



PLANNING COMMISSION

May 13, 2025 at 6:30 PM

City Hall Council Chambers – 450 Virginia Avenue, Long Lake, MN 55356

AGENDA

1. Call to Order

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Approve Agenda

4. Consent Agenda

A. Approve Minutes of February 11, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting

5. Open Correspondence

NOTE: Open Correspondence is an item on the agenda during which the public may address the City Council.

No formal action is taken by the City Council and comments shall be limited to five minutes or less.

Open Correspondence comments may also be emailed to City staff by 12:00 noon on the date of the meeting.

6. Regular Business

A. Public Hearing: Amending Section 19 of the Zoning Ordinance to Update Requirements for Residential, Business, and Swimming Pool Fences

7. Other Business

8. Adjourn



**CITY OF LONG LAKE
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
February 11, 2025**

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 pm by Chair Adams.

Present: Chair: Roger Adams; Commissioners: Judd Axelson, Virginia See, Lori Goodsell, and Anita Secord; City Administrator: Scott Weske; City Planner: Hannah Rybak; and Councilmember: Mike Feldmann

Absent: None

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

APPROVE AGENDA

Commissioner Secord moved to approve the agenda as presented. Commissioner See seconded. Ayes: all.

CONSENT AGENDA

The Consent Agenda consisted of the following:

- A. Approve Minutes of the December 10, 2024 Planning Commission Meeting

Commissioner See moved to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Commissioner Secord seconded. Ayes: all.

OPEN CORRESPONDENCE

No one was in attendance to address the Planning Commission during Open Correspondence.

BUSINESS ITEMS

- A. Recommendation for Appointment of Planning Commission Chair and Chair-Pro-Tempore Positions for 2025**

Commissioner Goodsell moved to recommend Commissioner Roger Adams serve as Chair of the Planning Commission for 2025. Commissioner Secord seconded. Ayes: all.

Commissioner Secord moved to recommend Lori Goodsell serve as Chair Pro-Tempore for 2025. Commissioner See seconded. Ayes: all.

- B. Public Hearing: Planning Case #2025-11/Long Lake Rowing Crew Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Amendment Request**

Chair Adams pointed out that the City had received 14 letters over the past week regarding this agenda item and they would be included in the official record. Every letter that had been received was in support of the request from the Long Lake Rowing Crew.

City Planner Rybak reviewed the location of the subject property, Birch's on the Lake at 1310 Wayzata Boulevard W, and introduced the applicant's request for a CUP amendment to expand their operating hours. She reported that the Long Lake Rowing Crew (LLRC) was asking for an additional 2.5 hours on Thursday evenings; 1 hour earlier start and 5.5 additional hours on Friday afternoons; and 1 hour earlier start on Saturday mornings. She provided an overview of the LLRC's operations at Birch's for the past 10 years; reviewed the details of their existing CUP and the amendments that were made in 2019; and highlighted the overall reasons behind their current request for additional hours. She observed that the key issue the City should consider was the parking situation at Birch's, particularly when the expanded LLRC hours would coincide with peak restaurant hours. She revisited the existing CUP's conditions of approval and discussed the findings that would be necessary in order for the City to approve an amendment to the CUP.

Chair Adams officially opened the public hearing at 6:40 pm.

Bryan Miller, 295 Lakeview Avenue – Mr. Miller stated that he felt that the lake was the City's biggest asset and he believed that the LLRC was a fantastic addition to this asset. He reflected that it was an honor for the City to have such a unique and prestigious water sport in the City that also carries the name of Long Lake. He added that the LLRC has been a great steward of the community in various ways, he has always enjoyed seeing them out on the water, and he would like to see the City do anything possible in order to help the LLRC be successful.

Tim Hultmann, 285 Lakeview Avenue – Mr. Hultmann recalled that he had been the City's Mayor when the LLRC had originally contacted him about supporting their plans, which he had. He stated that there had been some issues with the first person who ran the organization; and there have also been some Councilmembers who live on the lake who had, in the past, complained about the LLRC. He explained that the Hennepin County Water Patrol had to explain to the Council that the lake was public. He indicated that he felt the right thing to do was to move forward with the LLRC's request and asked the Commission to recommend approval.

Joseph Cerny, 1802 Symes Street – Mr. Cerny noted that he did not dispute that the LLRC gives some extra benefits to the community; but as someone who uses the lake, when the LLRC is on the lake, it is a problem because the responsibility to avoid the rowers and conduct his sport (waterskiing) meant that there were frequently navigation issues. He shared examples where boats from different directions were crossing at the narrowest point. He believed the City had granted the LLRC about 60 hours per week, they were now asking for about 9 hours more, and he would like to know when additional hours would stop. He added that if the City was just going to go ahead and essentially say that the LLRC can use the lake anytime they want to, then they should just say that. He reiterated that as a lake user, there was an impact from the LLRC being on the lake. He commented that he had been very pleased that their plan to build a giant complex at Summit Park had fallen through. He indicated that he felt that there was never enough time for people to engage in a sport, that the balance for rowing on the lake had already been exceeded, and shared that he was not in favor of expanded hours for the LLRC.

Commissioner Axelson observed that he hoped the full Commission understood the rules of the lake and motorized watercraft versus non-motorized watercraft.

Pete Jaenchen, 2515 Bobolink Road, LLRC Board President – Mr. Jaenchen stated that he understood that the primary obligation of the Commission was to their constituents. He had submitted a letter earlier this week and had been a resident in the area for the past 30 years. His sons, daughter, and himself had all started rowing after the LLRC came to the community. He encouraged the Commission to read through all the letters that have been submitted about this request and asked them to consider what an activity like the LLRC actually brought to the community. He noted what the Commission would see in the letters that had been submitted is that the LLRC and its members are always giving back to the community, and he shared examples of some of the things they have been involved in. He explained that their agenda involved trying to make the LLRC more available for students and adults, which was essentially everyone.

There being no additional comments, Chair Adams closed the public hearing at 6:52 pm.

Commissioner Secord asked how much space the rowing crews take up when they are on the lake and added that she understood that motorized boats had to give way to non-motorized boats. She voiced that she would like to know how much time other residents and individuals would have to enjoy the lake if the City approved the LLRC request to expand their hours of use; asked how the LLRC helped make everyone be able to have an experience on the lake; and questioned how full the lake got on a regular basis.

Amy Johnson, Director of the LLRC, mentioned that this year will be the LLRC's 12th summer on the lake and noted that she felt they have been able to share the lake. She added that if there are concerns, she would encourage people to contact the LLRC directly. She stated that she recalled times in the morning when there have been water skiers out and when the coaches had decided to go to a different part of the lake, so she believed that they were working together in order to make space for everyone. She indicated that there had been a comment made about cutting across the narrow sides of the lake, which was sometimes due to their permit hours, and explained that she felt that they were trying to work together. She described the usual space they take up with coaching launches and groups of students/rowers, and explained that one of their thoughts behind the request for additional hours was to try to consolidate people closer to launches in order to split them into different categories or groupings. She noted that the permit language may appear that the LLRC would be out there from 6:00 am to 8:00 pm, but she clarified that those were just the hours that they were permitted to use the lake which would give them the option of running a community education class, for example. She shared that their actual practice hours were always listed on their website; and that they continue to keep the lake open during the busiest times, for example, Saturday afternoons and all day on Sunday.

Commissioner Secord stated that she did not have any issue with additional morning times but expressed concerns about how busy the lake may be from 6:00 to 8:00 pm.

Ms. Johnson assured Commissioner Secord that it wasn't the LLRC's intent to take over the lake and they wanted to share it. She reflected that on a summer evening in the middle of July, it will definitely be busier, and there have been a few times when they decided that the lake was too crowded so they canceled practice on the lake or have adjusted practices in order to just do smaller circles along the shoreline.

Mr. Cerny commented that he lives on the lake and he believed the intent was always for traffic to travel east to west on the north side, and west to east on the south side, but that was not consistently done. The crews also spread out pretty wide which can create a bigger choke point. He indicated that many times they have run into the situation where they are traveling from the northwest corner to the southeast corner, they have been water skiing on a certain portion of the lake because there is no wind, and the LLRC comes in and sits right in their pathway which makes them have to stop because the LLRC has the right-of-way. He clarified that this means water skiers stop and have to try to find somewhere else on the lake if possible, but essentially, the situation makes it so they cannot actually use the lake. He took issue with some of the assertions being made by Ms. Johnson and noted that he understood sharing the lake may be their intention, but that has not been how it was actually playing out and he felt it was creating a lot of tension on the lake between boaters and the LLRC.

Ms. Johnson suggested that if, for example, Mr. Cerny wanted to make some runs down the east shoreline, if he would just flag down their coach boat, they would be happy to chat with him.

Mr. Cerny replied that they have had rowers actually come into an area when they were already there using a portion of the lake, and asserted that this had happened to them on multiple occasions.

Ms. Johnson reiterated that the LLRC was not trying to be in the way and surmised that the rowers may have just selected the area that day because the water was calmer there.

Mr. Cerny explained that he wanted everyone to be aware that both groups want calm water and also want to share the water, but when the LLRC has the right-of-way, they kind of take it away from the people who do not have the right-of-way. He added that his intent was not to get rid of the LLRC, but to try to find an appropriate balance between the different uses on the lake because Long Lake is a recreational lake that should be allowed to be used by all people.

Commissioner Secord agreed and noted that Long Lake was a public lake that is used by people from outside of the City, so some common sense rules and courtesies need to be in place.

Ms. Johnson stated that people make reference to the LLRC using the lake but wanted to remind everyone that the members of the club were their neighbors and people that they bump into at the grocery store. She emphasized that they have always been a big proponent of staying as safe as they can and had made some changes to ensure that they were visible to the boaters.

Commissioner Goodsell shared that she was a rower and has been a member of the LLRC for the last five or six years. She noted that what she liked about having the club in the City was that it was a healthy sport that was also very socially oriented; and rowing was an environmentally sensitive activity that had a large span of ages involved. She commented that she could completely see the impact on other lake users because the LLRC takes up a lot of room and the lake can get extremely full. During her time on the lake, she recalled that they had canceled a few times due to wind, but she could not think of a time that they canceled because the lake had been too busy. She added that one thing that hadn't been brought up is that there are places where they tend to congregate on the lake during practices, and she could only imagine if she lived on the lake and two dozen chatty rowers and a coach with a megaphone showed up outside her house at 6:00 am. She observed that it was not a surprise to her why the LLRC gets so much pushback.

Mr. Cerny pointed out that essentially lake users were competing for the same times on the lake and noted that water skiers also liked to go out early because the lake is calmer and they also need to ski in a straight line, just like the LLRC does. He agreed with Ms. Johnson that the rowers wearing high visibility clothing has made a big difference in making them easier to spot.

Commissioner Goodsell questioned whether there may be a reasonable compromise.

Ms. Johnson responded that with their morning groups, the LLRC has made a specific point to be near the City beach area and not go near the homes.

Commissioner Goodsell reiterated her question about whether there may be able to be some type of compromise between the two sides. She commented that when Mr. Jaenchen had brought this topic up last October, he had told her that he just wanted to be able to have Thursday nights, so she had been surprised to see the actual request come in with additional hours.

Ms. Johnson replied that they had added Fridays and some of the other time periods to their request because people wanted to be able to schedule lessons. She clarified that they want to keep the lake for everyone else to use as well.

Mr. Cerny added that he was aware many of the lake users have ended up changing their own plans for use of the lake because of the presence of the LLRC. He urged the Commission to also keep in mind the potential parking issues with the increased hours.

Ms. Johnson indicated that Brennan Greene (Birch's) was in favor of their request and had signed their application. She explained that over the last few years they had been using the Union Cemetery lot for parking. They had asked if they could also park there on Thursday evenings, but it hadn't been run by their board yet.

The Commission and members of the audience discussed the difficult parking situation in the area.

Commissioner Secord asked if the intent behind expanding their hours was to add more classes to their schedule.

Ms. Johnson responded that they had a few focuses including the possibility of separating and classifying the rowers, for example, keeping the faster rowers together. They also have community education classes for adults and right now, their only option is Tuesday night. For the additional Friday hours, they did not have specific plans other than to have additional spots available for people who wanted to take lessons.

The Commission and the audience discussed the number of boats on the lake, the crossing patterns used by the rowers, the language in the CUP that does not limit the number of rowers and boats that can be on the lake, and difficulty for water skiers to be able to use the lake when the rowers are there.

Mr. Cerny stated that he was in favor of keeping the usage hours for the LLRC the same, noting that they already had 63 hours of free access to the lake. He felt that approval of the LLRC's request would restrict other recreational users.

The Commission and the audience discussed how LLRC scheduled their practices.

Commissioner Secord asked what the LLRC did when they encountered fishermen who have their boats anchored.

Ms. Johnson replied that they start at the east or the west bay and the coaches say something like, 'we are going to go 1,000 meters, there's one boat off to the right in the southwest bay and one on cemetery point'. She noted that they give the same kind of communications related to water skiers.

Commissioner Goodsell explained that because she was a member of the LLRC, she did not feel comfortable voting on this item.

Chair Adams confirmed that Commissioner Goodsell could recuse herself from voting on this item. He commented that he did not have any issues with the proposed expansion of hours, but certainly understood the concerns that have been expressed. He noted that he felt changing the hours from beginning at 7:00 am to 6:00 am was less of an issue than going later in the evenings, because evenings were generally a busier time on the lake.

The Commission and members of the audience discussed ways they may be able to compromise; the hours of availability for the rowing club; and also for other residents.

Weske reminded everyone present that the public hearing had been closed and the discussion should only be happening amongst the Commission and not with everyone present at the meeting.

Chair Adams asked the Commission whether they felt it would be helpful if the LLRC's request were to include the stipulation that some of the additional hours were not to be used for group activities.

Commissioner Axelson believed that a provision of that nature would be hard to enforce.

Ms. Johnson offered to amend their request for Friday to be 6:00 am to 3:00 pm.

Commissioner Axelson observed that in his opinion, the City had been very accommodating to allow the LLRC 63 hours/week of access to the lake for rowing activities, and he did not think anything more was justifiable.

Commissioner See moved to recommend the City Council adopt a Resolution approving an amendment to a Conditional Use Permit to allow rowing crew facilities for the Long Lake Rowing Crew on property located at 1310 Wayzata Boulevard W.

Motion died for lack of a second.

Commissioner Axelson moved to recommend the City Council adopt a Resolution denying an amendment to a Conditional Use Permit to allow rowing crew facilities for the Long Lake Rowing Crew on property located at 1310 Wayzata Boulevard W. Commissioner Secord seconded. Ayes: Adams, Axelson and Secord. Nays: See. Abstain: Goodsell. Motion carried.

Commissioner Secord recommended that the LLRC take a deeper look at their request and see if they can have conversations with some of the individuals who spoke tonight and see if they may be able to put together some amendments.

Chair Adams explained that the Commission had recommended denial, but the City Council could still approve their original request.

OTHER BUSINESS

A. Council Liaison Report

Councilmember Feldmann gave a brief update on recent Council activities including a progress report on negotiation meetings related to fire services.

B. Commission Member Business

Commissioner Goodsell commented that she would like to see Long Lake Public Works utilize a brining truck like other communities in the area to make things less slippery in winter road conditions, and suggested that the Council consider the possibility of contracting with Orono.

C. Staff Business

None.

ADJOURN

Hearing no objection, Chair Adams adjourned the meeting by general consent at 7:56 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott Weske
City Administrator



CITY OF
LONG LAKE

Planning Commission Agenda Report

City of Long Lake

450 Virginia Avenue, PO Box 606
Long Lake, MN 55356

MEETING DATE / May 13, 2025

SUBJECT: Public Hearing: Amending Section 19 of the Zoning Ordinance to Update Requirements for Residential, Business, and Swimming Pool Fences

Prepared By: Jeanette Moeller, City Clerk

Report Date: 5/7/2025

Planning Commission Action

Upon conclusion of the public hearing, the Planning Commission should discuss the draft ordinance and consider the following action:

Motion to recommend the City Council adopt an ordinance amending Section 19 of the City's Zoning Ordinance to update requirements for residential, business, and swimming pool fences.

Overview / Background

City staff has been aware for some time that zoning code pertaining to residential fences and swimming pools was outdated and perhaps overly restrictive compared to more current fence standards. A recent request by a resident to tie in to a property line fence prompted staff to move forward with a review and update of the City's existing fence language set forth in Zoning Code.

The attached draft ordinance proposes amending Section 19 of the City's Zoning Ordinance to include the following updates:

- Temporary erosion control and construction fences are required for new construction. Though not previously recognized in fence code, the proposed ordinance includes language providing exemptions for temporary erosion control, construction, new landscaping, snow, and seasonal-only garden fences; and includes safeguards to prevent these types of temporary fences from remaining in place year-round.
- Current fence code requires a survey for submission with a fence permit application. Staff has found that a detailed site plan is often adequate to document a fence's location and can typically be generated by a permit applicant at no cost.
- Existing residential fence requirements state that all residential fences must be set back at least one foot from all property lines; however, businesses are allowed to erect a property line tie-in fence. The one-foot residential fence setback requirement has been a source of regular objection by residents considering a fencing project, particularly because it doesn't allow for adjoining properties to share boundary line fencing. Consistent with current fence standards, staff's proposed ordinance language would allow boundary line fences for residential, business and industrial district fences to be shared if the location is agreed to by notarized signature of all adjoining property owners. Additionally, rather than a one foot setback, fences would be required to be located entirely upon the private property of the person or business constructing/causing construction of the fence.

- Rather than the current (and outdated) requirement that swimming pools be surrounded by a six foot fence, the proposed ordinance would allow the more typical four foot safety fence equipped with safeguards. To assure that swimming pool related zoning requirements are addressed comprehensively and for ease of ordinance applicability/use, pool setback standards have also been included in the updated language within the same subdivision.

Staff requests the Planning Commission review the attached draft ordinance, hold the required public hearing, and discuss whether to make a recommendation that the City Council adopt the draft ordinance as presented.

Supporting Information

- Ordinance amending Section 19 of the City's Zoning Ordinance
- Email from resident requesting the City consider allowing boundary line tie-in fences



**City of Long Lake
Hennepin County, Minnesota
Ordinance No. 2025-__**

An Ordinance Amending Section 19 of the Long Lake Zoning Ordinance to Update Requirements for Residential, Business, and Swimming Pool Fences

The City Council of the City of Long Lake does hereby ordain as follows:

Section 1. The Long Lake Zoning Ordinance, Section 19, Subd. 9 is hereby amended as follows. Additions are underlined, and deletions are shown with a ~~strike through~~:

Subd. 9. Fences

- A. Permit Required. Except as otherwise expressly stated in this section, No person, firm or corporation shall hereafter construct, erect, alter or relocate any fence within the City or cause to be constructed or erected within the City of Long Lake, any fence without first making an application for and securing a building permit from the City. Temporary erosion control fences, temporary fences to protect newly seeded areas, and temporary snow fences are allowed without a fence permit provided that no such fence may be left in place for more than six (6) months without written City approval; and that any such fence must be removed within 15 days of the City providing written notice to the property's owner or occupant that the City has determined the fence no longer serves its originally intended temporary or seasonal purpose.
1. Temporary Construction Fences. Fences on construction and excavation sites for erosion control, the protection of plants, and the protection of the construction site shall not require a fence permit; however, the fence(s) may not be standing for more than 180 days consecutively, or in a calendar year, unless otherwise authorized by the city engineer or other authorized agent. Any such fence must be removed within 14 days of the City providing written notice to the property's owner or occupant that the City has determined the fence no longer serves its originally intended temporary purpose.
 2. Seasonal Garden Fences. Fences made of wire and/or wood shall be allowed around garden areas without a permit, provided that any such fence is located entirely in the side or rear yard, does not exceed six (6) feet in height; and all fencing shall be removed at the end of the growing season, unless otherwise authorized by the city's zoning administrator or other authorized agent. Any such fence must be removed within 14 days of the City providing written notice to the property's owner or occupant that the City has determined the fence no longer serves its originally intended seasonal purpose.
- B. Application Procedures. Each application for a permit under this section shall be submitted on forms provided by the City. Each such application shall include:

1. A certificate of survey or detailed site plan showing the property boundaries, the location of house(s), garage(s), any structures, access drives, and other relevant improvements on the lot.
 2. and the location of the fencing to be erected, altered or relocated.
 3. A drawing and description of the proposed fence; and where required for property line fences, the notarized signature of all abutting neighbors. A survey may not be required if the corner property stakes are located on the property or a survey exists in the property file.
- C. Standards for Residential District Fences. Fences of chain-link construction shall only be permitted in rear yards. Except as otherwise provided herein, no fence shall be erected or maintained more than six (6) feet in height. The following standards shall also apply:
1. All fences shall be approximately 1' from the property line, located entirely upon the private property of the person, firm or corporation constructing or causing the construction of such fence. No fences shall be placed on or extend into public rights-of-way, or be located on public easements. Fences placed within city drainage and utility easements would need to be removed and replaced at the expense of the property owner should the easement need to be accessed at any time and for any purpose. Fences may be located on the boundary line between properties only if the location is agreed to by notarized signature of all adjoining property owner(s), with copies provided to the City.
 2. That side of any fence considered to be its "face" (i.e., the finished side having no structural supports) shall face abutting property or street right-of-way.
 3. Every fence shall be constructed in a substantial, workman-like manner and of substantial material reasonably suited for the purpose for which the fence is proposed to be used. Every fence shall be maintained in a condition of reasonable repair and shall not be allowed to become and remain in a condition of disrepair or danger, or constitute a public or private nuisance. Any such fence which is, or has become dangerous to the public safety, health or welfare, is a public nuisance, and the City shall commence proceedings for the abatement thereof. Link fences, wherever permitted, shall be constructed in such a manner that no barbed ends shall be at the top. Electric and barbed wire fences shall not be permitted.
 4. Fences on all corner lots erected within thirty (30) feet of the intersecting property line shall be subject to Section 19, Subd. 8 of this Ordinance.
 5. Fences in the required front yard shall not exceed 3 and 1/2 feet in height.
 6. Fences used for the enclosure of tennis sport courts shall not exceed ten (10) feet in height and shall be located in a rear yard only and at least five (5) feet from any property line.

D. Standards for Business and Industrial District Fences. Property line fences in all Business Districts shall be a maximum of six (6) feet in height and in Industrial Districts shall be a maximum of (8) feet in height, except as otherwise provided herein. The following standards shall also apply:

1. All fences shall be ~~approximately 1' from the property line~~, located entirely upon the private property of the person, firm or corporation constructing or causing the construction of such fence, ~~unless the owner of the property adjoining agrees, in writing, that such fence may be erected on the division line of the respective properties.~~ No fences shall be placed on or extend into public rights-of-way, ~~or be located on public easements.~~ Fences placed within city drainage and utility easements would need to be removed and replaced at the expense of the property owner should the easement need to be accessed at any time and for any purpose. Fences may be located on the boundary line between properties only if the location is agreed to by notarized signature of all adjoining property owner(s), with copies provided to the City.
2. That side of any fence considered to be its "face" (i.e., the finished side having no structural supports) shall face abutting property or street right-of-way.
3. Every fence shall be constructed in a substantial, workman-like manner and of substantial material reasonably suited for the purpose for which the fence is proposed to be used. Every fence shall be maintained in a condition of reasonable repair and shall not be allowed to become and remain in a condition of disrepair or danger, or constitute a public or private nuisance. Any such fence which is, or has become dangerous to the public safety, health or welfare, is a public nuisance, and the City shall commence proceedings for the abatement thereof. Link fences, wherever permitted, shall be constructed in such a manner that no barbed ends shall be at the top. Electric and barbed wire fences shall not be permitted.
4. Fences on all corner lots erected within ~~thirty (30)~~ feet of the intersecting property line shall be subject to Section 19, Subd. 11 of this Ordinance.
5. Fences exceeding the maximum height requirement may be permitted as a conditional use permit if findings are made that the fence is necessary to protect, buffer or improve the premises for which the fence is intended and the application meets the requirements of Section 28.-

Section 2. The Long Lake Zoning Ordinance, Section 19, Subd. 10, is hereby amended as follows. Additions are underlined, and deletions are shown with a ~~strike through~~:

Subd. 10. Required Screening

The fencing and landscaping required by this Ordinance shall be subject to Section 19, Subd. 9 and shall consist of either a fence or a green belt planting strip.

A. Locations Requiring Screening

1. Swimming Pools. All swimming pools shall be ~~fenced and secure so as to prevent unauthorized persons from entering.~~ Fences shall not be less than six (6) feet in height, fully enclosed by a noncorrosive material safety fence at least four (4) feet in height, and equipped with safeguards to prevent children from gaining uncontrolled access. All gates or doors to swimming pools shall be equipped with self-closing and self-latching devices placed at a sufficient height so as to be inaccessible to all small children. Safety fences shall be constructed so as to inhibit the climbing thereof by any person.
 - a. In all residential districts, swimming pools shall be setback at least 10 feet from all adjoining property lines and, except for fences and pump enclosures, shall be located at least 10 feet away from any other building or structure on the same property. Swimming pools shall not be permitted in a front yard, in the area between the street right-of-way and the minimum required building side yard setback line, or within any drainage or utility easement.
 - b. Swimming pools in the R-2 District shall be permitted in the rear subject to the required side yard and building/structure setbacks, and must be located outside of the shore impact zone. The survey accompanying a permit application for a pool in the R-2 District must include an updated impervious surface calculation for any paving or hard surface to be added in conjunction with the pool (pool deck, equipment pad, etc.).

Section 3. Effective Date. This Ordinance shall be effective upon adoption and publication according to law.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Long Lake this _____ day of _____, 2025.

Date of Adoption:	_____, 2025
Date of Publication:	_____, 2025
Effective Date:	_____, 2025

ATTEST:

BY:

Jeanette Moeller, City Clerk

Charlie Miner, Mayor



Jeanette Moeller <jmoeller@longlakemn.gov>

Neighboring Fence

1 message

Luke Brehmer <luke.brehmer@hotmail.com>

Tue, Feb 25, 2025 at 10:05 AM

To: "jmoeller@longlakemn.gov" <jmoeller@longlakemn.gov>

Hi Jeanette,

I'm writing to request that Long Lake changes the rules for tying or leading into a neighbor's fence. We have a dog and would very much like to tie with our neighbor's chain link fence (they're okay with this and would be willing to sign a statement). In this case we would not actually connect to the fence, but place a post right next to their fence. If needing to leave a 2-foot gap between the two fences (current rules), we likely will not install because it will look bad and mowing grass between the two will be a large inconvenience. It is my understanding that businesses are allowed to tie in to each other, which seems like an inconsistent rule as I would expect businesses to share the same property concerns as residents. The fence vendor also stated that Long Lake's no tie in rule is an outlier and one of the only cities in the area with such rule.

Ideally, we would like the rule change as soon as possible for our dog to enjoy our new house's backyard, however we're afraid to let him run free with coyotes in the area.

Thank you!

Luke Brehmer

[1561 Stoneridge Circle](#)

Long Lake, MN