

**CITY OF BATTLE LAKE
PLANNING COMMISSION**

The Battle Lake Planning Commission met Wednesday, July 6, 2016 at 7:00 pm at City Hall. Present were Commissioners Bev McAllister, Mike Adkins, Chuck Reeve, Dave Tomhave and Don Maslow. Also present were Deputy Clerk-Treasurer, Karalee Brandner, Mike Henkenius and Bert Olson filling in for Val Martin Zoning Officer.

The meeting was called to order by Don Maslow.

McAllister moved to approve the agenda. Tomhave seconded. MCU

McAllister moved to approve the minutes. Adkins seconded. MCU

Don Maslow opened the meeting for a variance request from Battle Lake Hotel Partners, Inc. requesting the following variance:

The Request is to expand the number of camping sites from 8 to 9. The current allowance is based on residential code. Since county commercial code is less restrictive we request that code be considered.

Olson presented his staff report: *“The results of the calculations for the original CUP that allowed the 8 units were very close to allowing 9 units in the campground. After reviewing the calculations that would include an additional unit and another driveway they still remain fairly close. The calculations which include the motel complex, parking lot and the additional unit and driveway show that the open space is 65% compared to the required minimum of 50% and the impervious surface is 16.8% compared to the maximum allowed of 25%. Another observation is there probably would not be a negative impact on the land or the lake because the placement of the additional unit would be well behind the required lake setback.”*

Following discussion, the Commission formulated the following findings of fact: 1- Does the variance request conflict with the purpose and intent of the zoning ordinance? No. 2 – Will the variance request have an adverse impact on government services such as street usage, snow removal, stormwater runoff, emergency services, etc.? No. 3- Will the requested variance alter the basic character of the neighborhood? Will it result in a substantial detriment or disadvantage to neighboring properties? No. 4 – Does this variance request involve use of the property in a reasonable manner? Yes. 5 – How did the need for a variance arise? Hotel Partners wanted to add another space for RV parking. Are there unique circumstances to the property, not created by the property owner? No. 6 – What portion of the variance request is based upon economic considerations? (economic considerations alone DO NOT constitute “practical difficulties”). N/A. 7 – Does existing sewage treatment need upgrading? No. 8 - Is the variance request consistent with the City’s Comprehensive Plan? Yes. Are there any conditions that should be imposed in granting this variance? (conditions must be directly related to, and roughly proportionate to, the impact created by the variance) Project must comply with the Minnesota Department of Health specifications.

Tomhave moved to recommend the council approve the variance request to allow the extra unit per CUP 6-2-09 with the contingency that it passes the MN Department of Health inspection and they receive permit from the MN Department of Health. Adkins seconded the motion. MCU, with McAllister abstaining from the vote.

McAllister moved to adjourn the meeting. Tomhave seconded. MCU

Meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

Karalee Brandner
Deputy Clerk-Treasurer