

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

The Ramsey Planning Commission conducted a regular meeting on Thursday, March 7, 2019, at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota.

Members Present:           Commissioner Cheri Gengler  
                                  Commissioner Patrick Surma  
                                  Vice Chairperson Gary VanScoy  
                                  Commissioner Matt Woestehoff

Members Absent:           Chairperson Randy Bauer  
                                  Commissioner Bruce Anderson  
                                  Commissioner Daniel Onyambu

Also Present:               Community Development Director Timothy Gladhill  
                                  City Planner Chris Anderson  
                                  City Planner Chloe McGuire Brigl

**1.     CALL TO ORDER**

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

**2.     CITIZEN INPUT**

None.

**3.     APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Motion by Commissioner Woestehoff, seconded by Commissioner Gengler, to approve the agenda as presented.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chairperson VanScoy, Commissioners Woestehoff, Gengler, and Surma. Voting No: None. Absent: Commissioners Anderson, Bauer and Onyambu.

**4.     APPROVE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

**4.01: Approve the Following Planning Commission Minutes:**

**4.01.1: Planning Commission Meeting Minutes Dated February 7, 2019**

Commissioner Woestehoff requested a change to the minutes on Page 7 noting his reference to the event time should be 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.

Motion by Commissioner Woestehoff, seconded by Commissioner Surma, to approve the following minutes as amended: Planning Commission Meeting Minutes dated February 7, 2019.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chairperson VanScoy, Commissioners Woestehoff, Surma, and Gengler. Voting No: None. Absent: Commissioners Anderson, Bauer and Onyambu.

## **5. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

None.

## **6. COMMISSION BUSINESS**

### **6.01: Review Sketch Plan for Rivenwick Subdivision (Project No. 19-02); Case of Paxmar**

#### **Presentation**

Community Development Director Gladhill presented the staff report stating the purpose of this case is to review a sketch plan for a subdivision within the Rivenwick neighborhood. City Code states the Planning Commission shall advise the subdivider of the extent to which the plan conforms to the requirements of the community and the ability of the City to provide essential services and may discuss possible modifications necessary to secure approval of the subdivision.

Community Development Director Gladhill explained the developer is Paxmar and the proposed project is located within the Mixed Use Planned Unit Development (MU/PUD) District. It is guided the same in the Comprehensive Plan. He stated the development is proposed to be made up of three main components. The MU/PUD is the guiding, or umbrella district. Within that guidance, staff is applying the appropriate traditional districts for review based on the land use and density types. Staff displayed a map of the subject site to point out the following district:

1. Two-acre Commercial parcel (using the B-2 Business District for review);
2. Two-acre Assisted Living parcel (using the R-3 Residential District [high density residential] for review); and,
3. Detached Townhome Neighborhood (using the R-2 Residential District [medium density residential] for review).

Community Development Director Gladhill noted this is a unique District that is only applied in a couple areas of the community and the Rivenwick Neighborhood is the only existing neighborhood/development where the District actually applies. He explained the main intent of this District is to provide flexibility in final layout versus strict District boundaries. This should not be interpreted to require Urban Mixed-Use buildings. The current version of the MU/PUD District states that any one use may not comprise of more than 75% of the project area. According to staff review for the original subdivision, this remaining parcel was to develop as a

retail/commercial use. However, the maximum coverage per land use type at the time was 70%, which has since been amended to 75%. Staff provided further comment on the Sketch Plan and requested the Commission direct the developer to proceed with the Preliminary Plat.

### **Commission Business**

Commissioner Gengler asked if the properties to the east were R-2 Medium Density Residential.

Community Development Director Gladhill reported this was the case, noting these units were detached townhomes.

Vice Chairperson VanScoy questioned if a variance would be required to address the 75% use concern.

Community Development Director Gladhill explained the assisted living could be classified as a commercial use because it is a quasi-commercial/quasi-residential use. Other options available would be to change the zoning for this area or change the percentage. He noted staff does not have a formal recommendation regarding this matter.

Vice Chairperson VanScoy opened the meeting to public comment.

Terry Dahlstrom, 6902 139<sup>th</sup> Lane, stated he had reviewed the information he received from the City. He was of the opinion the proposed autobody/paint shop was toxic. He feared how the adjacent senior housing development would be impacted by the proposed autobody shop. He stated the autobody shop and senior housing were not compatible uses. He feared the development would be doomed. He stated he opposed the autobody shop within this development and recommended the City consider a new location for the autobody shop.

Community Development Director Gladhill commented on the health and welfare standards that would have to be followed by the proposed autobody shop.

Joel Lynmeyer, 6912 139<sup>th</sup> Lane NW, explained he served on the Board of Directors for the adjacent townhome association. He indicated he did not support an autobody shop in the proposed location and encouraged the City to find another use for this property. He stated he supported more townhomes in the area, but noted traffic along 139<sup>th</sup> Lane would become a concern.

Al Riesler, Paxmar, thanked the Commission for their consideration of the Rivenwick subdivision. He explained he appreciated the Commission's feedback on this project.

Vice Chairperson VanScoy asked if the business use was final and decided on.

Mr. Riesler reported this was not final, but noted he had been approached by a business owner. He noted he was simply requesting a B-2 guiding for the commercial property.

Vice Chairperson VanScoy questioned how close the developer was to selling the commercial parcel.

Mr. Riesler stated the sale of the property was being negotiated.

Vice Chairperson VanScoy inquired if the potential business owner would be willing to attend a public workshop meeting in order to address the concerns that were raised at this meeting.

Mr. Riesler stated he believed this would be possible after a purchase agreement was in place.

Commissioner Surma commented he did not want to see an autobody shop or other auto use within this development. He explained he would rather see a nice restaurant on this corner.

Vice Chairperson VanScoy asked if a PUD would allow for a higher density.

Community Development Director Gladhill commented both residential areas were within the City's acceptable limits.

Commissioner Woestehoff stated ignoring the business aspect of the development, he believed the flow of the remainder of the project made a lot of sense. He explained he liked how this development transitioned into the adjacent neighborhood.

Commissioner Gengler agreed and stated she did not have a strong feeling regarding the attached or detached townhomes.

Commissioner Surma requested the representative from Village Bank address the Commission.

The Village Bank representative stated they had no comments at this time.

Vice Chairperson VanScoy indicated he supported the general approach of the development with respect to the R-2 and R-3, noting there were concerns with the safety of having an autobody shop within this development.

The general consensus of the Commission was to direct the developer to proceed with the Preliminary Plat.

## **6.02: Review Sketch Plan for 6080 Highway 10; Case of Village Bank (Project #18-163)**

### **Presentation**

City Planner McGuire Brigl presented the staff report stating the purpose of this case is to review a sketch plan submitted by Village Bank for 6080 Highway 10 NW for a 14-lot residential subdivision. The applicant proposes 50-foot wide, R-2 Detached Villa lots. He noted the purpose of sketch plan review is to provide the applicant high-level feedback and pertinent information to inform and expedite the preliminary plat process. Staff reported the proposed

project would require a rezoning and Comprehensive Plan amendment, both of which are discretionary actions so the City Council has the right to approve or deny the request.

City Planner McGuire Brigl stated the City saw a similar proposal in the past, which was halted due to the cost of removing the construction debris onsite. The applicant is proposing to remove all the debris with the construction of this project. A debris removal plan will be required with preliminary plat submittal. He explained it is assumed that there are no hazardous materials. However, there is approximately an acre of disturbance as deep as 14 feet. The site was utilized as an unpermitted landfill for construction materials. This material must be mitigated as part of the project. Staff provided further comment on the request and recommended the Commission direct the developer to proceed with preparation of the Preliminary Plat.

### **Commission Business**

Vice Chairperson VanScoy asked if density transitioning was required.

City Planner McGuire Brigl explained this was only required for existing residential.

Commissioner Surma requested further clarification on the location of this project.

City Planner McGuire Brigl reviewed the location of this project with the Commission on a LOGIS map. It was noted the parcel shared a border with the City of Anoka.

Vice Chairperson VanScoy opened the meeting to public comment.

Jen Schumacher, 6150 Rivlyn Avenue, explained this project would impact her property as she lived directly adjacent to the proposed project. She noted she has lived in her home for the past two years. She expressed concern with the proposed project noting all of the trees had been removed from the property. She stated this property had been used as a dumping ground and she believed there was more than construction debris on the site. She expressed concern with the digging that has occurred on this property and feared that Village Bank was digging on the site illegally. She encouraged the City to make sure the digging that was occurring was safe. She was of the opinion 14 houses was too many for the site. She suggested the City reevaluate if this was the proper fit for this property given the fact it was a gateway property into the City. In addition, she was of the opinion a dock would not work in the proposed neighborhood.

Community Development Director Gladhill stated he understood the concerns of the residents. He described the oversight that would occur while this property was being cleaned for redevelopment. He commented further on the digging and soil tests that occurred on the property. He reported it was the developer's intent to remove the waste pit and have this area replaced with clean soil.

Scott Schumacher, 6150 Rivlyn Avenue, stated he was concerned with the location of the proposed road noting it appeared to run through the front of his property. He expressed concern with the fact the new development would have an outlet to Highway 10 and discussed how this

would increase traffic through his neighborhood. He encouraged the City to pursue 12 homes versus 14. He believed the dock was a ridiculous idea. He noted a dock in this area would sit on the ground and would not float.

City Planner McGuire Brigl explained the intent was to extend the cul-de-sac and not run through the front of the Schumacher's property. She reported staff was not recommending an access onto Highway 10 for safety purposes.

Mr. Schumacher asked if it would be better for this development to be accessed off of Highway 10 and running into a cul-de-sac within the development.

City Planner McGuire Brigl stated this has not been considered as the City was trying to reduce access points onto and off of Highway 10.

Mr. Schumacher stated he was very concerned with the cul-de-sac being extended into the new neighborhood.

Ms. Schumacher requested that if an emergency entrance were considered for Highway 10 that this be blocked off for traffic to ensure additional traffic was not flowing into her neighborhood.

Brian Krystofiak, Village Bank representative, thanked staff for their presentation on this request. He noted this was a challenging site. He indicated he was proposing to only have an emergency vehicle access to Highway 10.

Vice Chairperson VanScoy asked if there would be any issues in cleaning the site.

Mr. Krystofiak explained he was applying for grants to assist with the cleanup of the site. He commented further on the oversight that would have to occur in order to properly clean the property.

Commissioner Woestehoff stated he believed the development would be extremely beneficial to the City as it would clean up the property.

Commissioner Gengler agreed.

Vice Chairperson VanScoy stated he also believed this development would benefit the neighborhood. He asked staff how the Commission should proceed.

Community Development Director Gladhill requested the Commission make a motion to direct the developer to proceed with the net loss of two lots.

Motion by Commissioner Gengler, seconded by Commissioner Surma, to direct the developer to proceed with preparation of the preliminary plat after City Council review, per staff's current recommendation.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chairperson VanScoy, Commissioners Gengler, Surma, and Woestehoff. Voting No: None. Absent: Commissioners Anderson, Bauer and Onyambu.

## **7. COMMISSION / STAFF INPUT**

### **7.01: Zoning Bulletins**

Zoning Bulletins were noted.

## **8. ADJOURNMENT**

Motion by Commissioner Woestehoff, seconded by Commissioner Surma, to adjourn the meeting.

Motion Carried. Voting Yes: Vice Chairperson VanScoy, Commissioners Woestehoff, Surma, and Gengler. Voting No: None. Absent: Commissioners Anderson, Bauer and Onyambu.

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission adjourned at 8:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Tim Gladhill  
Community Development Director

ATTEST:

---

JoAnn Shaw  
Community Development Assistant

Drafted by Heidi Guenther  
*TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*