

**BIG LAKE PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

JUNE 2, 2021

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Zettervall called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIENCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

3. ROLL CALL

Commissioners present: Ketti Green, Alan Heidemann, Scott Marotz, Lisa Odens, Paul Seefeld, and Scott Zettervall. Commissioners absent: None. Also present: City Planner Lucinda Meyers.

4. ADOPT AGENDA

Commissioner Heidemann moved to adopt the agenda. Seconded by Commissioner Green, unanimous ayes, agenda adopted.

5. OPEN FORUM

Chair Zettervall opened the Open Forum at 6:01 p.m.

No one came forward for comment.

Chair Zettervall closed the Open Forum at 6:01 p.m.

6. APPROVE MEETING MINUTES

6A. APPROVE REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES OF MAY 19, 2021

Commissioner Green motioned to approve the May 19, 2021 Regular Meeting Minutes. Seconded by Commissioner Heidemann, unanimous ayes, Minutes approved.

7. BUSINESS

7A. PLANNING COMMISSION STRATEGIC PLAN

Meyer discussed recommendations from Staff on action items for objectives in the strategic plan. Meyers noted additional suggestions and revisions that had been made to the strategic plan. Meyers reviewed the first point which is to maintain zoning and subdivision ordinances. Meyers discussed general housekeeping tasks to maintain the zoning and subdivision ordinances and how they differed from a full re-write of the City Code. Meyers noted that many of the objectives and actions strongly aligned with the objective to maintain the zoning and subdivision ordinances. Meyers proposed to remove workshare with the code revision task force from the strategic plan. Meyers proposed the moving action items such as research parking requirement become objective items. Meyers continued that researching parking requirements, accessory dwelling units, and standardizing roadway designs fit under the first goal. Meyers noted these goals were inclusive with the timeline for achieving the goal to rewrite the zoning and subdivision ordinance. Meyers identified the Code Revision Taskforce and other boards could be potential partners in working towards achieving these goals.

Zettervall asked Meyer if the top goal should be to re-write the zoning and subdivision code. Meyers agreed it could be possible, but the layout and hierarchy of the strategic plan is to convey the priority of certain goals over others. Zettervall noted that goals were not meant to be specific so as they may be maintained year to year. Zettervall followed that the action items should be achievable and change year to year. Green affirmed the goals were meant to be maintained year to year. Zettervall described that he interpreted objectives as something to be completed, and action items are the micro jobs that make up how the Planning Commission accomplishes those objectives.

Meyers followed up on the initial conversation that the first goal's objective is the full rewrite of subdivision ordinances for the first goal. Meyers asked if the Commissioners would be comfortable moving other objectives under the first goal as action items, such as researching parking requirements, and roadway standards. Odens noted those items could also be maintained as objectives.

Green asked for clarification on the difference between goals and objectives. Zettervall defined that:

- Goals are guidelines for what the Planning Commission would like to achieve, general enough that they do not need to be changed annually and specific enough that they provide direction and responsibility.
- Objectives are measurable accomplishments that support one or more goals.
- Action Items specifically list tasks to accomplish.

Marotz asked how the Commission would determine the priority of certain goals and objectives over others. Odens stated the Comprehensive Plan guides which goals are

Big Lake Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Date: June 2, 2021

Page 3 of 5

prioritized.

Green asked what the relationship would be between the Planning Commission and the Code Revision Task Force. Meyers provided an example that the Planning Commission would research parking standards and provide that information with Staff recommendations for code revisions to the Code Revision Task Force to determine how the re-write should be completed.

Zettervall noted liaisons to the Planning Commission will also be involved with the Code Revision Task Force. Green was concerned too many of the strategic goals would become the responsibility of the Code Revision Task Force. Zettervall stated the Planning Commission could begin addressing goals and objectives while the Code Revision Task Force was not meeting.

Marotz discussed the Planning Commission could delegate objectives and actions from the strategic plan to the Code Revision Task Force and set priorities through delegating objectives. Marotz noted that ultimately, the work product from the Code Revision Task Force will require approval from the Planning Commission. Zettervall suggested the Planning Commission could conduct a quarterly review of the objectives and update tasks as needed.

Odens stated the more input the Planning Commission provides the Code Revision Task Force the better and would ensure a smooth collaboration between the two entities. Meyers asserted again that the Planning Commission will conduct much of the research that the Code Revision Task Force will use to inform their work. Odens stated that items that do not exist in the City Code today will not be reviewed by the Code Revision Task Force and could be researched at the Planning Commission level. Meyers agreed that the Planning Commission could review items that do not exist in the City Code and provide the Code Revision Task Force with research to draft language to be added to City Code.

Meyers informed the Commission she will move the maintain zoning and subdivision ordinances into a goal and move sub-goal action items and objectives accordingly. Meyers reviewed strategic plan goals City Staff have already achieved and proposed to add collaboration with other City departments to relevant goals. Meyers plans to incorporate the input from Planning Commission to prepare an updated plan for the next meeting, after which City Council will review the plan.

The Commission reviewed whether the goal to Gather Public Input could be applied to more specific objectives. Heidemann noted the goal to Gather Public Input could be added to Goal #3. Marotz and Green discussed holding a visioning session rather than gather public input. Odens raised that it could be productive to hold a visioning session with City departments. Marotz asked whether this should be a Planning Commission objective.

Marotz proposed paring down the broad objective of gathering public input, that a visioning session might be out of the scope of the Planning Commission. Green agreed but stressed a visioning session could provide updated and detailed information for the Planning Commission and City Staff to use in directing their goals. Marotz agreed information from a City Council visioning session could help direct the goals of the Planning Commission.

Meyers will incorporate the feedback from the Commissioners and bring an update to the next meeting.

7B. CODE REVISION TASK FORCE UPDATE

Meyers noted the Code Revision Task Force has not met since April and no update was available.

7C. CENTRAL MISSISSIPPI RIVER REGIONAL PLANNING PARTNERSHIP (CMRP) FRAMEWORK 2030 UPDATE

Seefeld informed the Board Council Members had reviewed goals and objectives for the CMRP. Seefeld noted solar had moved up in their list of priorities. Meyers followed up that the CMRP objectives are going through the final review and adoption phases.

7D. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT UPDATE

Meyers presented the Community Development Department Update and recommended the Board reach out to Hannah Klimmek with any questions.

8. PLANNER'S REPORT

Meyers reviewed items in the Planners Report. Meyers noted the Planning Commission had received four applications to fill the vacant seat on the Commission. Meyers added the process for interviewing potential Commission members had changed, with 2 City Staff, and 2 City Council members will interview in a public forum. Meyers noted the interview meeting has not yet been scheduled.

Meyers discussed a site plan application for an industrial development in the industrial park had been submitted to the City for the parcel listed at \$1.00. Meyers noted the applicant is a new business to Big Lake.

Meyers noted a candidate had been selected to assume the position of Planner Technician.

The Prairie Meadows Concept Plan was reviewed at City Council and the Parks Board.

Big Lake Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Date: June 2, 2021

Page 5 of 5

The applicant contacted Meyers to inform her they will begin determining the feasibility of the development. The Commissioners discussed the process for concept plan review at separate commissions. Zetervall proposed submitting a summary of the Planning Commissions feedback on concept plan reviews for City Council. Seefeld stated the draft minutes are included with the Council packet and Planning City council could ascertain feedback on concept plans from the Planning Commission draft minutes. The Commissioners discussed whether to submit their findings to other City Commissions during concept plan reviews.

Meyers reviewed previous Planning Commission agenda items which are now on the City Council Agenda.

Meyers noted the next Planning Commission meeting will be June 16.

9. COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS

Seefeld discussed street projects and the City Councils proposal to advance the timeline for street projects planned in the next 4-6 years to the next two years due to low interest rates.

10. OTHER

Marotz noted trees planted in the new Station Street Apartments appear to be smaller than the 2.5-inch requirement. Meyers noted landscape inspections are conducted by the building official and that she will pass the information along.

Zetervall discussed the logistics behind the Planning Commission vacancy. Zetervall asked when, where, and who will chair the interview meeting. Zetervall suggested allocating 20 minutes per candidate for the interview process. Green recommended starting the meeting at 5 and postponing the Planning Commission to 6:30PM. The Commission agreed upon the 5PM interview meeting and postponing the Planning Commission to 6:30PM. Green suggested a Planning Commission member as the Chair for the interview meeting. Seefeld asked whether Council had to approve the meeting format.

Zetervall and Seefeld discussed holding the interview meeting two weeks from today. Green and Zetervall volunteered to serve as Planning Commission representatives in the interview process. The Committee for Interviewing will be 2 city staff, 2 city council members, and 2 commission members.

11. ADJOURN

Commissioner Green motioned to adjourn at 7:23 p.m. Seconded by Commissioner Heidemann, unanimous ayes, motion carried.