

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

Present: Dale Borgmann, Don Merten, Dan Hansen, Toni Honer, Linda Peck, Vern Ahles (liaison from City Council). **Absent:** Jerry Bechtold, Kathleen Stanger.

Staff: Rena Weber-Administrator/Clerk, Judy Neu-Administrative Asst., Scott Hedlund-Engineer.

Approval of Agenda/Amendments: Moved by Toni, seconded by Dale, to approve the agenda and amendments. Passed.

Approval of Minutes of 05-24-05: Moved by Don, seconded by Toni, to approve the minutes as presented and suspend the reading of the minutes. **Passed**

New Business:

a) Voigt Concept Plan: Rena went over the concept plan being proposed by the Voigts to develop land along the south side of Pleasant Road (Section 1, T123,R29). The plan involves 8 residential parcels. Each parcel has 85 feet of frontage along the road and depths of 200 feet. This area of Pleasant Road is serviced by the sewer system, and there is enough sewer capacity to accommodate this development. However, water service is not yet available. The present water service area boundary is along the northern edge of Government Lot 3, slightly to the north of the proposed 8 lots. Therefore, to proceed at this time, the City Council would have to allow each lot to have an individual well. Since this proposal is still in the concept phase, the Planning Commission discussed the advisability of allowing individual wells for each lot, the idea of a community well, and requiring that the area be serviced by City water. Scott Hedlund was asked to work on estimating the basic cost for each of these options.

Moved by Toni, seconded by Dan, that the Planning Commission recommends approval of the concept plan by the City Council with the preference that the 8 lots to be serviced by city water. Unanimous approval.

Scott will provide the Planning Commission and the City Council with estimated basic costs for the following: a) providing City water; b) drilling/providing individual wells for each lot; c) constructing a community well system.

Amended:

Moved and seconded to approve the minutes with the following items to be added to the discussion as regards the Voigt Concept Plan:

- 1) The Planning Commission has only approved a concept plan for 8 residential parcels along the south side of Pleasant Road.**
- 2) Before any further approvals are requested that involve a preliminary plat, the Planning Commission wants to see a concept plan for the whole development indicating where the roads in and out of the development will be located.**

Approved unanimously with these additions.

b) Discuss Comp Plan/Ordinance – Municipal Development Group, Inc (MDG):

There has been concern by many members of the Planning Commission and City staff that our Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances do not accurately reflect the intent of our newly adopted Comprehensive Plan in many areas. As the Plan was done by MDG, the Planning Commission felt that it was economically prudent that MDG be the consultant hired to do such a task. In addition, MDG could do the task more efficiently than a different consultant or staff/planning commission members. The City Council has concerns about hiring anyone to do this job, however, the Planning Commission feels that our comprehensive plan and the zoning/subdivision ordinances are the major tools we have to do good, fair planning in our City. Thus:

Moved by Linda, seconded by Dale, that the Planning Commission strongly recommends that the City Council approve submitting a grant for \$2500 to the Initiative Foundation to hire MDG to update the City of Rockville's Zoning/Subdivision Ordinances AND to conduct a working session with the Planning Commission and City Council members after the work is completed. Unanimous approval. Hiring MDG, as the consultant, is the most economical and efficient approach to assure that our ordinances match the intent of our new Comprehensive Plan.

c) Discuss Ordinance Amendments:

Issues:

- 1) **Sign – Informational signs.** Rena raised some concerns about the lack of clarification on the meaning of Public Informational Signs and Personal Message Signs. Stearns County identifies a Public Informational Sign as one that directs people to a particular public place such as a public library, museum, and hospital. A Personal Message Sign is one that relays a personal message which could address and issue, a private organization, etc. The Prolife America sign that was presented for approval by the Planning Commission and Council is in actuality a personal message sign **NOT** a public informational sign, and could also be construed as an advertising sign according to MNDOT. On page 57 of Rockville's new zoning ordinances it states: **“Public Information Signs: Bulletin boards or public information signs not exceeding thirty-two (32) square feet located only on the premises of public, charitable or religions institutions.”** Thus the approval of the Prolife American sign on private land adjacent to TH 23 and CR 47 was an error under our ordinances for two reasons: 1) the land where the sign would be located is not public land – it is privately owned; 2) the sign to be placed here is a personal message sign not a public informational sign. Also discussed was the understanding that having billboards and signs along this section of TH 23 was to be avoided. Although this particular sign has been inadvertently allowed, we do not want to set a precedent for more and more signs here. Another issue discussed was the length of time such signs would be allowed to stay standing.

The Planning Commission recommends the following amendments be made to our ordinances:

1) Definitions be added for Public Informational Signs and for Personal Message Signs clarifying that they are different.

2) Add the following statement: A single noncommercial personal message sign may be allowed if it is a noncommercial personal message sign that also contains the name of a non-profit organization and the sign is located on the property where the sign owner lives. Both # 1 and #2 passed unanimously.

2) Accessory Building: In our ordinances there is confusion about what an accessory building is, what constitutes a storage shed, and what is considered a private garage. Much discussion took place on how to clarify which is which. This is an issue that could be raised with MDG as they go over our ordinances. Vern suggested that we might want to differentiate these entities by using the square footage that each entity is allowed. Other items we need to be working on in our ordinances are a) rear and side yard setbacks in R1 (not including garages) – see pages 91-94. How do we keep consistency? 2) AG40/Residential – homogeneous in appearance 3) B1/Residential – homogeneous in appearance. These two sections in our ordinance do not require the same things. (See pages 82 and 108). Another item for continued discussion is having horses in an R1 District. (See page 80 in our ordinances). Stearns County Zoning Ordinances state: 9.9.12 Keeping of Animals: The keeping of animals, with the exception of dogs, cats and similar animals kept as household pets, is prohibited on any lot, parcel or tract in the R-1 District.

The final issue discussed was the number of junk yard areas in the City that need to be addressed. Involved here also is the issue of outside storage by various businesses along TH 23 (and elsewhere) and making sure the Planning Commission is consistent in its requirements for fencing amongst the businesses that have outside storage. Some have fenced off these areas while others were requested to do so as conditions of their construction but have not done so. **The Planning Commission agreed to have Rena schedule a one-day on-site inspection of businesses with outside storage areas (during business hours). This visit will be scheduled some time after Rockfest and is tentatively set for Friday, July 22, 2005.**

Adjournment: Dale moved, Toni, seconded, to adjourn the meeting. Time: 9:15 pm. Passed unanimously.

Chairman _____

Rec. Sec. _____