



**MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
May 10, 2011**

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:33 p.m. by Chair Crump.

Present: Commission Members Kelley, Crump, Hughes, and Loosen; City Councilmember Goodwin; City Administrator, Terry Post; Planning Consultant, Ann Perry, and City Councilmember Skjaret.

Absent: Commissioner Jeff Stephenson (excused absence).

APPROVE AGENDA

City Administrator Post requested to add an item to the agenda following item 6A, Informal Presentation by Sports Dome business owner Donny Mark .

Commissioner Kelley moved to approve the agenda as amended. Commissioner Hughes seconded. Ayes: all.

CONSENT AGENDA

A. Minutes of the April 12, 2011 Planning Commission Meeting

Commissioner Hughes moved to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Commissioner Loosen seconded. Ayes: all.

OPEN CORRESPONDENCE

None.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Planning Case #2011-02 Long Lake Assisted Living, 345 Brown Road N; Expansion of Nonconforming Structure

City Administrator Post reported that notice of the meeting had been sent to residents as tonight's discussion includes a public hearing.

Planning Consultant Perry reviewed the staff report for the Planning Commission. She reviewed the request in comparison to the ordinance of the City which regulates nonconforming structures. She explained that the current owner had previously split a portion of the property into a separate lot and reviewed conditions of approval for that request which had been approved by the City Council. She advised that the proposed addition to the building would not change any of the existing nonconforming issues. She

stated that the parking provided on Brown Road is a safety issue and staff recommends that, should this request be approved, the parking along Brown Road should be addressed. She reviewed the items that the Commission should discuss tonight in regard to the request.

Chair Crump confirmed that the hardcover percentage had not been completed at this time. He also questioned the status of the landscaping and conditions of the previous approval.

Planning Consultant Perry advised that the landscaping and pavement removal are the only conditions of that approval which had not yet been completed.

Chair Crump opened the public hearing at 6:44 p.m.

Neil Weber stated that he is the project architect and was representing the applicant, whom is out of town. He commented that the landscaping had not been completed at this time as the previous condition required that to be done when the parcel is sold. He advised that the remaining landscaping and pavement removal would occur with this project. He advised that currently there are 30 rooms and the addition would provide two floors of rooms, for a total of 40. He noted that a community room would also be included in the addition and advised of other areas in the floor plan which would change with this project. He displayed the proposed materials for the addition and explained that the intent is to have more of a residential aesthetic rather than commercial. He addressed the parking along Brown Road and advised that within the past seven years there have not been any safety issues resulting from that parking. He explained that the parking stalls provide handicap access to the building and proposed three parallel parking spaces in that area, two of which would be marked for handicap access. He stated that a neighborhood meeting was held and an issue with the existing lighting of the building had been brought up and will be addressed.

Commissioner Kelley questioned if additional staff would be required with the additional beds being provided and whether additional parking would be needed.

Mr. Weber reviewed the parking requirements.

Mike Besky, Operations Manager, advised that one staff member may be added during the daytime. He advised that only two residents own vehicles and they are seldom used.

City Administrator Post questioned the effect the addition would have on winter snow storage.

Mr. Besky highlighted the portion of the property currently used for snow storage and did not think that this addition would interfere.

Michael Helm, 316 Charles, questioned the status of the vacant lot. He questioned if the lot could be sold as a residential lot.

Mr. Besky did not believe that the lot was currently listed for sale.

Planning Consultant Perry advised that the lot is zoned R3 which would be residential.

Mr. Helm questioned the benefit to the City of Long Lake should this project be approved. He asked if the residents spend money at local businesses and the effect the addition could have on the vacant lot and the probability of that lot to sell.

Mr. Weber advised that the addition would allow more housing for seniors within the community. He confirmed that the residents to use local businesses. He advised that the proposed materials would reduce the impact of the site and attempt to blend the building in with the residential area.

Mr. Helm stated that he believed the proposed community room would face the residential homes in that area and could be viewed as an invasion of privacy. He questioned if the design could be amended to face the community room in another area.

Mr. Weber stated that the proposed design is the most logical. He advised that the project does meet setbacks and is no different than any other multi-family residential unit.

Chair Crump advised that the screening required for the vacant lot would provide 50 percent screening immediately and 100 percent screening within ten years.

Mr. Helm commented that the community room window would not be screened at all from the neighbors.

Chair Crump commented that there are several properties in the City of Long Lake, which if a homeowner is on their deck or screened porch, there are at least two to three other screened porches or decks facing each other. He questioned how that would be any different than this property.

Mr. Besky explained the proposed design and noted that the community room on the end of the addition is vaulted and therefore there would not be any second level bedrooms facing those properties. He advised that the only view out of the community room would be on the first level.

Joan Grimes, 296 Charles, stated that although she understands the benefit for the business she did not agree with the expansion of the property.

Mr. Helm commented on the high percentage of hardcover should this addition be built.

Chair Crump advised that the Commission would review that issue and questioned if the lot could be re-incorporated into the property rather than sold.

Mr. Besky advised that the vacant lot is owned by the State and not the assisted living facility.

Ms. Grimes stated that although she did not mind the facility in the community she did not believe that the use should be intensified and commented on other items which she felt were not neighborly, such as the garbage not being covered.

Mr. Helm stated that he understood that there may have been miscommunications between the prior owner and the current owner over which items needed to be completed, such as the landscaping and garbage enclosure. He stated that the addition would provide benefit to

the business owner but he did not feel that any benefit would be provided to the homeowners in that area. He questioned if any thought had been given to the additional medical and emergency services which may be needed.

Mr. Besky stated that he was unsure the effect that the added residents would have.

Mr. Helm advised that 11 medical calls were made to the facility in the past year.

Chair Crump estimated that approximately three or four additional medical calls could be generated using the average from the past year. He advised that all homeowners pay property taxes for those services.

Commissioner Loosen recognized the concerns of Mr. Helm but noted that the business owner also has fundamental right to develop his property. He provided an example of Mr. Helm's home which was built eight years prior and the property owners that opposed that home because of the proposed height. He advised that Mr. Helm's home was still allowed to be built and noted that the business owner also has the right to develop their property. He stated that the Commission is meant to review the proposed project and ensure that it is acceptable to the standards of the community. He advised that the City Council could reject the project but the Commission is only meant to ensure that building codes and ordinances are met. He believed that this project was good for the community overall and did not feel that the addition would cause the building to be too large.

Chair Crump advised that the proposed material is residential in nature and could be used on any home in that area. He questioned if the neighbors favored the proposed materials.

Mr. Helm stated that he did not have any problems with the proposed materials. He stated that if the project is to move forward he would like to see additional trees or larger trees which could provide additional screening to the neighboring properties.

Mr. Weber stated that he was unaware of the landscaping required until discussions with Planning Consultant Perry and had no problem completing that screening. He stated that he would be open to additional landscaping ideas as well.

Chair Crump encouraged the property owner to move forward with the required landscaping and pavement removal conditioned by the previous request. He believed it would be beneficial for the property owner to complete those items prior to the review by the City Council.

Mr. Helm believed that a condition should be added regarding the maintenance of the trees planted as well. He also wanted to ensure that the garbage enclosure was built.

Chair Crump closed the public hearing at 7:25 p.m.

Commissioner Loosen questioned if 12 foot trees could be planted rather than six foot trees.

Chair Crump suggested a fence which would be a less costly option. He commented that the fence would provide immediate screening to the neighboring properties.

Mr. Weber stated that he would not be opposed to a fence.

Commissioner Kelley moved to recommend approval of an expansion to the nonconforming structure located at 345 Brown Road based on the findings in the staff report and the conditions noted in the staff report, with the addition of the following conditions, enclosure of the garbage, Hennepin County approval of the proposed parallel parking off Brown Road, that the lighting glare be addressed, and a fence is constructed to provide additional screening. Commissioner Hughes seconded. Ayes: all.

B. Informal Presentation by Sports Dome Business

Commissioner Hughes disclosed that he and Mr. Mark may be business partners.

Donny Mark displayed a proposed sketch of his property and advised that his intent would be to provide additional outdoor use of the property. He highlighted the existing dome and mini-putt locations and advised that he would like to build a field area, which could be used for soccer or volley ball in the summer and could be boarded and flooded to provide an ice rink in the winter.

Chair Crump stated that he believed it was a good idea but reminded the property owner to invest in the proper setup and equipment to maintain a good aesthetic for the area.

Mr. Mark reviewed the proposed type of lighting for the area.

City Administrator Post advised that a formal land use application has not been submitted by Mr. Mark at this time and noted that an amendment to the current conditional use permit would be required.

Chair Crump expressed concern over the possibility that the setback could be encroached. He believed that the idea was good and would be a good investment for the site and the property. He advised that the area should be given substantial design thought.

Mr. Mark advised of the materials he would be using for the area, such as turf. He advised that 72 parking stalls would be provided with this new utilization of the property.

Planning Consultant Perry confirmed that the parking provided would meet the city ordinance.

Chair Crump stated that he was excited to see the plans come through to the City.

City Administrator Post advised that if the application is submitted the Planning Commission would review this item at the June meeting.

C. Green Technology Subcommittee Preliminary Recommendations

Planning Consultant Perry advised that the Commission would review draft language at the June meeting and a public hearing would be held at the July meeting. She stated that the Subcommittee had provided good direction and suggestion.

OTHER BUSINESS

Council Liaison Report

Councilmember Skjaret stated that he brought forward the ideas of sustainability in regard to green technologies and advised that the Council would like to keep the issues separate. He advised that following the green technologies recommendations the Council would like the Commission to focus on rental housing and registering those properties. He stated that the Council was in agreement with the idea of presenting a green technologies award to the "greenest" resident or business and noted that the parameters could be sent to the Council for approval. He provided an update regarding the lighting of a berm within the City. He advised that the Council met with the Orono Council in regard to the Hennepin County CSAH 112 Turnback. He advised that Hennepin County would prefer that the Commission be formed of residents and others, such as Commissioners, rather than City Council members, to provide input in planning for the future turnback project. He advised of a rowing regatta event which would be held on June 11, 2011. He reported that the following week of June Summer Fest would begin and would cap off on June 25th with fireworks. He noted that the insurance salvage company had moved out of their Daniels Street building and Tonka Auto and Marine is interested in the site for auto and marine repair and storage. He explained that marine storage is currently not allowed but did not see why the function could not be allowed.

City Administrator Post stated that if marine storage was allowed it would also be allowed for other properties in the I-1 zoning district.

Chair Crump stated that he did not see a problem with marine storage as long as sufficient screening was provided.

Planning Consultant Perry stated that the 25% outside storage requirements may also be an issue.

Commission Member Business

Commissioner Loosen asked the thoughts of the Commission regarding an expired sign ordinance and whether that would be something the City should consider. He asked that staff research the issue further. He asked how the Council was progressing regarding the cutting of larger trees on residential property.

Councilmember Skjaret advised that the Council has not had much discussion regarding that item and is instead focusing on the Emerald Ash Borer.

Staff Business

City Administrator Post stated that the Council had given him authorization to begin a preliminary process to purchase the property owned by MnDOT near City Hall. He noted that property values have decreased in the City of Long Lake and the effect that may have on the local property tax rate.

Planning Consultant Perry advised of the items that would be discussed at the June meeting.

ADJOURN

Commissioner Kelley moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:13 p.m. Commissioner Hughes seconded. Ayes: all.

Respectfully submitted,

Terry Post
City Administrator