

December 28, 2012

McDonald's USA LLC  
Attn: Adam Jerstad  
1650 W. 82<sup>nd</sup> Street, Suite 900  
Bloomington, MN 55431

**Re: Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit Review  
McDonald's**

Dear Mr. Jerstad:

The City of Ramsey has received your application for Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit Review to construct an approximately 4,600 square foot single tenant building for a restaurant on approximately 1.36 acres. City Staff is recommending to the Planning Commission approval of the request contingent upon the following:

- Required amendments as outlined in the attached Staff Report dated December 28, 2012; and
- Adoption of an ordinance amendment related to expanded hours of operation for electronic speaker devices used in conjunction with a drive-thru.

***Please note: this is only a recommendation that is subject to review by the Planning Commission and final decision by the City Council.*** Copies of the review file and staff report are attached for your review. The Planning Commission will review the request on **Thursday, January 3<sup>rd</sup>, at 7:00 p.m.** at the Ramsey Municipal Center in the Council Chambers. You, or a representative of the development, are highly encouraged to attend this meeting. Please contact me at your earliest convenience prior to the meeting to verify if you will be attending. Following the Planning Commission, the request will need to be reviewed for a final decision by the City Council. This hearing would tentatively be scheduled for Tuesday, January 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2013, at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns. I can be reached at (763) 433-9905 or by email at [canderson@ci.ramsey.mn.us](mailto:canderson@ci.ramsey.mn.us).

Sincerely,

CITY OF RAMSEY

Chris Anderson  
Associate Planner/Environmental Coordinator

Enclosures

Cc: Darren Lazan, Landform Professional Services, 105 S. Fifth Avenue, Minneapolis, MN 55401

*Review File: Super America*

*Site Plan Review*

*September 28, 2012*

*Page 2 of 2*

Eric Kellogg, Landform Professional Services, 105 S. Fifth Avenue, Minneapolis, MN 55401  
Kurt Ulrich, HRA Executive Director

**CITY OF RAMSEY LAND USE APPLICATION  
TECHNICAL REVIEW FILE**

<b>DATE</b>	12/28/2012	<b>PROJECT ADDRESS</b>	TBD – XXXX SUNWOOD DR
<b>PROJECT. TITLE</b>	MCDONALDS		
<b>ESCROW #</b>	113443		
<b>DEPARTMENT:</b>			
<b>TECHNICAL REVIEWER:</b>	Name: Chris Anderson Phone: 763-433-9905 Email: <a href="mailto:canderson@ci.ramsey.mn.us">canderson@ci.ramsey.mn.us</a>		

We are in receipt of the proposed Site Plan for McDonalds. The submittal consists of the following sheets:

- Sheets C0.1, C1.1, C2.1, C3.1, C3.2, C4.1, C7.1, C7.2, EP2.1, L2.1, L7.1 prepared by Landform and dated November 26, 2012
- Sheets A1.0, A2.0, and A2.1 prepared by Reprise Design Incorporated and dated December 10, 2012
- Color 3D renderings and color building elevations dated December 20, 2012

(the “Plans”)

We offer the following comments regarding your conditional use permit and site plan:

**CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT**

***Planning and Zoning***

***Reviewer: Chris Anderson, Associate Planner/Environmental Coordinator***

***[canderson@ci.ramsey.mn.us](mailto:canderson@ci.ramsey.mn.us)***

***(763) 433-9905***

In the COR-2b Subdistrict, drive-thrus serving permitted and conditional uses are permitted under certain conditions. The submittal indicates a double drive-thru serving the building. There are two (2) ‘ordering lanes’ that merge into a single lane for payment and pick-up of food. There appears to be sufficient stacking distance (must accommodate not less than five [5] vehicles without interfering with other drive areas, parking spaces, sidewalks or pedestrian access to the main entry of the building). The configuration of the drive-thru is such that there not be any headlight glare to adjacent uses to the west (Armstrong Blvd); however, to the south, while the parcel is currently vacant, there is an approved site plan on file with the City and headlight glare from the drive-thru payment and pick-up lane may impact the future building on Lot 3 Block 1 COR TWO. The design includes a bypass lane for vehicles to exit the drive-thru lane from the stacking area. Drive-thru lanes and bypass lanes are not permitted within the front yard or within the front build-to line as outlined in City Code Section 117-118 (c)e1. If electronic speaker devices are used, they shall not be audible beyond the property boundaries and shall not be operated between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., unless approved by a Conditional Use Permit (zoning code text correction pending). *It is assumed that the orientation of the building and floor plan and drive-thru configuration is the result of the business model and efficiencies related to food preparation and service as well as drive thru traffic flow needs. Staff has been working with your civil*

engineer to prepare an exhibit visualizing alternative configurations for the building/drive-thru orientation (facing Sunwood Dr and facing the 'campus' center) to provide verification that other orientations cannot be implemented and why the floor plan could not be mirrored or 'flipped' from its present layout. Staff is working to prepare a simple sketch that identifies traffic movement and conflict points of the proposed and alternative alignments to help our Planning Commission and City Council visualize the assumptions provided in your written analysis.

In addition, City Staff needs to verify that the stacking space does indeed accommodate not less than five (5) vehicles without disrupting other drive areas, parking spaces, sidewalks or pedestrian access to the main entry of the building. Please provide an exhibit that verifies compliance with this standard.

In a December 20, 2012 correspondence from Landform Professional Services, there is reference to ensuring pedestrians do not have to cross drive-thru lanes to enter the restaurant. Please note that the submitted site plan provides for a pedestrian crosswalk thru not only the bypass lane but also both drive-thru ordering lanes. Staff suggests exploring the option to have that sidewalk follow the green space along the eastern edge of the property. Staff has prepared an amendment to remove potentially inconsistent language related to hours of operation for speaker use within the drive-thru within the COR-2 Sub-District. However, any approval of a Conditional Use Permit must be contingent upon adoption of a text amendment to Section 117-118 of the Ramsey City Code to address this matter.

## **SITE PLAN**

### **Planning and Zoning**

**Reviewer: Chris Anderson, Associate Planner/Environmental Coordinator**

[canderson@ci.ramsey.mn.us](mailto:canderson@ci.ramsey.mn.us)

(763) 433-9905

**General:** The development proposal consists of a one story building that is approximately 4,600 square feet in size and will be used as a restaurant with a drive-thru. The drive-thru consists of two 'ordering lanes' that merge into a single lane for payment and pick-up of food. The facility will be located on a 1.36 acre parcel, which is located at the southeast corner of Sunwood Dr and Armstrong Blvd (Lot 4 Block 1 COR TWO). In this area, Sunwood Dr is identified as a Parkway Street and Armstrong Blvd is an Arterial Street as outlined in the Design Framework. *Please update Sheet C2.1 as the stated building dimensions do not match the building coverage calculation nor do they scale out accordingly either.*

**Zoning:** The site is zoned COR-2b Commercial Subdistrict. This area is intended to encourage a mix of large and small places accommodating auto-oriented uses. This suggests even greater attention be paid to public realm and streetscape improvements that not only accommodate vehicles, but also invite bicycle and pedestrian traffic. Restaurants are a permitted use in this district as are drive-thrus serving permitted uses; however, use of electronic speaker devices associated with drive-thru lanes is limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., unless approved by a Conditional Use Permit (zoning code text correction pending). A conditional use permit is being processed simultaneously with the site plan for twenty-four (24) hour use of the electronic speaker devices. *Note that any approval of a conditional use permit would be contingent upon adoption of a text amendment to Section 117-118 of the Ramsey City Code to address this matter.*

**Building Orientation:** Building orientation is subject to the Design Framework of The COR, which is incorporated by reference as part of the Zoning Code. While the building location complies with

Development Plan 6.1, neither the building front nor the main entrance faces the public road. However, the intention of the COR TWO plat was to function more as a campus setting with the buildings fronting the private drive serving each of the three lots. As proposed though, it appears that the rear elevation of the building fronts Sunwood Drive with the front elevation (as noted on the submitted elevations) facing the south (toward Lot 3 Block 1 COR TWO) rather than the private drive; although there is an entrance to the building on the east wall that is facing the private drive.

As stated previously, City Staff is working to prepare an exhibit that visualizes traffic patterns and conflict points to supplement the written text submitted. City Staff feels this shall be an important component to assist the Planning Commission and City Council in fully understanding the proposal as submitted. Color, three-dimensional renderings were subsequently submitted showing an architecturally enhanced north (rear) wall (windows) facing Sunwood Drive.

*Again, it is assumed that the orientation of the building and floor plan, as well as the drive-thru configuration, is the result of the business model and efficiencies related to food preparation and service, and City Staff generally supports these assumptions. However, Staff would recommend that you prepare an exhibit that shows why alternative configurations for the building/drive-thru orientation (facing Sunwood Dr and facing the 'campus' center) cannot be implemented and why the floor plan could not be mirrored or 'flipped' from its present layout. This exhibit should also include turning/maneuvering patterns and the potential points of conflict accompanied with a narrative outlining the specific design constraints that are not only driving the proposed orientation but also why alternative orientations are not feasible. Note that if no other orientation is possible, the north (rear) wall of the building must be architecturally enriched to enhance the street view at one of the major gateways into the COR. City Staff acknowledges that you have enhanced the architecture of this façade, and appreciates the additional work that has been completed thus far. The applicant should be prepared to expand on and demonstrate why the building/drive-thru orientation must be as proposed and why alternative configurations are not feasible at the Planning Commission meeting, both in terms of building orientation and floor plan.*

**Building Height:** The COR-2 Subdistrict allows for building heights between one (1) and four (4) stories. The proposed building is a single story with a flat roof and parapet wall. Per correspondence from Landform, dated December 20, 2012, all mechanical equipment will be located on the roof and screened from pedestrian view by a parapet wall that is incorporated into the building design.

**Maximum Structure Area:** The COR-2 Subdistrict does not have maximum building coverage or minimum floor area ratio requirements.

**Setbacks:** While the COR-2b Subdistrict requires build-to lines, the Development Plan is the driver for building placement. Within the COR-2b Subdistrict, the currently approved Development Plan (version 6.1) depicts all the buildings on the north side of Sunwood Drive setback as far as possible from Sunwood Drive. While the Design Framework does identify build-to requirements, Development Plan 6.1 does also show the building location for Lot 4 Block 1 COR TWO as proposed on the site plan. In an attempt to address the street edge contemplated within the Design Framework, the submittal does include decorative fencing (combination of stone columns and decorative aluminum fencing), which matches what was approved on Lot 5 Block 1 COR TWO (Super America site), to create a street edge along Sunwood Drive. The plans indicate that the decorative fencing will cover forty-two percent (42%) of the street frontage along Sunwood Drive.

**Exterior Materials:** The application includes two (2) sheets of architectural elevations, dated December 10, 2012, as well as a color rendering of architectural elevations, dated December 20, 2012. Buildings shall be finished with high-quality, durable materials such as glass, stone, brick, windows, canvas awnings, etc. The exterior finish of the building appears to consist of face brick, brick accent bands, dryvit accents (EIFS), corrugated metal panels, clear, tempered glass, two (2) roof cap accent elements and an aluminum trellis. Subsequent to the initial submittal, a new rendering was submitted (December 20, 2012) that showed new windows on the north (rear) wall of the building (facing Sunwood Drive) and eliminated the two (2) down spouts. *If no other building configuration/orientation is feasible, further enhancements to the north wall may still be necessary. The color architectural elevations, dated December 20, 2012, include four (4) windows south of the entrance area while sheet A2.0, prepared by Reprise Design Incorporated and dated December 10, 2012, only shows three (3) windows. Please reconcile this discrepancy and resubmit. None of the 3D renderings or color architectural elevations include down spouts that were originally included on the north wall. How is water going to be drained from the roof area? Also, please note that Minnesota State Plumbing Code 4715 requires both primary and secondary roof drainage be identified.*

**Waste Storage:** The waste storage area is proposed to be integrated into the building at the north end with access for servicing along the east wall of the building.

**Off-Street Parking - Spaces Required:** The Design Framework provides a range of allowable parking stalls for restaurant uses, with a minimum of one (1) stall for each two (2) seats and a maximum of one (1) stall for every one (1) seat. The site plan proposes fifty-one (51) off-street parking spaces. It is City Staff's understanding that there may be shared parking for Lots 3-5 of Block 1. *If it is the intent to participate in a shared parking arrangement with the other lots, please submit a shared parking easement for review prior to the City releasing the Building Permit. Please provide a seating plan for the building to determine if the off-street parking provided complies with the Design Framework. Also, please update Sheet C2.1 to include dimensions for the angled stalls in the parking summary. It appears that the intent is to utilize some of the provided off-street parking spaces for loading/unloading, might there be a better design to accommodate that need? The height of the handicap parking signs are shown to be measured from top of curb but ICC/ANSI A117.1 2003section 502.7 requires that measurement to be made from the parking surface. Finally, the parking stalls fronting Armstrong Blvd do require screening, which could be in the form of a decorative wall, railing, hedge or combination of these elements, to a minimum height of three (3) feet and a maximum height of four and a half (4.5) feet above the parking lot. Considering the grade difference between the lot and Armstrong Blvd (presently and after the Armstrong Blvd/Highway 10 interchange is complete), this screening may not be warranted, nonetheless, this is identified for the City Council to consider.*

**Signs:** Please note that all signs for the proposed building must be approved through a separate sign permit process. Sign regulations can be found within the Design Framework as well as in City Code Chapter 117, Article II, Division 8. The developer is encouraged to review these sign regulations early in the process to avoid any unnecessary delays due to potential needs for special permits. *No dimensions are provided for any of the proposed signs and thus, only general feedback is possible at this time, which includes the following:*

- *Wall, canopy or marquee signs are limited to fifteen percent (15%) of the front building façade and at least fifty percent (50%) of the signage area must be placed on the measured wall.*
- *Menu boards are limited to one (1) per drive-thru lane and forty (40) square feet each.*

*Review File: McDonalds*

*Site Plan Review*

*December 28, 2012*

*Page 5 of 6*

- *Directional or instructional signs are restricted to on-site direction and instruction and shall not exceed four (4) square feet in size. Such signs shall only provide direction or instruction to guide persons to facilities intended to serve the public.*

***Landscape Review***

***Reviewer: Chris Anderson***

***[canderson@ci.ramsey.mn.us](mailto:canderson@ci.ramsey.mn.us)***

***763-433-9905***

**Landscaping Plan:** The submittal included a landscaping plan, prepared by Landform and dated November 26, 2012, which includes landscaping interior to the site. The streetscape landscaping was installed in conjunction with the Sunwood Drive realignment project. The landscaping plan is generally acceptable with the following comments:

- *Additional plantings along the western edge of the site should be considered. Presently, the trees are spaced at about sixty-five (65) feet on center, which provides ample space to incorporate a couple additional trees while maintaining a spacing of about thirty-five (35) feet on center. Adding shrubs along this edge will accomplish some of the required screening for the adjacent parking.*

**Tree Preservation:** This site is devoid of any significant tree cover and therefore, no tree preservation plan is necessary.

**Sidewalk and Trails:** As part of the Sunwood Drive realignment project, a sidewalk was installed along Sunwood Drive and terminates just after turning south along Armstrong Boulevard. Typically, a requirement of development would be to extend this sidewalk to the southern limit of the property. However, this segment of sidewalk is included in the plans for the Armstrong Boulevard interchange and thus, will be completed as part of that project.

**DEVELOPMENT FEES**

Development fees were determined during the COR TWO platting process. Applicable fees associated with this project (Lot 4 Block 1 COR TWO) can be found on the enclosed spreadsheet. Please coordinate with the Development Manager regarding these fees as you complete the real estate transaction.

**GENERAL INFORMATION**

**Additional Review.** Due to its location, the request has been forwarded to Anoka County Highway Department for review and comment. *The Anoka County Highway Department (ACHD) Engineering Plan Review Process will apply to this site. Additional information regarding this process can be found on the enclosed Anoka County Site Plan Review Letter dated December 19, 2012.*

**Next Steps.** *Following review by the Planning Commission, the request will be forwarded to the City Council for final action. The City Council is tentatively scheduled to review the request at their January 22, 2013 meeting. Staff will follow up in writing at that time.*

*All comments contained within this letter shall be included in the final set of plans submitted with the appropriate permits. The Applicant shall be responsible for all required permits including, but not*

*Review File: McDonalds*

*Site Plan Review*

*December 28, 2012*

*Page 6 of 6*

*limited to, the MPCA NPDES Permit and Lower Rum River Water Management Organization (LRRWMO) Permits.*

**CITY OF RAMSEY LAND USE APPLICATION  
TECHNICAL REVIEW FILE**

<b>DATE</b>	12/28/12	<b>PROJECT ADDRESS</b>	TBD – XXXX SUNWOOD DR
<b>PROJECT. TITLE</b>	MCDONALDS		
<b>ESCROW #</b>	113443		
<b>DEPARTMENT:</b>	Engineering		
<b>TECHNICAL REVIEWER:</b>	Name: Leonard Linton Phone: 763 433-9834 Email: <a href="mailto:llinton@ci.ramsey.mn.us">llinton@ci.ramsey.mn.us</a>		

We offer the following comments regarding your site plan submittal dated November 26, 2012 prepared by Landform. This plan set makes reference to connecting to existing curb, sanitary sewer, storm sewer and watermain. These facilities were not in place at the time of review. Coordination will be required if this project advances to construction prior to installation of the off site utilities.

**Demolition Plan:**

A demolition plan is included with the set. This sheet does not show any work to be performed. The notes make reference to building removal. There has never been a building on the site. The adjacent work by others has not been installed as noted above. The demolition sheet should be revised to reflect the demolition work required or be removed from the plan set.

**Grading and Drainage:**

- Please make sure that all items shown on the various plan sheets are either clearly noted on the plans or are referenced in the legend.
- The pedestrian ramp details have recently been modified at the state level, and the plans should be revised to include the most recent Mn/DOT approved detail and design.
- Silt fence must be installed along the southern edge of the site.
- We are continuing to evaluate the submitted stormwater plan and associated calculations so additional comments may be forthcoming. The site storm sewer system drains into a common system shared by lots 3, 4 and 5 of COR TWO which includes an underground storage component. Updated calculations have not been received for inclusion.
- A maintenance agreement will be required for the proposed nonpublic storm sewer system outlining responsibilities of the respective parties and the maintenance schedule for the system. This document must be approved and recorded against the property at the time of site plan approval.
- Inlet protection must be provided for all existing catch basins adjacent to the site.
- The NPDES summary on sheet C 3.1 does not match the data provided on sheet C 2.1.
- Revise or remove note 9, sheet C3.1. There is no curb to match into.

Please note on the plans if there is any dewatering required for this project. If so, the City will want to review the dewatering plan prior to implementation. No dewatering activities can occur until the required permit is secured and submitted for review.

**Street and Building Access:** The site will derive access from a private drive shared by Lots 3, 4 and 5 of COR TWO. Cross access agreements must be recorded against each lot.

**Utilities:**

- Change note 1 to DIP Class 53.
- Revise note 7 to state “10 gauge tracer wire”.
- Revise notes 8 & 11 to state “City of Ramsey Engineering Department” instead of Public Works Department.
- Add note “Water valves shall only be operated by City of Ramsey personnel.”

Offsite utilities have not been installed as noted above. Coordination with City of Ramsey Engineering Department will be required for connection to offsite utilities.

The detail sheet must include the current City Details for any improvements proposed within the right-of-way. The manhole details should be updated to include language for a water tight wrap around the adjusting rings.

**Permits:** The applicant is responsible to secure all required permits for this project; including but not limited to an MPCA NPDES construction permit, a Lower Rum River Watershed Organization permit, and Anoka County and MnDOT right-of-way permits. Additionally, the contractor performing the work will be required to get a City license and right-of-way permit. *The Anoka County Highway Department (ACHD) Engineering Plan Review Process will apply to this site. Additional information regarding this process can be found on the enclosed Anoka County Site Plan Review Letter dated December 19, 2012.*

**Lighting:** The lighting plan was submitted for review. City standards require that the luminaire (light source) must not be visible from beyond the property line. Any lighting used to illuminate an off-street parking area, sign, or structure shall be arranged to deflect away from Armstrong Boulevard (CSAH 83) and Sunwood Drive. *Please provide shop drawings for each type of light fixture to be used.*

**REU Number:** This property will be subject to a storm water utility charge based upon the amount of impervious surface on the site. The quarterly charge is dependent upon the number of Residential Equivalent Units (REU) calculated for this property. The site is proposed as 78.3% impervious. This leads to an REU of  $(1.359 \times 3.79) 5.151$  and a quarterly stormwater fee of \$206.67 (2013 Rate).

**CITY OF RAMSEY LAND USE APPLICATION  
TECHNICAL REVIEW FILE**

<b>DATE</b>	12/28/2012	<b>PROJECT ADDRESS</b>	TBD – XXXX SUNWOOD DR
<b>PROJECT. TITLE</b>	MCDONALDS		
<b>ESCROW #</b>	113443		
<b>DEPARTMENT:</b>	Fire		
<b>TECHNICAL REVIEWER:</b>	Name: Matt Kohner Phone: 763-433-9832 Email: mkohner@ci.ramsey.mn.us		

We offer the following comments regarding your site plan and plat submittal:

**Fire:** The ingress access from the north is shown at 16 feet. Fire apparatus access roads are required to have an unobstructed width of not less than 20 feet. *Please revise plans accordingly.*