

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

<b>DATE</b>	OCTOBER 25, 2018	<b>PROJECT ADDRESS</b>	EAST OF NOWTHEN BLVD WEST OF POTASSIUM ST NORTH OF OLD NOWTHEN BLVD
<b>PROJECT. TITLE</b>	PRELIMINARY PLAT – SHADE TREE COTTAGES		
<b>ESCROW #</b>	116588		
<b>DEPARTMENT:</b>	Community Development: Planning Division		
<b>REVIEWER:</b>	Name: Chloe McGuire Brigl Phone: 763-433-9821 Email: CMcGuire@CityofRamsey.com		

**Summary of Required Changes**

- The applicant should provide a detailed proposal of the proposed cost-share between the City and the applicant to upgrade Potassium Street.
- Submit Landscape Plan. Topic will not go to City Council without Landscape Plan.

**Preliminary Plat & Variance Submittal Review**

**General.** The proposed subdivision is a 36 lot subdivision, with 34 detached townhome lots, one single family lot, and one lot covering all wetlands which is entirely drainage and utility easement.

**Site.** All that part of the Northeast Quarter of the Northeast Quarter of Section 23, Township 32, Range 25, lying east of the Easterly Right-of-Way of County State Aid Highway No. 5, in Anoka County, Minnesota. The lot is located on the east side of Nowthen Blvd NW, north of Old Nowthen Blvd, and west of Potassium St NW. The site is approximately 28.41 Acres.

**History.** A previous PUD was approved in 2005 and rezoned the parcel from R-1 (MUSA) to PUD. The property has remained as PUD even though the PUD has since expired.

**Streets and Access.** The Applicant is proposing the following streets and roadways.

<b>Street Name</b>	<b>Road Type</b>	<b>Street Width</b>
157 <sup>th</sup> Avenue NW	Private Road	28 feet
Radium Street NW	Public Road	32 feet
Public Road (Unnamed) connecting Radium and Potassium	Public Road	32 feet
Potassium Street NW	Public Road	24 feet

As part of this project, Potassium Street must be upgraded from a gravel road to a paved, public road. The applicant has proposed a cost-share with the City.

**Proposed Lots.** The current zoning is PUD. Typically, in this situation, staff would defer back to the original, or underlying zoning, to review lot sizes and setbacks. The original zoning, before this site was rezoned to PUD in 2005, was R-1 MUSA. There are two distinct characteristics within the development; traditional detached

single-family and small-lot detached single-family/detached townhomes. The townhome lots do not meet these requirements, as the minimum lot size is smaller than the underlying Zoning District.

**Detached Townhomes. Block 1, Lots 1 – 28 and Block 2, Lots 1-6.**

NOTE: This style home would ordinarily be located within the R-2 Residential District. The proposed homes generally meet the minimum standards of the R-2 Residential District.

Requirement	Current Requirement	Proposal	Conforming Status
Lot Size	10,800 square feet	Varying, <10,800 sq. ft.	Non-Conforming
Density	3 u/acre 4u/acre w/PUD	3.34 units/acre*	Conforming
Lot Width	80 feet	53 feet	Non-Conforming
Front Yard Setback	30 feet	11 feet	Non-Conforming
Rear Yard Setback	30 feet	17 feet	Non-Conforming
Side Yard Setback	6 (uninhabitable) 10 feet (habitable)	8 feet	Non-Conforming
Max lot coverage	35%	< 35%	Conforming

\* Measuring development area only; not entire parcel

**Detached Single-Family Review. Block 1, Lot 30 meets all requirements of the R-1 MUSA district.**

**Trails.** The applicant has agreed verbally that all trails will be public. This change will be made on the next set of plans.

**Grading and Drainage Plans.** Please see Engineering Comments in ProjectDox with regard to grading and drainage.

**Development Fees.** Development Fees will be due with the Plat including, but not limited to, Park Dedication, Trail Development, and Stormwater Management. These fees are collected at the time the Final Plat is recorded and at the rate in effect when the plat is recorded.

**Development Agreement:** An executed Development Agreement will be required prior to releasing the plat for recording.

**Proposed PUD Setbacks.**

	Townhomes:	Single Family
Front Street:	25 ft from curb	30 ft from ROW
Side Street:	25 ft from curb	n/a
Side Yard:	15 feet btwn buildings	10 ft (house) 6 ft (garage)
Rear Yard:	n/a	30 ft
Plat Boundary:	30 feet from boundary	
Wetlands, Stormwater Ponds	16.5 feet	16.5 feet

**Planned Unit Development Review**

**Analysis Per City Code Section 117-123.**

(a) Intent. The intent of the Planned Unit Development District is to provide a district that will encourage:

- 1) Flexibility in land development in order to make better use of new techniques in building design and construction and land development.
- 2) Housing affordable to all income groups.
- 3) More efficient use of public infrastructure.
- 4) Energy conservation through the use of more efficient building designs and through the clustering of buildings and land uses.
- 5) Preservation of desirable land characteristics and open space and protection of sensitive environmental features such as steep slopes, poor soils and trees.
- 6) More effective and efficient use of land, open space and public facilities through the mixing of land uses and assembly and development of land in larger lots.

**Staff feels that the intent of the PUD District is met.** The clustering of the homes provides a new type of home for this area, and the plat does include a mix of housing types (though there is only 1 single family home and the rest are detached townhomes). Staff feels that from the original approval, this proposal fits better with the intent of the PUD district, fits the character of the neighborhood, and is less impactful to the surrounding homes and land uses as there is a reduction in the number of homes. There will be public trails and protection of wetlands onsite.

This is a difficult site to develop, and staff feels that the applicant has attempted to make a project that will benefit the community and lessen its impacts on the surrounding neighbors.

(b) Criteria. The city shall consider the following criteria and objectives in reviewing the *PUD*:

Criteria	Meets – Yes/No
A high quality of design and design compatible with surrounding land uses, both existing and planned.	<b>Yes</b>
A wider range of housing types, price ranges and styles than could be accomplished under existing zoning.	<b>Yes</b>  Townhomes and one single family home
Public amenities, facilities and open spaces that are greater than the minimum requirements of existing zoning and determined to be in the public good.	
Compatibility with the purposes and intents of this chapter and the city's comprehensive plan, specifically residential density requirements. Increases in density may be allowed, provided that traffic patterns will not be adversely affected and that public facilities are adequate.	<b>Yes</b>
Provision for a minimum of 20 percent public open space and/or 50 percent private open space protected by adequate covenants running with the land or by conveyances or dedications. Credit for public open space shall be given pursuant to the following schedule: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Woodlands, steep slopes, prairie and grasslands: 100 percent credit.</li> <li>• Water features and wetlands: 50 percent credit.</li> </ul>	<b>Yes</b>  50% private open space

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Private open space may include yard space, street boulevards, and other private common areas.</li></ul>	
The proposal shall exercise no substantial detrimental influence on the market value of surrounding properties.	<b>Yes</b>
The proposal shall show a favorable economic impact on the community at large.	<b>Yes</b>
The proposal shall not adversely impact natural features such as wetlands, water features, woodlands, and steep slopes.	<b>Yes</b>
The proposal shall protect and preserve scenic qualities to the greatest extent possible.	<b>Yes</b>
The proposal shall not impose any undue burden on public services and facilities, including fire and police protection, schools, streets, water systems, sanitary sewer systems and storm sewer systems.	<b>Yes</b>
The proposal is designed in such a way to form a desirable and unified environment within its own boundaries, and also will not be detrimental to future land uses in the surrounding areas.	<b>Yes</b>
The proposal is consistent with all other applicable city and state regulations.	<b>Yes</b>

**Staff believes that the project does meet the criteria above.** Staff did feel that the criteria were met when the original PUD was approved, and this project as a whole is less impactful than the original proposal.