



Planning Commission of Pine City, Minnesota

Minutes of Regular Meeting: 30 June 2020

Commissioners Present in Person: none

Commissioners Present by Electronic Means: Bombard, Clark, Jahnz, Pettie, Scholin, Skluzacek

City Staff / Officials Present by Electronic Means: Andy Luedtke, Sauter

Absent: D'Aigle, LeMier, Rydberg, Student Representative Graci Huff

Others Present by Electronic Means: Jamison Kohout, Terri and Rich Prihoda, D. Metz

Sauter, running RingCentral for the electronic meeting, called the meeting to order at 6:32pm. *Minutes of the March 24th meeting were approved as written, on a motion by Skluzacek, seconded by Bombard. All voted in favor.*

New Member Introduction: Mark Clark was introduced as our new member, replacing Frank Christopherson.

Election of Officers: After several months' delay due to difficulties and cancellations related to the pandemic, election of officers was held. *Skluzacek nominated himself to be Chair. Pettie seconded the nomination. No others were nominated, and he was elected unanimously. Next, Bombard was nominated by Pettie for the position of Vice-Chair, with Skluzacek seconding. Again, there were no other nominations, and the Commission voted unanimously for Bombard. Finally, Jahnz nominated Scholin to continue in his position as Secretary, and Skluzacek seconded the nomination. With no other nominations, Scholin was elected unanimously. Skluzacek took over running the meeting.*

Public Hearing on Hilltop Cottages Development Site Plan Amendment Request: Since approval of the Hilltop Cottages Development Site Plan, the developer has requested that condition 8, permission for public use of the playground area in lieu of land or monetary contribution, be eliminated so as to now not require any contribution. The public hearing was called to order at 6:41pm, to allow for public input into this proposal. There was no one in attendance wishing to speak to this proposal, so the hearing was closed at 6:42pm.

Consideration of Hilltop Cottages Site Plan Amendment: With no further discussion, *Pettie made a motion to adopt Resolution P20-05, recommending that the Council approve the site plan amendment as proposed, allowing the development to proceed with no contribution for parks. Bombard seconded the motion. Scholin expressed some concern that this could set a bad precedent for future developments. The motion passed by a vote of 5 to 1, with Scholin opposed.*

Public Hearing on Pine City Senior Living Request for Extension of Development Site Plan Approval: Pine City Senior Living received approval of a Development Site Plan last year for their proposed 103-unit senior facility in the Northridge Business Park. However, due to the current situation with the pandemic, construction has not yet begun, and the site plan has expired. The developer has applied for approval of an extension to this plan, and also to modify the sidewalk condition, and staff have prepared resolution P20-06, recommending that the Council grant this extension. This hearing was called to order at 6:47pm, to allow public input on this proposal. Sauter explained the changes since the last action. Other than the timeline extension, the significant change is to allow a payment in lieu of the sidewalk installation, since there are no other sidewalks to connect with. Pettie asked how this payment would work, and Sauter explained the process. There being no further comment, Skluzacek closed the hearing at 6:50pm.

Consideration of Pine City Senior Living Development Site Plan Extension: After brief discussion, *Pettie made a motion to adopt Resolution P20-06, recommending Council approval of the extension to the site plan timelines and the change to sidewalk fees. Bombard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.*

Report on Zoning Permits: Andy Luedtke, the Safety Inspector, reported on zoning permits to date, which have been more numerous than expected. A large number of them have been for fences, which has exposed some weaknesses in the Ordinance wording (see the next item).

Discussion of Fences on Corner Lots: Sauter explained a bit more about the issues that have come to light with MDO wording on corner lots and fences, and inconsistencies between sections. She has prepared a handout summarizing the requirements. There was discussion of how this could be fixed, and a consensus that it may take a change in the Ordinance wording defining “front yards” on corner lots, and several related definitions.

In one particular case, the Hegge car wash, a fence was required by the CUP, but there is inconsistency with other MDO language, so no fence has yet been installed. There was discussion of what should be done about this particular situation, and Terri and Rich Prihoda commented on this. They do not think adding a fence will help. They would prefer some sort of sound-absorbing wall. Sauter said that staff will continue to work with Hegge on this issue, and see what can be done to help.

Discussion on Exterior Finish Requirements for Accessory Structures: Sauter and Luedtke explained a summary sheet for regulations applied to accessory structures in residential districts. One of the questions that has come up is with application of requirements that accessory structures must match the exterior look of the principal structure. The MDO contains the statement, “Brick, stucco and stone dwelling shall justify a variance for an accessory building.” In the past, this has been interpreted as an exception to the requirement, so that no variance is required, but staff are seeking clarification on this. The consensus was that this past interpretation should continue, and the language should be changed to indicate this as an exception, rather than justification for a variance. Staff will move this change forward.

City Council Feedback: Scholin reported that the Council approved the City lot rearrangement at Hilltop Recreation Area, as recommended at the last Planning Commission meeting.

Commissioners’ Concerns: none

Staff Comments: Sauter said that she has been discussing with the developers the subdivision permission granted to developers of the former Gail Motel property. They now would like to keep the parcel intact. *A motion was made by Bombard, seconded by Jahnz, to remove the subdivision requirement granted a few months ago. The motion passed unanimously.*

Sauter also explained a potential request to open a tattoo parlor in the CBD. The ordinance was changed in 1999 to allow this use conditionally in the CBD, but then changed again in 2006 so that now it does not allow this use in any location where it would likely occur. The consensus was that staff should develop an ordinance revision to once again allow tattoo parlors in the CBD.

There being no further business, *Skruzacek declared the meeting adjourned at 7:53pm on a motion by Pettie, seconded by Jahnz.*