

**MINUTES  
PEQUOT LAKES PLANNING COMMISSION/  
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT  
REGULAR MEETING  
NOVEMBER 15, 2018**

PRESENT: Mark Hallan, Laura Larson, Nathan Norton, Christopher Savino, and Wesley Wilson. ABSENT: Andrew Birch

CITY PLANNER: Justin Burslie, Sourcewell

ZONING SPECIALIST: Dawn Bittner

COUNCIL LIAISON: Randy Loukota

Chair Hallan called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

**A motion was made by Planning Commission Member Wilson, seconded by Planning Commission Member Norton, to open the Public Hearings.**

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**APPLICANT: Robert Rickard**

**Applicant requests an Ordinance Amendment to expand the Offsite Sign Overlay District**

Mr. Burslie explained the Staff Report. Mr. Rickard was present.

Chair Hallan noted the Planning Commission will make a recommendation to the City Council. The final decision on the Ordinance Amendment will be made by the City Council.

Planning Commission Member Wilson asked if the application meets all of the requirements. Mr. Burslie stated the application is only to include the parcel in the Overlay District. The application for the sign will be a separate application to Staff.

Chair Hallan asked if this is the first application the City has received to expand the Offsite Sign Overlay District. Staff stated this is the first.

Planning Commission Member Wilson asked if this location is more than 2,000 feet from the existing City sign. Staff stated the location exceeds 2,000 feet.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

**A motion was made by Planning Commission Member Wilson, seconded by Planning Commission Member Norton, to recommend the City Council expand the Offsite Sign Overlay District. All members voted “aye”. Motion carried.**

**APPLICANTS: Kent and Pamela Johnson**

**Applicants propose a Conditional Use Permit to operate an Indoor Sports Facility in the Commercial zone**

Mr. Burslie explained the Staff Report. Applicant was present. Two letters have been received in support of this application.

Mr. Burslie asked the applicant to explain the Landscape Plan as a condition of approval be an acceptable screening plan that meets the ordinance. Mr. Johnson stated the stars on the Landscape Plan indicate existing trees; additional trees can be added between this building and the residential area after final grading. On the east side of the building they plan to plant 8 to 12 red twigged dogwoods to buffer that area in the spring.

Chair Hallan stated the Landscape Plan indicates a red area and asked what this indicates. Mr. Johnson stated that is the area where the dogwoods will be planted.

When asked by Chair Hallan, Mr. Burslie stated the ordinance requires 100% screening from a residential area and 50% screening requirement on the east side. If you were standing on the residential property looking toward the commercial property, you should not see the commercial building in mature, leaf-on conditions, or a fence. If you are standing on the right-of-way, you should only see 50% of the commercial property.

Chair Hallan noted that the Landscape Plan does not indicate 100% screening. Mr. Burslie stated it does not meet the 100% screening requirement.

Planning Commission Member Norton asked the applicant if the 100% requirement was understood prior to submittal. Mr. Johnson stated there was existing vegetation along the south line and during construction determined what was viable and what needed to be replaced. When asked, Mr. Burslie stated the 100% requirement is during leaf-on conditions.

Planning Commission Member Larson asked if any of the sports facility activities will be outside. Mr. Johnson stated all activities are planned to be conducted inside the building with no equipment outside. The only anticipated outdoor activity would be running sprints.

Chair Hallan stated that it appears substantial plantings will be required along the building.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

Mr. Burslie noted the two pieces of correspondence included in the packet from Andrea Nelson, Pequot Lakes Community Education Coordinator, and Brian Voigt, Central Lakes College Head Baseball Coach, are both in support of the application.

Chair Hallan noted Condition Number 2 refers to the Landscape Plan. The Landscape Plan provided is not adequate. It should designate the existing trees, type, height and any new ones to be planted. He suggested moving the date for planting implementation to be next fall rather than June. Mr. Burslie stated the Landscape Plan shall be submitted and approved by the Planning Commission before the Conditional Use Permit is issued. He suggested an approved plan be submitted prior to beginning operation.

Mr. Burslie asked Mr. Johnson when they plan to open the sports facility. Mr. Johnson stated mid-January. Mr. Burslie stated the Planning Commission does not meet in December and would not review the Landscape Plan until their January 17, 2019 meeting.

Chair Hallan suggested Condition Number 4 be added that a Landscape Plan meeting the requirements of the ordinance shall be submitted for the January 17 meeting for Planning Commission review and subsequent approval.

**A motion was made by Planning Commission Member Wilson, seconded by Planning Commission Member Savino, to approve the Conditional Use Permit to operate an Indoor Sports Facility in the Commercial zone, based on the following Findings of Fact:**

1. The conditional use permit request is to operate an indoor sports facility that will include concession area with a drive-thru window for coffee drinks and pre-packaged snacks in the Commercial zone.
2. The subject property is located at 28795 Peterson Path and is zoned Commercial.
3. The subject property is a conforming parcel. It contains an existing structure on the north end of the parcel that meets all setback requirements. There is a shed encroaching the north lot line that belongs to the property owner to the north. A Land Use Permit was recently issued for the construction of 4,800 square foot pole building for building contractor office and storage space. The parcel to the west contains an existing structure that meets all setback requirements. The parcel to the north contains a restaurant. The subject property surrounds two parcels on three sides. One of these parcels is vacant and the other contains a day care and a restaurant.
4. The subject property will be served by a private water well and a conforming private sewer system.

5. The proposed “use” is considered “Commercial Use (Other, Not Classified)” and requires a conditional use permit.
6. The proposed use, with conditions, conforms to the comprehensive plan.
7. The adjacent property is zoned “Rural Residential” and “Commercial”.
8. The proposed use is compatible with the existing neighborhood.
9. Signage will be applied for under separate Land Use Permit meeting Section 17-7.1 of the City Code.
10. The proposed use, with conditions, will not be injurious to the public health, safety, welfare, decency, order, comfort, convenience, appearance or prosperity of the City.
11. The conditional use, with conditions, will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity of the subject property.
12. The subject property is accessed via Peterson Path. There will not be a significant increase in traffic due to the proposed use. The public cost for facilities and services for the proposed development will not be detrimental to the economic welfare of the community.
13. The subject property is not served by the city sewer or water systems. There will be no additional costs to the city with the proposed use.
14. There is adequate off-street parking and loading space on the subject property for the proposed use.
15. The proposed use will not generate any offensive odor, fumes, dust, noise or vibrations that will be a nuisance to neighboring properties.
16. The proposed use will not destroy any natural or scenic features. There are no known historical features of major significance on the subject property.
17. The proposed use, with conditions, will promote the prevention and control of ground and surface waters.

And subject to the following Conditions:

1. There shall be no exterior storage of materials or equipment.
2. The Landscape Plan shall be implemented by September 30, 2019 and shall remain in a live state.
3. Signage shall be permitted by separate application.
4. A Landscape Plan meeting the requirements of the ordinance shall be submitted for the January 17 meeting for Planning Commission review and subsequent approval.

**All members voted “aye”. Motion carried.**

**APPLICANT: Nathan Walberg**

**Applicant requests a Conditional Use Permit to increase the parking area for used motor vehicle lot, and add maintenance and repair of customer owned vehicles, provide towing services, tire sales, and onsite sales and display of sawmills and related products in the Commercial Zone.**

MINUTES

Pequot Lakes Planning Commission  
November 15, 2018

Mr. Burslie explained the Staff Report. Applicant was present. Mr. Burslie explained this is an amendment to the existing CUP to include the additional items. Mr. Burslie stated the City has received complaints on this property and the Planning Commission visited this property a couple of years ago and identified vehicles parked outside of the designated areas and applicant moved the vehicles into the designated spaces. The City has again received complaints that vehicles are being parked in areas not designated to be parked.

Mr. Burslie stated the applicant's current CUP allows him to repair vehicles he owns, and he is now requesting to repair third-party vehicles. Applicant is also requesting to provide towing services from the property and tire sales and onsite sales and display of sawmills and related products.

Impervious coverage in the Commercial zone is 25%. The site plan indicates they are under the 32,550 sf limitation. The east portion of this property is zoned Commercial while the west portion is zoned Shoreline Residential. The types of uses we are discussing are not allowed in the Shoreline Residential zone, but are allowed in the Commercial zone with a Conditional Use Permit.

There are two Subsurface Sewage Treatment Systems (SSTS) on this property. The SSTS for the office building is compliant, while the SSTS for the dwelling has expired. Mr. Burslie stated he would like to add as a condition to obtain a Compliance Inspection on the SSTS for the dwelling.

The applicant has not indicated how the waste products from the general mechanic and repair business will be disposed of. This is addressed in the Conditions.

The site plan indicates areas for parking of vehicles. Each area includes a portion described as green space. Mr. Burslie stated this will need to be discussed further. Parking areas are usually designated as the entire parking area, not individual parking spaces with green space between.

Mr. Burslie stated these are allowed uses, with conditions, with a Conditional Use Permit. Reasonable conditions can be included as part of the CUP. Rarely are Conditional Use Permits denied.

Mr. Burslie read the proposed Conditions and changed the first sentence of Condition 4 to read: A floor drain/oil, water or sediment trap shall be installed in the auto repair area in accordance with MPCA's best management practices. This information is included in the packet. Mr. Burslie pointed out the information from the MPCA regarding oil and related waste that encourages installation of a floor drain with a water and oil separator into an SSTS, rather than a holding tank.

Planning Commission Member Norton stated he thought a flammable waste trap was a requirement. Mr. Burslie stated he didn't see where it was required, but the City has the ability to require it as part of the CUP. Chair Hallan stated that the Plumbing Code states the decision will go back to local jurisdiction for requirements. This waste will also need to go to a holding tank, never into an SSTS. There is no municipal sanitary sewer at this location.

Chair Hallan noted a site plan had been received, but we usually see a certificate of survey for the entire lot showing features that includes setbacks, parking, etc. Mr. Burslie stated it is not a requirement in the ordinance, but the City could require one. Typically we receive detailed site plans.

Planning Commission Member Wilson asked if a screening plan was required in the original CUP. Chair Hallan stated it was a condition, but Staff doesn't recall if it was received or not.

Mr. Walberg stated he read the Staff Report online and regarding the floor drain contacted Bob Bartel for a design. Mr. Bartel stated with the information he had, he was not able to give a quote. Tank size is unknown, floor drain size unknown. Mr. Bartel said he wanted to come to a Planning Commission meeting to ask questions. Mr. Burslie stated the City would rely on the licensed SSTS Designer to provide the capacity. Chair Hallan stated it could also be designed by a licensed plumber as this is part of the Plumbing Code.

Mr. Walberg stated he is not looking to implement this immediately. He is not looking to do work on customer owned vehicles currently. He is probably not looking to do towing services currently. He just doesn't want to come back every couple of years so he basically included a 10-year plan.

Chair Hallan stated this may get tabled this evening and thanked Mr. Walberg for his input. There is a lot of information that needs to be discussed.

Chair Hallan stated that working with other communities, it is very common for someone operating a towing facility that certain vehicles brought in need to be fenced or secured for police or sheriff. If towing is going to be considered as part of this CUP, Mr. Walberg should look into that further.

Planning Commission Member Norton inquired whether or not there was a flammable waste trap installed now for the work being done. Mr. Walberg stated there is not. He doesn't change oil but does a little transmission work. He doesn't anticipate doing oil changes for customers. Chair Hallan stated the application does include service and repair. Mr. Walberg stated he doesn't see his company wanting to do oil changes for customers.

Planning Commission Member Norton inquired about the change in area from 16,000 sf to 40,000 sf. Mr. Walberg stated the vehicles are now crammed in small areas and it is difficult to make them look presentable. What he is looking to do is expand and use more of the 600 feet he is allowed, have them parked neater and be less visible.

When asked by Planning Commission Member Norton if he planned on paving or using class 5 on the parking areas, Mr. Walberg stated he had no plans for that. Mr. Walberg did state he would like to place a fence along the neighbor to the south.

Planning Commission Member Norton asked how many additional vehicles there would be. Mr. Walberg stated he had not done the math and that he is not looking to have that many vehicles, just the option to do it. This time of year he takes in a number of trade-ins and hopefully the trade-ins can be moved during tax season.

Chair Hallan stated it is much simpler to establish a number of units, whether it be vehicles or something, that will be on this property at any given time. He would like to see a site plan showing areas proposed for parking vehicles and an established number of vehicles for that area. Mr. Walberg stated the last CUP discussion he was told he wouldn't be given a number of vehicles because he is limited by the space. He is limited by the 600 feet.

When asked by Mr. Burslie if he kept the vehicles in the areas allowed, Mr. Walberg stated there are a few outside of those areas; that is why he wants to amend his CUP to get those vehicles into an approved area.

Mr. Burslie stated when we look at this from an enforcement issue, it is much easier to enforce a specific number of vehicles or sawmills, or whatever it is, as opposed to go out there and measure and stake areas out. He recommends using a specific number.

Chair Hallan requested the number of vehicles for each area be included on a new site plan. The impervious area is calculated for the entire parking area, not each parking space.

Mr. Walberg asked if it is typical for a city to limit the number of cars for a used car lot? Does Baxter limit the number of vehicles Dondelinger can have on their lot? Mr. Burslie stated it is usually based on impervious surface coverage and it would be within the city's right to do that. Mr. Burslie stated there have been a number of complaints on this property and a specific number would make it easier to enforce the CUP. Mr. Walberg stated he does not feel a specific number is generally done. He offered to check with other car dealers or the car dealer association for clarification.

Chair Hallan stated regardless of that, there will need to be a scalable site plan showing the proposed parking areas on which the impervious is based on

Mr. Burslie stated that Baxter does require their car dealers to pave their parking areas and have a stormwater management plan that is usually created by a licensed engineer. He felt it would not be unreasonable to be either class 5 or paved. Mr. Walberg stated paving and/or class 5 with a stormwater plan would be cost prohibitive.

Planning Commission Member Norton favored using a number of vehicles or units given the history of complaints and it would seem to be easier for the applicant to know how many vehicles can be there.

Planning Commission Member Wilson stated he would like to see a fence along the south lot line. Mr. Walberg agreed.

Planning Commission Member Larson asked if the abandoned motor vehicle condition from the original CUP is covered in the new conditions. Mr. Burslie stated the previous conditions would still be in effect and staff should have included those in this amendment.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Lucas McCoy. The old permit only allowed use of half of the property in the 600 foot commercial portion and only use 25% of that. That was restricting. Now Mr. Walberg will be able to use all of the commercial property, but only 25% can be used. The plan states where everything would go.

Mr. Walberg stated he thought he may have been restricted to only half of the area in the original CUP because he was a tenant. He now owns all of the property.

Chair Hallan stated he will be looking for a scalable plan, including setbacks and parking areas. Mr. Walberg had stated earlier that he planning on what could take place in the next 10 years, so we will be looking for specific areas and number of vehicles in those areas.

Mr. McCoy stated at this point they don't know which way the business will go; they may start selling more sawmills. Mr. Walberg stated he is the only dealer for Hudson sawmills and sells them in North Dakota and Michigan.

Mr. Burslie stated 3 letters had been received from Megan Carlson, Watt Automotive, Andy Kratochvil, Fish Lectronics, and Gregory Seils, Crow Wing Auto Body. All 3 of these were in opposition of the CUP request. Most had concerns regarding the appearance of the property.

Chair Hallan closed Public Comment.

Since the Planning Commission does not meet in December, Chair Hallan wondered if the applicant had to agree to a table this evening. Mr. Burslie stated the City has 60 days to review the application and can extend the review period once for another 60 days. The applicant would have to waive the 60-Day Rule for a second extension.

Mr. Walberg asked if he could comment on the 3 letters received. These are all businesses in the area. They are all complaining about mess. He doesn't like to complain, but he is constantly picking up trash from neighboring businesses.

If there is no strong desire for approval or denial, Chair Hallan stated he would request Staff to work with the applicant to receive further information for the January meeting. Chair Hallan requested Staff to research the previous CUP to see if the Landscape Plan was received. If there is none, applicant will need to submit a Landscape Plan meeting the requirements of the ordinance. Applicant should indicate location of all existing trees on the Landscape Plan. Update the site plan showing specific dimensions, setbacks and the number of vehicles designated for each parking area. Even if an area isn't planned to be used for 10 years, show it on the plan because it becomes part of the CUP. Also indicate the specific location for the fence, the length, height and type of fence construction.

Mr. Walberg asked if the screening is only required along the highway. Chair Hallan stated the screening is only along the highway as the adjacent properties are Commercial. Mr. Burslie stated the parcel to the south is actually Recreation and would require 50% screening, even though it is only a narrow strip.

Chair Hallan also stated a Compliance Inspection will need to be received for the SSTS for the dwelling.

Mr. Walberg asked if a fence would meet the screening requirement. Chair Hallan stated it would. Mr. Walberg also asked if the trees within the right-of-way would count toward the 50% screening. Mr. Burslie stated that trees within the Patriot Avenue right-of-way would not count toward the 50% screening. Mr. Walberg stated the neighboring businesses don't have 50% screening. Chair Hallan explained those businesses were permitted many years ago under a different ordinance. Mr. Walberg stated with the trees in the right-of-way and adding 50% screening, his business would not be visible from the road. The right-of-way is very wide in this area.

Council Member Loukota noted trees could be planted in the 10-foot setback area. He further noted he doesn't agree with the ordinance and screening a business from the roadway is not a favorable idea. Maybe this is something the Planning Commission can revisit in the future.

**A motion was made by Planning Commission Member Wilson, seconded by Planning Commission Member Savino, to table this application to the January 17, 2019 Planning Commission meeting. All members voted “aye”. Motion carried.**

**A motion was made by Planning Commission Member Wilson, seconded by Planning Commission Member Norton, to close the Public Hearings. All members voted “aye”. Motion carried.**

**ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS TO AGENDA:** None.

**OPEN FORUM:** None.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**a. Anton Dabbs, After-the-Fact Permit**

Mr. Burslie explained the Staff Report. Applicant was present.

Planning Commission Member Wilson asked if the contractor said he did get the permit. Applicant stated the contractor said he pulled the permit. The County Assessor was out and noted that there was no permit for the accessory structure.

Chair Hallan asked if the 10' X 20' accessory structure is non-conforming. Mr. Dabbs stated it has been removed.

When asked, Chair Hallan stated Staff is looking for the after-the-fact permit amount. With the removal of the driveway, the impervious coverage is now very low.

Planning Commission Member Larson asked the applicant if he removed the driveway prior to constructing the garage. Mr. Dabbs stated it was removed after contacting Staff regarding the permit.

Planning Commission Member Norton asked Mr. Burslie to repeat the fees. Mr. Burslie stated the original permit fee would have been \$125 or 5 times would be \$625. The minimum after-the-fact fee is \$300.

Planning Commission Norton noted their predicament and willingness to make things right, and asked if there an option to waive the fee all together? Bittner stated Staff and the Planning Commission do not have that authority. Chair Hallan stated the Planning

Commission would have to make a recommendation to the City Council for a reduced fee.

**A motion was made by Planning Commission Member Savino, seconded by Planning Commission Member Wilson, to establish the After-the-Fact permit fee at \$300. All members voted "aye". Motion carried.**

**b. Virgil Dahl, Land Use Permit Extension**

Mr. Burslie explained the Staff Report. Applicant was present.

Chair Hallan asked if there were any outstanding violations. Bittner stated the City Administrator and Police Chief have been monitoring this and the City has not received any complaints.

Planning Commission Member Norton asked if the permit is extended now, what happens if it needs to be extended again. Mr. Burslie stated the applicant would need to apply for a new permit.

Mr. Dahl stated he had received a permit in 2016 to build a cabin. Then the City said that he wasn't compliant and took all his stuff, and his building materials. Then he received another permit to build, but it should have been an extension of the first one.

Discussion ensued regarding fees paid for permits. Staff stated the original payment was credited toward the permit issued after the property was brought into compliance.

Chair Hallan asked Mr. Dahl how much construction has been completed. Mr. Dahl stated footings have been installed. Chair Hallan asked Staff if the July 1 date was a one year extension or if that was the date requested by applicant. Staff indicated Mr. Dahl had stated he could complete construction by July 1, 2019. Chair Hallan noted an applicant several months ago was granted a longer time to complete construction as it would be her last extension.

Staff asked applicant if he understood what Mr. Hallan was asking. Mr. Hallan was asking if applicant felt he could complete construction by July 1, 2019 or extend it out further. Mr. Dahl stated extending it out as far as possible would help. He stated his nephews are willing to help him with the construction when they have time off or on weekends.

Chair Hallan revised the date to complete construction to September 30, 2019, which essentially gives him the entire construction season.

**A motion was made by Planning Commission Member Norton, seconded by Planning Commission Member Larson, to extend the Land Use Permit**

**completion date to September 30, 2019. All members voted “aye”. Motion carried.**

Mr. Dahl questioned the certification to taxes for the last cleanup. Chair Hallan stated that the Planning Commission does not make decisions regarding taxes. Bittner stated the tax certification meeting was at the Council meeting the previous evening. Mr. Dahl asked why he wasn't informed of that. Bittner stated he had been notified; she sent him a letter. Mr. Dahl stated he received a letter for tonight's meeting. Bittner stated she also sent him a letter for the tax certification prior to the letter for tonight's meeting. Mr. Dahl asked when the next tax meeting would be. Bittner explained because he hadn't appeared at the Council meeting the previous night, the amount was certified to his taxes payable in 2019. Mr. Dahl stated he wanted to appeal it to the Board. Bittner advised him to contact Nancy Malecha the following day to see if there was a way to appeal the certification. Mr. Dahl stated the letter had said there was an application to complete if you were disabled. Bittner stated he would need to talk to Nancy Malecha, the City Administrator; she would be able to help him.

Mr. Dahl asked if the wood that was taken in the dumpster was taken to the landfill. Bittner stated she was not onsite that day and is not aware of what transpired that day. Mr. Dahl stated more than 3 cords of wood was placed in the dumpster and it was taken to the roll-off owner's husband's car lot. They took \$1,700 worth of wood and are burning the wood up there. Bittner advised him to talk to Nancy Malecha about that as she was not there that day. He wanted to know where to go to complain about this. Chair Hallan stated Staff has advised him to contact Nancy Malecha the following day during business hours.

Mr. Dahl stated there has been a lot of thievery going on and it makes him sick. Mr. Dahl was very upset that the City takes his property and charges him for it. Chair Hallan advised him to present his information to the City Council for their action.

Mr. Dahl requested a copy of the Minutes.

### **c. Heart of the Good Life Development – Discussion**

Mr. Burslie explained the Staff Report. Discussion ensued regarding the uses in the Business Park and if we should establish a zoning classification specific for this area. The City may want to see where the free market is leading and be willing to work with the new businesses. This may become a type of a business park or more light industrial uses. A buffer may be needed between commercial type uses and our Business Park.

Kelly Woodman, a community member, stated there will be fundraisers and seeking donations to market this area. When asked where the donations would come from or go to, Ms. Woodman stated the Community Foundation is driving the HOTGL. The

Community Foundation will be asking for donations for marketing and doing fundraisers.

Council Member Loukota inquired if this area could be residential. Mr. Burslie stated residential uses are not allowed in the Commercial zone. Chair Hallan stated this area had not been discussed as a residential area; Bittner stated the Economic Development Commission had looked into residential uses, but due to its location, residential uses were not suitable.

This is a very visual park and the Planning Commission offered the following:

- Include landscape standards;
- Include architectural standards;
- Keep the uses market driven;
- Create a new zoning classification for this area;
- Light Industrial uses should be in Phase One;
- Define the general type of uses desired;
- The Planning Commission likes the design, as presented.

#### **OLD BUSINESS:**

##### **a. Short-term Rental Ordinance**

Chair Hallan stated the Planning Commission has reviewed several drafts and this final draft is ready for Council approval. Mr. Burslie explained this does not require a Public Hearing as it is not part of the Land Use and Subdivision Ordinance.

Chair Hallan provided the new ordinance for Lake Shore, which is more restrictive and requires more documentation and submittals.

Bittner reported she spoke with the Lake Shore City Administrator regarding their permit fees. Our Planning Commission had discussed a fee of \$25 per year. Lake Shore has been charging \$50 per year for a permit, but will likely increase this to \$75 per year to cover staff time. Bittner suggested \$50 per year for a permit, rather than the \$25 discussed earlier. It was the consensus of the Planning Commission for the fee to be \$75 per year.

**A motion was made by Planning Commission Member Wilson, seconded by Planning Commission Member Savino, to recommend the City Council approve the ordinance amendment. All members voted "aye". Motion carried.**

##### **b. Exterior Storage Ordinance**

Mr. Burslie explained the Exterior Storage Ordinance applies to all properties, regardless of their zone. Last month, the Planning Commission discussed different

MINUTES

Pequot Lakes Planning Commission  
November 15, 2018

zones could have different needs for exterior storage. Staff created the matrix included in the Staff Report differentiating zones and exterior storage uses.

The description for Agriculture and Forest Management needs to be corrected because they are not on public waters.

Mr. Burslie pointed out the definition for the Public and Light Industrial zone and asked if there should be 100% screening from right-of-ways, as well as adjacent properties. That could be decreased to 50%.

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to review this again in January and hold the Public Hearing in February.

**c. 2018 City Work Plan**

Mr. Burslie explained Bittner had drafted a letter to the City Council outlining the completion of projects by the Planning Commission as directed by the Council.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**A motion was made by Planning Commission Member Wilson, seconded by Planning Commission Member Norton, to approve the October 18, 2018 Planning Commission Minutes. All members voted "aye". Motion carried.**

**P & Z ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT:**

Bittner pointed out the 8 permits issued in October and the 14 letters sent since the last meeting.

Bittner reminded Commission Members Hallan, Savino and Norton to complete their applications for re-appointment to the Planning Commission by December 14.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

**A motion was made by Planning Commission Member Wilson, seconded by Planning Commission Member Norton, to adjourn the meeting. All members voted "aye". Motion carried.** The meeting was adjourned at 8:54 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Dawn Bittner  
Zoning Specialist

MINUTES  
Pequot Lakes Planning Commission  
November 15, 2018