

**7.08: Adopt Resolution #20-114 Approving Preliminary Plat for Hampton Homes (Project #19-140); Case of Platinum Land LLC**

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl reviewed the staff report and recommendation of the Planning Commission to approve the Preliminary Plat contingent upon:

1. Compliance with the Staff Review Letter and Plan Review Comments.
2. Completion of a Noise Study and incorporation of any necessary mitigation elements.
3. Incorporation of turn lanes on Nowthen Boulevard at 146<sup>th</sup> Avenue with details of cost allocation addressed at time of Final Plat.

Councilmember Menth asked what mitigating elements would be for noise.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl provided examples of landscaping or a noise wall.

Councilmember Heinrich asked for input from public safety on the right turn option onto CR 5.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated that public safety is supportive of the right out onto Nowthen Boulevard.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if the noise mitigation would be for the existing residents as well as the new residents of this development.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated that the noise study would be for the project site and therefore only the new townhomes.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill explained that Nowthen Boulevard would not trigger noise mitigation for the existing homes and that requirement would be specific to the new homes. He stated that the benefit would be to the people purchasing the newly created homes.

Councilmember Musgrove stated that it does not appear that there would be room for a berm.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill provided different examples of things that could be used to mitigate noise, such as landscaping or fencing. He noted that the study would provide those examples.

Councilmember Musgrove stated that Anoka County provided four options for CR 5, with one option being a right out only used for emergency or utility vehicles. She asked for input from staff.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated that at this time the proposal is for a right out for any vehicles. She stated that public safety requested a right out for their vehicles and noted that it would make more sense to allow that action for all traffic. She noted that public safety was supportive of that option. She stated that Anoka County would like to see no new access onto County Road 5.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill stated that Anoka County originally stated that they would not want to see an additional access, but if Ramsey public safety believed that access could be supported, the County would allow it.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated that currently there is a driveway on the southern portion of the property, therefore this will not be an additional access.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if there is concern with the proximity to existing access points.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl noted that was not brought up as a concern by the engineering team. She noted that additional information could be brought back with final plat if desired.

Councilmember Heinrich asked how long this road would be compared to Bowers Drive. She also asked if the cul-de-sac and barricade for emergency vehicles would suffice.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill replied that this would be significantly shorter than Bowers Drive as this would be several hundred feet long. He stated that Bowers Drive is a public road whereas this would be a private road that the City would not own or maintain.

Elena Hunter, 14628 Helium Street NW, commented on the stretch of CR 5 which can be difficult, from TH 47 to the elementary school, where vehicles are attempting to pick up speed while others are attempting to turn left. She stated that it is more and more difficult to turn left onto 146<sup>th</sup> because of the increased traffic and challenges of that stretch of CR 5. She stated that people walking on the pedestrian path also have to deal with the turning traffic. She believed that traffic mitigation is needed at that intersection. She noted that this development will increase the traffic and increase the problem that already exists. She stated that the larger concern is the potential for accidents when vehicles stop on CR 5 to turn at 146<sup>th</sup>. She stressed the importance of a turn lane at that intersection and hoped that the City would share some of that cost. She hopes that the improvement would be completed with this development. She stated that noise from CR 5 continues to increase and supported the requirement for a noise study. She stated that it has been pleasant to work with the developer and Planning Commission throughout this process and was pleased with the buffering that will occur. She commented that she much prefers homes on this location rather than a commercial development.

Chad Lindgrun, 5561 145<sup>th</sup> Circle NW, stated that they have worked with the Planning Commission, staff and the developer and thanked everyone for their time. He stated that traffic is a huge concern from CR 5 on 146<sup>th</sup>. He also believed that a turn lane is important for that intersection. He stated that at the Planning Commission meeting there was a walking trail between the private road and CR 5, which he did not see on the plan tonight, and hoped would continue to be a part of the plan. He commented that as the traffic increases and if the trail connects to 146<sup>th</sup> there would need to be a turn lane for safety. He referenced the right out from the development and asked what would deter drivers from taking a right into the development at that location.

Jason Bebo, applicant, stated that he completed his own traffic study and noted that during the four-day period, two vehicles during the peek time of 4:00 to 6:00 p.m. had to wait more than one second to turn left onto 146<sup>th</sup>. He did not believe it would be appropriate to ask him to fund a turn

lane improvement for this development. He commented that this is a small development with little margin. He stated that he is attempting to create additional homes in the community that would be affordable, and he cannot afford to construct turn lanes.

Councilmember Heinrich thanked the developer for working with the residents. She asked which four days of the week the study was completed.

Mr. Bebo commented that the study was done Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday. He did not believe the results would change if the study were done over a weekend. He stated that he does understand that a turn lane would be helpful in that location for the existing problems mentioned by residents but noted that he did not notice any vehicles passing on the shoulder during his study.

Councilmember Riley referenced the noise study and asked the developers thoughts on that requirement.

Mr. Bebo stated that the townhome project to the south would have an almost identical layout and is completely sold. He did not see an issue but would be okay with completing a noise study if the City desires. He stated that he cannot fit both a sidewalk and buffer, therefore it would need to be one or the other.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that she believes that the current conditions have lower traffic because of COVID and school being out. She stated that traffic coming out of the development would try to take a left on 146<sup>th</sup> in the morning when there is a lot of traffic trying to get onto CR 5 and asked if the developer has concerns with that. She also asked if the developer had concerns with pedestrians crossing at 146<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Bebo stated that he would be willing to provide the sidewalk connection to 146<sup>th</sup>. He stated that his comment was that there would not be enough room to also include a berm with the sidewalk.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that she believes that traffic will be an issue and there should be some kind of mitigation included.

Mr. Bebo stated that he would most likely not continue the process if turn lanes are required.

Councilmember Musgrove stated that CR 5 is a County road and asked if the County would contribute to any improvements.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill stated that improvement is not included in the County's capital improvement plan and therefore funds are not budgeted. He stated that could be a part of the larger corridor study. He stated that staff is recommending that one turn lane be constructed with the City sharing 30 percent of the cost. He stated that he has yet to see a project abutting a County road that does not have to contribute towards an improvement.

Mayor LeTourneau asked the likelihood that the County would share 30 percent of the cost as well.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill commented that the improvement is not included in the County's five-year capital improvement plan, therefore the County would not contribute in the next five years.

Councilmember Musgrove stated that she is unsure that she would be comfortable with the City contributing towards the improvement in terms of precedent. She asked about the availability of HRA funds.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill confirmed that the HRA fund could be used or the PIR fund could be used for the cost-share.

Councilmember Musgrove stated that she would be comfortable using the County HRA funds because this is a County road.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill explained that the City gets involved in road improvement costs with developers when the improvement occurs on a collector roadway that serves more than just the development, similar to Puma Street.

Mayor LeTourneau commented that the City cost-share would come into play when the improvement provides a broader benefit to a larger segment of the community and would not just benefit the proposed development. He agreed that the developer should not pay the whole cost of the turn lane improvement.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill explained that the direction tonight would simply be that the City is willing to contribute towards the improvement and noted that staff and the developer would work out the details prior to Final Plat.

Councilmember Menth commented that with the City contributing 30 percent of the cost for the turn lane, the cost per townhome for one turn lane would be \$2,100. He noted that two turn lanes would equate to \$4,200 per townhome.

Councilmember Riley asked the City's interest in requiring the noise study.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill explained that this is a County State Aid Highway, therefore the City would have some liability in terms of noise. He noted that if the City improves CR 5 in the future, that would trigger automatic review of noise study and the City would then be responsible for any noise mitigation. He stated that the City would prefer for that developer complete the study on the front end of the proposal and complete any noise mitigation efforts that may be required.

Mr. Bebo asked if a noise study was required for the townhome project to the south.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill stated that he is unsure of that townhome project as that predated his time with the City but stated that multiple other projects required noise studies, providing those examples.

Ms. Hunter acknowledged that the turn lane is costly for the developer. She asked that the interest of safety be considered as saving lives should be more important. She agreed that this is an unusual time in terms of traffic, as there is more traffic during usual times and during the school year. She wondered why a four-way stop could not be installed. She believed that would help mitigate the traffic and would allow vehicles to turn, along with aiding in pedestrian safety. She appreciated that the developer was willing to provide the sidewalk connection but noted that pedestrians would still need to cross the road as the sidewalk does not connect to Sunwood.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill stated that the City could complete an intersection control evaluation study but stated that there would be priorities for intersection control. He stated that the ICE study could be completed with the recommendation for the turn lane remaining and the developer and staff could work out which would be better.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated that she reached out to Anoka County about the possibility of a four way stop and the County did not view a four way stop or traffic light as an option at that intersection because of spacing. She stated that the County stated that adding a four way stop at that location could actually make traffic worse down the road.

City Engineer Westby stated that volumes of traffic and pedestrians, along with site constraints have to be reviewed along with a number of warrants. He stated that with these traffic volumes a four-way stop would not be warranted. He stated that a four-way stop could also create a false sense of security for pedestrians.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl clarified that the trail along Nowthen is in the plan sheets, although she did not present that element tonight.

Councilmember Specht stated that he has been contacted by residents about this proposed project. He stated that he would need to see turn lanes, traffic studies and noise studies included in order to support this project.

Councilmember Heinrich asked for details on the plan review comments and staff letter mentioned in the staff report recommendation.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill explained that staff provides comments to the developer in multiple sources and provided clarification.

Motion by Councilmember Riley, seconded by Mayor LeTourneau, to Adopt Resolution #20-114 Approving Preliminary Plat for Hampton Homes with the incorporation of one turn lane.

Further discussion: Councilmember Menth asked why only one turn lane is wanted. Councilmember Riley stated that staff suggested only a northbound turn lane. Deputy City Administrator Gladhill stated that the priority of residents is the northbound turn lane. He stated

that the southbound turn lane could be addressed during the CR 5 corridor study. Councilmember Musgrove stated that she would have difficulty supporting this because of the proximity to CR 5 and the issues with traffic. She stated that she would prefer to have two turn lanes funded by the developer and therefore would not support this motion.

Motion carried. Voting Yes: Mayor LeTourneau, Councilmembers Riley, Kuzma, and Menth.  
Voting No: Councilmembers Heinrich, Musgrove, and Specht.