

**City of Grant
Planning Commission Agenda
June 18, 2012**

A Planning Commission Meeting of the City of Grant will be called to order at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, June 18, 2012, in the Grant Town Hall for the purpose of conducting the business hereafter listed, and all accepted additions thereto.

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Pledge of Allegiance**
- 3. Approval of Agenda**
- 4. Approval of Minutes, May 21, 2012**
- 5. Public Comment**
- 6. New Business**
- 7. Old Business**
 - A. Grading Permits**
 - B. Complaint Protocol and Communication Process**
 - C. City Job Descriptions**
- 8. Commissioner Reports**
- 9. Set Agenda, July 16, 2012 Planning Commission Meeting**
- 10. Adjournment**

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

CITY OF GRANT

May 21, 2012

Present: Terry Derosier, Loren Sederstrom, Becky Siekmeier, Larry Lanoux, Bill David, Bob Tufty and Mark Wojcik

Absent: None

Staff Present: City Clerk, Kim Points

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Derosier called the meeting to order at 7:08 p.m.

2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

3. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Commissioner Lanoux moved Item 6A, Discussion of Grading Permit Process, City of Grant, Watershed Districts and Building Inspector to Item 7A noting it is old business.

The agenda was approved as amended.

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES, APRIL 23, 2012**

MOTION by Commissioner Siekmeier to approve the April 23, 2012 Minutes, as presented. Commissioner Wojcik seconded the motion. **MOTION** carried unanimously.

5. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

MOTION by Commissioner Lanoux to allow public comment to opened up after every agenda item. Commissioner Sederstrom seconded the motion.

Chair Derosier made a friendly amendment to include that it is up to the discretion of the Chair. Commissioner Lanoux and Sederstrom agreed to the friendly amendment.

Mr. Bob Englehart, Joliet Avenue, came forward and asked that the Planning Commission take into consideration that he wanted to talk at one of the previous meeting and the Chair would not let him. The Planning Commission should listen to the citizens.

MOTION carried with Commissioner Tufty voting nay.

6. **NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

7. **OLD BUSINESS**

A. Discussion of Grading Permit Process, City of Grant, Watershed Districts and Building Inspector

Ms. Karen Kill, Administrator for Brown's Creek, came forward and stated she is not sure what kind of information the Planning Commission is looking for.

Commissioner Wojcik advised he attended a meeting of the Brown's Creek Watershed District and found out about the grading permit process. He stated that the City is looking at their process and there may be an opportunity to streamline the entire process.

Ms. Kill provided the background relating to grading permits noting the concern for Brown's Creek is erosion and moving 50 cubic yards or more is the trigger for a permit. Any amount less than that is handled administratively. She reviewed the current fees for permits and deposits relating to site visits, inspections, etc. She explained the erosion control permits in detail noting all their rules are posted on their website. She advised that adding to an existing gravel driveway does not trigger a permit from Brown's Creek and she also believes there are opportunities to streamline the process.

Mr. Kyle Axdahl, Rice Creek Watershed District, came forward and advised erosion control permits can be triggered by itself or due to other rules or guidelines. He stated the fee schedule is on the website. The City of Hugo has accepted all the rules of the watershed and they administer all erosion control permits for the watershed district. He noted the minimum fee is \$1,000 for one acre and residential has a flat fee of \$150-\$250.00.

Mr. John Hanson, Valley Branch Watershed District, came forward and provided the background noting there are fourteen different communities within their district. The top permits include erosion control and impervious surface. For residents the fee is typically waived but the fee is based on the project itself.

Mr. Jim Shaver, Marine Carnelian Watershed District, came forward and distributed the fee schedule and district rules. He noted the rules are similar to Brown's Creek as they were modeled after them.

Mr. Jack Kramer, Building Inspector, came forward and stated he always tells developers and contractors to contact the watershed district. It is beneficial if they go to the watershed district before coming to the City for permitting.

MOTION by Commissioner Siekmeier to compare the City's ordinance to the Watershed Districts rules to get an understanding and see if the process can be simplified. Commissioner Tuffy seconded the motion.

Commissioner Lanoux stated he believes the issue should be tabled until both the City Engineer and City Planner are present.

Commissioner Siekmeier and Commissioner Tufty withdrew the motion and the second.

MOTION by Commissioner Lanoux to table the grading permit discussion until the City Planner and City Engineer are present at the June meeting. Commission Wojcik seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Ai. Complaint Protocol and Communication Process – Chair Derosier advised the packet that went out was fairly large and asked that the Planning Commission focus on recent complaints. He inquired about the current complaint process.

Commissioner Lanoux advised the State Electrical Inspector emailed the City regarding his electrical license. He stated he did not receive a phone call from the City Clerk. He provided the background of this incident noting a phone call would have been sufficient. Because he did not receive a phone call he filed a Freedom of Information Act that has cost the City a lot of money.

Chair Derosier stated he would like to discuss the incident and then put it to rest.

Commissioner David stated the City received a phone call from the League of Minnesota Cities. The complaint was not documented so he inquired as to how it got to the City Attorney.

Commissioner Wojcik stated there are issues within the City that need certain protocol. The scope of those issues needs to be broadened and a specific protocol needs to be followed at all times.

Commissioner David stated he had the understanding that all complaints need to be documented. Acting on a complaint based on only a phone call is wrong. Tax dollars are being spent on this. What the City Clerk did regarding the League of Minnesota Cities incident is very wrong and he does not want to see it happen again.

Commissioner Sederstrom stated there is no direction at all from the Mayor. An outline of how to deal with these things is needed.

Commissioner Tufty stated there is a huge difference between citizen complaints and the two issues with Mr. Lanoux.

Commissioner Lanoux stated that at the January Council meeting he could have picked up his toys and gone home. But he did not do that, he is still volunteering within the City and citizen participation is very important.

Chair Derosier went through the complaint model that was included in the packets. Suggested revisions to the documents were made.

Mr. Jack Kramer, Building Inspector and Zoning Enforcement, came forward and explained the current complaint process advising it works very well.

MOTION by Commissioner Lanoux that the City of Grant will have a written complaint policy in place to follow of who, what, where and when and applied equally to all citizens and it will start with a phone call. Commissioner Sederstrom seconded the motion and added a friendly amendment that the complaint policy

will apply to all complaints and situations. Commissioner Lanoux agreed to the amendment.

Commissioner Siekmeier stated written policy is a great idea but complaints need to be separated from situations as they are very different.

MOTION carried with Commissioners Siekmeier, Tufty and Derosier voting nay.

Chair Derosier directed staff to draft a written complaint/situation policy for the Planning Commission to review at the June meeting.

B. City Job Descriptions – MOTION by Chair Derosier to table the City Job Descriptions item to the June meeting. Commissioner Sederstrom seconded the motion.

Commissioner Lanoux added a friendly amendment to include that the Planning Commission look at the advantages and disadvantages of having a City Administrator who has more authority to take care of things in between Council meetings.

Chair Derosier did not accept the friendly amendment to the motion stating the Planning Commission is just starting the process of looking at job descriptions.

MOTION carried unanimously.

7. **COMMISSIONER REPORTS**

Commissioner Lanoux stated he spoke to the City Engineer after the road tour was completed. Many roads are beyond repair within the City and sealcoating will not help. He stated he would have liked to attend the road tour but did not get enough notice.

Chair Derosier thanked Mr. Glenn Larson for his many years of service on the Planning Commission.

8. **SET AGENDA, JUNE 18, 2012 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

The next Planning Commission Meeting is scheduled for Monday, June 18, 2012, 7:00 p.m.

Agenda items will include Grading Permits, Complaint Process and Job Descriptions.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION by Commissioner Sederstrom to adjourn the meeting at 9:43 p.m. Commissioner Siekmeier seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Kim Points
City Clerk

DRAFT

CITY OF GRANT COMPLAINT PROCESS

1. **COMPLAINT** – The complaint is submitted.
2. **INSPECTION** – Appropriate staff visits the property to conduct an inspection. The city then follows up with the complainant. The City strives to complete this step within five business days.
3. **NOTIFICATION** – The City contacts the people involved in the situation that produced the complaint and explains the problem and how to resolve it. Depending on the situation, this may be the owner, the tenant, or both. If the problem still exists, the owner/tenant will be given ten days to resolve it. If the problem no longer exists, the owner/tenant will be informed that another complaint within a year may result in a citation or other action.
4. **RE-INSPECTION** – Staff re-inspects the property after seven days. If the violation is resolved, the case is closed. If not, final notice will be given.
5. **FINAL NOTICE** – The property owner/tenant will again be notified of the problem and what must be done to resolve it. The owner/tenant is given another ten days to resolve it before the City takes action.
6. **CITY ACTION** – If the violation remains unresolved after the second ten-day period, depending on the situation, the City may issue a citation or initiate the abatement process. In an abatement process the City takes care of the problem and then bills the owner/tenant for the work done.
7. **RECURRENCE** – If the substantially same violation happens again the City will take the appropriate action.