

Approve Minutes: December 14, 2015

M/S/P: Williams/Dodson move to approve minutes as amended, ***Vote: 5-0, motion carried unanimously.***

Approve Minutes: December 14, 2015

M/S/P: Williams/Dodson move to approve minutes as amended, ***Vote: 5-0, motion carried unanimously.***

Interim Use Permit – Commercial Wedding Ceremony Venue.

Wensman stated that at the request of the applicant, they would like to continue the public hearing to the February 8, 2016 Planning Commission meeting.

Public Hearing opened at 7:26 pm.

There was no one who spoke.

There was no written or electronic correspondence.

M/S/P: Williams/Dodson move to continue the public hearing to the February 8, 2016 Planning Commission meeting , ***Vote: 5-0, motion carried, unanimously.***

Varinace Request from IRET properties for a sign Variance.

Wensman started his presentation for a sign variance at 8650 Hudson Blvd. The variance is for 5' in height and 4' in width for a pylon sign. This property is located in the Eagle Point office park. The purpose of the sign is to display the signs of the tenants that are in the building. Right now there is not much visibility for these businesses due to topography. There is some ambiguity in the Eagle Point Development Standards. When this application was first submitted, the former City Planner thought it looked good, but when the Community Development Director looked at it, he said it didn't meet the requirements. Based on research and what Wensman has read regarding previous conversations, he recommended a variance.

The applicant first approached the City in January 2015. Staff feels that the variance criteria has been met and is recommending approval.

Griffin asked if this met the sign ordinance. Wensman stated that this development is a PUD and would be covered under their PUD Regulations.

Kreimer is wondering if where the sign is going is a buildable lot. Wensman stated that it is part of the same lot. He did not evaluate if more could be built there.

Dodson is wondering if this is a lighted sign. Does this go over the height for lighting? Wensman stated that we can follow up with the applicant to see if the whole sign is lighted.

Dawn Grant, IRET Properties, distributed pictures to the Planning Commission. She stated that this is one property. This property was designed to have an additional building, but this is a very small piece of property. She also stated that they have talked about putting a road through where the sign is so people would know where to turn

Steve Hertz, Nordquist Sign, stated that the height is dependent on where it is measured. He addressed the lighting of the sign and stated that not all parts of the sign are illuminated. He estimated that the distance from this sign to the Park Dental is about 150-200 feet.

Louis Suarez, Colliers, went through pictures of all angles of the property.

Griffin asked if Park Dental will have a problem if people use their driveway to get to this building. Dawn Grant stated that Park Dental is a tenant of theirs and they received a letter of support from them. If it becomes an issue, they are willing to put a road back to the building.

Dunn stated that she is in support of sign for giving better clarity to where this building is.

Larson asked if there was a way to put something on the sign as to where people are supposed to turn. Dawn Grant stated that it would be a possibility.

Mal Sullivan, St. Croix Orthopedic, the visibility of the campus has always been a challenge, but their business has changed and grown. People have trouble finding them and they would really appreciate the help in getting this sign passed as it would help their business.

Public Hearing opened at 8:04 pm.

No one spoke.

There was no written or electronic correspondence.

Public Hearing Closed at 8:05 pm.

Williams is in support of the concept for a more visible sign, however, there are a number of unanswered questions for if this is the solution. He feels that the location of this sign might actually induce people to turn into Park Dental. He would like to learn

more about access spacing, the elevation differences and the feasibility of routing traffic to the Park Dental lot and possibly increasing that lot. He wants to support this business, but he is not sure enough global thinking has gone into this decision.

Steve Hertz, stated that the idea of this type of sign is to create an identity for the businesses. There could be an addition to the sign about where to turn, but the intent was really to identify what businesses are back there.

Dunn supports the signage and feels it is important to identify what is back there. She feels it meets the intent of the PUD ordinance and it is an exception for this one building that is hard to see. She said it is the age of GPS to assist on where to turn.

Kriemer agrees with Commissioner Dunn. He feels that the visibility is key to the success of these businesses. He does not feel it is for visibility, but more for advertising. He wants to support the commercial businesses and would like to see more in this area.

Griffin feels it is a good place for the sign so that you can see it from the freeway. She also feels it would be beneficial to get another sign out on the freeway.

Suarez stated that this PUD was planned 20 years ago. Healthcare has dramatically changed since then and part of that change is to advertise and attract more people and identify the businesses that are there. The point of this sign is to build the brand of the Highpoint medical campus.

Dodson is not in favor of the aesthetics of the sign. He would have liked to see more of a monument type.

M//: Williams/ move to postpone consideration of this application until the Commission receives elevations, access spacing, opportunities to modify the Park Dental Parking lot for access and MnDot contact for I94 signage supplied by the applicant, ***motion fails for lack of 2nd***.

M/S/P: Dodson/Griffin, move to recommend approval of the 5 foot height and 4 foot width variance request at 8650 Hudson Blvd to allow for a 35 foot high, 16 foot wide pylon sign at the High Pointe Medical Campus based on the findings identified in the staff report, ***Vote: 4-1, motion carried.***

Dunn stated that the elevation is important to think about. She goes along with this motion.

M//: Dodson/, move to amend the motion to add a condition of approval that the possibility of a road be looked at, ***Motion fails for lack of second.***