



MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF NISSWA
PLANNING COMMISSION/BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
TUESDAY, January 9, 2018, 8:00 AM

Members Present: Don Jacobson, Jim Swanson, Woody Haecker, Peter Mann, Anne Laufman

Members Absent: Ann Beaver

Others Present: Mark Hallan

Staff Present: Desmond McGeough

1. Call to order

2. Tour of properties

- a. Grandview's Camp Lincoln property - 10,780 sf multi-function gym facility
- b. Gull Four Seasons Resort. – Resort redevelopment
- c. Lutheran Church of the Cross

3. Additions or deletions to agenda

4. Approve Minutes:

- a. December 12, 2017 Minutes

5. Open Forum: None

6. Public Hearings: (published in the Echo Journal December 28, 2017 & notice was mailed to all property owners within 350 feet & the affected state agencies.)

- a. Conditional Use Permit Application 036-17- City of Niswawa. - TABLED
- b. Conditional Use Permit Application 038-17- ETOC CO Inc. - TABLED
- c. Conditional Use Permit Application 035-17 ETOC CO Inc. - TABLED
- d. Conditional Use Permit Application 043-17-Lutheran Church of the Cross - APPROVED
- e. Conditional Use Permit Application 037-17 - ETOC CO Inc. - APPROVED
- f. Variance Application 042-17;-ETOC CO Inc. - APPROVED
- g. Conditional Use Permit Application 032-17 -ETOC CO Inc. - TABLED
- h. Conditional Use Permit Application 034-17- ETOC CO Inc.- APPROVED
- i. Conditional Use Permit Application 044-17 - Gull Four Seasons Resort. - APPROVED

7. New Business:

- a. Final Plat Application 040-17 -Thomas Steffens – RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL

- 42 b. Metes and Bounds Subdivision Application 045-17 - Robert Johnson -
43 RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL
44 c. Sketch plan Proposed OHW Lake Setback Variance – Luke Bluhm;

45 **8. Old Business: NONE**

46 **9. Commission Discussion Items**

- 47 a. Nisswa Comprehensive Plan Update 2017, Special Meeting Scheduling
48 b. February meeting; Chair / Vice Chare selection
49 c. February meeting; Water Protection
50 d. Filling Vacancy
51 e. Nisswa Auto Clear Cutting
52 f. Archeological digs
53 g. List of potential discussion items

54 **10. Planning & Zoning Administrator’s Report**

55 **11. Adjourn**

56
57

58 **MEETING MINUTES FROM JANUARY 9, 2018**

59

60 **1. Call to Order:** Haecker calls the meeting to order at 8:00 AM.

61

62 **2. Tour of Properties:**

63

64

65 **3. Additions or Deletions to Agenda:**

66

67 **MOTION:** Jacobson motioned to approve the agenda as presented, Hacker
68 seconded. All members voting “Aye”, motion carries.

69

70 **4. Approval of Minutes:**

71

72 **a. December 12, 2017:**

73

74 Hacker stated he had 29 very minor edits he would like to be made and
75 recommended that that the minutes be tabled until Maggi returns next month.
76 Hacker asked if anyone else had any corrections. Laufman indicated that she
77 had a correction to line 251 and 681 where it indicates the size as 1.54 acres
78 and it should be 1.73 acres. McGeough indicated that was correct.

79

80 **MOTION:** Hacker noted that his comments were relatively minor and that he
81 would entertain a motion to approve the minutes. Mann motioned to approve
82 the November 12, 2017 minutes. Swanson seconded. All members voting
83 “Aye”, motion carries.

84

85

86

87

88

89 **5. Open Forum:**

90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136

No members of the public spoke at open forum. Jacobson stated that the Commission should probably discuss Ann Beaver. Hacker stated that Ann Beaver had missed the last 3 or 4 meetings which means she is automatically off the Planning Commission unless the chair provides an excuse. Hacker indicated that he was providing such and believed that Beaver should remain on the Commission. Hacker asked if there were any objections to keeping Beaver on the Commission. No one raised objection, Hacker stated Beaver would remain on the Commission. Hacker further noted that the City has a Vacancy on the Planning Commission that must be filled.

6. **Public Hearings: MOTION:** Hacker asked for motion to open the public hearing, Mann moved to open the public hearing Swanson seconded. All members voting “Aye”, motion carries.

Jacobson stated he had a question for Mark Ronnei. Jacobson asked Ronnei if he agreed to an extension of the 60-day clock for the Spa Expansion application. Ronnei stated that he does agree to the extension. Jacobson stated with that understanding, he would motion to table items 6a, 6b, 6c be continued to the February 13 meeting, seconded by Mann. Laufman asked if all items were to be extended 60 days. McGeough indicated that the applicant extended the clock on item 6b at the last meeting and the City was the applicant on 6a. All members voting “Aye”, motion carries.

Mann asked why 6a was on the agenda. McGeough indicated that it was placed on the November meeting. Commission tabled that item requesting final design for architecture of the sign. McGeough stated he anticipated final design next month.

- a. **Conditional Use Permit Application 036-17; Consideration of plans to construct a 44-square foot (two-sided, 88 square foot total) freestanding dynamic display sign.**
Property Location: located at 23962 Smiley Road.
Applicant: City of Nisswa.
- b. **Conditional Use Permit Application 038-17; Consideration of plans to construct a 2,550-sf dining hall & 1,764 sf kitchen facility generally located south of Lake Hubert within a Commercial Waterfront District**
Property Location: approximately 1,600 feet west of E. Lake Hubert Drive and 1,200 east of the terminus of S. Lake Hubert Drive.
Applicant: ETOC CO Inc.
- c. **Conditional Use Permit Application 035-17; Consideration of plans to construct a 5,730-sf expansion of an existing spa structure within a Commercial Waterfront District**
Property Location: generally located on the west side of Woodward Avenue, approximately 700 feet south of forest Avenue.

137 **Applicant: ETOC CO Inc.**

138
139
140 **Motion:** Jacobson motioned to table items 6a, 6b and 6c until the February
141 13, 2018 meeting, seconded by Mann.

142
143 Further Discussion:

144
145 Jacobson asked Mark Ronnei (Grand View Lodge) if Grand View agreed to
146 an extension of the 60-day clock for tabling of Application 035-17. Ronnei
147 confirmed Grand View agreed to an extension of the 60-day clock.

148
149 All members voting “Aye”, motion carries

- 150
151 **d. Conditional Use Permit Application 043-17; Request to place three, 160**
152 **square foot storage containers on a permanent basis to provide needed**
153 **storage capacity associated with the Lutheran Church of the Cross**
154 **Rummage Sale Ministry within a Highway Business (HB) Zone District.**
155 **Property Location: located at 5064 County Road 13**
156 **Applicant; Duane A. Blanck**

157
158 Hacker opened discussion of the application and noted that Jim Swanson was
159 a member of the church.

160
161 Hacker asked the other members if they thought there might be a conflict of
162 interest. Jacobson asked Swanson if he was going to vote on the item.
163 Swanson indicated he would like to vote. Hacker polled the Commission, no
164 objection was expressed.

165
166 McGeough read his staff report and gave a presentation

167
168 Hacker asked the Applicant to speak to the request. Duane Blanck, member of
169 the Church of the Cross stated the reason they were asking for the additional
170 storage was due to the rummage sale becoming very successful. Blanck stated
171 that a member of the church donated containers so that they wouldn't need to
172 pay rent on a storage facility. However, at present time the Church needs
173 permanent storage on site and is asking for the CUP so the containers do not
174 need to be removed. Blanck stated that they are planning to build a permanent
175 structure in 3 to 5 years and need time to accumulate funds for the permanent
176 structure. Blanck noted that the church would seasonally remove storage
177 containers but in the last few years one unit was needed year-round. Blanck
178 noted that they were able to raise 65 thousand dollars last year to support
179 various ministries and 300 thousand over the last 10 years. 25% of the monies
180 raised remain in the community.

181
182 Blanck indicated the units would line up with the current trash enclosures and
183 there was sufficient space between the units and the Crossroads development
184 to the north. Blanck noted that they had not had any complaints about using
185 the storage containers in the past.

187 Hacker asked if there were any comments from staff. McGeough noted that
188 the only comment that he had was a condition for landscape screening of the
189 units. Hacker asked if there were comments from the Commission.
190 Laufmann indicated that she thought this should be an Interim Use Permit
191 rather than a Conditional Use Permit. Laufmann noted that the zoning
192 ordinance indicates that there will be no storage in parking areas and that the
193 third unit that is there seasonally is located on the parking lot. Laufmann
194 stated she was not opposed to the placement, however, that was a requirement
195 of the zoning ordinance. Hacker stated the Commission had the option to
196 change the location of the unit.

197
198 Mann asked the applicant if there was any intent to place a truss and roof over
199 the two permanent units. Blanck indicated they did not anticipate doing so, the
200 units were waterproof. Mann noted that he had seen two storage units that
201 had a roof overhead and materials stored in between units. Blanck indicated
202 that there was no room to separate the two units and there is only a few feet
203 between storage units.

204
205 Jacobson asked McGeough if the CUP was perpetual. McGeough stated that
206 the CUP ran with the property and was perpetual unless the Commission
207 placed a sunset clause on the permit. Jacobson asked if the applicant had
208 concern regarding the condition for landscape screening. The applicant stated
209 that these units were intended to be temporary there was significant vegetation
210 already behind the structures. He stated it was a bit of a burden and
211 questioned the condition considering the amount of green space behind the
212 units. Jacobson noted that in the summer it was screened well but that it was
213 very open in the winter. Jacobson asked about the color of the units, the
214 applicant stated that they would be gray in color.

215
216 Jacobson stated that he agreed with Laufman n that this was not a Conditional
217 Use Permit but Interim use permit. Jacobson stated that temporary structures
218 can end up being permanent on site. Swanson indicated that he agreed with
219 Jacobson. Hacker also agreed that this was an Interim Use Permit and that he
220 felt it needed to be screened.

221
222 Hacker noted that the small triangular property looked to be zoned Urban
223 Residential rather than Highway Business and asked if that was correct.
224 Blanck stated the Crossroads property use to belong to the Church and it
225 probably was unintendedly left as residential zoning.

226
227 Hacker stated that he was unsure if the application could be approved with the
228 underlying residential zoning. Hacker asked if staff could look to initiate a
229 change of the zone district. McGeough noted that the triangular property was
230 urban residential. However, the assessor parcel map probably did not
231 accurately depict the location of the property as the line went through the
232 parking lot and trash enclosure, likely the urban residential zoning was just
233 north of the storage units. McGeough pointed out the Crossroad duplex units
234 and how far off the lines were off the structures on the aerial photo,
235 McGeough stated that it was very likely that the property line was about 10

236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282

feet north of where represented on the back side of the existing trash enclosure.

Hacker asked the Commission regarding the time frame. Laufman indicated 3 to 5 years would be appropriate. Laufman noted that if it was shorter period that she might not be inclined to require screening. Swanson stated that 5-year time period with requirement for a fence was a good compromise. The applicant noted that the back side of the units did not look very different than the existing fence and extension of the fence really wouldn't change the appearance of things. However, if the Commission required the fence they would comply.

Hacker indicated that he would entertain a motion.

Motion: Laufman motioned to approve the Interim Use Permit application to place three, 160 square foot storage containers with an end date of five years, with the condition that there is screening of coniferous trees or a fence to match the existing trash enclosure fence.

Findings of Fact:

1. The subject property is located 5064 County Road 13 with a Parcel ID Number of 280144300H00009.
2. The subject property is zoned "Highway Business."
3. The conditional use permit request is to place three (3) storage units on site, each being 8'x 20' and 8.5 feet in height.
4. The use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted will not be impaired by this use.
5. The use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding vacant property for predominant uses in the area. Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and other necessary facilities have been or are being provided.
6. The use will not have any impact on the need for off-street parking and loading spaces.
7. Adequate measures have been or will be taken to prevent or control offensive odor, fumes, dust, noise, and vibration, so that none of these will constitute a nuisance, and to control lighted signs and other lights in such a manner that no disturbance to neighboring properties will result.
8. The use will not depreciate property values within the immediate vicinity.
9. The use will not cause the local, County or State road systems to exceed their safe carrying capacity.

Jacobson indicated that he would second the motion, but the size and number of trees need to be clarified. Laufmann stated that there should be five, six (6) foot trees. Jacobson stated that the Commission should also condition the

283 color; Laufmann amended the motion to reflect that the containers should
284 match and be of the same earth-tone color.

285
286 Hacker requested that McGeough read the motion back to the Commission.

287
288 All members voting “Aye”, motion carries

289

290

291

292 **e. Conditional Use Permit Application 037-17; Consideration of plans to**
293 **construct a 10,780 sf multi-function gym facility within a Commercial**
294 **Waterfront Zone District generally located on the west side of Camp**
295 **Lincoln Road**

296 **Property Location: approximately 1,950 feet south of the Camp Lincoln**
297 **Road intersection with County Road13**

298 **Applicant: ETOC (Camp Lincoln) – Mark Ronnei (present)**

299

300

301 Hacker initiated discussion of item e and f to be considered together.

302

303 McGeough read his staff report and gave a presentation.

304

305 Hacker asked if the applicant, Mark Ronnei had any comments regarding the
306 application. Ronnei indicated the site was heavily wooded and the proposed
307 structure would be of very-low impact and that the structure can not be seen
308 by any other property. The height variation was need to facilitate indoor
309 volleyball and basketball activities for children attending the camp. Ronnei
310 further noted that construction of a lower profile roof to meet the provision
311 was impractical.

312

313 Hacker asked staff if there was further comment; McGeough stated he did not.

314 Hacker asked for any comment from the City Engineer. Hallan indicated the
315 building was 38 feet total but the height, as calculated by code was 30 feet.

316

317 Hacker stated that he would like Commission discussion only on the height
318 issue first. Jacobson asked if the proposed structure was a five-foot departure
319 from the ordinance requirement. McGeough confirmed his understanding.
320 Jacobson indicated that he had no concerns regarding the height of the
321 structure as it was so far placed off Camp Lincoln Road and that the facility
322 could only be seen from the camp property. Swanson noted no concern with
323 the 5-foot variance. Mann asked if the fire department had been involved or
324 commented on the 5-foot variance. Ronnei indicated there would be no
325 livable, storage, or office space or any type of space above grade level.
326 Ronnei noted that the fire department has concerns when a third story is
327 involved. Mann stated that answered his concern. Laufman stated she did not
328 have issue with the height. Hacker summarized that no one on the
329 Commission had a concern regarding the height of the structure.

330

331 Hacker directed discussion toward the variance request regarding the exterior
332 building material, noting the metal siding was a departure from the ordinance.

333 Hacker noted that the Ordinance indicates notes that the Commission can
334 consider other materials. Laufman stated she did not have concern with the
335 material. Swanson and Mann also posed no concern on the material.
336 Jacobson stated he had one concern and that the metal siding should be brown
337 color. Ronnei stated that the building would be Camp Lincoln Brown.
338

339 Hacker summarized that the height and siding materials were acceptable and
340 directed discussion to the Camp Lincoln CUP application. Hacker asked the
341 Commission if there were any concerns regarding the CUP. Laufman stated
342 she did not. Mann indicated that the CUP application states the site be staked
343 prior to the Commission site visit and that the Commission needed to guess
344 where the building was to be sited. Mann stated that it was important for the
345 site to be staked and felt that the Commission should hold applicant to that
346 requirement in the future. Ronnei stated he though the site had been staked
347 and apologized that it had not. Swanson did not have any comment on the
348 CUP. Jacobson asked if there was a landscape plan. McGeough noted that
349 the isometric drawing also contained the proposed landscaping with several
350 new coniferous trees along the front and shrubs along the base. Jacobson
351 stated that if the other Commission members were satisfied with the drawing
352 that he would reserve comment about the landscaping on the isometric
353 drawing. Jacobson also stated that water and sewer systems should be held to
354 state standards. Ronnei noted that they will need to meet state health
355 department requirements. Jacobson stated it ought to be included as a
356 condition to ensure safety. Jacobson stated that any exterior lighting be down
357 cast. Jacobson stated that when a motion is made for the Variance
358 application the Commission should state the reason in the motion for
359 approving the request, that the Commission should be specific about why it is
360 being approved.
361

362 Hacker stated that he agreed with Mann regarding submittal materials.
363 Hacker stated that applications need to be complete or not scheduled.
364 Hacker expressed his concerns regarding the landscape plan, that many trees
365 were being removed and that was not noted with the isometric drawing and
366 that there was no architectural site plan and septic was not represented.
367 McGeough noted that the septic was represented in the new drainage plan that
368 was submitted, though that really wasn't the plan to show it on.
369

370 Hacker indicated he would take a motion on the Variance request.
371

372 **Motion:** Laufman motioned to approve this Variance Application for the
373 Camp Lincoln gym facility permitting a 30-foot high building rather than the
374 25-foot height as required by Ordinance to accommodate basketball court and
375 dark green or brown metal siding rather than the required siding as stated in
376 the ordinance due to the size of the building and due to the remote location.
377

378 Mann seconded the motion so that discussion that discussion could occur.
379

380 Further Discussion:
381

382 Hacker asked for further discussion. Mann requested clarification on the
383 height and asked if building was 30 feet, or if the overall height was 30 feet.
384 Hallan explained how the height of the building was calculated. McGeough
385 added the use would be anticipated in a commercial waterfront zone; however
386 the ordinance requirement effectively would limit the indoor activity.
387 McGeough further noted a pole building of this height would also be in
388 character with a rural environment.

389
390 Hacker stated there was a motion and a second:

391
392 Variance Findings of Fact:

- 393
394 1. The applicant has established that there are practical difficulties, as
395 defined in the ordinance; a basketball gym facility building requires a
396 height greater than the 25-foot height ordinance allows. Regarding
397 relief for commercial building material standards, given the relatively
398 remote location of this structure and the large façade area, metal siding
399 painted in earth tone green and brown color is a practical and
400 appropriate building material.
- 401 2. Deviation from the Ordinance is still in harmony with the general
402 purposes and intent of the Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan; the
403 structure is located in a heavily forested area nearly 1,000 feet from
404 property under different ownership and 866 feet away from the Lake
405 Hubert shoreline. It is unlikely the structure is visible from anywhere
406 but the Camp Lincoln property.
- 407 3. The plight of the property owner is due to circumstances unique to the
408 property and is not caused by the property owner. Camp Lincoln has
409 been present on the site for 100 years. The Commercial Waterfront
410 Zone District is intended to provide development of commercial
411 resorts and associated uses. Recreational facilities, such as a gym, are
412 subordinate uses that would be very much anticipated in a children's
413 camp environment. However, the 25-foot height limitation would
414 generally prohibit such facility. The area being heavily forested and
415 under the Applicant's ownership is a unique circumstance of the site
416 that makes the five-foot variance request relatively inconsequential.
- 417 4. The terms and conditions of the variance protect the essential character
418 of the neighborhood. The area is children's camp and heavily
419 forested. Approval of the five-foot height variance in no manner
420 negatively impacts the character of the area. A structure of this size
421 and character would generally be considered a typical structure in rural
422 environs.
- 423 5. The variance is based on findings of fact other than economic
424 considerations. There are unique circumstances related to the location
425 of the property that makes the request for height relief and exterior
426 finishing materials appropriate.
- 427 6. The gym facility is a use that is permitted in the Commercial
428 Waterfront Zone District.

429
430 All members voting "Aye", motion carries.
431

432 Hacker asked for the Commission to consider item 6e, Conditional Use Permit for
433 the Camp Lincoln Gym Facility.

434
435

436 **Motion:** Jacobson motioned to approve the Conditional Use Permit application to
437 construct a 10,780 sf multi-function gym facility within a Commercial Waterfront
438 Zone District, generally bounded by the east side of Camp Lincoln Road and
439 adopt the findings of fact accordance with the staff report and subject to the
440 following conditions:

441

- 442 1. That the landscaping of the project be consistent with the landscape plan
443 provided on the isometric drawing.
- 444 2. That water and sewer systems for the facility meet all State Health
445 Department Standards.
- 446 3. All exterior lighting should be downcast and cut off to avoid glare.

447

448 Mann seconded the motion as to enter discussion.

449

450 Hacker asked who prepared the architectural drawings. McGeough indicated
451 Norson prepared floor plans, elevations and isometric.

452

453 Findings of Fact:

454

- 455 1. The site generally located on the west side of Camp Lincoln Road,
456 approximately 1,950 feet south of the Camp Lincoln Road intersection
457 with County Road 13. PIN 281020000150009.
- 458 2. The subject property is located in the “Commercial Waterfront” Zone
459 District
- 460 3. The conditional use permit request is to construct a 5 construct a 10,780 sf
461 multi-function gym facility
- 462 4. The Crow Wing County Parcel Map exhibit identifies the total lot area
463 being 3,766,851,000 square feet (31.88 ac).
- 464 5. The total impervious area for the lot is approximately 65,345 square feet
465 (1.5 acres), which is 4.7% of the lot area.
- 466 6. The area within the fourth tier of the development is under 10%.
- 467 7. Exterior Finish: The exterior walls of the proposed structure consist of log
468 siding, wood trim and prefinished metal wall panel, divided light windows
469 and roof elements consist of prefinished standing seam roof and asphalt
470 shingles, the applicant’s narrative indicates the structure will be painted
471 green or brown.
- 472 8. The proposed height of the structure is 30 feet.
- 473 9. The use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the
474 purposes already permitted will not be impaired.
- 475 10. The expansion will not impact the orderly development and improvement
476 of surrounding properties.
- 477 11. Adequate utilities and access roads have been provided.
- 478 12. The structure will not depreciate property values within the immediate
479 vicinity.
- 480 13. The building expansion will not cause local, County or State road systems
481 to exceed safe carrying capacity.

482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530

All members voting “Aye”, motion carries.

- f. **Variance Application 042-17; (Associated application, CUP-037-17) Request for relief from established maximum building height standard, permitting a 30-foot high 10,780 sf multi-function gym facility and relief from Commercial Design Standard Section 4.8.3 permitting a metal panel siding exterior finish upon the structure.**
Applicant: ETOC (Camp Lincoln) – Mark Ronnei (present)

McGeough read his staff report and gave a presentation during 6e.

Discussion and action on the subject request occurred in the discussion of 6e and prior to action on 6e.

- g. **Conditional Use Permit Application 032-17; Consideration of plans for a 35,856 sf, 60-room hotel and attached conference room within a Commercial Waterfront Zone District.**
Property Location: generally located at the northwest corner of Forest Avenue and Woodward Avenue.
Applicant: ETOC CO Inc. – Mark Ronnei (present)

McGeough read the item description in to the record and report and gave a presentation.

McGeough noted that the variance application had just been submitted the day before and that the Conditional Use Permit application and variance needed to be considered concurrently.

Ronnei stated that the entrance off Woodward Ave. was the same entrance into the hotel parking lot. He noted that the dormers on the hotel building were false dormers and that there would be no third floor. Ronni noted that the variance request for height does not add an additional floor, ceiling heights were 9-feet and the pitch of the roof was a normal pitch. The overall height of the structure would be typical of any two-story hotel building.

The building will have fire suppression, they will be adding a well system for the hotel, all utilities, there is driveways on the back side for trash pickup. Every side will be seen by guests, so the building well-articulated on all sides. Ronnei stated to meet the 25-foot height requirement the roof would nearly need to be flat.

For the parking lot landscape, it will be fully screened. They are retaining the cedars on Forest Avenue. Not much of the hotel will be seen from Forest Avenue. The only place the hotel will really be seen is from the northbound Woodward traffic.

531 Jacobson asked what the height of the top of the roof at peak. Ronnei stated
532 the top of the structure is 42-feet. Laufman asked which building at Grand
533 View was the tallest. Ronnei stated that the main lodge is the tallest structure,
534 which stands a little more than the 42-foot overall height of the proposed hotel
535 structure.

536
537 Jacobson asked staff about the recommendation; McGeough stated that it
538 should be tabled to consider the variance concurrently at the next meeting.
539 Ronnei added that he wanted the item to be discussed at this meeting to
540 determine if any other information is needed for the next meeting.

541
542 Jacobson asked if construction traffic would be routed as stated in previous
543 hearings, Ronnei confirmed it would. Mann asked for confirmation that the
544 parking lot would be located where the modular units currently sit. Ronnei
545 confirmed that it is. Mann stated that he appreciated that the Cedar trees
546 would remain. Mann stated that he had concerns about the initial drawings
547 submitted for the Grandview expansion. He asked if you were driving west
548 on Forest Avenue, is all you would see is a large wall of the hotel. Ronnei
549 stated the hotel had been moved north from the original drawing.

550
551 Mann state that he had specific concerns about whether there was sufficient
552 parking for all of the new components of the Grand View expansion. Mark
553 noted the new parking areas and that the employees would be shuttled from
554 parking areas to the west. Mann said he did not know what the overall
555 parking situation was, that the Commission needed better information on the
556 parking.

557
558 Laufman asked if a variance on the parking and parking lot landscaping is
559 needed. McGeough stated it is his recommendation that planter islands be
560 placed in the middle to break up the expanse of parking area. McGeough
561 stated that he thought there was room in the site to place a few parking
562 islands in the middle and replace the parking spaces elsewhere on site.
563 Laufmann stated the two options would be to provide a variance to the
564 parking islands or require the 5% landscape area in the parking lot.
565 McGeough explained that a variance would need to be warranted by meeting
566 criteria such as self-imposed hardship and unique circumstances associated
567 with the property.

568
569 McGeough added that he questioned whether the there was sufficient parking
570 for peak periods. He noted the converted tennis courts. He stated that based
571 on the current site plan, the hotel met the 1.25 spaces per room requirement.
572 He further noted that there was a conference room at the hotel that seated 60
573 persons. He acknowledged that many conference attendees would also be
574 guests of the lodge and not take additional parking spaces. McGeough stated
575 that he would like to see a breakdown from the applicant, providing an
576 estimate of how many persons at a conference would also be staying at the
577 hotel. Also, how many additional parking spaces are provided by the
578 recreational center and converted tennis court area and whether those areas
579 could handle any overflow from the hotel. He stated that the wedding chapel
580 also needs to be considered at the same time as there is no on-site parking for

581 the chapel. McGeough stated the City needed to know the number of spaces
582 at tennis courts, how many persons at a wedding at the chapel would also be
583 guests of the hotel. McGeough indicated that a narrative regarding parking is
584 imperative so that the Commission is confident that they are making the right
585 decision regarding the overall parking for the projects. Ronnei noted that a
586 primary function for the hotel project was to facilitate many conferences and
587 that many would be staying at the hotel. He noted that they would address the
588 parking issue.

589
590 Ronnei stated that the islands cause some complications; however, they could
591 pick up spaces elsewhere on site. Ronnei stated that he thought that they
592 achieved the 5% since they had landscaping area from Woodward Avenue to
593 the parking lot. McGeough stated that it appears that they are right at the cusp
594 of the 5% when considering the landscaping area next to the porta-cochere
595 and landscaping surrounding the parking lot. McGeough indicated that the
596 street was private, thus the frontage landscaping was not required landscape
597 and could be counted toward the 5% requirement. McGeough noted that it is
598 at the Commission's discretion as to whether they considered the parking lot
599 to be of such a size that warranted landscaping islands in the middle of the
600 parking field.

601
602 Lafuman asked Ronnei if they knew for sure that if those areas were counted
603 toward the requirement that they would be 5% of the total parking area.
604 Ronnei stated they had discussed it and he believes it does, he added that it
605 appears to be five percent of the parking lot area looking at the plan.

606
607 Laufman asked about the softening of the intersection of Woodward and
608 Forest Avenues. Ronnei indicated that the City Council was setting up a
609 Committee to study the internal street network. Ronnei stated it was a City
610 street and they don't have the ability to do anything with it without Council
611 permission, therefore it is shown in it's current location.

612
613 Hacker asked if Hallan had any comment, Hallan did not. Jim Swanson did
614 not have comment. Hacker asked if there was any way to make only one
615 driveway into the hotel parking lot rather than two. Ronnei indicated that both
616 were needed, the first being an entrance and the second an exit.

617
618 Hacker asked for a motion to table the item, with additional information the
619 Commission is requiring.

620
621 Jacobson asked Ronnei if the City has permission to table the item without
622 being afoul of the 60-day rule. Ronnei conceded to the tabling of the item.

623
624 **Motion:** Jacobson motioned to table this Conditional Use Permit application
625 to February 13, 2018 Commission meeting.

626
627 seconded by Laufman.

628
629 Further Discussion:

630

631 Hacker stated needed to include the two items required by staff. He asked if
632 the applicant could provide an exhibit of the exterior lighting. Ronnei
633 confirmed they would. Hacker requested a color sample of the building and
634 roof, and note trash handling.

635
636 Hacker asked that the applicant provide the actual location of trees on the site.
637 Ronnei stated that they could provide an aerial. Hacker requested that the
638 applicant provide the building height.

639
640 Hacker asked for comment on the landscape island. Jacobson stated that
641 ordinance was intended to break up large area of asphalt, but the surrounding
642 landscaping appears to suffice in softening the area. Swanson indicated he
643 accepted the parking with out landscaping, Laufman also indicated she was ok
644 with the parking lot. Mann concurred. Hacker stated that the Commission
645 would accept the parking lot without the islands.

646
647 Laufman asked if the parking was needing a variance. McGeough indicated it
648 depended on what the numbers yield and whether there was sufficient
649 overflow located at the recreation facility and converted tennis courts.
650 McGeough stated that it does not necessary need to meet the stand-alone
651 calculation for hotel, conference room, recreational facility and chapel.

652
653
654 All members voting "Aye", motion carries.

655
656
657 **h. Conditional Use Permit Application 034-17; Consideration of plans to**
658 **construct a 1,260 sf Wedding Chapel within a Commercial Waterfront**
659 **Zone District.**

660 **Property Location: generally located at the southwest corner of Forest**
661 **Avenue and Nokomis Avenue.**

662 **Applicant: ETOC CO Inc. - Mark Ronnei (present)**

663
664
665
666 McGeough read the item into the record and gave a brief presentation

667
668 Ronnei apologized that the site was not staked. He stated there are 79
669 significant trees on that corner and that they would only be removing 2.
670 \Ronnei stated the only thing this will be used for is wedding events. There is
671 no kitchen facility and no plumbing to the structure.

672
673 Jacobson asked what the height of the structure was. Ronnei indicated that it
674 was only a single story and the main roof did not exceed the 25-foot
675 limitation, Ronnei indicated that the steeple was higher than 25 feet.
676 McGeough noted that architectural projections such as spires or chimneys
677 typically are not subject to height standards. Jacobson stated that they would
678 need a variance for parking as none is provided. Ronnei noted that the
679 Commission can consider the overall parking provided locations close to the
680 chapel. Jacobson concurred the Commission could consider the other parking

681 facilities and that the ordinance did give latitude, thus a request for variance
682 was not needed.

683
684 Jacobson asked if Ronnie had talked about bathroom facilities with the State.
685 Ronnei indicated that he had and bathroom facilities are not required.
686 Jacobson asked if they were going to install landscaping as per the submitted
687 drawings, Ronnei stated they would. Jacobson said he was satisfied with the
688 application. Swanson indicated he had no comment, Hacker stated that the
689 Commission discussed the issue and it was difficult to understand that there
690 would be no bathroom, however, it was not the Commission authority to
691 require one. Mann stated they should add a condition that Grand View meet
692 State requirements and let them resolve the issue with the State. Hacker
693 asked if there was a pedestrian path that went from the tennis court parking to
694 the chapel; Ronnei pointed out the pedestrian path that linked the parking to
695 the chapel.

696
697
698
699 **Motion:** Mann motioned to approve this Conditional Use Permit application
700 to construct a 1,260 sf Wedding Chapel within a Commercial Waterfront Zone
701 District subject to the findings of fact with the following conditions:

- 702
703 1. The applicant shall provide a project narrative that identifies the
704 number of needed parking spaces of the facility and number
705 available of available spaces in the new parking facility on the east
706 side of Woodward Avenue.
707 2. Shared parking of the adjoining facilities has been considered and
708 deemed adequate for this facility.
709 3. That the steeple height of 30 feet is acceptable
710 4. Exterior lighting will be downcast
711 5. Applicant shall comply with the Minnesota Department of Health
712 bathroom requirements if applicable.
713 6. Landscaping shall be planted in accordance with the plans
714 submitted by the applicant.

715
716 seconded by Jacobson

717
718 All members voting "Aye", motion carries.

719
720 Findings of Fact:

- 721
722 1. The subject property is generally located at the northwest corner of
723 Forest Avenue and Nokomis Avenue on three parcels. (PIN
724 281140000890009, 281140000900009, 281140000910009).
725 2. The subject property is zoned "Commercial Waterfront."
726 3. The applicant is proposing a 1,260-square foot wedding chapel
727 facility that will accommodate wedding events up to 50 people.
728 4. The applicant has provided a Site Plan, Floor plans, Elevations,
729 Grading Plan, Stormwater Drainage Plan, Erosion Control Plan,
730 Utility Plan,

- 731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
5. The architecture of the chapel is characteristic of church style vernacular that is consistent with the architectural elements of Grand View Lodge, consisting vertically placed dark colored wood siding, knee brace features under the roof line, a bell tower and divided light windows.
 6. The subject structure has no plumbing, kitchen or bathroom facilities.
 7. Parking facilities will be provided off site at the lodge parking lot located on the east side of Woodward Avenue.

740
741

- 742
743
744
745
746
- i. **Conditional Use Permit Application 044-17; Consideration of plans for demolishing an existing 4-plex lodge structure and two cabins and redevelopment of the site with five additional new cabin structures. The resort encompasses 11.28 acres located within a Commercial Waterfront (CW) zone district.**

747
748

Property Location: generally located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Donaldson Rd and St. Colombo Rd.

749
750

Applicant: Gull Four Seasons Resort.

751
752

McGeough read into the record and gave a presentation.

753
754
755

The applicant, Dan Patterness, spoke and indicated that the proposed changes are needed due to changes in family sizes and guest preferences.

756
757

Hacker asked if McGeough had further comment. McGeough noted that staff conditioned that the trees being removed be replaced, and that there should be additional replacement of trees for the large white pine that will be removed. Hallan had no comment.

758
759
760

Laufmann asked how tall the two-story structure would be, the applicant indicated that it would be 24 feet to the top.

761
762
763

Mann asked about density of tier one, two and three. It appears that the tier number two percentage may be in excess of State requirements. There is nothing that provides density in tier 3 which could cover the excess square footage in tier 2.

764
765
766
767
768

Mann stated that that tier one was under, which could be carried over to two. But we did not have overall density calculation. The applicant discussed health department requirements, and the need for a larger footprint based on those standards. Mann stated the DNR, another State agency, also provides how many square feet space of dwelling space can be each tier for resort development.

769
770
771

772
773
774

775
776

Swanson talked about the number of trees that would need to be removed and asked if the applicant had a landscape plan for replacing the existing trees.

777
778
779

The applicant stated that they did not presently have a plan, that it is their preference to work on the landscaping after it is known where the final

780 placement of the septic tanks will be. Swanson stated that they would like to
781 have some type of landscape plan to approve.

782
783 Jacobson noted that it appears that the proposed units are very close in square
784 footage as currently provided. Jacobson stated that they may be slightly over,
785 but this change is very minimal and it likely complies with state standards.
786 Mann stated he agreed but that record should be made regarding the density in
787 each tier. Jacobson indicated that this issue seemed to be the only concern
788 regarding this application and that as perhaps it should be approved. Mann
789 stated that he was fine with approving, subject to a condition that would
790 require the applicant show the resort complies with density requirements.
791 Mann noted that there was a small seasonal window and he did not want to
792 delay the applicant’s project, but the City needed to confirm the standard was
793 being met.

794
795 Hacker stated that he would take a motion on the item.

796
797 **Motion:** Jacobson motioned to approve this Conditional Use Permit for
798 demolishing an existing 4-plex lodge structure and two cabins and
799 redevelopment of the site with five additional new cabin structures on a resort
800 property encompassing 11.28 acres located within a Commercial Waterfront
801 (CW) zone district; PID#281330000010889, 281330000020889,
802 281330000030889 281330000040889, 2811200000010889,
803 2811200000020889, 281120000003010889, 2811200000040889
804 28177000001A009, with the following conditions:

- 805
806 1. The applicant shall replace the 4 trees cut down in the development
807 of the cottage units with a minimum of 4 coniferous trees having a
808 minimum height of 8 feet.
809 2. Prior to the issuance of a Land Use Permit for site development,
810 the applicant shall provide a Stormwater Drainage Plan in a form
811 that is acceptable to the City Engineer.
812 3. Prior to the issuance of a Land Use Permit for site development,
813 the applicant shall provide Correspondence from a State Certified
814 Septic System Designer indicating that the subject system is of
815 adequate condition and can provide the sewage needs required by
816 five new units and the resort as a whole.
817 4. Prior to the issuance of a Land Use Permit for site development,
818 the applicant shall submit a Property line adjustment application
819 removing property lines from resort structures and bring the
820 existing and proposed resort buildings into compliance with zoning
821 ordinance setback standards.
822 5. The applicant shall provide to an analysis to city staff that provides
823 of the resort density and demonstrates that the project is in
824 compliance with state density standards.

825
826
827 Findings of Fact:

- 828 1. The subject property is generally located on the northwest corner of
829 the intersection of Donaldson Rd and St. Columbo Rd.; PIN

- 830 281330000010889, 281330000020889, 281330000030889
831 281330000040889, 2811200000010889, 2811200000020889
832 281120000003010889 2811200000040889 28177000001A009
833 2. The subject resort site encompasses 11.28 acres and is located in a
834 Commercial Waterfront (CW) zone district,
835 3. The conditional use permit request is to demolish one 4-plex structure
836 and two cabins and redevelop the site with four new 2-bedroom
837 cottage units and one 4-bedroom cottage unit.
838 4. There is no change to the Tier 1 impervious surface. Tier 2
839 impervious surface will slightly increase to 26%.
840 5. Exterior Finish: The proposed units have a cabin style character with
841 siding that has the appearance of wood shingle and horizontally
842 running wood. The proposed buildings are earth tone in color, similar
843 in character and color to other structures on site.
844 6. New cabin units will be set back over 200 feet from the OHW of Gull
845 Lake and over 150 feet away from property under separate ownership.
846 7. The development will tie all new units into the resort septic system.
847 8. The use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for
848 the purposes already permitted will not be impaired.
849 9. Redevelopment will not impact the orderly development and
850 improvement of surrounding properties.
851 10. Adequate utilities and access roads and parking facilities are already
852 present upon the site.
853 11. The site redevelopment will not depreciate property values within the
854 immediate vicinity.
855 12. The site redevelopment will not cause local, County or State road
856 systems to exceed safe carrying capacity.
857
858

859 seconded by Swanson

860
861 Further Discussion:

862 Hacker stated he was concerned about the density in tier 2 as the Planning
863 Commission allowed it to exceed second tier density in a prior application.
864 Hacker asked how much latitude should be given to exceed. Jacobson
865 stated none because the ordinance allows using density from the third tier.
866 Mann concurred with Jacobson and indicated the probably won't be an
867 issue and the plan probably meets the ordinance requirements as
868 presented. The City just needs to document the density.
869

870 All members voting "Aye", motion carries.
871

872 **7. New Business**

- 873
874
875 **a. Final Plat Application 040-17; Subdivision of a 1.73-acre tract of**
876 **property in a proposed Commercial Waterfront (CW) zoning district,**
877 **consisting of a 9 lots total, 8 duplex lots and one common area lot.**
878 **Property Location: generally located on the east side of Oak Lane, 900**
879 **feet northwest of the intersection of Oak Lane with Poplar Avenue.**

**PIN 281260009010009, 28126000902A009, 281650050050009,
28165005006B009 Applicant, Thomas Steffens/Property Owner,
James E, Benedict**

Hacker opened the discussion of the item stating that staff was recommending that the subject item be tabled to the following meeting. Jacobson noted that the only reason for tabling the item was due to not having received comment from the DNR on the proposed development.

McGeough indicated the only reason for the recommendation was due to not having comment. He noted that the final plat was consistent with the Commission approval of the Preliminary Plat and the Conditional Use Permit. McGeough indicated that he anticipated communication from the DNR by Friday. The DNR staff hydrologist was to meet with other members of the agency to discuss the project. McGeough indicated that in the DNR cursory review, they expressed concerns regarding boat docking. McGeough noted that the Commission deferred to DNR on that matter. The other concern expressed by the staff hydrologist pertained to the project density. McGeough indicated that he had forwarded the method in which the project density was calculated and the resulting square footage permitted by those calculations. McGeough stated staff did recommend the item be continued to the following meeting; however, the Commission could consider the item and forward to Council, with the understanding that comment is forthcoming if they were comfortable in doing so. Or, the Commission could wait until they receive correspondence from the DNR.

Applicant Thomas Steffens asked to speak on the item. Steffens indicated that he had forwarded a previous decision regarding docking slips for commercial resorts to the staff hydrologist Danielle McNeil. The DNR only allows one slip for each dwelling unit in a residential PUD, however, the standard is not applicable to commercial resorts. Steffens noted the Cass County DNR hydrologist would discuss further with McNeil. Steffens noted that McGeough had emailed the density calculation and method to McNeil. He further indicated that it was expressed that the DNR would look to have any comments to the City by Friday.

Steffens noted that tabling the item for a month would significantly impact the intended scheduling of construction and extend into the resort season. Steffens requested that the Commission adopt a resolution recommending approval on the application, contingent to staff receiving communications that DNR that issues had been adequately addressed, prior to the City Council decision on the item.

Hacker indicated that he thought the Commission should make such action and requested if any member disagreed. Mann stated that he disagreed. Mann indicated the Commission had approved previous applications subject to DNR response on the project. Hacker asked what other members thought on how to proceed. Jacobson stated that if DNR was going to reply by Friday, that the Commission should recommend approval subject to receiving correspondence, and if there was negative

930 response to pull it off the City Council Agenda. Jacobson noted that
931 everything else had to this point been approved by the Commission and
932 that this was the only outstanding concern. If response was not received by
933 Friday, the Council should take action on the item. Laufman indicated that
934 she did not feel comfortable approving the item without final comment
935 from DNR as previous approvals were predicated on receiving response.

936
937 Steffens noted that the Commission had previously discussed whether or
938 not there would be a response provided by the DNR. It had been
939 discussed whether staff should send a letter to DNR indicating that the
940 City would act on the item should there not be a response, and that the
941 DNR has had the 30-day period in which to respond. Steffens indicated
942 that he would be comfortable with a resolution in which if no response
943 was received by Friday, or if a negative response was received that the
944 item be pull from the Council Agenda. Steffens noted that McNeil
945 indicated that she would look to respond by Friday; however, it could be
946 as late as the Tuesday before the City Council meeting.

947
948 Hacker indicated that it appeared to be the consensus of other Commission
949 members to approve the application subject to DNR response by next
950 Tuesday, and to pull it off Council Agenda if no response was provided.
951 Hacker indicated he was opposed to doing so because we can't require the
952 DNR to respond to the application. Steffens indicated he agreed with the
953 Chair indicating that we can't make the agency respond in a timely
954 manner. Steffens further indicated that DNR had previously noted that
955 they were not staffed to provide development review, they expect the City
956 to do development review and the DNR was to review docking
957 improvements.

958
959 Laufman indicated that DNR has had the information for only a little over
960 30 days, and did not believe the lack of a final response at this time was
961 unreasonable. Jacobson stated that he believed that it was appropriate for
962 the State to have their 30-day review period, but the City needs to act in a
963 timely fashion.

964
965 Shawn Hansen, Nisswa Chamber of Commerce, stated that it would be
966 unfortunate to push construction back into the resort season. Jacobson
967 indicated that the Commission should look to make a motion and make an
968 up or down decision on the motion.

969
970 **Motion:** Laufman motioned to recommend approval of the final plat for
971 Good Ol' Days First Addition to the City Council, based on the findings of
972 fact provided in the staff report, subject to receiving DNR correspondence
973 indicating agency concerns have been adequately addressed by January
974 16, 2018. If written correspondence from DNR has not been provided, or
975 correspondence indicating outstanding DNR concern, the Commission
976 recommends that the Council send it back to the Commission for further
977 consideration.

978
979 Findings of fact:

980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025

1. The subject property is generally located on the east side of Oak Lane, 900 feet northwest of the intersection of Oak Lane with Poplar Avenue. (PIN 281260009010009, 28126000902A009, 281650050050009, 28165005006B009).
2. The subject property is 1.73 acres and has been rezoned to “Commercial Waterfront”
3. The applicant is proposing 8 lots, 1 outlot, and a total of 8 units.
4. Proposed duplex lots conform to the CW zoning district lot size standards.
5. The subdivision contains 1.39 acres of open space.
6. The proposed impervious surface area of the subdivision is 25%
7. The proposed rental dwelling units are a permitted use in the Commercial Waterfront Zone District.
8. The applicant proposes to construct a private sewer system that will connect to the city municipal sewer collection system, which will serve all 8 dwelling units. Homeowners association will operate and maintain the private sewer system serving the 8 units.
9. The proposed road serving the units will be private, maintained, plowed, repaired and replaced as needed by the homeowners association.
10. The Final Plat for Good Ol’ Days First Addition is in substantial compliance with the Conditional Use Permit and Preliminary Plat approved by the Planning Commission at a Public Hearing held on December 12, 2017.

seconded by Mann.

Mann, Laufmann, Swanson voting “Aye”, Jacobson voting “No”, motion carries.

b. Metes and Bounds Subdivision Application 045-17; Robert Johnson Property- 25551 Main Street

Hacker opened discussion on the agenda item and asked if any member had any comments on the application. Laufman indicated she did not have any comments on the item. Mann stated he had no questions on the subdivision. Swanson indicated he had no comments on the item.

Jacobson asked if Tract “B” met the minimum lot standards for subdivision. McGeough stated that the tract did meet the minimum standards, the subject lot meets the minimum lot frontage requirement and there is no minimum lot size required for the Central Business zone district. Jacobson stated there was a lot of asked about the area

1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074

surrounding the lot, he noted that there was information on the survey around the periphery of Tract “A” and “B” outside of the shaded area and questioned whether if that was included as part of the subdivision area. McGeough outlined the lot and noted the adjoin lots on the survey and showed the proposed property line splitting the two tracts. McGeough noted that the inside shading represented the buildings located on site.

Mann asked why the property owner would look to divide the parcel into two separate tracts. Shawn Hansen, Chamber of Commerce, noted that the Commission asked for the subdivision when the restaurant plans were previously approved. Hansen stated that it was conditioned so that either building could be sold separate to each other. Jacobson asked if the plat would need to be approved by the Council. McGeough stated that the plat did need Council approval.

Motion: Jacobson motioned to recommend approval of the metes and bounds subdivision located at 25551 Main Street as proposed.

Findings of Fact:

1. The subject property is located at 25551 Main Street (PIN 28136001001A009).
2. The subject property is and is zoned “Central Business.”
3. The metes and bounds subdivision request is to split a 15,159 square foot parcel in to a 10,723 square foot parcel and a 4,436 square foot parcel.
4. “Tract A” is 10,723 square feet and encompasses a new restaurant and office suite building. “Tract B” encompasses an existing structure that serves as the Nisswa Post Office.
5. Both existing structures are connected to the City of Nisswa sewer system.
6. “Tract A” and “Tract B” meet the minimum lot requirements of the “Central Business” zone district.

seconded by Mann.

Further Discussion:

All members voting “Aye”, motion carries.

c. Sketch plan – Luke Bluhm; Proposed OHW Lake Setback Variance - 26314 Padre Place

McGeough made a brief presentation regarding the applicant’s proposal

Bluhm discussed the project where the new living quarters garage and four-season porch would be located. Jacobson asked the applicant

1075 whether he was aware that a sketch plan is not something that is approved.
1076 The applicant stated that he was aware and wanted to get input from the
1077 Commission to determine if he would make a formal submittal for
1078 variance.

1079
1080 Hacker asked why the applicant was not putting the addition on the right,
1081 where the setback encroachment was not as much. Bluhm indicated that
1082 he the septic was located on that side and take more trees out.

1083
1084 Jacobson noted that the structure was currently a legal non-conformity and
1085 the applicant sought to increase the nonconformity. Given the size of the
1086 parcel, there is plenty of room to build a new structure. Jacobson stated
1087 that he would not be in favor of increasing the nonconformity. Jacobson
1088 indicated that as much of the structure should be behind the white line
1089 (100-foot lake buffer). Bluhm stated he wasn't sure how he would attach
1090 it. Hacker stated that it was the Commissions role to protect not just the
1091 lake, the forest and trees. He indicated he thought building in the setback
1092 was preferable to the applicant cutting down many trees.

1093
1094 Jacobson stated that in order to approve the variance it has to be shown
1095 that there is no other way to improve the property and there are options to
1096 not building in the setback. Hacker stated they could connect with a
1097 breeze way. Laufmann indicated that she had problems with the drawing
1098 as it did not appear to be to scale. Bluhm stated he sought to get the
1099 drawing to scale.

1100
1101 Swanson asked that whether all the new habitable space would be above
1102 the garage connected to the existing structure with stairs. Mann asked if
1103 there would be bathrooms. Mann stated that if the addition was to the
1104 back side of the structure that he would likely consider the application
1105 positively. Hacker asked whether the septic would comply if new
1106 bathrooms were added. Bluhm stated that if it did not, additional tanks
1107 would be added. It is much more affordable to use the existing tanks than
1108 to move and start from new.

1109
1110 Hacker asked if the cabin could be moved. The applicant stated he though
1111 it would be cost prohibitive. Hacker summarized that it seemed the
1112 consensus of the group was to move the structure outside of the 100'
1113 buffer and connect the proposed structure with a small breeze way to
1114 connect the existing structure.

1115
1116 Hacker asked McGeough if he had any comment. McGeough stated that
1117 he considered the same thing regarding a breeze way connection to the
1118 rear of the house and with perhaps turning the orientation of the new
1119 structure.

1120
1121
1122
1123
1124

8. Old Business – None

9. Commission Discussion Items

1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174

Comprehensive Plan

McGeough stated he was looking for input regarding a date in which the Commission could hold a Special Meeting to further discuss the Comprehensive Plan Update. McGeough stated staff was looking to schedule the meeting for January 30th or February 6th. Staff was hoping that the Commission would come to the meeting with written comment upon the Plan. McGeough stated that it would be a Special Meeting of the Planning Commission, and City Council would be invited to attend. However, it would not be a joint session. Hacker stated that City Council and Commission members come to the meeting with issues in writing and solution to the issue. The written comments should be submitted a week in advance. Jacobson indicated that the Council sent it back to the Commission because of the split vote. Jacobson indicated that if the Commission works on it and comes back with a unanimous vote, the Council will approve it. Hacker stated Council should also be given an opportunity to make comment as well.

Laufman indicated that the Council decision was more than an issue of a split vote. Laufman indicated that there were concerns about the content as well. Jacobson stated that if the Commission got together to go over concerns that the Commission would be able to provided a document all could support. Jacobson stated he could redline the existing document. Laufman felt the document was fatally flawed and that that they should utilize the existing comprehensive plan as the base document, and amend that document based on the comments and input received from the steering committed. Hacker asked who would do that work, Laufman indicated that she could do that work. Hacker asked Jacobson what he wished to do. Jacobson responded that he would like to have the document redlined and thinned out. Hacker asked who would do that work. Jacobson stated that he would be willing to go through the document and edit it.

Jacobson stated he would redline the existing document and provide his comments and ideas to Laufmann in her revision of the existing comprehensive plan. Laufman indicated that it would take more than a few weeks and it would be best not to set a date for Commission discussion at the present time, it would probably take a few months.

Commission Nominations:

Hacker reminded that next month Commission officers need to be selected. That the chair position should be done by ballet.

Forest Clear-cut:

Hacker asked about the Nisswa Auto clear cut and if anything had been done on it. McGeough stated that nothing had yet been done on that issue and another clear cut has occurred on Smiley Road. McGeough stated he would be contacting both owners.

Archeological Studies:

Hacker asked about whether the Commission wished to require archeological studies for applications. Hacker asked who would pay for it and would it be required for all projects. Jacobson stated it should be of a certain size and meet some type of criteria as to whether an arkeological report should be required.

1175 Mann stated that he would look into other City ordinances and filed out how it was
1176 applied. Laufmann indicated that she did not want to require an archeological
1177 study. Hacker too does not want an archeological study.

1178
1179 List of discussion items:

1180 Hacker stated that they needed to discuss water to protect water resources and the
1181 forest resources.

1182
1183 Jacobson asked about improvements in the application review process.

1184 McGeough stated that he was going to cover that in the Administrators Report.

1185 McGeough stated that he would like to bring to the next meeting a revised
1186 calendar that added two weeks into the process that would allow a thorough
1187 vetting of applications and the ability for applicants to provide additional
1188 information prior to publication of the item. McGeough stated that it should result
1189 in better, more complete applications and better service for applicants.

1190

1191 **10. Planning & Zoning Administrator's Report**

1192

1193 McGeough stated he had a complaint regarding a potential zoning violation
1194 regarding junk and debris on a property on Highland Avenue that he will address.

1195

1196 McGeough stated he would contact the two owners regarding the clear-cut issues.

1197 McGeough noted that there were no permits issued last month, nor were there
1198 any site visits due to the holidays and the number of applications that were in
1199 process for the January Planning Commission meeting.

1200

1201 Jacobson asked about the vacant planning commission vacancy. McGeough
1202 stated that there were no applications. Jacobson asked the Commission how they
1203 might be able to entice some applicants.

1204

1205 The Commission asked to initiate a new process for site visits where they would
1206 be held in the week before the meeting at 10:00 am. Hacker asked McGeough to
1207 put out a few dates before the next meeting for site visits.

1208

1209 Where there are only one or two agenda items on the schedule for site visit, those
1210 visits can occur at the beginning of the regularly scheduled agenda. The
1211 Commission stated that meetings will start at 9:00, even if a site visit is on the
1212 regular schedule. Laufman added that McGeough should coordinate with Hallan
1213 so that he will also be available for site visits.

1214

1215 **11. Adjourn**

1216

1217 **Motion:** Jacobson motioned to adjourn the January 9, 2018 meeting, seconded by
1218 Swanson. All members voting "Aye", motion carries

1219

1220 Respectfully submitted,

1221

1222

1223 _____
1224 Desmond McGeough, Planning and Zoning Administrator

1224