AGENDA
BIG LAKE CITY COUNCIL
WORKSHOP

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2019
5:00 p.m.

1) CALL TO ORDER
2) ROLL CALL
3) ADOPT PROPOSED AGENDA
4) BUSINESS
   4A. CMRRPP Update
   4B. Commercial Vehicle Parking Discussion
   4C. Theft/Property Damage Ordinance Discussion
   4D. Discuss the Purchase of Additional Hwy 10 Holiday Decorations
   4E. New Ideas Discussion
5) OTHER
6) ADJOURN

Disclaimer: This agenda has been prepared to provide information regarding an upcoming workshop of the Big Lake City Council. This document does not claim to be complete and is subject to change.
COUNCIL DIRECTION REQUESTED
Discuss Central Mississippi Regional River Planning Partnership.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
Staff has been working with a number of neighboring communities in the past few years on the Central Mississippi Regional River Planning Partnership (formerly the Highway 25 Coalition).

The Partnership has so far focused on developing commitment of policymakers, and identifying need. At this point, the Partnership has determined that a broader scope is necessary.

Staff will give an update on the progress of the Partnership and discuss the next steps for the organization at the Workshop.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
N/A

ALTERNATIVES
N/A

ATTACHMENTS
Presentation from CMRRPP
Presenters

- Partnership representative: Seth Hansen
- Staff: Clay Wilfahrt, Hanna Klimmek, Layne Otteson, Michael Healy
The original Hwy 25 Coalition formed in 2017 established a collaboration to benefit the region

- Developed commitment among policymakers
- Created an understanding of:
  - Transportation issues affecting the region
  - Importance of the connection and opportunity represented by TH25, US10, I-94, River, and rail line
- Yielded clear, usable data on traffic and service level, and recommendation for a second river crossing to support long-term needs
Further discussion of a river crossing revealed that transportation factors alone cannot drive a bridge location

- Transportation supports land use and development goals
- The required Federal environmental process is time-consuming, expensive, and includes all location options -- and does not consider social, land use, and economic factors
- However, these factors are critical to accomplishing community goals
With guidance from FHWA and MnDOT, the group committed to creating a shared regional vision and goals -- and then determining what’s necessary to accomplish them

- This led to plans to explore a broader range of issues in more depth
- May: Hired consultant/facilitator with multi-jurisdictional process experience to provide support, guidance to group (Anne Carroll)
- July: Adopted a new name, Central Mississippi River Regional Planning Partnership
July/Aug: Prepared RFP for consultant to work with Partnership members to develop regional planning framework for:
- Economic development and growth
- Land use
- Environment and recreation
- Infrastructure, and other critical topics

Partnership issued RFP c. Aug 9, with launch by end of September

This highly collaborative project will run through early 2021
Critical need: Ongoing alignment among Partners

- Essential for Partnership/members to “own” planning project from start to finish
  - The process, intermediate guidance and recommendations, and final results must reflect Partnership member priorities
  - Requires elected bodies to be actively engaged throughout the planning project
    - Staff will be intensively involved
    - Other organizations + community stakeholders throughout region will be engaged by planning consultant

- Partnership recommendation: Elected bodies formally engage and drive results throughout planning project
Specifically, the Partnership seeks support for scheduled sessions with your Partnership rep and staff to:

- Provide a formal project update, such as:
  - Work to date
  - Issues, challenges, opportunities
  - Interim results
- Gather input, feedback, guidance to shape planning project moving forward
- Elected body votes on a resolution of concurrence indicating overall satisfaction with the work to date and the body’s role in helping shape the process and content
Request

• **Caveats and clarifications**
  ○ Nothing in such a resolution binds the elected body to any specific future actions or decisions
  ○ Presentations will be made to all elected bodies:
    ■ At approximately the same time
    ■ Addressing the same topics/issues
    ■ Tailored as appropriate to each body
  ○ Should an elected body *not* be satisfied, the Partnership will work directly with that body to resolve issues and concerns
Discussion, decision

- **Discussion: Questions, thoughts?**

- **Request for action by elected body:**
  - Agree to regularly schedule formal updates on the planning project by Partner rep and staff, and provide guidance to help drive results
  - Agree that after each formal update/engagement, will take action on a resolution of concurrence and follow up as required
COUNCIL DIRECTION REQUESTED

Staff is seeking direction from Council regarding “Next Steps.”

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Background

Large commercial vehicle parking in residential neighborhoods was discussed at the July 24th City Council meeting. The City’s current ordinance states that each residential property can have one (1) commercial vehicle but that commercial vehicle cannot weigh more than 12,000 pounds.

The Police Department had requested that the issue be reviewed by Council and that Council provide clear direction regarding enforcement of the rule so that the Police Department and Community Development Department can provide effective code enforcement. Police Chief Scharf spoke at the workshop in support of reviewing the ordinance. The City Council discussed the ordinance at length on the 24th and ultimately decided that the issue should be referred to the Planning Commission for review and a recommendation. The City Council asked that the Planning Commission “be creative” in reviewing the ordinance.

Planner Healy prepared a detailed Planning Commission memo (Attachment A) with assistance from Police Chief Scharf. Chief Scharf asked that the memo make it clear that the Police Department is neutral regarding whether the ordinance should be changed, they are simply requesting that the issue be reviewed.

Planning Commission Ordinance Review and Recommendation

The Planning Commission reviewed Healy’s memo at their August 7th meeting and discussed the ordinance. After a lengthy discussion, they reached a unanimous consensus regarding a recommendation to Council. They are recommending that the ordinance be kept “as-is” but believe that enforcement could be approached more creatively.

Staff has compiled a summary of the Planning Commission’s discussion and recommendation:

- This issue was previously discussed extensively in 2009. Several of the sitting Planning Commissioners were part of the 2009 discussion. The consensus in 2009 was to keep the ordinance “as-is.” Big Lake’s ordinance is already more generous than most other Minnesota cities which cap commercial vehicle weight at 9,000 pounds in neighborhoods. As noted by Staff, Fridley is the only city in the region that
allows large commercial vehicle parking in residential neighborhoods. Not even Minneapolis and Saint Paul allow large commercial vehicles in their residential areas.

- The Planning Commission noted that most, if not all, “high end” and even “mid-level” Big Lake neighborhoods built in the last 20 years have private restrictive covenants that ban large commercial vehicle parking and that such covenants are standard with new construction. They disputed Council’s idea from the workshop brainstorming session that allowing large commercial vehicles in neighborhoods would attract more “move-up housing.” All of the large commercial vehicle parking in Big Lake currently takes place in the starter home neighborhoods and older neighborhoods around the lakes, areas where there are not private covenants.

- Large commercial vehicles beat up pavement. Roads and parking areas that are intended for use by large commercial vehicles are usually built differently to accommodate the extra weight. Residential streets are not built to regularly support those types of vehicles. The Planning Commissioners feel that 12,000 pounds is a reasonable weight limit for commercial vehicles in residential neighborhoods.

- The Planning Commission noted that many cities restrict residents from storing over-sized RV’s in neighborhoods for aesthetic reasons and vehicle weight reasons but that this has never been politically feasible in Big Lake due to the popularity of RV’s. The Planning Commission would be receptive to reviewing the RV ordinance and adding additional restrictions if Council feels that it is important to have the commercial vehicle ordinance and RV ordinance match in terms of weight limits.

- Commissioner Sundberg performed an informal audit of Big Lake the weekend before the Planning Commission meeting and reported on the exercise to the rest of the commissioners. He drove/biked through all of the City’s neighborhoods and noted how many large commercial vehicles he saw being parked openly outdoors. He only counted five (5), four (4) of which were all in the same neighborhood along Sterling Drive and Kilbirnie Road.

  - The Commissioners expressed the belief that most property owners want to get along with their neighbors and know that parking a large commercial vehicle at home causes friction in neighborhoods and hurts property values.

  - It was noted that most residents follow the rules. The Planning Commission fears that changing the rules to accommodate the handful of violators would lead to a boom in other residents choosing to store their large commercial vehicles at home, something that would hurt property values and neighborhood aesthetics.

- Chair Marotz noted that many local companies, including the company he works for, rent space in their parking lots to people needing to store semi tractors and other large commercial vehicles. The charge for this is often quite low and may not be much more than $100 per month. He stated that there is no shortage of space in the Big Lake area, it just is not right “in town.”

- The Planning Commission would like to see the existing rule to kept “as-is” and enforced more consistently. They noted that several of the five (5) properties observed during Commissioner Sundberg’s parking audit have generated numerous complaints over the last two years. They expressed hope that the City Council will support Staff efforts to address the five (5) violations.
The unanimous consensus of the Planning Commission was to recommend that the ordinance continue to allow only one (1) commercial vehicle per residential property with a weight that does not exceed 12,000 pounds. They do not support making any changes to the zoning ordinance.

The Planning Commission does have two “creative solutions” that they want to provide to the City Council, Community Development Department, and Police Department:

1. Staff can compile a list of all of the businesses in the area that rent parking spaces to owners of large commercial vehicles, complete with contact information and pricing information (if available). When the Police Department receives a complaint about illegal parking, they can give the violator the list and tell them that they have one (1) month to find a new place to park their large commercial vehicle. At the end of the month, they will start to receive parking tickets.

2. The Planning Commission expressed tentative support for the City Council’s idea to turn the underutilized Sherburne County Park-and-Ride Lot by the Casey’s gas station into a municipal parking lot for large commercial vehicles. The location would be convenient for residents with large commercial vehicles and there is room on the property for future expansions of the parking lot. It was noted, however, that:

   a. The County owns that parking lot and is not obligated to let the City adapt it to a new use. The City may want to try to work with County Commissioner Danielowski on this?
   b. That parking lot’s construction was paid for with a State grant as a commuter park-and-ride demonstration project. Adapting it for a new use may require that the grant be paid back. This would need to be investigated.
   c. There would be some issues to work through in terms of logistics, screening, etc. There are existing businesses near that parking lot that may have concerns about the aesthetics of an open storage lot for large commercial vehicles being located across the street.
   d. Some Planning Commissioners expressed skepticism about whether it is really the City’s responsibility to provide free parking for residents with large commercial vehicles if there ends up being a significant expense related to the effort.

This is the Sherburne County Park-And-Ride
FINANCIAL IMPACT
The Planning Commission believes that allowing/encouraging large commercial vehicles in residential
neighborhoods would have a very negative effect on property values and hurt the City’s tax base.

ALTERNATIVES
Alternative A - Implement the Planning Commission’s advice by keeping the ordinance “as-is,” continuing
enforcement, and directing Staff to compile a list of parking areas for rent and to reach out to the County to
discuss the Park-and-Ride Lot.

Alternative B – Direct Staff to take some other type of “Next Step”.

ATTACHMENTS
A- Planning Commission Memo from August 7, 2019
AGENDA ITEM
Big Lake Planning Commission

Prepared By: Michael Healy, City Planner
Meeting Date: 8/7/2019
Item No. 7C

Item Description: Discussion on the Big Lake Police Department’s request to review the ban on large commercial vehicle parking in residential neighborhoods
Reviewed By: Joel Scharf, Chief of Police
Reviewed By: Clay Wilfahrt, City Administrator

ACTION REQUESTED
The Big Lake Police Department has asked the City Council to review the ban on large commercial vehicles in residential neighborhoods. The Police Department believes the issue is complicated and would like it explored further.

The City Council has asked the Planning Commission to review the Police Department’s request and make a recommendation to Council regarding “next steps.” Council is encouraging the Planning Commissioners to “be creative” in responding to the Police Department’s request.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
Existing Ordinance
The City of Big Lake does not allow large commercial vehicles to be parked in residential neighborhoods. The Code allows each residential property to have one (1) commercial vehicle parked on-site but it must be a small commercial vehicle with a gross vehicle weight rating of 12,000 pounds or less.

The Code reads:

SECTION 1030 – OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING
1030.04: GENERAL PROVISIONS:
Subd. 5. Residential Off-Street Parking.

1. Off-street parking facilities accessory to residential use shall be utilized solely for the parking of licensed and operable passenger automobiles; no more than one (1) commercial vehicle, not to exceed gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) of twelve thousand (12,000) pounds; and recreational vehicles and equipment. Under no circumstances shall parking facilities accessory to residential structures be used for the storage of commercial vehicles, semi trailers, or equipment or for the parking of automobiles belonging to the employees, owners, tenants, or customers of business or manufacturing establishments not a resident at the residential site.

2. Any vehicle cannot exceed 36 feet in total length unless a interim use permit is obtained. All front yard storage must be set back fifteen (15) feet from the street curb and storage shall not encroach on any sidewalk.
Discussion at July 24\textsuperscript{th} City Council Workshop

Earlier this summer, the Police Department requested that the Community Development Department prepare a memo on large commercial vehicle parking for discussion at a City Council workshop. The Police Department handles the majority of parking enforcement in Big Lake and has experienced significant pushback from some residents in regards to parking tickets being written for large commercial vehicles.

Code Enforcement Intern Lorrie McKee researched the rules for commercial vehicle parking in surrounding communities and prepared a memo for Council to review at their July 24\textsuperscript{th} workshop (Attachment B). McKee presented her findings to the Council and the Council discussed her findings.

Police Chief Scharf asked to speak to the City Council regarding the issue and stated the following:

- The transportation sector is rapidly growing and Big Lake has numerous residents who work in the transportation sector. These are good jobs and these people are hard workers.

- There are not many locations in the area where owners of large commercial vehicles can safely and conveniently store their vehicles. His understanding is that the nearest site is in Monticello and that space is limited. There are no sites in the Big Lake community.

- Big Lake already allows residents to park recreational vehicles at their properties so long as the RV's are not longer than 36 feet. There is even a provision to allow RV's that are larger than 36 feet if an Interim Use Permit is obtained. Most of the commercial vehicles that the police department has been called to ticket are smaller than an RV.

- Most residents who own large commercial vehicles make an effort to be respectful in how they store them. When they are stored on a paved or gravel surface and screened with a fence or some bushes, many of the negative aesthetic effects can be mitigated.

- The Police Department would ask that the City Council review the current ban on commercial vehicles larger than 12,000 pounds. Might there be some mechanism for allowing/ regulating larger commercial vehicles such as box trucks and semi tractors (without trailers) and allowing them to be stored somewhere in Big Lake? Maybe the weight limit could be raised higher than 12,000 pounds?

Council discussed the Police Department's request at length. They also reviewed a letter received from Planning Commissioner Sundberg in opposition to loosening any of the restrictions on large commercial vehicle parking. The Council discussed the importance of protecting property values while also respecting individual property rights. They believe that it is a balancing act and property values cannot be the only consideration when setting City policy. The Council did not reach a firm consensus on the issue but were in agreement that it is important to find some way for owner/operators of large commercial vehicles to be able to store them somewhere in the community. Options that were discussed included:

1. Allowing most large commercial vehicles to be stored in neighborhoods by dramatically raising the weight maximum so it is much higher than 12,000.

2. Allowing some larger medium-sized commercial vehicles to be stored in neighborhoods by raising the weight maximum only somewhat, maybe to 14,000 or 20,000 pounds.
3. Allowing large commercial vehicles but requiring/encouraging landscaping around the commercial vehicle parking area. Staff noted that this would be extremely hard to enforce without a permit requirement and/or strict code enforcement. The City previously had this requirement for RV’s and it was essentially unenforceable due to the vagueness of how the ordinance was written and the limitations of the City’s low level of code enforcement staffing.

4. Developing a municipal parking lot for large commercial vehicles. No funding source was identified. This may be a good long-term solution?

The City Council ultimately decided that this is an issue that should be reviewed by the Planning Commission before any specific course of action is pursued. They asked Staff to bring the issue to the Planning Commission for discussion. Council stated that their hope was that the Planning Commission would “be creative” in trying to find a solution.

**Previous Discussion on Large Commercial Vehicles in Neighborhoods in 2009**

This issue was last discussed in 2009. The issue surfaced after Staff began “cracking down” on violators who were parking semis at their homes and the violators appealed to the City Council. In 2009:

- Council asked the Planning Commission to review the ordinance and make a recommendation.
- Former Police Chief Rifeneberick was opposed to changing the ordinance.
- The Planning Commission discussed the issue over three (3) meetings. Their ultimate recommendation was to keep the ban on large commercial vehicles completely “as-is.”
- The City Council instructed Staff to treat all properties that had large commercial vehicles before 2009 as if they were “grandfathered” and write letters for the property owners verifying that they could continue to park their large commercial vehicles at home. Staff was instructed not to allow any new large commercial vehicles to park in neighborhoods. This policy appears to have been forgotten during the recession, possibly due to Staff turnover.

**Planning/Zoning Department Comments**

The Planning and Zoning Department has the following comments regarding the Police Department’s Request:

- This is ultimately a community values decision and there is not necessarily a “right” or “wrong” answer. The majority of the communities in this region do not allow large commercial vehicles to be parked in residential neighborhoods. The only community that Staff was able to find that generally allows large commercial vehicles to be stored outside in residential neighborhoods was Fridley. The City of Plymouth technically allows large commercial vehicles in neighborhoods but requires them to be either stored inside a garage or fully screened from all neighboring properties and from the street, a level of screening that is impossible on most ¼ acre city lots. Otsego allows up to 14,000 pounds which is slightly more generous than Big Lake’s ordinance which caps the weight at 12,000 pounds. Many cities are even stricter than Big Lake and cap commercial vehicle weight at 9,000 pounds.

- Many of Big Lake’s newer neighborhoods, those developed after 2002, have private restrictive covenants which prohibit large commercial vehicle parking. The City does not track or enforce private covenants but residents of those neighborhoods may be able to take their neighbors to court to
prevent them from storing large commercial vehicles even if the City were to “legalize” it. Residents of older neighborhoods without private restrictive covenants would not have this option.

- If the Planning Commission and/or City Council want to allow larger commercial vehicles to be parked in neighborhoods, Staff would caution the following:
  
  o Most people want to park their RV’s and large commercial vehicles in the front yard on the driveway. They will park their large vehicles there unless the Code specifically prohibits it and the rules are enforced by fines.

  o Only 25-40% of properties in town have room to build a legal parking pad on the side of their garage that is large enough to fit a large commercial vehicle and still meet the 5-foot setback requirement. One would need to have at least 17 feet between the side of one’s garage and the property line to fit a 12-foot wide parking pad and most properties do not have that much room. Many of the Big Lake’s existing large parking pads were built illegally and encroach onto the neighbor’s property or at least into the 5-foot setback area.

  o Most residents do not have sufficient extra “impervious surface allowance” to build a hard-surface parking area in their back yards or a driveway to lead to it. Properties within 1,000 feet of a lake are capped at 25% impervious surface coverage and all other properties are capped at 35% coverage.

  o Putting aesthetics “mandates” in a commercial vehicle parking ordinance, such as requiring landscaping or fencing around large commercial vehicle parking, would be complicated. This type of rule is typically very staff-intensive to enforce as very few residents voluntarily comply. The RV ordinance previously had a requirement that the RV be “screened from neighboring properties by landscaping or fencing” and there was close to 0% compliance with the rule. It was unclear how screening an RV would even be possible when the majority of RV’s in Big Lake have always been parked in the front yard on driveways. There is really no way to screen a front yard driveway. The RV screening requirement was removed in 2017 during a “cleanup” of the code.

  o Big Lake only allows privacy fences to be up to six (6) feet tall and does not allow privacy fencing in front yards. Six (6) feet is not tall enough to fully screen an RV or large commercial vehicle so fencing could only accomplish partial screening. “Full screening” would likely need to involve hedge rows. It can cost thousands of dollars to install a tall hedgerow along a property line and few residents would plant one voluntarily unless they were unusually committed to being a respectful neighbor.

  o If any type of screening requirement were to be placed in the Code, it would need to be clearly defined what the “bare minimum” is for compliance. Most residents would be looking to do the “bare minimum” and would likely only do so in response to code enforcement action. The City does not have year-round code enforcement staffing.
FINANCIAL IMPACT

The City Council noted the following during their discussion:

- Some residents may not like living next to large commercial vehicles. The large commercial vehicles may decrease property values in neighborhoods.

- If the rule changed, some people may choose to move to Big Lake specifically because we allow large commercial vehicles in neighborhoods. There was a feeling amongst some on the Council that many owners of large commercial vehicles are financially successful and may be interested in “move-up housing” within the community.
  
  - Staff would recommend that this part of Council’s assessment be discussed further. In Staff’s experience, most city developments with “high end” housing include private restrictive covenants that prohibit large commercial vehicle parking. Most wealthy individuals who want to store large commercial vehicles at their homes purchase acreage lots (5-10 acres) in rural Township areas where there is increased privacy and the rules are laxer.

- The City Council believes that the financial impact of allowing large commercial vehicles will be a “wash.” The Planning Commission is asked to weigh in on Council’s assessment.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

As previously stated, this is a community values decision and there is not necessarily a “right” or “wrong” decision. Planning/Zoning Staff would note that allowing large commercial vehicles in residential neighborhoods would be unusual and would place Big Lake in the minority on this issue. Staff was unable to find any cities in the region aside from Fridley that allow large commercial vehicles to be parked outdoors in residential neighborhoods (excepting Plymouth where the rules are so strict that large commercial vehicle parking is effectively prohibited even though it is technically allowed).

If City policymakers want to move forward with an amendment, Staff would need clear direction regarding whether the intent is to allow large commercial vehicles or just slightly raise the limit to allow some mid-sized commercial vehicles that are currently prohibited. As previously stated, Staff would caution against adopting an overly technical ordinance with lots of aesthetics mandates unless Staff is given tools to enforce those mandates (code enforcement staffing, permit requirement, etc.). When the City Code contains ordinances that the City lacks the ability to effectively enforce, it causes frustration for residents and this can lead to a lack of trust in City government.

ATTACHMENTS

A- Chart Showing Vehicle Types by Gross Vehicle Weight Rating
B- Staff Memo from July 24, 2019 City Council Workshop
ATTACHMENT A

CHART SHOWING VEHICLE TYPES BY GROSS VEHICLE WEIGHT RATING

Class 1 - 6,000 lbs & Less
- Minivan
- Cargo Van
- SUV
- Pickup Truck

Class 2 - 6,001 to 10,000 lbs
- Minivan
- Cargo Van
- Full-Size Pickup
- Step Van

Class 3 - 10,001 to 14,000 lbs
- Walk-in
- Box Truck
- City Delivery
- Heavy-Duty Pickup

Class 4 - 14,001 to 16,000 lbs
- Large Walk-in
- Box Truck
- City Delivery

Class 5 - 16,001 to 19,500 lbs
- Bucket Truck
- Large Walk-in
- City Delivery

Class 6 - 19,501 to 26,000 lbs
- Beverage Truck
- Dingle Axel
- School Bus
- Roll Truck

Class 7 - 26,001 to 33,000 lbs
- Refuse
- Furniture
- City Transit Bus
- Truck Tractor

Class 8 - 33,001 lbs & Over
- Cement Truck
- Truck Tractor
- Dump Truck
- Sleeper
ATTACHMENT B
STAFF MEMO FROM JULY 24 CITY COUNCIL WORKSHOP (1 of 3)

WORKSHOP ITEM
Big Lake City Council

Prepared By: Lorrie McKee, Code Enforcement Intern
Meeting Date: 7/24/2019
Item No.: 4B

Item Description:
Discussion on Large Commercial Vehicle Parking in Residential Neighborhoods

Reviewed By: Michael Healy, City Planner
Reviewed By: Clay Wilfahrt, City Administrator

COUNCIL DIRECTION REQUESTED
Direction regarding whether Council would like to keep ordinance on large commercial vehicle parking in residential districts "as-is" or whether Council wishes to discuss potential revisions to the ordinance

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
Current Ordinance

The City of Big Lake does not allow large commercial vehicles to be parked in residential neighborhoods. The City of Big Lake City Zoning Code currently states that:

1030.04: GENERAL PROVISIONS:

Subd. 5. Residential Off-Street Parking.

Off-street parking facilities accessory to residential use shall be utilized solely for the parking of licensed and operable passenger automobiles; no more than one (1) commercial vehicle, not to exceed gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) of twelve thousand (12,000) pounds. Under no circumstances shall parking facilities accessory to residential structures be used for the storage of commercial vehicles, semitrailers, or equipment for or the parking of automobiles belonging to the employees, owners, tenants, or custom. All front yard storage must also be set back fifteen (15) feet from the street curb and storage shall not encroach on any sidewalk.

The City of Big Lake’s Police Department and Community Development Department have received numerous complaints regarding large commercial vehicles parked in residential neighborhoods. While enforcing this code in response to the complaints, there has been strong pushback from the residents who are in violation. These residents have requested that the City Council review the current ordinance as they want to park their large commercial vehicles at their homes. Community Development has been asked to prepare a discussion memo for review at workshop. Staff is seeking Council feedback regarding the existing ordinance and ongoing enforcement efforts.

Rules in Other Communities

After researching surrounding/similar cities to Big Lake, City Staff found that almost all of these cities prohibit parking of large commercial vehicles in residential neighborhoods. The only city in the region that was found to allow it, with restrictions, was the City of Fridley. It is important to note that most of the neighborhoods in Fridley are decades older than most of Big Lake’s neighborhoods resulting in very different development patterns. Most of the houses in Fridley have backyard detached garages with long driveways.
so there is ample room to keep a large commercial vehicle out of sight. Fridley requires large commercial vehicles to be parked 10 feet from the front property line or roughly 22 feet from the back-of-curb. Most of Big Lake’s houses have attached garages with front yard driveways. Very few of Big Lake’s houses have long enough driveways where a large commercial vehicle could be parked 22 feet from the back-of-curb.

Fridley allows for one large commercial vehicle, having a licensed gross vehicle weight over 12,000 pounds, to be parked on property in any residential district provided it meets the following requirement:
• Owner/operator must reside on the property.
• Vehicle shall be parked on a hard surface driveway in compliance with the zoning district requirements. (following setback rules)
• Idling noise is regulated.
• Must be parked at least ten feet from the front property line.

Important Note: Fridley is one of the only communities in the region that does proactive code enforcement. Fridley employs a staff with the equivalent of nearly 5 full-time code enforcement officers. An officer visits each property once a year to perform a zoning compliance check. They aggressively enforce their zoning rules.

Surrounding Cities Where Large Commercial Vehicle Parking is Not Allowed in Residential Areas:
• Elk River- Does not allow commercial vehicles over 9,000 pounds gross weight.
• Monticello- Under no circumstances shall large commercial vehicles be parked or stored in residential zoning districts, or on property that is used for residential purposes.
• Becker- Does not allow commercial vehicles over 12,000 pounds gross vehicle weight.
• Coon Rapids- It is police responsibility, vehicles are normally ticketed by police on a case by case basis. It is illegal to park or store a truck licensed for more than 9,000 pounds gross vehicle weight.
• Rockford- Does not allow commercial vehicles 10,000 pounds or more.
• Otsego- Allows commercial vehicles of 14,000 pounds gross vehicle weight or smaller
• Brooklyn Park- Does not allow commercial vehicles over 12,000 lbs.

Staff Analysis
• Staff does receive a lot of complaints about large commercial vehicles parked in neighborhoods. All of the code enforcement on commercial vehicle parking has been in response to complaints.
• The only residents who have reached out in support of large commercial vehicle parking in neighborhoods are those who own large commercial vehicles and want to park them at home.
• Revising the parking ordinance to allow large commercial vehicles to be parked in neighborhoods would require a zoning code amendment and a public hearing at the Planning Commission. Several of the Planning Commissioners have been very vocal about wanting to see the ban on large commercial vehicle parking enforced more aggressively. It comes up frequently under “Other” at Planning Commission meetings. Staff expects that the Planning Commission will recommend that the City Council keep the ordinance “as-is” and continue enforcement. If that recommendation were given, Council would need to overrule the recommendation in order to
revise the commercial vehicle parking ordinance. Council does have that authority as the Planning Commission is an advisory body.

- This is a “community values” policy decision. There is not necessarily a right or wrong way to write a commercial vehicle parking ordinance. Council has the right to revise the parking ordinance as they see fit.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT**

N/A

**ALTERNATIVES**

Alternative A: Consensus to leave existing ordinance regarding residential commercial vehicle parking “as is” and continue enforcement.

Alternative B: Provide Staff with clear direction regarding any changes they would like to see made to the commercial vehicle parking ordinance. “Next Steps” could include additional workshop discussion or discussion by the Planning Commission. A draft ordinance amendment could be prepared if Council provides instructions regarding content.

**ATTACHMENTS**

N/A
COUNCIL DIRECTION REQUESTED
Discuss the possible addition of ordinances related to Theft and Vandalism for the City of Big Lake, and to direct Staff to bring forward an Ordinance for future consideration.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
Some of the more common quality of life crimes our department fields are those related to Theft, Property Damage, and Disorderly Conduct. Often times, a solution is sought by both parties involved to have a formal action taken, but not criminal in nature.

The addition of City Codes related to these three offenses would give both Officers and the victims, the opportunity to utilize a method other than a criminal summons to address a violation by the issuance of an Administrative Citation.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
Estimated $1,500 in Administrative Fines if this option is utilized 20 times in a budget year. There is also a potential savings as it relates to Officer over-time in court appearances for cases which could be resolved in this manner.

ALTERNATIVES
Continue to utilize the current system of either a criminal summons, or no charge taking place.

ATTACHMENTS
N/A
COUNCIL DIRECTION REQUESTED
Direction to Staff regarding purchasing an additional fifteen holiday decorations to be hung on City lampposts on Highway 10 during the holiday season.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION
In an attempt to ‘light up’ the community, City staff requested financial sponsorships in 2018 from local organizations to cover costs for new Holiday Decorations to be hung on City lampposts on Highway 10 during the winter months. The City’s old decorative lighting was 40+ years old and was no longer in usable condition. With the vast support of local community organizations and businesses, the City was able to purchase fifteen total decorations in 2018 that occupy alternate lampposts starting from Highway 25 to Lakeside Park on Highway 10. Originally some of the donations were going to be used to replace the damaged Highway 10 banners that are hung in both winter and summer months. Due to the overwhelming support of local sponsors, City staff was able to purchase new banners without using the total donations from the Highway 10 Holiday Decorations project. There was a total of $5,790 that was originally fundraised and not used for holiday decorations or banners. The Recreation Coordinator would like to purchase an additional fifteen decorations that will occupy the last of the thirty lampposts during the holiday season.

FINANCIAL IMPACT
$5,790 in donated funds still remain available to purchase additional holiday decorations.

ALTERNATIVES
- Approve Staff’s recommendation to purchase 15 additional holiday decorations for use along the Highway 10 corridor.
- Utilize remaining donated funds for other holiday decorations as determined by Council.

ATTACHMENTS
Pictures of holiday decorations purchased in 2018.
Highway 10 Holiday Decorations
### Item Description

**New Ideas Discussion**

### Reviewed By

- Reviewed By: N/A
- Reviewed By: N/A

### COUNCIL DIRECTION REQUESTED

None

### BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

In early 2019, the Council discussed having a standing item on the agenda where Councilmembers could bring up ideas. This time is dedicated for Council to bring up any ideas that they have to the rest of Council and staff.

### FINANCIAL IMPACT

None

### ALTERNATIVES

None

### ATTACHMENTS

None