

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

The Ramsey Planning Commission conducted a regular meeting on Thursday, June 4, 2020, at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota.

Members Present: Chairperson Randy Bauer
 Commissioner Bruce Anderson
 Commissioner Cheri Gengler
 Commissioner Torrey Johnson
 Commissioner Eric Peters
 Commissioner Gary VanScoy
 Commissioner Matt Woestehoff

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Senior Planner Chloe McGuire Brigl
 Deputy City Administrator Tim Gladhill
 City Planner Chris Anderson
 City Council Liaison Debra Musgrove

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill read a statement related to the COVID-19 pandemic and local state of emergency. In declaring this Local State of Emergency, the City of Ramsey has determined that in person meetings and meetings conducted under Minnesota Statutes Section 13D.02 are not practical or prudent because of the declared health pandemic emergency.

2. CITIZEN INPUT

None.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

A roll call vote was performed:

Commissioner Peters aye

Commissioner Woestehoff aye
Chairperson Bauer aye
Commissioner Johnson aye
Commissioner Anderson aye
Commissioner Gengler aye
Commissioner VanScoy aye

Motion Carried.

4. CONSENT AGENDA

4.01: Approve the May 7, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

4.02: Receive Update on Trott Brook and Hunt Property Cases from City Staff

4.03: Receive Update on Proposed Site Plan for RGH Ramsey/Rob Hardy/Sunwood Retail

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

A roll call vote was performed:

Commissioner Peters aye
Commissioner Woestehoff aye
Chairperson Bauer aye
Commissioner Johnson aye
Commissioner Anderson aye
Commissioner Gengler aye
Commissioner VanScoy aye

Motion Carried.

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS/COMMISSION BUSINESS

5.01: Public Hearing: Consider Request for an Amended Conditional Use Permit for the Property Located at 6750 Highway 10 NW (Project No. 20-108); Case of 22 Properties, LLC

Public Hearing

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 7:07 p.m.

Presentation

City Planner Anderson presented the staff report stating staff recommends approval of Resolution #20-101 granting an Amended Conditional Use Permit for 6750 Highway 10 NW that

extends the deadlines to complete the required paving upgrades. Due to the economic impact related to COVID-19, it does seem reasonable to approve an extension to the timeframes for completing the paving improvements on the subject property. This also aides in bringing the subject property into compliance with the lighting and signage standards.

Citizen Input

Dave Evenson, applicant, thanked the Commission for considering his request. He confirmed that he does not have issues with bringing the signage or lighting items into compliance. He asked the date those items would need to come into compliance.

City Planner Anderson replied that the temporary signage would need to be removed within 30 days of the approval of the amended CUP and the lighting would need to be addressed within 90 days after the approval of the amended CUP.

Motion by Commissioner Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Peters, to close the public hearing.

A roll call vote was performed:

Commissioner Johnson	aye
Chairperson Bauer	aye
Commissioner Woestehoff	aye
Commissioner Peters	aye
Commissioner Anderson	aye
Commissioner Gengler	aye
Commissioner VanScoy	aye

Motion Carried.

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 7:17 p.m.

Commission Business

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Anderson, to recommend that City Council adopt Resolution #20-101 approving an Amended Conditional Use Permit for Diamond Auto at 6750 Highway 10 NW.

A roll call vote was performed:

Commissioner Woestehoff	aye
Commissioner Peters	aye
Commissioner Johnson	aye
Chairperson Bauer	aye
Commissioner Anderson	aye

Commissioner Gengler aye
Commissioner VanScoy aye

Motion Carried.

5.02: Public Hearing: Consider Resolution #20-114 Approving Preliminary Plat for Hampton Homes (Project #19-140): Case of Platinum Land LLC

Public Hearing

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 7:19 p.m.

Presentation

City Planner Anderson presented the staff report stating that staff recommends approval of the Preliminary Plat with one or more of the following contingencies:

- Compliance with the Staff Review Comments
- Completion of a noise study prior to final action by the City Council
- Incorporation of northbound and southbound turn lanes on Nowthen Boulevard at 146th Avenue

City Planner Anderson stated that this would help address the concerns that have been raised both by the public (traffic) as well as Anoka County (noise). The Preliminary Plat does address the other major concern which was tree preservation and density transitioning. The subject property is zoned and guided for the proposed product and density. Based on the feedback over the years concerning Nowthen Boulevard and public comments specific to this project regarding traffic, staff supports this alternative with all three contingencies.

Chairperson Bauer asked why the developer would be made to pay for the turn lanes when there are more residents outside of the development causing the problems with traffic at the intersection.

City Planner Anderson replied that Nowthen Boulevard has been identified as a concern and there will be a corridor study done in 2020 or 2021 to review the improvements that could be made throughout the corridor. He stated that project will add additional vehicular traffic to the road, and this is an opportunity to start to address some of the concerns with the roadway.

Chairperson Bauer stated that he understands the concern but asked why that would be an expense of the developer and not the City.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill stated that when there is an increase in demand because of a new project, the improvement is the responsibility of the developer. He stated that because this is a County road, the City could not assess any other properties other than this property because of the right-of-way. He stated that there are safety issues on Nowthen Boulevard that need, and

should be addressed, noting that if the Commission believes that the City should cost share a portion of the improvement that recommendation could be made.

Chairperson Bauer stated that he previously lived north of the intersection and even at that time, two years ago, there was an issue with the turning traffic at that intersection and vehicles bypassing on the shoulder. He stated that this is a problem that has existed for years and therefore while he believes that this improvement is needed, he does not believe that this is the responsibility of the developer.

Citizen Input

Craig Jochum, representing the applicant, stated that they appreciate the residents and the City's concern with the intersection and turn lanes. He stated that while he does not disagree that the area would benefit from turn lanes, it would not be fair to place that improvement on this project which is four developable acres and would cause the project to be cost prohibitive. He stated that the developer would be willing to pay their share for the improvement, but it would not be fair to place the entire cost upon this development.

Commissioner VanScoy asked the percentage the developer would feel comfortable contributing to the improvement.

Mr. Jochum stated that he had not completed the calculations but suggested perhaps 20 percent, noting that this parcel would be about 10 percent of the area using the turn lane and 20 percent of the traffic.

Chairperson Bauer asked if staff is aware of the cost to make the improvement.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill stated that cost is not yet known. He stated that the Commission could state that they would support the turn lane improvement with the developer paying their pro rata share.

Alena Hunter, 14628 Helium Street NW, stated that the City really does need to look at Nowthen Boulevard and the turn lanes. She stated that she fears that this would get to the situation where the City refuses to fund a portion of the improvement as a cost-share which would push the project years down the line. She commented that intersection is a dangerous area and adding additional homes and traffic in that area will only increase the problem further as that would be the only way into the neighborhood. She stated that the turn lanes are needed but recognized that it will be a matter of who pays for the improvement. She hoped that the City and developer could come to an agreement and would like to see the improvement installed as a part of the project. She thanked the developer for incorporating suggestions that were made with the landscaping and buffering.

Chad Lindgren, 5561 145th Circle NW, stated that the developer has listened to the concerns and worked hard to incorporate the suggestions. He stated that the turn lane is essential, whether it was caused by existing traffic or this project, this is an opportunity to complete the improvement.

He stated that the use of the trail will change and there will need to be something done at 146th. He referenced the noise study, stating that there is not a lot of room to complete something if that is needed. He hoped that the results of the study would be known soon to ensure something could be included in the project, if needed. He appreciated the developer hearing the concerns but commented that it is unfortunate that this is the second meeting the developer has been unable to attend.

Mandy Erlandson, 5640 146th Avenue NW, stated that she appreciates that representatives from the applicant are participating in the meeting but shared the concern that this is the second meeting that the developer has not participated in. She stated that seems to send the message that the developer is not concerned with the comments of the residents. She echoed the comments that have been made by the previous residents. She stated that she is very concerned with the increase in traffic and safety concerns. She stated that she is also concerned with the noise, noting that her biggest concern would be that the noise is not mitigated and would prevent people from wanting to purchase the townhomes. She stated that concern was brought forward by multiple residents at the meeting in February. She commented that the townhomes are close to the road and with possible noise issues, the residents in the area are concerned that the townhomes would remain vacant. She stated that the existing residents want to ensure that the product constructed would be desirable and attract new residents.

Chairperson Bauer asked the number of units that could be built under the zoning compared to the number of homes proposed in this project.

City Planner Anderson replied that the zoning would allow for four to seven units per acre. He stated that this project proposes about six units per acre, with 26 attached townhome units.

Ms. Hunter asked if the City is able to require that the items discussed would be resolved prior to construction beginning, such as the noise mitigation and traffic improvements. She stated that there are homes across the street from her home that abut County Road 5, which act as a noise buffer for her property. She commented that noise mitigation will be huge for the residents in the proposed development. She stated that perhaps trees and fencing be used to mitigate that noise and hoped that those could be included in the project along with the turn lane to ensure that those items are completed.

City Planner Anderson commented that a noise study would need to be completed before final approval of the project could occur to ensure that any mitigation efforts could be included in the project. He stated that if there is a cost-share with the developer for the turn lane improvement, that would still be done as a part of this project. He confirmed that all of the items would be fully resolved prior to construction beginning.

Commissioner VanScoy stated that he agrees that there is an issue with the turn lanes and would like that addressed. He questioned the need for the noise study. He asked if a sound study was required for the townhomes to the southeast, as this seems to be a similar project.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill stated that it is common to require a noise study for any project on a County/State highway. He stated that the project to the southeast also completed a noise study and made some alterations to their building in order to mitigate noise, along with other measures. He commented that the mitigation along Nowthen Boulevard are typically small compared to those properties adjacent Highway 10.

Commissioner Anderson referenced the cost of the turn lanes, which could be \$100,000 or \$200,000, and asked if the County would contribute a portion of the improvement cost as it is a County road.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill stated that if the improvement is a reaction to a development proposal, it would be up to the City and developer to fund the improvement. He stated that if the improvement is associated with a long-term study of the corridor, the County could be a partner but noted that the improvement would then not occur for many years.

Commissioner Anderson asked if the City is allowed to make changes to a County road.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill replied that the City can gain approval for turn lanes from the County.

Ms. Erlandson stated that it seems that it would be appropriate for the noise study to be done, whether it has been a protocol in the past. She commented that this development has very little wiggle room in terms of the available space and layout and therefore wanted to ensure that the proper mitigation elements could be included in the plan. She stated that there are multiple exits she can use from her property and was concerned about the traffic impacts that would occur during construction for existing residents.

Chairperson Bauer recognized that there would be construction traffic during any project.

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

A roll call vote was performed:

Commissioner Peters	aye
Commissioner Woestehoff	aye
Chairperson Bauer	aye
Commissioner Johnson	aye
Commissioner Anderson	aye
Commissioner Gengler	aye
Commissioner VanScoy	aye

Motion Carried.

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 8:07 p.m.

Commission Business

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Woestehoff, to recommend that City Council adopt Resolution #20-114 approving Preliminary Plat for Hampton Townhomes with the conditions noted in the staff report and the added condition that the City work with the developer to cost-share the turn lane improvement.

A roll call vote was performed:

Commissioner Woestehoff	aye
Commissioner Johnson	aye
Commissioner Peters	aye
Chairperson Bauer	aye
Commissioner Gengler	aye
Commissioner Anderson	aye
Commissioner VanScoy	aye

Motion Carried.

5.03: Public Hearing: Consider Resolution #20-115 Approving a Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit for Cobblestone Hotel

Public Hearing

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 8:11 p.m.

Presentation

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl presented the staff report stating that staff recommends adoption of Resolution #20-115 approving a Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit for Cobblestone Hotel.

Commissioner VanScoy asked for details on the shared parking mentioned.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that there would be a parking lot connection to New Horizon Academy to the east and the property to the west, when that property is developed, therefore there is an opportunity for shared parking to occur at the New Horizon site during their non-peak hours.

Commissioner VanScoy asked if New Horizon has issues with people parking in their lot.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl replied that staff has not spoken with New Horizon about the shared parking but would be happy to have that discussion. She stated that it is a common practice to share parking within The COR.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill stated that the Commission has been particular about shared parking but in this instance, staff was comfortable with shared parking access. He stated that there may not be shared parking, but traffic could flow through between the sites.

Citizen Input

Stewart, representing the applicant, stated that he is present to answer any questions the Commission may have. He stated that they are excited to come to Ramsey. He noted that he has been in charge of building 75 to 80 new hotels. He believed the proposed parking would be sufficient for the hotel and restaurant.

Commissioner Woestehoff asked for details on the idea to have a concrete dumpster pad in the center and asked if there would be a better place for that.

Stewart, replied that they need to locate the dumpster in an area where the garbage truck can access it and be able to maneuver. He stated that the only other location where it would work would be next to the restaurant patio and they did not find that to be a good fit.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that it would be a dumpster enclosure, noting that it would be full brick on three sides with a completely wood covered gate, noting that the dumpster would not be visible.

Motion by Commissioner Peters, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to close the public hearing.

A roll call vote was performed:

Commissioner Johnson	aye
Commissioner Woestehoff	aye
Commissioner Peters	aye
Chairperson Bauer	aye
Commissioner Anderson	aye
Commissioner Gengler	aye
Commissioner VanScoy	aye

Motion Carried.

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 8:23 p.m.

Commission Business

Motion by Commissioner Anderson, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to recommend that City Council adopt Resolution #20-115 approving site plan and conditional use permit for Cobblestone Hotel.

A roll call vote was performed:

Commissioner Peters	aye
Commissioner Woestehoff	aye
Chairperson Bauer	aye
Commissioner Johnson	aye
Commissioner Gengler	aye
Commissioner Anderson	aye
Commissioner VanScoy	aye

Motion Carried.

6. COMMISSION BUSINESS

6.01: Discussion Item: Potential Concept of Private Marina/Dock for River Walk Village (Project No. 18-163); Case of Dave Wills on Behalf of N & D Management, LLC

Presentation

City Planner Anderson presented the Staff Report recommended that the Commission provide the applicant with any feedback, recommendations, and/or concerns related to the concept of a multiple slip dock for the River Walk Village community.

Commission Business

Chairperson Bauer asked if there are regulations or suggestions as to how far into the river a dock can project.

City Planner Anderson replied that a dock should not project any further into the river than would be considered navigable water. He noted that 3.5 to four feet in depth would be navigable water.

Chairperson Bauer asked the width of the river in that location.

City Planner Anderson estimated a width of about 700 feet.

Commissioner Gengler asked if any of the nearby properties have docks.

City Planner Anderson replied that he has not seen any docks for the immediate adjacent properties but noted that many properties remove their docks during the winter months. He commented that there is a dock about four or five properties to the west.

Commissioner Anderson stated that he is concerned with the proximity to the neighboring properties and how the boats would get to the dock. He stated that it would appear that there is not much space and that tree removal would be necessary. He stated that he is not in favor of

having the dock in this area because it is a narrow lot and it would not fit into the neighborhood. He stated that he would not want to block the creek at all.

City Planner Anderson commented that it was just brought to his attention that the neighboring property does have a dock. He stated that there is a public boat launch at the County Regional Park. He noted that there is a similar setup further up the river, where a homeowners association has a dock that serves multiple properties but noted that HOA has much more shoreline and is not near an oxbow.

Commissioner Peters asked the type of dock. He stated that if the dock is removable, he would question where it would be stored and if it is permanent it would cause a problem with debris.

City Planner Anderson stated that staff has limited information at this time and therefore is unsure of the type of dock that would be used. He stated that typically river docks are temporary and pulled out at the end of the boating season to avoid damage from ice. He stated that the potential applicant stated that they would extend a pedestrian trail to access the dock, which could have an impact to the shoreline and trees noting that staff worked hard with the developer to protect the shoreline and trees.

Commissioner VanScoy stated that he would interpret a marina to be multiple slips, where a dock is smaller and intended for a few people to use. He asked the difference between a marina and a dock and when the DNR would need to be brought in.

City Planner Anderson replied that a marina would be a commercial enterprise. He stated that this would be a multiple slip dock that serves more than one user, although within the private neighborhood. He stated that the DNR noted that until they had more information on how the slips would be awarded, they could not make the determination on whether a DNR permit would be necessary. He stated that if this were to come forward for formal consideration, staff would continue to work with the DNR.

Commissioner VanScoy stated that his interpretation would be that a reasonable sized dock would be acceptable but a mega dock with multiple slips seems to be too much. He stated that there are only seven homes and questioned how many boats would be in the water at one time.

City Planner Anderson stated that the original communication from the applicant attempted to accommodate each lot of the development, but the applicant acknowledged that would not be feasible and instead attempted to accommodate the seven lots. He stated that even with the new information received today, the consultant acknowledged that it would even be difficult to accommodate seven slips because of the narrow lot and position on the river.

Commissioner Anderson stated that the neighborhood was not pleased with the development and therefore if this moves forward, he would like to see it done as a public hearing to allow the residents to provide input. He stated that this does not appeal to him in the form presented. He believed that additional information would be needed before the developer could be provided with the desired feedback.

Commissioner Woestehoff agreed that there was a lot of public feedback received in regard to the development itself and therefore he would want the input from the neighbors on this element as well. He asked if the marina categorization would require a change in zoning.

City Planner Anderson replied that there would not be a change in zoning as it would be tied to private property owned by the HOA and would instead follow what the association up river did, creating a dock association with its own covenants. He stated that he did not believe there would be an intent to convert the dock to a commercial marina. He noted that if this moves forward to a formal request, a public hearing would be required for the Conditional Use Permit and advised that the notification area could be extended. He noted that conditions could be placed in a CUP that would prevent the dock from commercial activity.

Chairperson Bauer provided background information on a shared dock concept that he participated in years ago when he lived further north.

6.02: Review Updated Sketch Plan of Garden View Villas (Project 19-136)

Presentation

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl presented the Staff Report stating that staff recommends that the Commission provide input to the applicant on the revised sketch plan. This could include, but is not limited to identifying any red flags, noting any potential concerns, and providing the applicant direction to invest in a Preliminary Plat.

Commission Business

Commissioner Anderson asked the concern of public safety with the driveways.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl replied that individual driveways onto the road increases the possibility of accidents and prefer driveways onto a frontage road for townhome products. She noted that it was a comment and not a requirement as it is not uncommon for single family homes to have driveways onto the road. She stated that as proposed it would meet the standards and the comment was simply made as a suggestion.

Darren Lazan, applicant, stated that they made a full Preliminary Plat application, but staff believed it would be better to bring this forward as a Sketch Plan to gather input. He stated that originally this was a townhome development, but the constraints associated with the parcel and the requirements of the Code, put significant constraints on the project and therefore a fully conforming single-family plat was developed. He stated that this application should be considered as any other single-family subdivision plat. He referenced the landscaping comment from the staff report related to the requirement for the developer to install the landscaping. He explained that there is no opportunity for a developer to landscape as the lots will be constructed singly instead of as a whole development and therefore grading would occur and irrigation would not be available for landscaping to be provided by the developer. He noted that while it may not

be ideal for driveways onto the road, there are other single-family home driveways on the roadway, so this would not be unique. He stated that the depth of the lot would prevent the private frontage road that was previously proposed with the townhome concept.

Commissioner VanScoy referenced the comment related to the perimeter landscaping and asked why staff would ask the developer to be responsible for that.

City Planner Anderson replied that it is not typical for a developer to complete the plantings, as that typically falls to the individual builders. He noted that there are perimeter plantings and outlot plantings not associated with any lot being constructed and therefore there would be a potential for confusion and frustration for individual builders that anticipate two trees per lot and then discover that some lots have nine or ten trees. He stated that it would be difficult for building staff to track and place on an individual permit. He stated that it would seem more prudent to have a single entity responsible for those plantings to prevent confusion.

Commissioner VanScoy asked if that has been required of other developers.

City Planner Anderson stated that staff is attempting to solve the surprise that builders would have on whether two, six or ten trees would be required on the lot.

Commissioner VanScoy asked why different lots would be responsible for a different number of trees.

City Planner Anderson displayed the Sketch Plan and identified lots that exceed the two front yard trees, noting that a builder would need to be aware that there would be additional expense to install those trees. He noted that could create a difficult scenario for staff and the builder.

Commissioner VanScoy asked who developed the landscape plan and tree locations.

City Planner Anderson replied that the applicant provided the landscape plan.

Mr. Lazan stated that some of the confusion came in when the transition was made from a villa/townhome project with an HOA that would have common grounds and common irrigation. He stated that this would be the same product type and plat at COR 3, which are individual lots. He stated that they developed this plan to address the comments related to the landscaping requirements, noting that this is how this could meet the requirements. He recognized that different lots would have different burdens in order to meet the requirements. He did not recall any landscape requirements for COR 3, outside of the typical builder requirements. He noted that this is no longer a villa project and is a standard plat.

Commissioner Anderson stated that if these are single family lots, they should fall under the two-tree rule. He noted that the adjacent residential is distanced and therefore density transitioning would not be required. He asked why so many trees are being required for standard lots.

City Planner Anderson replied that he assumes that the plan was developed based on comments from the previous iteration. He stated that if this has morphed into small lot single family, or something similar to COR 3, planting requirements would be based on street frontage. He stated that the landscaping plan could then be modified and some of this confusion might be eliminated. He agreed that it does not appear density transitioning would be required as part of this initial phase.

Mr. Lazan stated that he would be more than happy to work with staff to better reflect the requirements of small lot single family. He noted that they would also be willing to work to allow more diversity in building materials as well. He agreed that perhaps the staff comments from the previous concept were carried through in the development of this plat.

6.02: Approve Planning Framework for Highway 10 South Planning Area – Riverstone South

Presentation

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill presented the Staff Report stating that staff would like clear policy direction on the points raised in the staff report.

Commission Business

Commissioner Gengler asked to see the alternative road layouts and which is being proposed.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill stated that this was developed later in the process because of input from residents on Bowers Drive. He provided additional details on the road alignment and connection to Bowers Drive. He noted that the connection to Bowers would be a public road but would not be Riverdale Drive.

Commissioner VanScoy referenced the public safety connection to Bowers Drive and noted that under any other circumstance he would not understand why a minimum access for safety is being considered as it seems inadequate. He stated that there are a lot of residents on Bowers Drive and asked why a connection to the new development is not proposed.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill noted that has been discussed at length. He stated that there has been opposition from those on Bowers Drive. He noted that the existing situation was not created by the developer. He stated that City can choose to make the road a full road, but the residents on Bowers Drive do not want that. He stated that public safety feels that it would be adequate as proposed. He stated that the two neighbors in Pearson Place seemed unaware that the plan would be to connect the area, even though the 60-foot corridor was collected. He stated that the Commission could make the recommendation for a full road, but this seemed to be an adequate compromise.

Commissioner VanScoy commented that he does not understand why this is an issue for those folks. He commented that there is a mile-long cul-de-sac which is unacceptable from a safety aspect.

Commissioner Anderson agreed with the comments of Commissioner VanScoy. He did not believe this could move forward unless a road goes through. He stated that in his opinion he would not support a plan that did not provide a connection. He commented that there needs to be a way out.

Commissioner Woestehoff stated that he would agree with those comments, noting that the 20-foot extension would be a minimum. He stated that people will appreciate the cut through more than they would oppose it after constructed. He stated that the new road seems like a good idea.

Commissioner Anderson stated that he wants a road in there and does not think it should be constructed to bare minimums and should instead stick to the standards for a City street.

The applicant, stated that they appreciate continuing to work with the staff as they want to make this a nice neighborhood. He stated that staff did a good job describing the constraints and conditions around the property. He stated that they are trying to achieve sustainability of the neighborhood and the concept plan is key. He stated that multiple housing types bring in multiple age groups and buyers which helps to make the development sustainable over time. He stated that they knew that tree preservation would be important. He noted that the deeded parcel was provided by the adjacent property and they would provide additional property that would be used for screening. He stated that they support the current layout that has been developed, versus having the access on the east side. He explained that they want people coming into the site to first see the park and preserved tree area. He stated that once the input is gathered in the next few meetings, they will present a concept plan that provides a transition from the existing neighborhood with a variety of housing products and fits with the other adjacent uses.

Motion by Commissioner Anderson, seconded by Commissioner VanScoy, to recommend that the City Council adopt the document as an official, yet nonbinding policy document to guide future conversations pertaining to Riverstone South with the added condition of the public road.

A roll call vote was performed:

Commissioner Peters	aye
Commissioner Woestehoff	aye
Chairperson Bauer	aye
Commissioner Johnson	aye
Commissioner Gengler	aye
Commissioner Anderson	aye
Commissioner VanScoy	aye

Motion Carried.

7.01: Public Hearing: Consider Ordinance #20-10 Amending Bulk Standards in the R-1 Residential District

Public Hearing

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 9:40 p.m.

Presentation

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl presented the staff report stating that staff recommends approval of Ordinance #20-10 revising City Code Section 117-111 related to side yard setback bulk standards within the R-1 Residential zoning district.

Commissioner VanScoy stated that this would make the standard distance between buildings at 12 feet. He asked if this would create an issue for public safety.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl replied that ten feet between buildings was previously used and advised that this would be enough space to get between the homes. She confirmed that public safety did not have an issue. She stated that this would not change the distance between buildings, but what happens inside of those buildings.

Citizen Input

No comments made.

Motion by Commissioner Woestehoff, seconded by Commissioner Peters, to close the public hearing.

A roll call vote was performed:

Commissioner Johnson	aye
Chairperson Bauer	aye
Commissioner Woestehoff	aye
Commissioner Peters	aye
Commissioner Anderson	aye
Commissioner Gengler	aye
Commissioner VanScoy	aye

Motion Carried.

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 9:46 p.m.

Commission Business

Motion by Commissioner Woestehoff, seconded by Commissioner Peters, to recommend that City Council adopt Ordinance #20-10 amending City Code Section 117-111 related to side yard setbacks within the R-1 Residential District.

A roll call vote was performed:

Commissioner Peters	aye
Commissioner Woestehoff	aye
Chairperson Bauer	aye
Commissioner Johnson	aye
Commissioner Anderson	aye
Commissioner Gengler	aye
Commissioner VanScoy	nay

Motion Carried.

8. COMMISSION / STAFF INPUT

8.01: Receive Staff Update

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill stated that filing has closed for Council seat elections. He noted that the list of candidates will be forwarded to the Commission. He noted that a primary is not required as all four seats only have two candidates.

Chairperson Bauer encouraged any residents that have not yet filled out the 2020 census to do so. He noted that the preliminary results were released and Ramsey was the second fastest growing community from 2010 to 2020.

9. ADJOURNMENT

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

A roll call vote was performed:

Commissioner Peters	aye
Commissioner Woestehoff	aye
Chairperson Bauer	aye
Commissioner Johnson	aye
Commissioner Anderson	aye
Commissioner Gengler	aye
Commissioner VanScoy	aye

Motion Carried.

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission adjourned at 9:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Chloe McGuire Brigl
Senior Planner

ATTEST:

JoAnn Shaw
Community Development Assistant

Drafted by Amanda Staple
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.