

T. Sawatzky Yes No

D. Thieling Yes No

Chair M. Ness declared the motion carried.

Approval of Minutes

Motion by J. Ness to approve the minutes as presented.
Second by T. Sawatzky.

Roll Call Vote:

M. Ness Yes No

J. Ness Yes No

T. Sawatzky Yes No

D. Thieling Yes No

Chair M. Ness declared the motion carried.

Public Hearing 7:27-8:11p.m.

Notice is hereby given that on Tuesday, April 20, 2021, at 7:00 p.m.; or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, the Stacy Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on an application for a Zoning Amendment and Conditional Use Permit.

Property Address: 30360 Forest Blvd, Stacy MN 55079
Property ID: 19.00131.54

Rezone: The applicant would like to change the zoning of the property to GB-General Business from R3B-Apartments.

Conditional Use Permit: The applicant would like to build a mini-storage facility on the property.

All interested parties are encouraged to attend. All written and verbal testimony will be taken at this meeting and written testimony will be taken prior to the meeting.

Presentation

Jerry Anderson, presented information regarding the proposed project; they propose to build mini-storage at 30360 Forest Boulevard, he said that:

- The facility will be open 7a.m.-7p.m.
- The facility will be locked
- Renters will have background checks performed
- They will try and work with the neighboring property owners to address their concerns.

- The property is zoned for apartments, mini-storage would create less traffic.
- He could build potentially 160 apartments on the property
- Chisago County will not allow access to the property from County Road 30 (61).

Public Comment, not identified:

- What kind of signage for the property? (on the building)
- Does the developer have other similar projects? (in Forest Lake).
- Has the city requested access from 61? (yes, denied)
- Concern regarding people driving around the development out of curiosity.
- We have enough mini-storage in the area.

Rick Blackburn, 6020 302nd Street:

- Would prefer the apartments over mini-storage. However, he ultimately would like single family residential.
- Concern of impact on property taxes.
- The commission had made a recommendation on this item in January, why is it being discussed again (the developer did not receive notice of the hearing due to an address change).
- We still do not want this.
- Why are they doing this project now, why not apartments? (the property is recently paid off; the developer would like to build revenue generation).

Kris Blackburn, 6020 302nd Street:

- Said she appreciated the visit from Mr. Anderson regarding this project.
- Concern regarding the safety of children in the neighborhood.
- Safety of pedestrian traffic as there are no sidewalks in the neighborhood (Mr. Anderson said that he may be able to work with the property owners to address this concern, if it were only for a few homes).

- The mini-storage users have no vested interest in the community.

Jacob Brott, 30179 Foxtail Lane:

- He would prefer to see the storage facility rather than the apartments.
- The mini-storage in Forest Lake are nice.
- He would rent one of these units in Stacy.
- He does understand this would not be in his backyard.
- The county is being ridiculous about the access to 61.

The clerk read into the record an email received from Rob Krajewski, 30199 Foxtail Lane:

Hello, Sharon. Since the City Council meeting is on Tues and I will not be able to attend due to other commitments, I am re-asserting my position about the driveway being on 61 rather than through our neighborhood. Additionally, if the site is to become a mini-storage, I think a fence btw that property and those along 302nd (the south boundary) is necessary.

My key contribution is the need to have a driveway/entrance to this property directly from/to Hwy 61. If that is possible/granted, then I am relatively OK w/ the zoning change and the building of the mini-storage.

If the entrance MUST go through our neighborhood, then I reject this change to the zoning and would adamantly insist that any building done on that property be limited to that of fewer than 8 residential units (whether that be an apartment, attached/detached townhomes, connected single family housing units such as duplexes/triplexes/etc, or single family homes).

The amount and kind of traffic that this property generates is the driving force behind my opinion, knowing that people who are not invested in the neighborhood (b/c they are simply storing items OR b/c they are so numerous that they are 'disinterested') are likely to not care as much about those of us who live on/just off of 302nd; this will necessarily lead to

more carelessness in driving and less consideration in general. My house is right on the corner where the property's access would be if it were through our neighborhood...I can imagine how that corner will be more dangerous in a number of ways b/c of increased traffic, esp'ly that generated by a storage unit or by a multi-family residential structure/apartment building).

I am willing to discuss this further by email or by phone (in person and at meetings becomes more difficult for me b/c of both schedule and pandemic concerns). I appreciate the opportunity to express my concerns.

Member J. Ness asked what the residents would prefer, mini-storage or apartments? Only one answer received and that was single family residential.

Member M. Ness said that this project is a Planned Unit Development (PUD) and the city can place additional conditions on the project, such as the number of units, and building design materials.

Member J. Ness said that if a zoning change was requested there is not guarantee that it would be approved.

New Business

Action on Route 61 Mini-Storage

The purpose of the current zoning of R3B-Apartments is to allow a buffer between industrial and residential.

The Planning Commission did not change their original recommendation from their January 19, 2021, meeting.

The Findings of Fact will include:

1. The local residents are opposed to the zoning amendment; siting increased traffic, safety, and security concerns.
2. The current zoning is appropriate and meets the Comprehensive Plan.

3. The lack of additional access to the North to County Road 30 does not make this project practical at this time.

Motion by J. Ness to approve the Findings of Fact. Second by D. Thieling.

Roll Call Vote:

M. Ness Yes No J. Ness Yes No
T. Sawatzky Yes No D. Thieling Yes No

Chair M. Ness declared the motion carried.

SGSI Building Design

This item handled out of order by motion of M. Ness. Second by D. Thieling.

Roll Call Vote:

M. Ness Yes No J. Ness Yes No
T. Sawatzky Yes No D. Thieling Yes No

Chair M. Ness declared the motion carried.

City Planner, Phil Carlson, reviewed his email with the commission:

One issue that came up was the design of the building which they called a "pole barn". I pointed out to them that Zoning Code in 153.053(F) specifically notes that wood pole buildings are prohibited. Section (d) below deals only with the exterior, section (e) deals with the interior structure:

(d) In the case of metal buildings, the Planning Commission shall prefer masonry buildings; but other types of construction shall be considered during the plan review.

(e) Buildings with wood poles or timbers as the primary support for the roof system and form the foundation structure (pole buildings) and temporary construction are prohibited.

The builder and architect said they were looking for the same kind of approval that Northstar Insulation received, which is now being built as a wood frame building, clad in metal panels. I looked back at my files on Northstar and recall the discussion of the exterior but no record or mention of the interior structure. Was this understood at the time? I don't recall any discussion of the interior frame being wood.

I assume this section of the Code prohibiting wood pole barns goes back a generation or more when these were considered cheap, unattractive buildings. That may have changed. Generally, the Zoning Code deals with external impacts and leaves the interior structure to the building code.

It is ultimately up to the Stacy City Council to determine what building standards they want to encourage and require, but I wanted you to be aware that the question of wood pole barns was a surprise to me. If Northstar and other buildings are in fact acceptable I suggest the Zoning Code should be changed. If they are not acceptable, then the City should be aware of how recent buildings have been built that don't comply with the Code.

The commission determined it is the external structure that needs approval.



Motion by Ness to recommend approval of the building design for Service Grinding and Sharpening Inc., as presented with changing the lower four-feet of the front of the building to decorative brick and around the building to a matching four-foot color. Second by Thieling.

Roll Call Vote:

M. Ness Yes No
T. Sawatzky Yes No

J. Ness Yes No
D. Thieling Yes No

Chair M. Ness declared the motion carried.

**Recess Planning
Commission, Open Council
Special Session**

Motion by M. Ness to recess the Planning Commission meeting until after the City Council acts on the SGSI building design. Second by T. Sawatzky.

Roll Call Vote:

M. Ness Yes No
T. Sawatzky Yes No

J. Ness Yes No
D. Thieling Yes No

Chair M. Ness declared the motion carried.

Mayor Utecht called the Special Meeting of the City Council to order at 7:24p.m.

Council Action on SGSI

Motion by M. Utecht to adopt the findings of the Planning Commission and approve the SGSI building design. Second by T. Sawatzky.

Roll Call Vote:

M. Ness Yes No
T. Sawatzky Yes No
M. Utecht Yes No

M. Lawrence Yes No
J. Carlson Yes No

Mayor Utecht declared the motion carried.

Chair M. Ness called the Planning Commission back to order at 7:27p.m.

**Adjourn the Special Council
Meeting and Reconvene the
Planning Commission
Meeting**

Motion by M. Utecht to adjourn the Special Meeting. Second by M. Ness.

Roll Call Vote:

M. Ness Yes No
T. Sawatzky Yes No
M. Utecht Yes No

M. Lawrence Yes No
J. Carlson Yes No

Mayor Utecht declared the motion carried. Adjourned at 7:25p.m.

Chair M. Ness called the Planning Commission back to order at 7:27p.m.

Table Items

Motion by M. Ness to table the following items until the May meeting:

- 6A-Chapter 93 Streets and Sidewalks
- 6B-Building Design Standards
- 6C-Continue Review of the City Code

Second by J. Ness.

Roll Call Vote:

M. Ness Yes No

J. Ness Yes No

T. Sawatzky Yes No

D. Thieling Yes No

Chair M. Ness declared the motion carried.

Adjourned at 8:26p.m.

Chair M. Ness declared the meeting adjourned at 8:26p.m.

Sharon MT Payne