

City of Rockville Planning Commission Minutes
August 9, 2005 Time: 7:00 pm
Place: John Clark Elem. School Media Ctr.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Bechtold at 7:00 pm.

Roll Call: Present: Chair Jerry Bechtold, Toni Honer, Kathleen Stanger, Linda Peck, Don Merten, Dale Borgmann. Absent: Dan Hansen. Also present: Vern Ahles (liason with City Council).

Staff: Judy Neu – Administrative Asst.

Approval of Agenda/Amendments: Moved and seconded that the agenda and amendments be approved with the following **addition** requested by Jerry: **Further discussion on the Planning Commission, City Council and MDG, INC. working together on the Comprehensive Plan and our Zoning/Subdivision Ordinances. Approved.**

Approval of Minutes for 07/26/05: Moved and seconded that the minutes of 07/26/05 be approved with the following **two corrections** - see page 3 under Additions to the Agenda 1a) Viewing Committee Update: 1) remove Toni Honer's name from those who visited the granite companies; 2) change Stonecutters to Stonecrafters. **Approved.**

New Business:

A1) Screening Definition: At present our ordinances mention screening but there is no definition for what constitutes adequate screening and why screening would be required and by what entities. In our packet was a copy of section 7.19 from Stearns County's Zoning Ordinance that described what standards shall apply when screening is required by the provisions of their Ordinance. Much discussion followed. The following points were raised by those present: 1) What is the purpose for requiring screening? Is it for safety purposes? Is it for visual aesthetics? Is it to hide from view products that someone might vandalize, steal? 2) If required for light industrial/ industrial operations, what about certain commercial operations, farm operations? 3) Should any screening required be flexible i.e. provide various choices in how the screening is accomplished by the business: 4) Should screening options be site specific vs. strict/limited mandates? 5) Would it not be wise to have fencing/screening requirements that benefit both the owner of the business and the viewer of the business? 6) How does screening and fencing accommodate the various stages in the production of products? Are we talking about certain stages in production where screening and fencing might be appropriate or do we paint everything with the same brush i.e. all stages are equal? 7) What is considered "junk" and what is considered okay to be viewed? 8) Should the security of a business be left to the business to decide i.e. if they feel a security fence is what they need to protect them from potential liability claims, then they can put up a security fence? OR Should the City get involved in the liability issue?

The Planning Commission decided to further this discussion at our next meeting. Prior to that meeting each Commission member will try to gather more information

on what is done in other cities and perhaps get pictures of various screening choices already implemented i.e. berms, landscaping, various types of fencing, trees, and places where several of these options have been combined.

A2) Compliance Time: The original intent of this item being on the agenda was to identify whether or not a time frame should be established as regards when businesses should complete efforts to fence, screen, and/or put inside materials, products, equipment presently stored outside. In Stearns County, staff may indicate a compliance date for businesses when screening options and standards for that business are agreed upon. This is done internally and can sometimes become subjective. Another compliance time issue was covered by the information in the Planning Commission packet (see building permit application guidelines and two letters from Nancy Scott, Rockville Building Official – ALLSpec Services, LLC). The compliance time discussed here has to do with time frames associated with building permits and their expiration date.

- b) Schedule site visits to view other outside storage areas:** It was moved and seconded to have Rena Weber set up site visits to three properties on September 14, 2005, starting at 9:00 am. The three properties are: 1) The Bauerly granite crushing site on the corner of TH 23 and Broadway St.; 2) the Hansen farm site; 3) Klein Electric. Passed unanimously.
- c) Reschedule Joint Zoning Ordinance Meeting Aug. 29:** Because there is an all cities meeting scheduled for August 29th, the new date for the joint working session to update our zoning ordinances is **tentatively set for Thursday, September 8th**. This joint meeting is with MDG, Inc., the Planning Commission and the City Council. To be discussed at this first meeting: 1) B-1 (Central Business District); 2) B-2 (General Business District). The meeting will start at **7:00 pm. Location: hopefully at the John Clark Elem. School Media Ctr.** but this will have to be confirmed. It is highly recommended that council members and commission members look over the B-1 and B-2 Sections of the Comprehensive Plan and compare them to the existing Zoning/Subdivision Ordinances.

Old Business: Skaja RV Use- R1 Shoreland: Judy reported that Rena had contacted the League of MN Cities and gathered the following information: 1) a valid complaint can be made in a variety of ways (a phone call; a note; a stop at City Hall) and valid complaints must be investigated; 2) if the 2 RVs on site were grandfathered in then the situation follows a different process. Such is not the case, however. 3) there seems to be too much on this parcel of land that does not meet setback and side yard distance requirements. Much discussion followed that highlighted all sorts of problems as regards this particular situation: What constitutes a residential dwelling unit? If this is allowed here, then will other property owners on Pleasant Lake and Grand Lake make similar requests? There seem to be many inconsistencies in both Stearns County Zoning Ordinance and our own Zoning Ordinance. **Motion made and seconded to have the City Attorney examine this situation: 1) help clarify what the ordinances intend; 2) are two RVs on this property okay or not? Passed unanimously.**

Additions to the Agenda:

1a) Approve Administrative Plat – Vern Salzl: The owner of the Property wishes to sell 4.74 acres (more or less) of land (Tract A) that contains one residence and a shed located adjacent to County Road 138 to the west and adjacent to County Road 122 to the north. This 4.74 acres will be split off of land (39.04 acres) proposed for general industrial development by Vern Salzl in the future. **Moved and seconded that the Administrative Plat for Vern Salzl be approved with the following restriction: there be no further construction on the 4.7 acre parcel. Passed Unanimously.** The Planning Commission also requested to be informed on any plans that will extend 99th Avenue south from Co. Rd. 122 (parallel to Co.Rd. 138).

1b) Joint Working Session(s) with MDG, Inc., Planning Commission and City Council: Jerry feels these sessions are crucial for the health of our community. A recommendation was made for scheduling a bus tour of the entire City of Rockville for council members, commission members, MDG, Inc. and others familiar with the geology and natural resources we have here. It is important for each of us to be educated in the diverse land uses already in place (agriculture, etc) so that we can relate more directly to the land vs. looking at drawings on pieces of paper. There was general consensus that a bus tour would benefit everyone.

Adjournment: It was moved and seconded that the meeting be adjourned at 8:55 pm. Approved.

Chairman _____

Rec. Sec. _____