

**PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF RAMSEY
ANOKA COUNTY
STATE OF MINNESOTA**

The Ramsey Planning Commission conducted a regular meeting on Thursday, August 3, 2017, at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota.

Members Present: Vice Chair Gary VanScoy
 Commissioner Bruce Anderson
 Commissioner Ralph Brauer
 Commissioner Cheri Gengler
 Commissioner Cindy Nosan
 Commissioner Patrick Surma

Members Absent: Chairperson Randy Bauer

Also Present: Community Development Director Timothy Gladhill
 City Planner Chris Anderson
 Planning Consultant Eric Maass
 Planning Intern Alec Anderson

1. CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair VanScoy called the regular meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. CITIZEN INPUT

None.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion by Commissioner Nosan, seconded by Commissioner Anderson, to approve the agenda as presented.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chair VanScoy, Commissioners Nosan, Anderson, Brauer, Gengler, and Surma. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Bauer.

4. APPROVE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

4.01: Approve the Following Planning Commission Minutes:

None.

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS/COMMISSION BUSINESS

5.01: Public Hearing: Consider a request for Preliminary Plat approval of Bunker Lake Industrial Park (Project #17-127); Case of PSD, LLC

Public Hearing

Vice Chair VanScoy called the public hearing to order at 7:02 p.m.

Presentation

Planning Intern Moss presented the staff report stating the purpose of this case is to review the preliminary plat for a new Business Park being proposed near the southeast corner of Bunker Lake Boulevard and Puma St. The total area is about forty-five (45) acres in size, but only a portion of that is being proposed for development initially. It should be noted that the City Council has approved a Tree Clearing and Grading Agreement for the Developer to allow some of the site preparation work to begin in advance of final approvals to aid in getting Lots 1 & 2 pad ready as soon as possible. Staff recommends approval of the Resolution granting preliminary plat approval of Bunker Lake Industrial Park, contingent upon compliance with the Staff Review Letter dated July 27, 2017.

Citizen Input

Matt Kuker, PSD, stated he recently completed a tree inventory for the site and addressed the 30% replanting plan. He explained staff cleared him to begin mass grading and tree removal this week. He noted he would begin a spec building yet this fall to have the home occupied by February 1st.

Motion by Commissioner Anderson, seconded by Commissioner Nosan, to close the public hearing.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chair VanScoy, Commissioners Anderson, Nosan, Brauer, Gengler, and Surma. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Bauer.

Vice Chair VanScoy closed the public hearing closed at 7:06 p.m.

Commission Business

Motion by Commissioner Nosan, seconded by Commissioner Surma, to recommend that City Council adopt Resolution #17-08-192 granting preliminary plat approval of Bunker Lake Industrial Park, contingent upon compliance with the Staff Review Letter dated July 27, 2017.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chair VanScoy, Commissioners Nosan, Surma, Anderson, Brauer, and Gengler. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Bauer.

5.02: Public Hearing: Consider a request for Preliminary Plat and Site Plan for Jaspas Industrial park (Project #16-69); Case of Sharp Associates, LLC

Public Hearing

Vice Chair VanScoy called the public hearing to order at 7:07 p.m.

Presentation

Planning Intern Moss presented the staff report stating the City has received an application for Preliminary Plat and Site Plan for Jaspas Business Park. The Applicant is proposing a 52,000-square foot multi-tenant building for small or startup businesses in manufacturing and services. The project is proposed on the southeast corner of 143rd Avenue and Jaspas Street and east of the current public works facility. The Developer, Sharp & Associates, has proposed a three-lot subdivision with one buildable lot for the proposed building and two outlots (one of which is potentially to site the future public works facility). Staff recommend approval of the preliminary plat and site plan, contingent on revisions outlined in the Staff Review Letter.

Citizen Input

Dan Sharp, Sharp & Associates, commented on the multi-tenant building he was proposing to construct for startup businesses. He explained there was a demand for this type of use. He anticipated the users would be machine shops, contractors or small manufacturing businesses. He indicated the tenant sites would range in size based on the needs of the business.

Commissioner Brauer stated he was pleased to see a small business incubator location coming to the City of Ramsey.

Commissioner Nosan agreed stating this was a nice concept.

Motion by Commissioner Surma, seconded by Commissioner Nosan, to close the public hearing.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chair VanScoy, Commissioners Surma, Nosan, Anderson, Brauer, and Gengler. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Bauer.

Vice Chair VanScoy closed the public hearing closed at 7:16 p.m.

Commission Business

Motion by Commissioner Surma, seconded by Commissioner Anderson, to recommend that City Council adopt Resolution #17-08-193 approving the Preliminary Plat for Jaspas Business Park,

and recommend adoption of Resolution #17-08-194 approving the Site Plan for Jaspar Business Park, both contingent upon revisions outlined in the Staff Review Letter.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chair VanScoy, Commissioners Surma, Anderson, Brauer, Gengler, and Nosan. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Bauer.

5.03: Public Hearing: Consider Request for a Variance to cul-de-sac size requirements (Project #117-132); Case of Bryon Cole

Public Hearing

Vice Chair VanScoy called the public hearing to order at 7:17 p.m.

Presentation

Planning Intern Anderson presented the staff report stating the City has received an application from Bryon and Lynn Cole (the "Applicant") requesting a variance to minimum cul-de-sac radius for the Cole Addition. The Cole Addition would subdivide three existing lots totaling 2.7 acres into eight lots for single family homes, including the existing Cole residence at 6851 168th Avenue NW. The development proposes to remove the existing temporary cul-de-sac and extend 168th Lane into a new cul-de-sac. Engineering, Fire, Public works, and Planning departments are not supportive of the variance to the standard cul-de-sac bulb radius. Fire and engineering will submit memos describing their concerns with supporting substandard cul-de-sacs.

Citizen Input

Vice Chair VanScoy noted a decision made by the Planning Commission will stand and will not be reviewed by the City Council, unless the decision is appealed.

Darren **Lazan**, Landform Professional Services, stated he was representing Bryon Cole, who was a 40-year resident of Ramsey. He described how the land around Mr. Cole has changed and urbanized over the years. He reviewed a plat surrounding Mr. Cole's property in detail with the Commission and commented on the proposed cul-de-sac. He noted there was no City Code that prohibited temporary cul-de-sac's in the City of Ramsey. He described an alternative plat with the Commission which would require him to drop a lot, which was a tremendous hardship.

Community Development Director Gladhill reported staff had not reviewed the alternative and this was not being considered by the Planning Commission this evening.

Mr. **Lazan** stated he was simply requesting feedback from the Commission on the alternative and if this was a better option for the plat.

Motion by Commissioner Surma, seconded by Commissioner Nosan, to close the public hearing.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chair VanScoy, Commissioners Surma, Nosan, Anderson, Brauer, and Gengler. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Bauer.

Vice Chair VanScoy closed the public hearing closed at 7:35 p.m.

Commission Business

Vice Chair VanScoy stated he was most concerned with the safety issues regarding the proposed cul-de-sac size and for this reason, explained he would not be supporting the variance request.

Community Development Director Gladhill suggested that if the Commission was going to deny the variance request that Items 2 through 5 be removed from Resolution #17-08-196.

Motion by Vice Chair VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Gengler, to recommend that City Council adopt Resolution #17-08-195 approving unfavorable findings of fact #0982 for the cul-de-sac bulb size variance.

Further discussion

Community Development Director Gladhill reviewed the language within the unfavorable findings of fact.

Commissioner Brauer recommended the last two findings be removed and that an additional finding be added stating: It is the opinion of the Fire Chief that this cul-de-sac does not meet the minimum specifications for fire apparatus access.

Vice Chair VanScoy and Commission Gengler accepted this friendly amendment.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chair VanScoy, Commissioners Gengler, Anderson, Brauer, Nosan, and Surma. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Bauer.

Motion by Vice Chair VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Nosan, to recommend that City Council adopt Resolution #17-08-196 denying the variance for cul-de-sac bulb size, striking Items 2 through 5.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chair VanScoy, Commissioners Nosan, Anderson, Brauer, Gengler, and Surma. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Bauer.

Further discussion ensued regarding the alternative plans submitted by the applicant. Community Development Director Gladhill noted staff would be reviewing these plans with the applicant in the coming weeks.

Commissioner Brauer thanked the applicant for bringing in an alternative.

Vice Chair VanScoy stated he supported the alternative moving forward and asked if the applicant had spoken to the property owner to the east.

Mr. **Lazano** explained he had not spoken to the land owner recently but understood he would like access to his site.

5.04: Public Hearing: Consider Request for an Amended Conditional Use Permit for Motor Vehicle Sales and Repair at 6845 Highway 10 NW (Project No. 17-136); Case of EJ Properties LLC

Public Hearing

Commissioner Brauer recused himself from taking action on this item and excused himself from the meeting at 7:54 p.m.

Vice Chair VanScoy called the public hearing to order at 7:54 p.m.

Presentation

Community Development Director Gladhill presented the staff report stating in March of 2010, the City approved a Conditional Use Permit for motor vehicle sales and repair on the property located at 6845 Highway 10 NW (the "Subject Property"). However, the property owner, EJ Properties LLC (the "Applicant"), has approached the City about the potential to make some internal building modifications to accommodate additional tenants conducting motor vehicle sales and repair. That represented an expansion of the conditional use and thus, the Applicant submitted a request to amend the existing conditional use permit. Staff recommends approval of the Amended Conditional Use Permit contingent upon the Applicant bringing the property into compliance with the terms of the Conditional Use Permit and Zoning Code (this would include removing inoperable vehicles, removing the numerous small signs in the greenspace area, removing the 'tiny home' displayed on grass, and eliminating the overnight and/or longer-term parking/storage of semis).

Citizen Input

Ed Frayer, 6540 169th Lane, introduced himself to the Commission and thanked them for their consideration. He explained he was proposing to amend his CUP to allow for motor vehicle sales and repair.

Motion by Commissioner Anderson, seconded by Commissioner Surma, to close the public hearing.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chair VanScoy, Commissioners Anderson, Surma, Gengler, and Nosan. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Bauer and Commissioner Brauer.

Vice Chair VanScoy closed the public hearing closed at 8:00 p.m.

Commission Business

Motion by Commissioner Anderson, seconded by Commissioner Nosan, to recommend that City Council adopt Resolution #17-08-197 approving an Amended Conditional Use Permit contingent upon bringing the Subject Property into compliance with the terms of the Conditional Use Permit and Zoning Code.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chair VanScoy, Commissioners Anderson, Nosan, Gengler, and Surma. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Bauer and Commissioner Brauer.

5.05: Public Hearing: Review Sketch Plan for Lavern Estates (Project No. 117-137); Case of Joshua Peterson

Public Hearing

Vice Chair VanScoy called the public hearing to order at 8:01 p.m.

Presentation

Planning Intern Anderson presented the staff report stating this file is to review the Sketch Plan Submittal for Lavern Estates. The Sketch Plan proposes to subdivide one 36.17 Acre Lot into two (2) buildable lots; Lot 1 is 35.49 Acres and Lot 2 is 4.05 Acres. The submittal consisted of one (1) sheet, prepared by Developer John Peterson (You Wish You Had This Land, L.L.C.) and Carlson McCain dated October 3, 2016. The submittal also includes a request for a Zoning Amendment and Comprehensive Plan Amendment to rezone the property from R-1 Residential (MUSA) to R-1 Residential (Rural Developing) and to re-guide the land from Low Density Residential to Rural Developing (Received July 6, 2017). The land use and zoning amendments will officially occur during Preliminary Plat approvals. Staff recommends that the Developer proceed with preparation of the Preliminary Plat, contingent upon the directives of the Staff Review Letter, including the necessary Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

Community Development Director Gladhill reported staff was not completely supportive of the proposed Sketch Plan as it was creating a number of flag lots. He believed another local road should be considered to serve these homes.

Citizen Input

Vice Chair VanScoy asked if the surrounding property owners were aware of the proposed zoning change.

Community Development Director Gladhill explained all of the adjacent landowners were aware of the applicant's intent, but noted their approval was not required.

Vice Chair VanScoy questioned how long it would take City water and sewer to get to this area.

Community Development Director Gladhill estimated this would take 10 to 15 years, if ever.

Lonnie Gray, 17530 Nowthen Boulevard, stated the back of his property abuts the property in question. He stated his only concern was with the increased number of cars that would be traveling past his property. He requested numerous lots not be developed.

Community Development Director Gladhill clarified the applicant was proposing to develop 2.5 acre lots.

Mr. Gray questioned how this property would be impacted by the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

Community Development Director Gladhill reported the impacts would be very minimal to adjacent property owners.

Norm Novak, 7041 175th Avenue, indicated he has lived in his home for the past 16 years. He explained his property abuts the proposed project as well. He stated he has been trying to purchase five or six acres from the applicant for some time and was told by the City the property could not be rezoned. He expressed frustration that he was not able to purchase these five acres.

Community Development Director Gladhill commented the property owner and Mr. Novak could come to an agreement, but recommended this remain separate from the request before the Planning Commission.

Josh Peterson, 7009 175th Avenue, stated he did speak to all of his neighbors north of 175th and west of Nowthen Boulevard. He stated all but three or four signed off on the project.

Vice Chair VanScoy asked if the applicant had any objections to the staff recommendations and conditions for approval.

Mr. Peterson stated he has yet to review this letter in detail.

Community Development Director Gladhill recommended staff review this information in further detail with the application.

Motion by Commissioner Anderson, seconded by Commissioner Nosan, to close the public hearing.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chair VanScoy, Commissioners Anderson, Nosan, Gengler, and Surma. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Bauer and Commissioner Brauer.

Vice Chair VanScoy closed the public hearing closed at 8:22 p.m.

Commission Business

Motion by Commissioner Nosan, seconded by Commissioner Surma, to recommend that City Council approve the Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Zoning Amendment to change the zoning from the urban service area to Rural Developing, contingent upon the Staff Review Letter.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chair VanScoy, Commissioners Nosan, Surma, Anderson, and Gengler. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Bauer and Commissioner Brauer.

6. COMMISSION BUSINESS

6.01: Discussion Item: Update on Variance Request for a Fence Installation at 7214 167th Terrace NW; Case of Brandon Sis

Presentation

Community Development Director Gladhill presented the staff report stating at the July 6 Planning Commission meeting, a Public Hearing was held regarding a request to construct a fence partially within a stormwater management area, including wetland. Representatives from both the Anoka Conservation District (ACD) and the Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) were going to visit the property at 7214 167th Terrace NW (the "Subject Property") to make a determination about the status of the wetland area. However, at the time of the Public Hearing, that site visit had not occurred. Ultimately, the Planning Commission closed the Public Hearing but tabled action on the requested variance until additional information was received on the wetland status.

Community Development Director Gladhill explained representatives from BWSR and ACD conducted a site visit on the Subject Property the week of July 10. City Staff met with ACD staff and did a follow up site visit of the Subject Property the week of July 17. It was found that the wetland area still meets the criteria to be defined as a wetland, both on the Subject Property as well as many of the surrounding properties. It appears that there have been some significant encroachments into the wetland area, with fill, sod, structures, etc., over time. It is clear that there is a broader wetland encroachment issue than just the request for the Subject Property.

Community Development Director Gladhill explained as was noted in the ACD review, it is unclear whether encroachments were the result of the initial development itself, the builder(s), or past/current homeowners. Additional time is needed to explore what options are available to resolve the cumulative encroachments rather than attempting to address them individually. This likely will require broader policy discussion with, and direction from, the City Council as to how best to address this issue. Staff believes that it will ultimately be beneficial for all of these

property owners to look at this matter (and available options) holistically and therefore does not recommend any action by the Planning Commission this evening.

Commission Business

Commissioner Nosan asked if the applicant had submitted new plans for the fence. Brandon Sis, 7214 167th Terrace, stated he has not submitted any other plans for the fence. He was still asking for consideration on the original request.

6.02: Site Plan for Greenway Terrace (Project #16-84); Case of Aeon, LLC

Presentation

Planning Intern Moss presented the staff report stating the purpose of this case is to review an application for site plan approval of Greenway Terrace. This site is generally located south of 146th Avenue NW, west of Traprock Street NW, and North of East Ramsey Parkway and is identified as PID 28-32-25-13-0033. Staff recommends approval of Resolution #17-08-189 granting Site Plan approval of Greenway Terrace.

Commission Business

Leslie Maring, Aeon, LLC, thanked the Commission for their consideration. She updated the Commission on the project timeline and stated she hoped to break ground on this project in October.

Vice Chair VanScoy indicated he supported the proposed project.

Commissioner Nosan stated she was really excited for this project to be completed in Ramsey.

Ms. Maring questioned what preference the Commission had for the entrance.

Commissioner Anderson recommended the entrance way be covered in brick. The Commission supported this recommendation.

Vice Chair VanScoy asked if the applicant had any concerns with the Staff Review Letter.

Ms. Maring stated she had no concerns with the Staff Review Letter.

Motion by Commissioner Anderson, seconded by Commissioner Nosan, to recommend that City Council adopt Resolution #17-08-189 granting Site Plan approval of Greenway Terrace contingent upon compliance with Staff Review Letter dated July 27, 2017.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chair VanScoy, Commissioners Anderson, Nosan, Gengler, and Surma. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Bauer and Commissioner Brauer.

6.03: Recommend Approval of Final Home Designs for Vistas at North Commons; Case of Morning Sun Homes

Presentation

Community Development Director Gladhill presented the staff report stating the purpose of this case is to approve final model home designs for Vistas at North Commons. This case has been updated to include final model designs and Staff review. Architectural review and approval was a contingency of plat approval to finalize architectural design. No homes have yet been constructed within this plat. This is a step in plat approval, versus Building Permit Review. With that in mind, this is not an appeal process as was the case with recent requests. This step is crucial to provide clarity for Staff to be able to approve Building Permits in a timely fashion and in a manner consistent with Planning Commission and City Council approval. Staff recommends authorizing the proposed models.

Commission Business

Vice Chair VanScoy asked what kind of conversations staff has had with the developer.

Community Development Director Gladhill commented on the conversations staff has had with the developer regarding the proposed front facades and front porches. Staff feels they have taken these conversations as far as they could with the developer.

Mark Milner, Owner of Morning Sun Homes, understood there was a gap between his proposed home models and noted he was willing to alter the homes slightly. He explained these proposed improvements would increase costs. He stated he was not in favor of putting stone along the back sides of the homes as there would be no benefit to the homeowner.

Vice Chair VanScoy indicated the requested improvements were being made because this development abutted a major roadway. For this reason, the City was hoping to have the rear facades of the homes enhanced architecturally.

Commissioner Anderson stated he would like to see a sliding glass door as an option for these homeowners. In addition, he wanted to see homeowners have the option of a rear façade that was two-tone.

Commissioner Nosan understood it was different to dress up the rear façade of a home. However, these homes would abut a main drag in Ramsey and numerous people would be driving by the rear side of these homes.

Vice Chair VanScoy suggested the developer consider shutters for the front and rear facades.

Community Development Director Gladhill summarized the comments made by the Commission to enhance the rear façade of the proposed homes.

Commissioner Surma stated he would like to see the buildings match and compliment the other homes in the area.

Commissioner Nosan supported these homes blending in with the adjacent neighborhood as well.

Commissioner Gengler believed it would be difficult to make a decision on the proposed models without further information.

Vice Chair VanScoy stated he would like more articulation on the rear façade.

Bill Gleason explained the drawings presented to the Commission were not of the greatest quality. He commented further on how the rear facades and plantings would be enhanced.

Motion by Commissioner Nosan, seconded by Commissioner Gengler, to recommend that City Council authorize the proposed model homes for Vistas at North Commons.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chair VanScoy, Commissioners Nosan, Gengler, Anderson, and Surma. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Bauer and Commissioner Brauer.

6.04: Review Sketch Plan for Davis Addition; Case of Green Valley Greenhouse

Presentation

Community Development Director Gladhill presented the staff report stating the purpose of this case is to consider a lot split that will ultimately allow for the future expansion of Green Valley Greenhouse. Ideally, the lot split would occur concurrently with a Comprehensive Plan Amendment from Low Density Residential to something that would allow the expansion of this existing commercial greenhouse. However, the time to consider and approve will take a longer period of time than Green Valley Greenhouse has with an existing purchase agreement. A closing is scheduled for the end of August.

Community Development Director Gladhill reported staff believes that any liability can be covered in a Development Agreement. By approving this lot split, there is no approval of any site plan for expansion of Green Valley Greenhouse. Green Valley will still need a Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Site Plan Approval prior to any construction activities that would expand the footprint of the existing facility. Staff recommends approval of this Plat, contingent upon the Applicant entering into a Development Agreement with the City and the completion of a Comprehensive Plan Amendment prior to any actual construction activities.

Commission Business

Commissioner Nosan asked if the pending purchase agreement was for Lot 1, Block 1.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated this was correct and noted this was an “L” shaped lot that was approximately 64.37 acres in size. He reported the homestead would remain on 12 acres of land. He provided further comment on the proposed land transaction.

Brad Wolf, 6421 Green Valley Road, discussed with the Commission his proposed building expansion and described how his business has been growing in recent years.

Vice Chair VanScoy congratulated Mr. Wolf on his successful business.

Scott Nill, 6231 177th Lane, stated he supported this thriving local business but expressed concern with how the traffic was impacting his neighborhood. He believed that soon it would appear the Green Valley Greenhouse has turned into an industrial park.

Anthony Belknap, 6230 177th Lane NW, stated he had concerns with the growth that has occurred at the Green Valley Greenhouse considering the site was not zoned for a business use. He explained the surrounding property was all zoned agricultural and he would like to see this remain. He expressed concern with the high level of noise and traffic coming to and from the business. He indicated he was also concerned with the amount of well water was being used by the greenhouse.

Vice Chair VanScoy explained the City views Green Valley Greenhouse to be an agricultural use and are a conditional use in the R-1 zoning district.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated this was the case but understood the City’s intent was not to have greenhouses of this size in the R-1 zoning district. He reported this would be the maximum size for the greenhouse.

Vice Chair VanScoy thanked the public for bringing their concerns and feedback forward this evening.

Motion by Commissioner Nosan, seconded by Commissioner Surma, to recommend approval of this Plat, contingent upon the Applicant entering into a Development Agreement with the City and the completion of a Comprehensive Plan Amendment prior to any actual construction activities.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chair VanScoy, Commissioners Nosan, Surma, Anderson, and Gengler. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Bauer and Commissioner Brauer.

6.05: Review Concept Plan for 175 Unit Market Rate Apartments in The COR; Case of Inland Group

Presentation

Community Development Director Gladhill presented the staff report stating The City has been approached by Inland Development Group about a potential market-rate apartment building in Ramsey. In order to set up a smooth review process learning from lessons of the past, the City has prepared Concept/Context Maps and Architectural Renderings on the front end of the Purchase Agreement phase. The Inland Group is looking at purchasing property from the City of Ramsey. Traditionally, these real estate contracts are reviewed by the City's Economic Development Authority (EDA) in the context of real estate management and financial analysis. In the past, the City has identified a need to involve the Planning Commission to a greater degree earlier in the purchase agreement phase to avoid perceptions of full project approval at the time of Purchase Agreement approval.

Community Development Director Gladhill explained the purpose of tonight is simply to introduce the topic and see what questions exist as Inland Group continues to discuss with City Staff. He explained there are certainly items that will need to be tweaked and plans to be formally adopted as part of this discussion. Staff believes that this generally meets the spirit and intent of The COR Interim Development Plan. Staff will identify any deficiencies in these concepts in future review with the Planning Commission. This evening is simply a high-level review and introduction. Staff will come with a more formal recommendation on preferred alternatives at future steps.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated staff acknowledges that additional discussion needs to occur surround parking strategies and architectural design. The Developer appears to at least be proposing a strategy to attempt to reduce the amount of surface parking required (underground parking). It may be premature to get into great detail on this topic at this stage. Staff is simply attempting to get to a purchase agreement to be able to have more detailed conversations in the near future. Staff requested feedback from the Commission on how to proceed.

Commission Business

Keith James, Inland Group, thanked the Commission for their time and introduced Inland Group. He stated he has completed 18 communities throughout the country and noted he recently started a development in Eagan, Minnesota. He described the proposed age restricted community and commented on the amenities that would be provided. He reported the demographics in Ramsey show this was a strong market for the proposed development. He believed The COR would be a great location for an Affinity community.

Commissioner Surma believed the proposed senior housing would be a complimentary development within The COR.

Commissioner Nosan stated she was thrilled to see this type of development being proposed for Ramsey and believed this would be a great option for Baby Boomers and would allow them to remain in the community.

Vice Chair VanScoy agreed and believed this was an exciting project that had great value. He stated it would be a great fit for The COR.

Commissioner Anderson suggested the location of the proposed development be moved to a COR1 area.

Further discussion ensued regarding the differences between COR1 and COR2.

Community Development Director Gladhill summarized the comments made by the Commission and understood there was general consensus for the project, noting details still had to be worked out.

7. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE ITEMS

Community Development Director Gladhill had no update on the Comprehensive Plan at this time.

8. COMMISSION / STAFF INPUT

8.01: Receive Staff Update

The Staff Update was noted.

8.02: Zoning Bulletins

Zoning Bulletins were noted.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Commissioner Nosan, seconded by Commissioner Anderson, to adjourn the meeting.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chair VanScoy, Commissioners Nosan, Anderson, Gengler, and Surma. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Bauer and Commissioner Brauer.

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Gladhill
Community Development Director

ATTEST:

JoAnn Shaw
Planning Division Secretary

Drafted by Heidi Guenther
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.

DRAFT

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
CITY OF RAMSEY
ANOKA COUNTY
STATE OF MINNESOTA**

The City of Ramsey Economic Development Authority (EDA) conducted a regular meeting on Thursday, August 10, 2017, at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota.

Members Present: Acting Chairperson Chris Riley
 Member Philip Brunt
 Member Glen Hardin
 Member Kristine Williams

Members Absent: Chairperson Jim Steffen
 Member Brian Burandt
 Member Wayne Skaff

Also Present: Patrick Brama, Econ. Dev. Mgr/Assistant City Administrator
 Kurt Ulrich, City Administrator
 Councilmember Mark Kuzma

1. CALL TO ORDER

Acting Chairperson Riley called the Economic Development Authority meeting to order at 7:30 a.m.

2. APPROVE AGENDA

??

Motion by Member Williams, seconded by Member Hardin, to approve the agenda.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Acting Chairperson Riley, Members Williams, Hardin, and Brunt.

Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Steffen and Members Burandt and Skaff.

3. APPROVE MINUTES

3.01: Approve Meeting Minutes Dated July 13, 2017

Motion by Member Hardin, seconded by Member Williams, to approve the July 13, 2017, minutes as presented.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Acting Chairperson Riley, Members Hardin, Williams, and Brunt.

Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Steffen and Members Burandt and Skaff.

4. EDA BUSINESS

4.01: Inland Group

Economic Dev. Mgr./Assistant City Administrator Brama presented the staff report.

Keith James, Inland Group, stated that the company is a multi-family contractor based out of Spokane, Washington, and provided examples of projects that the company has built in the senior home market. He stated that the Affinity concept is an apartment building that is age restricted and would be market rate apartments and would be amenity rich with all-inclusive rents. He stated that the company has 16 stable developments in three states, Washington, Texas, and Colorado. He noted that they are building additional developments and have a development in Egan, Minnesota. He reviewed some of the amenities the buildings include which range from fitness center, theater room, internet café, craft room, pub, pool, and spa. He stated that rents would range from \$1,400 to \$2,400 depending on the unit and number of bedroom and bathrooms. He stated that the demographics in Ramsey are strong and they would like to be here. He noted that there are some similar projects in this area but they are a bit different, such as a co-op. He believed that the specific activity in The COR would be perfect for the Affinity brand and the transit hub in Ramsey. He stated that he is simply looking for direction from the group as to whether they would be interested in the product and feel it would be a fit for Ramsey.

Acting Chairperson Riley stated that he is excited about the idea.

Economic Dev. Mgr./Assistant City Administrator Brama stated that staff has put together five concepts sketches, labeled A through E, that would include this development and other desired features in The COR to show how the uses would work together. He noted that the concepts with shared parking are a non-starter for the developer as there would be concerns with safety of the vehicles and views of the residents. He provided input on each of the concepts, highlighting the elements that work or do not work for Inland. He noted that Concept C would be the ideal site for the developer as the site would be adjacent to the proposed park and near the transit station. He noted that the concept is also support by staff as it still leaves space for retail along Sunwood Drive. He noted that Concepts D and E are against Sunwood Drive and therefore the needed infrastructure is already in place. He stated that the developer is comfortable with Concepts D and E, although those are not their preferred sites. He stated that staff would be comfortable with any of the five concepts.

Member Williams stated that the concept roads do not always line up with the Center Street loop and Ramsey Parkway. She asked for details on infrastructure locations.

Economic Dev. Mgr./Assistant City Administrator Brama provided clarification on the road alignments, noting that the sketches identify old road alignments as well as current and therefore the roads would align. He identified the current infrastructure and noted that he could follow-up to determine additional locations.

Member Williams stated that a four to five story building seems large for The COR and asked if that project would fit in with the development in The COR.

Mr. James replied that the sketches were a bit larger than what would be proposed for The COR. He noted that this would be similar to the Residence at The COR. He noted that this area is a transit oriented development. He stated that he would hope to separate from Sunwood to prevent the creation of a canyon feeling as people are driving down Sunwood.

Member Williams asked for information on the feelings towards structured parking.

Mr. James stated that there is a security issue with structured parking. He stated that the stalls furthest from the elevator are the least used. He stated that if residents can drive into an underground parking and walk a short distance to the elevator, that is preferred and access would only be given to residents. He stated that if the shared parking is incorporated, the first two levels would have views of the parking structure and that would not be preferred at the market rate the apartments would rent at.

Member Hardin asked if most of the tenants in their other complexes have one or two vehicles and the percentage of parking that is provided underground.

Mr. James stated that most of the units have a vehicle range of one to 1.5 vehicles per unit. He stated that they aim to match 1.5 stalls per unit. He noted that in Egan there is an option to rent additional spaces in the structured parking nearby should that development need it. He stated that even in a location like this, where transit is an option, they would still most likely utilize a ratio of 1.3 to 1.5 vehicles per unit.

Acting Chairperson Riley asked and received confirmation that Concepts C and D would meet the floor area ratio standards.

Economic Dev. Mgr./Assistant City Administrator Brama stated that this project would meet the standards of The COR, most likely better than even the PSD project.

City Administrator Ulrich asked for financing information.

Mr. James stated that the company is privately owned and the projects are privately financed. He stated that most often they have construction financing in place, noting that USBank was used for the Egan project. He stated that once the project is built a long-term financing would be secured. He estimated a \$35,000,000 budget with \$6,000,000 to \$6,500,000 in equity. He stated that their preference would be to self-fund and retain ownership.

Economic Dev. Mgr./Assistant City Administrator Brama stated that the Planning Commission reviewed this case the previous week and was excited by the project. He stated that the Commission would like to keep the project in the COR 1 Zoning District and would not support the concept that straddles the COR 2 Zoning District. He noted that a comment was made that if the project were up against Sunwood, they would prefer a retail element. He stated that the Planning Commission would like to encourage this project to move forward.

Acting Chairperson Riley stated that it would seem the Concept C would be the best fit.

Councilmember Kuzma stated that the case states that no financial assistance is requested but noted that most projects come along with an ask and asked if there will be an ask.

Mr. James stated that they do not have knowledge of the soil conditions nor the cost-share for infrastructure. He stated that he would not be frightened of a 40 percent cost-share for roadways but stated that without concrete information he cannot say there would not be an ask in the future. He stated that at this point he does not have an ask. He stated that the cost of the land and development fees are quite good, which puts him in a good spot competitively.

Member Williams stated that there is a lot of apartment units in Ramsey and asked if there is a demand for additional units in Ramsey.

Mr. James stated that the demographics are very strong to support this development. He stated that the market study would be in the next four to five weeks to ensure that the units would be supported by the market. He stated that if the demand were smaller than 150, that would not be worth the effort.

Member Williams stated that when the market study is completed and there is a demand for the units, she would like to hear that clearly presented. She stated that the perception of the residents is that there is not a demand for additional apartment units and therefore that would help her position as a Councilmember if that information is clearly presented.

Mr. James stated that they are a privately funded company and the loans are secured by the principals in the company and therefore if the market does not support this development they would not continue.

City Administrator Ulrich asked if the market demand was strong, would the development then be interested in a second phase.

Mr. James replied that the Affinity product has never been built close by each other, noting that the closest proximity would be about ten miles. He stated that if the project was a huge success, they would maybe consider it. He stated that the other product type the company has is affordable senior housing and noted that the City already has that in The COR with more to come and therefore he was not sure there would be demand for that project. He stated that they have struggled with bringing that product to Minnesota.

City Administrator Ulrich asked for the opinion of Mr. James regarding retail.

Mr. James stated that the ideal location for this product would be near activity. He stated that the seniors are active and therefore choices are helpful for retail and entertainment in close proximity. He stated that they have not chosen traditional mixed-use development as retail is not their expertise and they focus on multi-family development and senior development. He stated that incorporating commercial is not their choice. He stated that they would be willing to site

plan around a commercial site that could be sold and developed by a commercial developer that has that experience. He stated that they would prefer to be nearby commercial development but would not want to own that commercial development.

Economic Dev. Mgr./Assistant City Administrator Brama stated that it does not appear that there are any concerns and confirmed the consensus of the EDA to support this project moving forward with a preference for Concept C.

4.02: Maple Investments LLC (dba Sharp & Associates) Purchase Agreements (Portions of this case may be closed to the public)

Economic Dev. Mgr./Assistant City Administrator Brama presented the staff report.

Councilmember Kuzma asked if there would be exclusivity for the second purchase agreement or whether that would be open to anyone.

Economic Dev. Mgr./Assistant City Administrator Brama stated that the property would be tied up similar to any purchase agreement, with the exception being the timing.

Councilmember Kuzma asked if there is additional interest built in for the second purchase agreement, like an inflation to support the timing.

Dennis Sharp, Sharp and Associates, stated that the proposed separation of the purchase agreements would help the cost of the project. He noted that they are attempting to lower the costs as much as possible. He stated that while this is not a good short-term investment for him, he believes that the long-term return would be beneficial. He stated that he is attempting to lower the costs on the first building as much as possible and the suggestion was made to split the purchase agreement into two. He stated that his tenants are small users and there are requests to build their own buildings. He stated that they have not had a piece of property in Ramsey that has been available for that type of activity and therefore some of their businesses have ended up moving to other nearby communities. He stated that this would allow him to have that space available for additional businesses that want to expand in the future.

Acting Chairperson Riley asked if the proposed timeline for the second building fits within the timeline for the developer.

Mr. Sharp replied that it is pretty quick but he has had a few interested calls already. He stated that more than likely the proposed timeline would work.

Member Hardin asked if there is an estimate of the holding costs for the other piece of land.

Economic Dev. Mgr./Assistant City Administrator Brama stated that he would have to look into that, as staff has not contemplated that in the past. He noted that it is City owned land and therefore there would not be taxes.

Member Williams asked how much in taxes the City would be giving up in that year delay.

Economic Dev. Mgr./Assistant City Administrator Brama stated that he did not have the figures.

Member Williams stated that there is value in a smaller parcel and believes that the City should be compensated for allowing this option for over a year. She stated that she was not in favor of the price of the parcel originally and the City needs to consider the opportunities and costs that would be missed. She stated that some key information is missing. She stated that she would be in favor of an increase in the purchase price for the future closing, non-refundable earnest money and non-refundable option fee would assist her in supporting this change.

Councilmember Kuzma stated that he understands the reasoning for splitting this purchase agreement to decrease the costs. He stated that having the option for the second parcel is important for the growing of the builder but would put the City in a tough position for the holding costs and therefore would like to see the purchase agreement adjusted for the holding costs. He stated that if the builder walks away from the second parcel, the holding costs should be covered.

Acting Chairperson Riley asked if non-refundable earnest money would resolve the issue.

Member Williams stated that she is not comfortable negotiating a larger deal and then splitting that into two. She stated that in her opinion the second parcel is worth more than the first parcel with the delayed timeline and would like to see something additional in addition to the non-refundable earnest money.

Member Hardin stated that there is already a signed purchase agreement with an agreed upon amount and therefore he would not be in favor of increasing that agreed upon price. He stated that there is not interest in the parcel from another development and delaying the development by one year does not cause additional holding costs. He stated that he would support the staff recommendation.

Member Williams stated that this parcel has never been marketed, although this is the second purchase agreement that has come forward.

Member Hardin stated that the City has owned this parcel for 10 to 15 years and only two offers have come forward.

Acting Chairperson Riley stated that there are only four EDA members present and therefore a consensus would need to be reached. He asked if Member Williams would agree to anything that would not involve changing the price, as the purchase agreement has already been agreed upon.

Member Williams stated that she would support the request if there was non-refundable earnest money.

Motion by Member Hardin, seconded by Member Riley, to recommend to City Council to approve the Purchase Agreement amendment and second Purchase Agreement, between the City

of Ramsey and Maple Investments LLC; subject to final review and amendments by the City Attorney with the additional language added to specify the \$10,000 earnest money is non-refundable.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Acting Chairperson Riley, Members Hardin, Brunt, and Williams. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Steffen and Members Burandt and Skaff.

Councilmember Kuzma left the meeting.

4.03: Select Date and Speaker for 2017 EDA Business Networking Event

Economic Dev. Mgr./Assistant City Administrator Brama presented the staff report.

Acting Chairperson Riley stated that he likes the idea of having a specific topic. He asked if it would make sense for the City to purchase a small stage rather than continuing to rent the equipment.

Economic Dev. Mgr./Assistant City Administrator Brama agreed that would be an appropriate item to consider as the equipment could be used for multiple events. He confirmed the preference to focus on the Super Bowl this year and Coco next year.

4.04: Update: Joint Council/EDA Case on September 26, 2017

Economic Dev. Mgr./Assistant City Administrator Brama presented the staff report.

Member Hardin asked the length of the meeting.

Economic Dev. Mgr./Assistant City Administrator Brama replied that the length of the work session is from 5:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. but noted that there are typically other topics on the agenda. He estimated about 40 minutes for the discussion.

The EDA provided consensus direction to schedule a joint EDA/City Council Work Session Case on September 26, 2017, at 5:30 p.m. in the Lake Itasca Room to review the EDA Work Plan and the EDA strategy for marketing/selling land at The COR.

City Administrator Ulrich noted that he believed two Councilmembers may be absent at that meeting.

Economic Dev. Mgr./Assistant City Administrator Brama noted that a different date may be chosen.

5. MEMBER / STAFF UPDATE

The EDA reviewed the Staff Update.

City Administrator Ulrich noted that staff is going to bring forward a negotiated settlement with McDonald's to the City Council and that would free up that site.

Economic Dev. Mgr./Assistant City Administrator Brama stated that he received a tour of the PSD site and noted that it is exciting to see the dirt being moved from the PSD site to the Capstone site for use in their berm.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Member Hardin, seconded by Member Williams, to adjourn the meeting.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Acting Chairperson Riley, Members Hardin, Williams, and Brunt. Voting No: None. Absent: Chairperson Steffen and Members Burandt and Skaff.

The regular meeting of the Economic Development Authority adjourned at 8:47 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kurtis G. Ulrich
City Administrator

ATTEST:

Patrick Brama
Econ. Dev. Mgr./Assistant City Administrator

Draft by Amanda Staple
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.