

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

The Ramsey Planning Commission conducted a regular meeting on Thursday, December 3, 2020, at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota.

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

Members Absent: Commissioner Torrey Johnson

Also Present: Senior Planner Chloe McGuire Brigl
 Deputy City Administrator Tim Gladhill
 Planning Technician Brian McCann
 City Council Liaison Debra Musgrove

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairperson Bauer led the group in the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. CITIZEN INPUT

None.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

A roll call vote was performed:

Commissioner Woestehoff aye
Commissioner Gengler aye
Commissioner Peters aye
Commissioner Anderson aye

Commissioner VanScoy aye
Chairperson Bauer aye

Motion Carried.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

5.01: Approve the November 5, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes:

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

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion Carried.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS/COMMISSION BUSINESS

6.01: Public Hearing: Consider Resolution #20-283 Approving a Home Occupation Permit for Twin Cities Generator at 17040 Baugh St NW (Project No. 20-132); Case of Twin Cities Generator

Public Hearing

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 7:03 p.m.

Presentation

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl presented the staff report stating that staff recommends approving Resolution #20-283 granting a Home Occupation Permit on the subject property. She confirmed that the proposed garage would meet all requirements of City Code.

Citizen Input

No comments made.

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

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion Carried.

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 7:08 p.m.

Commission Business

Motion by Commissioner Anderson, seconded by Commissioner Peters, to recommend that City Council adopt Resolution #20-283 approving a Home Occupation Permit on the subject property.

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion Carried.

6.02: Public Hearing: Consider Resolution #20-281 Approving an Interim Use Permit for Storage Containers for Ve-Ve Inc. (Project No. 20-136); Case of John Vevea on behalf of Ve-Ve Inc.

Public Hearing

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 7:10 p.m.

Presentation

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl presented the staff report stating that staff recommends approving Resolution #20-281 for an Interim Use Permit for two storage containers on the subject property.

Commissioner VanScoy asked if the five-year period is typical for an interim use permit.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl confirmed that it a typical timeframe that the City and other municipalities use. She noted that an interim use permit can also be tied to a point in time, such as reconstruction of a road.

Commissioner VanScoy stated that his only concern would be the length of five years.

Commissioner Peters asked if there would be hazardous materials stored in the structures.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that she did not believe hazardous materials would be stored in the structures but noted that the applicant can provide additional details.

Citizen Input

John Vevea, applicant, confirmed that there will not be hazardous materials stored in the structures and provided details on what would be stored in the cold storage, such as boxes and pallets. He stated that these are not normal storage containers that you see on railroad tracks with an end door. He stated that these have double side doors, which allow all materials to be accessed. He stated that these would be an investment of \$12,000 and therefore he would like to have a period of five years. He stated that his business is growing, and this would allow additional storage space and give them time to adjust to the growth.

Chairperson Bauer asked for details on the exterior of the container.

Mr. Vevea replied that it does have a corrugated look with side doors. Staff displayed an example photograph. He stated that his dad started this business in 1973 and they have continued to grow in Ramsey. He hoped that he could continue that growing relationship.

Commissioner Gengler asked if the applicant would keep the trees that provide screening and if those trees would be removed some other screening would be added to screen the containers from the road.

Mr. Vevea agreed that the trees help to screen the containers and confirmed that he does not plan to remove any trees. He stated that the structures will come in the tan color and he could paint it if desired. He stated that these containers are meant to serve for a number of years and therefore will hold up during the five-year period.

Commissioner Anderson asked for additional information on the location of the containers.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl highlighted the proposed location, which would be behind the trees on the subject property.

Mr. Vevea provided additional information on the different tree screening.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl confirmed that this area only has business uses and does not receive regular residential traffic.

Commissioner VanScoy asked the plans of the applicant in five years.

Mr. Vevea stated that ideally, he will be expanding into a new space, but it is uncertain to say that would be for sure with all the unknowns.

Councilmember Musgrove thanked the applicant for coming forward with this proposal, noting that the area looks nice from the aerial photograph. She stated that this is a business district, and this would be a great way to help a business make the jump to possibly continue to expand in the future. She commented that the proposed location is both functional and screened.

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

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion Carried.

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 7:27 p.m.

Commission Business

Motion by Commissioner Gengler, seconded by Commissioner VanScoy, to recommend that City Council adopt Resolution #20-281 Approving an Interim Use Permit for two storage containers on the subject property, contingent upon screening remaining in place.

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion Carried.

6.03: Public Hearing: Consider Resolution #20-282 Approving an Interim Use Permit for Storage Containers and Gravel Outdoor Storage Area at 8049 146th Ave NW (Project No. 20-137); Case of JBR Ramsey, LLC on behalf of Richard Lee

Public Hearing

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 7:28 p.m.

Presentation

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl presented the staff report stating that staff recommends approving Resolution #20-282 for an Interim Use Permit for parking on gravel surfacing and the use of storage containers currently on the subject property.

Commissioner Anderson asked for details on the containers.

Richard Lee, applicant, replied that they are shipping containers similar to the last case. He stated that these containers would be front loaded. He stated that the current tenant uses three containers for salt storage and the other containers are used for storage of seasonal equipment.

Commissioner VanScoy stated that there are six containers on the site and asked if the intent would be to keep the container between the building and Ferret Street.

Mr. Lee believed that the tenant would keep the container in that location. He stated that the property is fenced with gates and that container is easily accessible as it sits across from the gate.

Commissioner VanScoy asked for details on the site setbacks.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl replied that these are unique uses and because the entrance of the building is to the south, it is not that much of a concern with the container on the front of the building. She stated that the containers are easily moved, and that container could be moved to another location.

Commissioner VanScoy stated that he would anticipate that the City would continue to receive these types of requests and therefore he would be concerned with continuing to approve interim use permits, rather than modifying the ordinance. He stated in this case the container is not screened from the road.

Commissioner Woestehoff asked when the container usage began.

Mr. Lee replied that the previous owner constructed the building and used the property from 1986 to 2018. He stated that when he purchased the property in 2018, some of the containers were already onsite.

Commissioner Woestehoff commented that these containers do not seem to be temporary and seem to be long-term storage in a temporary container and based off the lifespan of these types of containers, he would be hesitant. He also recognized that the property is listed for redevelopment and it would be easier to remove these containers than to remove a building.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl confirmed that this area is identified for retail development and at some point, this type of use would end on the site.

Mr. Lee stated that he purchased the property for future development. He stated that they found it easy to find a tenant to use the site until development reaches this site. He agreed that the future use of this site would be retail but stated that it would be hard to anticipate when that will occur. He stated that this action would help them to maintain the site until the development reaches this site.

Commissioner Woestehoff asked if there is screening between this site and the adjacent retail development.

Mr. Lee confirmed that the retail development planted a line of trees to provide screening.

Commissioner Anderson asked and received confirmation that the time period for this interim use permit would be five years. He asked if the containers could be moved back to be behind the building and look better on the site rather than the haphazard placement that currently exists.

Mr. Lee confirmed that could be considered.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl displayed an aerial photograph of the site, identifying the location of the containers and the area Commission Anderson would desire.

Councilmember Gengler asked if there is a specific area that would hope to be covered with the class five gravel.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl identified the area where gravel would be placed.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if the location of the containers proposed by Commissioner Anderson on the side of the building would be functional for the use.

Mr. Lee commented that it would be hard for him to answer that question as he is not the end user and is the property owner. He did not believe there would be an issue as the containers are front loaded.

Commissioner VanScoy commented that two of the containers abut the eastern fence and asked if there would be a setback or screening added.

Mr. Lee replied that the fence is setback 10 feet from the property line, and they did not have any intent on adding screening as the neighboring property owner planted trees.

Commissioner VanScoy commented that when he visited the property, he did not notice screening in the area where the containers back to the fence. He commented that the trees on the neighboring property are on the north end, whereas he is speaking about the containers on the south end of the property.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl displayed the landscaping plan for Armstrong Retail, which is the adjacent development and then identified the location of the containers in relation.

Citizen Input

No additional comments.

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

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion Carried.

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 7:49 p.m.

Chairperson Bauer stated that he received a comment Commissioner Johnson., who was not able to attend the meeting. Commissioner Johnson does not support the requests related to shipping containers as they do not meet the architectural requirements of the City. He expressed concern that if this case and the previous case were approved, the City will continue to see these types of requests.

Commission Business

Commissioner VanScoy stated that he would have difficulty supporting this request without screening and in the current locations related to setback. He believed that the City should review these uses on a more long-term consideration.

Commissioner Gengler commented that she would rather see the container on the far side remain on that side as it would be less visible from the retail center.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that this is a unique situation as this is currently an industrial area, but the use will potentially change in the coming years. She did not want to be too onerous on the business to plant trees that may be removed when the site redevelops. She stated that she would support the use of the containers rather than having the items stored outdoors.

Commissioner Anderson commented that this property can be seen from the entrance ramp onto Highway 10. He stated that these containers are not aesthetically pleasing. He commented that he would like to see the business able to function but would like to see the site cleaned up. He

stated that he does not like allowing these containers in this area and would like to see the containers perhaps fenced.

Commissioner Woestehoff stated that he also has concerns as this is an interested location and zoning compliance. He stated that he also has concerns with salt being placed into metal containers as the containers could rust more quickly. He stated that the containers are meant to store things but in the aerial photographs you can see materials stored outside of the containers. He estimated that another two containers would be needed in order to contain all the equipment.

Commissioner Anderson asked if the Commission should table this request and the applicant could come back with a better site layout and how the containers could be arranged to be more aesthetic. He stated that perhaps screening be placed around the containers as well.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that there is a not a specific timeline as the containers are already on site. She stated that having gravel placed is a priority of staff as the site is dirt and there is a concern that it would snow before that could happen. She stated that if the Commission would like to see a revised plan making the containers less visible from Armstrong Retail, staff can work on that administratively and bring that forward to the Council once they believe it is ready.

Motion by Commissioner Anderson, seconded by Commissioner VanScoy, to table this review to allow staff to work with the applicant to present a more favorable layout for the storage containers that may include screening.

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion Carried.

7. COMMISSION BUSINESS

7.01: Review Concept Plan for Rivenwick 4th Addition; Case of Lennar for Rivenwick 4th Concept Plan (Project 20-134)

Presentation

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl presented the Staff Report stating that staff is open to this compromise request if the land uses within the PUD contain the same amount of commercial a previously directed. Public Works and Public Safety had a few concerns about the public road

ending at a private road, and do prefer the layout with the previous proposal, but can make this layout work with the proper signage.

Commission Business

Commissioner VanScoy asked if the pond would be that large as it takes up a portion of the site that could be used for commercial development.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that would be close to the estimated size, noting that Lennar does not tend to oversize its ponds.

Commissioner Woestehoff asked if the EDA provided input on this proposal.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl noted that this has not gone to the EDA but the economic development department provided input, sharing similar concerns to the last proposal but agreed that this could work and they would like the retail along Highway 10.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if the pond is proposed aesthetically or to meet requirements of the City.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl replied that it is a requirement of the City.

Commissioner Anderson commented that he would like all of the commercial property to face Highway 10. He stated that the pond could be moved to the back corner, as that location is flexible. He stated that he likes the previous proposal layout rather than this layout.

Chairperson Bauer agreed that he preferred the last proposal where the retail faced Highway 10.

Commissioner VanScoy commented that accommodations have already been made for this site and does not want to see more changes and would not support moving the pond onto the commercial area.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated that the previous proposal did not include the pond and a pond would be necessary for stormwater management. She stated that one of the biggest changes was the road layout and where parking should occur.

Chairperson Bauer asked if there would be one pond for both the residential and commercial uses or whether each use would have its own pond.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that there would most likely be ponding for both uses, as they would most likely develop at separate times.

Chairperson Bauer stated that he would prefer the retail to face Highway 10.

Commissioner Woestehoff echoed the comments of the Commission thus far. He stated that he is unsure of the road going into a T. He stated that he would prefer the townhomes removed as that could provide space for the ponding and free up additional commercial space.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl asked if the concern was that the townhomes would abut the commercial use or with the road.

Commissioner Woestehoff stated that it is the road issue and noted that moving the pond would allow additional space for the commercial use.

Commissioner Gengler commented that she preferred the previous layout as well and had concern with residential abutting commercial use and the proposed road in this configuration.

Chairperson Bauer reviewed the consensus of the Commission that the commercial portion of the property should not be reduced further than what has already been agreed to. The Commission also prefers a road between the commercial and residential uses rather than allowing those uses to abut each other as shown in this proposal.

7.02: Review Sketch Plan for Bacon Property; Case of Bill Boyum

Presentation

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl presented the Staff Report asked the Commission to provide feedback on which concept plan to move forward with and develop a formal sketch plan application.

Commission Business

Chairperson Bauer stated that the applicant's narrative includes two cul-de-sacs, noting that one lies within Nowthen. He recognized that the comments from public safety shows that they prefer the loop but asked if a larger cul-de-sac would accomplish the same things.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated that she could bring that idea forward to public safety for review.

Chairperson Bauer stated that Commissioner Johnson stated that he preferred the 19-lot layout.

Commissioner VanScoy referenced the option which would connect to 178th and asked for additional details.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that connection would be challenging as the road would go through the park area that is mostly wetlands.

Commissioner VanScoy commented that several of the lots appear to be encumbered with floodplain and asked how the developer would intend to handle that.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated that the floodplain circles the properties and there is upland area. She commented that some fill is allowed in the floodplain with proper measures and mitigation. She stated that the lots could accommodate the area needed for a house pad and well/septic and most likely only the driveways would be within floodplain.

Councilmember Musgrove referenced the nine-lot layout and easements and asked for additional input on whether those would be for roads.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl noted that these are easements that already exist for utilities and would not be used for roads.

Commissioner Anderson referenced lots two through five, which would appear to be hard to build on because of the floodplain in that area. He commented that he does not like the 1,500-foot cul-de-sac and asked if a road could be run from the cul-de-sac bulb to 178th to provide a second access to the development. He stated that he does not prefer to have only one way in or out of a development.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl displayed a map which identifies the wetlands on site, explaining that the road connection would run entirely through wetland. She stated that the comments of the neighbors have been that they do not want the road connection or disruption to the wetlands.

Commissioner VanScoy commented that it would appear the road connection would go through tilled fields rather than wetlands and that there would be minimal wetland disruption.

Commissioner Anderson stated that he could support a connection that would move to the west to connect to 178th.

Kendra Lindahl, Landform, commented that the only request tonight is for the nine-lot subdivision and they are requesting for input on the cul-de-sac. She stated that they do not intend to include a connection to 178th as it was clear that the neighbors do not want that. She stated that they received the input from the neighbors and reduced the number of lots from the 37 which would be allowed to nine lots. She stated that the road connection to 178th would need to go through a public park and require wetland fill and would instead preserve the natural features of the site with two estate lots that backup to that area and fits the existing character of the area. She stated that they are looking for feedback on this alignment and the longer cul-de-sac before they decide whether to invest additional funds into this proposal.

Commissioner Woestehoff asked if there is an economic consideration between the different alignments and whether a cul-de-sac would support nine lots and 19 lots would be needed to support a road connection. He commented that there just seems to be a large jump between the two proposals.

Ms. Lindahl replied that the neighbors would not support the 19-lot subdivision and they do not want to present something that the neighbors would not support. She stated that the road connection would require additional road costs and process, as the road would go through public

park land and impact wetlands. She commented that they believe the nine-lot proposal would be a better subdivision.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that while it may appear easy to make the road connection on paper, the requirements of the City would require acquisition of the entire public park and a portion of a neighbor's property. She commented that it would be a difficult process and would not be preferred by staff as it would be very challenging.

Commissioner VanScoy commented that it would appear that the connection to 178th would occur at the cul-de-sac bulb and did not see how a neighboring property would be impacted.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated that the City only has about 40 feet of frontage on the cul-de-sac, whereas 66 feet of right-of-way is needed for a roadway.

Commissioner Gengler asked for input from the developer on perhaps making the cul-de-sac wider for more turnaround room.

Ms. Lindahl stated that the cul-de-sac proposed would meet the City standards but confirmed that if that is the desire, they could work with City staff to satisfy those concerns.

Commissioner Anderson asked whether the road would be public or private.

Ms. Lindahl stated that as drawn this would be a public street and would meet the 66-foot street right-of-way with a 28 paved rural section street.

Commissioner Anderson commented that on the drawing it is shown as 24 feet and he would have concern with the 28-foot width as well.

Ms. Lindahl confirmed that the 24-foot shown as an error and that would be 28 feet as required by City standard. She stated that if a wider road is desired, they could work with City staff.

Commissioner VanScoy stated that he would prefer not to have another cul-de-sac that is 1,500 feet in length and would prefer to see another option.

Commissioner Anderson agreed.

Chairperson Bauer asked if there would be another option for a secondary access that would not go through the park.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated that the proposal from the applicant would be the only logical option as there is no development on the north or east to connect to and the other areas are surrounded by wetland.

Commissioner Gengler commented that she likes that the applicant listened to the input from the neighbors but also acknowledged the concerns of public safety. She stated that she would tend to support this layout because of the difficulties and uniqueness of the lot.

Chairperson Bauer noted that some issues and concerns have been raised and the developer should continue to work with staff in attempt to develop something more acceptable before going forward with full plan development.

8. COMMISSION / STAFF INPUT

8.01: Receive Staff Update

Chairperson Bauer asked how the Council liaison appointment is done.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that it is typically done by discussion of the Council.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill provided additional input on the process, noting that Councilmembers rank their preference for different appointments and the Council then discusses those.

Chairperson Bauer commented that he has appreciated the participation of Councilmember Musgrove and noted the experience of Commissioner Woestehoff. He stated that he would prefer that those two members of the Council continue in a liaison relationship because of their knowledge. He stated that Commissioner Johnson stated that it has been an honor for him to serve on the Board and appreciated the knowledge of City staff. He stated that Commissioner Johnson has not been able to attend the last few meetings because of conflicts with his work and therefore has submitted his resignation. He noted that with Commissioner Woestehoff moving to the City Council, that will create a second vacancy. He stated that applications are going to be accepted for those two vacancies and appointments will be made by the City Council in the spring, but until that time the group would be a Commission of five members.

Commissioner Woestehoff thanked the Commission and staff for the last few years, stating that he has enjoyed his time on the Commission and while he will be sad to leave the Commission, he will continue to serve as a member of the City Council. He confirmed that he would hope to be able to serve as a liaison to the Planning Commission. He also thanked Chairperson Bauer and Commissioner VanScoy in their leadership in moving the Commission to a fully remote meeting in this challenging time.

The Commission thanked Commissioner Woestehoff for his service.

Commissioner VanScoy thanked the staff for making it possible to hold remote meetings.

9. ADJOURNMENT

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

A roll call vote was performed:

Commissioner Gengler aye

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

Motion Carried.

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission adjourned at 8:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Chloe McGuire Brigl
Senior Planner

ATTEST:

JoAnn Shaw
Planning Division Secretary

Drafted by Amanda Staple
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.