

**WALKER PLANNING COMMISSION  
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
August 28<sup>th</sup>, 2017  
6:00 p.m. 701 Elm Avenue Walker Fire Hall Meeting Room**

**1. Call to Order** 6:02 p.m. by Wilkening

**Roll Call-**

Members Present: Annie McMurrin, Randy Carlson, Susan Ostlund and Gary Wilkening  
Public: Ron Geiser                      Staff: Pamela Smith                      Absent: Rich Hansen

**2. Additions or Deletions to the Agenda.**

None

**3. Announcements by Chair.**

None

**4. M/S McMurrin/Ostlund to recommend approval of Minutes for July 31<sup>st</sup>, 2017.**

**Motion passed (4-0)**

**5. Planning/Zoning –Report for May and July 2017.**

Smith reviewed the May Zoning reporting noting that the Small Cell Antenna application is the first one since adopting regulations for small cell antennas.

**6. Public Hearing 6:05 pm. To hear public comment on ordinance 2017-05 adding rural residential to districts established, amending the land use classification chart, and adding performance standards for rural residential**

Public Hearing opened at 6:05 pm

Wilkening explained that the synopsis behind this is to allow for what the county does in the outlying area. Residents would be able to have their own septic systems and much of the same Ordinance they live under currently. Larger tracts of land more rural in area not have to have paved streets, sewer and water, etc.

Geiser stated that there is no Rural Residential in the City at this time. He mentioned that there may some development coming along the County Road and he thought that this might be what this was about. Wilkening explains that this will allow for areas where people get brought into City Limits and will basically allow them to keep the same zoning ordinances and regulations that they had previously. It is more a future thing than it is a today thing.

No other public comments or questions were heard.

Public Hearing closed at 6:10 pm

**7. M/S Carlson/McMurrin to approve to recommend the adoption of Ordinance 2017-05.**

Wilkening stated that this approach is proactive. This allows people that get brought into the City and they don't necessarily want their land use classification to change, this

allows it to remain the way it is. Wilkening suggested that they looking to Commercial regulations for that same area next.

**Motion passed (4-0)**

**8. M/S Ostlund/ McMurrin to recommend approval of VAC-2017-01, a Vacation of a portion of Lakeside Drive in the Plat of Parkside addition to Walker, pursuant to Minnesota Statute §412.851**

Wilkening explains that this request was initially started roughly about 5 or 6 six years ago by Dave Cochran to straighten out the property access point by Cochran's Marina. What was thought to be the public access to the lake wasn't actually on City property is was on Cochran's. A deal was worked out to straighten out the description and come to find out we were to contact the DNR and that was never done.

Geiser questioned the location on the map; Wilkening pointed out on the Survey the exact location of the Tracts in question. Geiser stated that Lakeside Drive is actually further west than thought. Wilkening added that Lakeside Drive was always perceived to be Dave's property but it wasn't and the road was on his property which should not have been. Wilkening explained that they went through the survey process to determine exactly where the platted Lakeside Drive and where the actual roadway is and it was off considerably.

Ostlund questioned that the letter from the DNR stated that it was acceptable and agreeable to it, correct? Wilkening stated yes. That was the last component that we didn't do was notify the DNR because Lakeside Drives abuts public access.

Geiser questioned if it was a true public access. Wilkening clarified that it is not a DNR public access however the DNR is requesting that it remain open to the public as an access. As long as there is access from Railroad Avenue to the lake the DNR is acceptable to the vacation. Ostlund questioned if Dave was willing to swap the property. Wilkening stated that he was the one that approached the City notifying them of the issue and stated that he would like to get it fixed. This does impact his property as well, if the City ever chose to put the road through where the road truly is; it would impact him. It would cost us money to make it worse for him and no better access. Ostlund stated that it seems like there is no reason not to do this. Wilkening agreed that everybody has been on board to do this all along.

**Motion passed (4-0)**

**9. Discussion on permeable pavement systems.**

Geiser stated that they will be tearing up their parking lot at the Town hall and this is considered a possibility of installing something like this. They discuss area business in the Baxter area that has permeable asphalt: Manhattan Beach, the gas station across the road and Kohl's. Wilkening explained of his experience seeing this asphalt when it was raining and no water was pooling up in it. Ostlund questioned if the staff found out how long before it would silt up. Smith stated that Terri spoke with a representative from Anderson Brothers and stated that they recommend having it vacuumed once a year. However they have clients that vacuum it every year and they have clients that never have vacuumed after fourteen years and there has never been an issue. They usually have a 1 ½ inch rock base, but that is dependent on subsoil conditions. They are designed per inch precipitation and they generally design theirs with four inch precipitation standards.

Wilkening explains that this came up because a property owner that is proposing to build a new house; in order to meet the standards for the lot size and impervious surface coverage they had to do this. Ostlund asked if the property owners received council approval for this. Wilkening explained that there is nothing in our Ordinance that says yeah or nay to this approach. Wilkening stated that it is how impervious surface is considered. In our case if this board feels that this is acceptable and considers this as permeable surface coverage. The board briefly discusses the idea of giving credits due to the permeability of the asphalt. The Board discusses areas that this porous asphalt would work and areas that it would not work. This one will be a good example to see how it works out.

**10. Wilkening adjourned the meeting at 6:32 p.m.**