

**CITY OF CROSSLAKE
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION/CITY COUNCIL
SPECIAL JOINT MEETING
9:00 A.M., TUESDAY, JANUARY 16, 2007
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL
MINUTES**

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Mayor Jay Andolshek; Terry Curtis, Dean Swanson, Steve Roe, Irene Schultz.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Peter Ablner, Mike Winkels, Teri Jo Flynn, Roger Lynn, Nancy Addington, Andy Holm, Dale Melberg.

OTHERS PRESENT: Tom Swenson, City Administrator; Ken Anderson, Community Development Director; Jim Perry, Planner/GIS Coordinator; Dick Dietz, RuthAnn Hanson, Betty Ryan, Renee Richardson, Sandy and Alan Eliason.

REGULAR MEETING/CALL TO ORDER: Acting Mayor Dean Swanson called the regular meeting to order at 9:05 A.M. Swanson asked those present to introduce themselves, stating their name and position.

1. Review of Comprehensive Plan, September, 2003 Draft

Community Development Director Ken Anderson presented a timeline regarding the background of the proposed 2003 Comprehensive Plan. Anderson noted that the policies adopted by the Council in the Comprehensive Plan can change the direction of the City for years.

Mayor Jay Andolshek arrived at 9:10 a.m.

Anderson stated that the planning for the document began in 2002. He said that in 2003, the Commission recommended that the Council approve the document, and that revisions to the Land Use Map have since been made by the Council. Anderson noted that the Land Use Map became the main focus, and that the text was never fully reviewed by the Council. He also stated that issues such as density, sewer, and future growth areas need to be addressed prior to approval. Anderson also listed a Transportation Plan, Right-of-Way Ordinance and Trail Plan as possible additions to the document.

Terry Curtis stated that he would like to see the document get approved within a short period of time, and questioned why it was never approved in the first place. Irene Schultz stated that she was unsure why the document was not approved, but noted that the Land Use Map became the main focus. Curtis also stated that the City must also decide what the City wants to achieve with the Comprehensive Plan. He noted that the document can be more broad in nature, or more specific and detail oriented. Dean Swanson said that the document should only be revised to reflect changes that have happened since the document was drafted, adding that he thought it should have been approved in 2003. Swanson also stated that the Comprehensive Plan is a vision that can be modified, and is not locked in stone.

Planning Commission Chairman Peter Abler noted that he felt that the purpose of the document needs to be made more clear, mainly whether the document will be a broad statement of goals or one that involves more specifics. He presented an approach for approval of the Comprehensive Plan and recommended that the document be broken up into two parts, with the existing document remaining as a broad statement of goals, and a second section dealing with implementation of the goals. Abler added that the goals should be measurable, with a basis behind them. He noted that the existing document should be only modified to reflect changes that have taken place due to the amount of time and work already put into the plan. Abler noted that the second section would be broken up into near, mid, and long-term goals. Abler went on to say that the near term would be the most detailed, looking at the next five years; with the mid and long-term plans addressing the next ten years and more. He also recommended that the plan be reviewed every two years for maintenance purposes. Schultz stated that the approach seemed like a reasonable way to update the plan, while not throwing away the hard work of the people that contributed to the existing document.

MOTION BY STEVE ROE, SECOND BY TERRY CURTIS TO APPROVE THE APPROACH RECOMMENDED BY PETER ABLER FOR ADOPTING THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN WITH TWO SECTIONS, THE FIRST FOR GOALS AND A SECOND FOR IMPLEMENTATION STEPS.

Roe pointed out that the motion was not to approve the Comprehensive Plan itself.

Roger Lynn noted that he wants to see the public heavily involved. He also noted that he would like to see more "green" building encouraged. Curtis agreed, stating that development is driven by input and vision. Abler noted that seasonal residents should also be involved due to the fact that they are such a large portion of the community. Dean Swanson stated that the Comprehensive Plan should not get too heavy into implementation, as implementation is more the job of the Ordinance. Swanson went on to say that the Comprehensive Plan should be a vision, rather than something the City locks itself into. Swanson also stated that the Comprehensive Plan should include criteria related to variance approval, as he felt that variances are approved too easily and are being abused. Roe reemphasized that the motion was not to approve the plan, only to approve the approach.

MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL "AYES."

Abler noted that a major portion of the near-term revisions would be dealing with controversial issues such as controlled access lots, signs and accessory structures. Curtis stated that the City, along with the public needs to figure out what it wants when it comes to these issues.

Steve Roe noted that he has a problem with controlled access lots, stating that he felt there was no way to control or monitor them. Dean Swanson agreed, stating that there are plenty of public accesses on the lakes. Roe also stated that the City should acquire land for a City Park with lake access. Nancy Addington questioned what controlled access lots

do for the community, and added that they may contribute to lake degradation. Curtis said that he felt that non-riparian access should not be allowed.

Abler also addressed the issue of billboards and free-standing signs. He stated that questions have been raised as to whether a site with a pre-existing billboard can still have a free standing sign, and whether the City can force the existing billboards to be removed by setting a date in the Ordinance. City Administrator Tom Swenson stated that he was unsure if the City could require that. Anderson noted that it is not clearly stated in the Ordinance as to whether or not a property can have both an existing billboard and a free standing sign, or differentiate between the two.

Swanson stated that staff should recommend revisions to be brought before the Council. Steve Roe felt that all signs should note who the sign belongs to, and recommended that the "grandfather clause" end when a sign face is changed. Roe also stated that temporary signs should be addressed. Teri Jo Flynn said that she has concerns over the City not allowing off-site real estate arrow signs. She stated that property owners want something to direct them to their property, especially in the case of less traveled roads. Swanson urged staff to come back with ideas for revisions. Abler urged that the business community be contacted, noting that if the community believes in the ordinances, they are more likely to be followed.

Abler also discussed the issue of accessory structure allowances in the R-3 district, noting the City Council recommendation to base accessory structure allowances purely on impervious coverage. He stated that he felt that somebody would cross the line by building a very large structure if no other limitations were put in place. He said that he agrees with the idea set forth in the R-1 zoning district that allows a larger amount of accessory structure on a lot with more area.

Curtis stated that he felt that a property owner should be able to use their 25% maximum impervious coverage in any way they see fit. He stated that it should not be a "one-size fits all" situation. Curtis also stated that he was disappointed that somebody could build only a garage on their lot.

Abler also addressed the issue of the temporary structures. Anderson noted issues with the vinyl/flexible plastic accessory structures going up around town and that the vinyl/plastic material is prohibited by ordinance, and still creates impervious coverage. He also stated that property owners put up the structures without permits, and in many instances don't adhere to the required setbacks. Abler agreed, stating that they are cheap and easy to assemble, but not very desirable. Abler also stated that issues have arisen regarding mobile homes and manufactured housing. Swanson again urged staff to come forward with possible revisions for review by the Commission and Council.

Abler stated that the Commission would look at the possibility of setting up special meetings and workshops to gather input on revisions to the Comprehensive Plan along with the Zoning Ordinance.

Mike Winkels stated that he thinks the ordinances that are currently in place are good, but they need to be enforced properly in order to serve their purpose. Abler agreed stating that staff and the Commission must have support and agreement from the City Council that the ordinances will be enforced. Swanson stated that he is a strong supporter of staff and the Planning Commission.

MOTION BY TERRY CURTIS, SECOND BY STEVE ROE TO ADJOURN THE
SPECIAL MEETING AT 11:36 A.M. MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL "AYES."

Minutes Respectfully Prepared by Jim Perry


