward to the City level for approval.

Vice-Chair Green stated that the public hearing is being continued and asked if there was anyone present who would like to comment on this issue.

Carol Spriggs, 931 Lakeshore Drive, asked if other people with three (3) lots would be allowed to do the same thing that is being proposed. Wikstrom stated that they would have to follow the same variance process. Ms. Spriggs stated that she is not in favor of allowing the variance to allow for the building to be closer to her property line. Wikstrom stated that the applicant is not asking for that approval at this time. Ms. Spriggs stated that she would like to see one nice home built instead of two.

Richard Olson, 23658 – 183<sup>rd</sup> Street, Big Lake, stated that he is the applicant for this variance request. He further commented that when he bought the properties, he believed that he could split them but that was not the case. Mr. Olson stated that his hopes would be to sell to couples without children or older adults and that he is looking to find a solution to improve the area and that he wants something that blends/fits in with the neighborhood and that the neighboring property owners would appreciate.

Raeanne Danielowski, 981 Nicollet Avenue, stated that her concern is that she wants to see something better on the corner and that consideration should be given to any impact there will be to the neighborhood regarding parking, etc. She also stated her concern with the square footage discrepancies from the County's information and the applicant's survey. Wikstrom stated that the applicant would have to have a survey completed and filed with the County. Ms. Danielowski said that she was concerned about what an approval of this issue could open up for the City in the future and that possibly a discussion about square footage should take place at the Planning Commission level.

Vice-Chair Green discussed her concern regarding the shared access alley/driveway for the proposed two properties and potential problems should the purchasers of the two properties have issues. Wikstrom stated that the access would not be an alley but a private easement which would be owned by one property allowing easement to other site and that it could also be possible to potentially have driveways off of Lakeshore Drive, which may not be ideal.

Commissioner May stated that she is not in favor of having one driveway for two properties because in her past experience, there could be problems between the property owners. Mr. Olson stated that he could put the driveway off of Lakeshore Drive but he feels that it would create other problems.

Commissioner Hansen stated that he doesn't believe having two lots is a bad option and noted that if the three properties were sold separately, there could potentially be three small houses on three lots, which wouldn't be conducive to the area.

Commissioner Schreiber stated his concern with the run-off and how it could affect the lake quality if two homes were built. Mr. Olson stated that whether one home or two homes were built, the 25% impervious surface requirement would be met.

Erv Danielowski, 981 Nicollet Avenue, stated that previously someone had two or three adjacent lots and wanted to build a home, the lots had to be combined, which didn't require any variances.

No one else came forward for comment.

Vice-Chair Green closed the public hearing at 7:30 p.m.

Commissioner Hansen motioned to approve the lot size and lot width variance for 991 Lakeshore Drive contingent upon the submittal of written approval from the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. Seconded by Commissioner Wilfahrt, the motion passed on a vote of 3 to 2, with Commissioners Hansen, May, and Wilfahrt voting aye and Commissioners Green and Schreiber voting nay.

Wikstrom stated that this issue will be forwarded to the City Council for consideration at their May 28, 2014 regular meeting.

#### **6B. DISCUSSION: LOT COMBINATIONS AND DRIVEWAY REQUIREMENTS**

Wikstrom reported that this item is before the Commission for discussion due to recent inquiries from multiple individuals who have purchased vacant lots which are adjacent to their current property; if they combine the two lots, a detached garage/accessory building could be built on the previously vacant lot.

Wikstrom stated that a recent issue was brought to the City's attention where a resident purchased an adjacent, vacant parcel; however, when they attempted to combine the properties in order to get a driveway onto the vacant parcel, the request to combine was denied by the County because they had a mortgage on the primary lot and they had paid cash for the vacant lot. Because of this, staff is asking if the Commission would have any interest in considering a potential change to the ordinance to allow one driveway per platted lot or consider on a case-by-case basis.

After the discussion, it was the consensus of the Commission to address any issues pertaining to lot combinations and driveway requirements on a case-by-case basis.

**6C. DISCUSSION: LIMITED RETAIL IN INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT**

Wikstrom reported that a broker contacted staff about a property he managed/owned in the Industrial Park and he has an “occasional sale” business, which acquires inventory and schedules a set time per month for a sale. He also stated that there is another potential tenant that would have storage for estate sales and would not have sales on site but could possibly look at having on-site sales in the future a few days a month.

Wikstrom asked if the Commission would be interested in modifying the City’s ordinance to allow these types of uses (retail) in the industrial park. After a brief discussion, it was the consensus of the Commission to direct staff to inform the interested party that they can apply for an ordinance amendment and that the Commissioners were not opposed to considering an amendment.

**7. PLANNER’S REPORT**

**7A. PROJECT/PROSPECT STATUS UPDATE**

Wikstrom discussed items included on the Project/Prospects Status Report and answered questions of the Commission. No action required or taken on this item.

**7B. PROPERTY AT EAGLE LAKE ROAD & HUMBOLDT**

Wikstrom provided information regarding a property owner who has a party that is interested in the potential development of an assisted living project at the property located at Eagle Lake Road South and Humboldt Drive. He stated that the City’s ordinance does not include a definition of assisted listing, so that the use would possibly fall under a conditional use and staff is asking the Commission to discuss what they would like to see at this site and whether the zoning should remain as it is. This item was for information only and it would need to be determined what classification this type of project would fall under.

**8. COMMISSIONERS’ REPORTS**

Vice-Chair Green stated that she participated at the recent clean-up day and there was a good turnout again this year.

**9. OTHER - None**

**10. ADJOURN**

Commissioner Hansen motioned to adjourn at 8:26 p.m. Seconded by Commissioner

May, unanimous ayes, motion carried.