Christopherson called the meeting to order at 6:30pm, with the Pledge of Allegiance. Minutes of the March 12 meeting were approved with a time correction on a motion by D’Aigle, seconded by Skluzaçek.

Consideration of Elan Shores / Yanik / Foster Rezoning Request: Elan Shores, LLC, owns a large parcel (“the point”) located at 20 First St SE (PID 42.3022.000) in the R-2 district. This property is also in a shoreland district. They are hoping to develop the property as a 60-unit senior apartment building, with potential for twelve units of memory care. In order to make their proposal work, they have requested that the property be rezoned from R-2 to MFR-2. Staff have prepared proposed findings of fact and draft resolution P19-05. This proposal was the subject of a public hearing at last month’s meeting, but limited public comment will be allowed this month as well.

Sauter explained what has happened in the past month with this proposal. She, public works staff, and the developers have reviewed and revised the plan, after hearing the concerns expressed by the public at last month’s meeting. She explained how the utility plan will affect others positively, and how the park would potentially be expanded and improved. She also reviewed her procedures in evaluating the proposal using the Comprehensive Plan and the MDO, and how things are expected to move forward administratively, should this be approved. Jerry Zuber of Yanik explained their plan for a temporary road during construction, and their discussion with the Parks and Recreation Committee. He also addressed concerns over additional traffic, his estimates of how big a factor that would be, and how they would limit effects on neighbors. Commission members expressed their satisfaction with the process that has been followed by staff, and their agreement with the findings of fact.

A neighbor named Vern, who works at a similar facility, expressed concern over distance to the train tracks and the lake and river for safety of residents. Tim, who lives nearby, stated that he believes he will be looking for this sort of facility in the future, and he thinks this is a really good plan, which may allow him to remain in Pine City, as he wishes. Mark Vanderhorck questioned whether transportation and traffic issues have been considered, and whether adequate time has been given for public comment. There was a question about how artifacts discovered on the property would be dealt with, with Zuber stated that his company has experience in that area. There were questions about costs of residency and other items that Zuber answered.

Earl Schuler objected to the proposed road, and said he didn’t feel we should be considering anyone in town but the current neighbors. There was a question about how sustainable the proposed development would be, in terms of occupancy levels. Zuber stated that he did not think that was a concern, based on the studies that have been done. There was a question about number of police and ambulances available in the community to answer calls from the facility, but no answers were known. Carl Anderson commented on soil conditions. Another commenter questioned the operation of the dam, and if that might change in the future in ways that would affect this property. There were complaints from Jeff and Holly Wilson about not being able to find Commission members’ phone numbers. They also asked about what has changed since 2001. She also questioned how the development could be done without causing a number of issues with trees and roads. Richard Novy gave the Commission minutes of the meeting in August of 2001, and asked what had changed. Holly Wilson again stated her displeasure with this proposal. Another neighbor expressed his concern with parking on First Street SE. Another audience member asked that we consider how this will affect staffing of the nursing home, feeling that at least half would be moving to work here.

There being no further discussion, Bombard made a motion to adopt the proposed findings of fact and Resolution P19-05, recommending that the Council grant the requested rezoning with the condition that section 10.700.0130 of the MDO (the Shoreland Ordinance) be complied with. Rydberg seconded the motion, which passed five to three with Skluzaçek, Jahnz, and Pettie opposed.

Discussion of Outdoor Sign Ordinance: Following discussion at several previous meetings and further modification to address concerns expressed, Sauter presented and explained her proposed updates to the Outdoor Sign Ordinance. She has discussed it with the Ordinance Review Committee, which recommended some additional changes. Sauter went through all the changes proposed at this point. There being no more discussion, Skluzaçek made a motion recommending the current draft to the Council. Pettie seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Discussion of Site Improvement and Citizen Planner Nomination Criteria: Sauter has developed some proposed eligibility criteria for these two awards, to make it clearer what projects and people would appropriately be nominated for the awards. Christopherson asked about the timeframe for nomination, and there was some discussion on changing from a set two years
to a more open-ended guideline. There was also discussion of who should present the award and where, and the Commission came to a consensus on some minor changes add flexibility to the language in that area. Sauter will bring an updated version to the next meeting.

City Council Feedback: Scholin reported that the Council had followed the Commission’s recommendations, approving the Valdovinos CUP, the Pine City Senior Living Preliminary Plat, CUP, and Development Site Plan, and the Hilltop Cottages Site Plan.

Commissioners’ Concerns: Skluzechek asked that someone look at traffic safety of Sixth Avenue SW in the area of the Elementary School. Rydberg asked that Public Works look at the condition of the pavement on the ends of streets. Skluzechek said he had concerns about lack of a southbound left turn lane, going into Casey’s. The Commission recalled discussing this during the development process, but that the County was resistant. The Commission discussed some other options to improve traffic in the area, particularly at the beginning and end of the school day, but none of them seemed easy to accomplish.

Staff Comments: Sauter explained an interpretation question about accessory buildings in commercial districts. It is not completely clear how this works with our ordinance. There is someone who would like to construct a large canopy, which exceeds 1008sf. The Commission consensus was that this is not allowed without a variance. Sauter will address it in that way.

There being no further business, Christopherson declared the Commission meeting adjourned at 8:01 pm.