

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

The Ramsey Planning Commission conducted a regular meeting on Thursday, May 6, 2021, at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota.

Members Present: Chairperson Randy Bauer
 Commissioner Bruce Anderson
 Commissioner Andrew Dunaway
 Commissioner Cheri Gengler
 Commissioner Eric Peters
 Commissioner Gary VanScoy

Members Absent: Commissioner Brian Walker

Also Present: Senior Planner Chloe McGuire Brigl
 Deputy City Administrator Tim Gladhill
 City Council Liaison Matt Woestehoff

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

Chairperson Bauer noted that Item 7.01 has been withdrawn and has been removed from the agenda prior to the meeting tonight.

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

A roll call vote was performed:

Commissioner Peters aye
Commissioner Anderson aye

Commissioner Gengler aye
Commissioner Dunaway aye
Commissioner VanScoy aye
Chairperson Bauer aye

Motion Carried.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

5.01: Approve the April 8, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes:

No action taken.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS/COMMISSION BUSINESS

None.

7. COMMISSION BUSINESS

7.01: ~~Review Concept Plan for Graw Addition (Lot Split); Case of Gail Graw Case Withdrawn~~

7.02: Discuss Ordinance Modernizing and Streamlining Land Use Applications

Presentation

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill presented the Staff Report stating that the purpose of this item is to discuss opportunities to streamline certain land use applications. No action is being requested at this time, but the Planning Commission is asked to provide broad policy discussion to direct staff to prepare/not prepare general policy framework and/or a draft ordinance at a future date.

Commission Business

Chairperson Bauer stated that he likes the first option but noted that sometimes site plans bring about questions and concerns. He cautioned that staff be aware of any questions or concerns the Commission may have to ensure those are addressed prior to preliminary plat and avoid having to place that burden onto the applicant after they have gone through the expense of preliminary plat. He also agreed with the proposal related to variances. He asked why interim use permits would continue to go to Council as those seem to be pretty much approved. He stated that the timing of the Council and Commission meetings does not align well for items to appear on the first Council agenda for the month.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill provided additional details on the staff deadline for the Council packet.

Chairperson Bauer asked if there would be enough time if the Commission meeting were moved to Tuesday night rather than Thursday.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill stated that would depend upon how important it would be to have draft minutes from the meeting and provided additional details on the length of time for a meeting video to be posted in order for minutes to be provided.

Chairperson Bauer stated that perhaps the Commission meeting could be moved to the fourth Thursday of the month, which would allow for additional time to make the next Council meeting.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill stated that staff could review a different date for the meeting but noted that he would need to review the other meeting schedules and whether it would even save time. He noted that it would all depend upon when the application is submitted due to the staff time necessary to review a request as well.

Commissioner VanScoy asked if staff were to approve a site plan, would it still come before the Commission for preliminary plat approval.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill commented that preliminary plat and site plan review are different applications. He noted that the Commission does not always see a site plan review once a preliminary plat is approved and provided additional details on the review process. He noted that staff cannot grant a variance and therefore those requests would continue to come before the Commission. He stated that site plan is pretty cut and dry as to whether a request meets the City Code.

Commissioner Anderson stated that he could live with staff reviewing the commercial and industrial properties, noting that he reviews the buffering, building materials, road layout, public safety concerns for a site plan. He stated that if staff takes those issues into account and thinks about how the Commission thinks about those things, he could support staff reviewing those. He stated that he would still want the Commission to review residential and applications within The COR. He stated that he would also support speeding things up related to CUP process. He stated that he would be fine changing the date of the Commission meeting as well.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill stated that public road design and infrastructure would always continue to be reviewed by the Commission unless it is a minor change. He confirmed that residential platting would continue to go through the regular review process. He stated that buffering is also included in the City Code and would have to be met. He stated that this process suggested would only apply to applications that meet all of the requirements of City Code and any deviations would need to go before the Commission.

Chairperson Bauer referenced an application that came in a few meetings prior for a site plan for a large commercial/industrial building and did not recall anything that was a major concern, noting that would have fallen under this new proposed process.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill stated that there was some discussion related to buffering and screening of outdoor storage and staff could have come to the group for guidance. He stated that

project has not yet moved forward but perhaps if it does, it could be the first example to go through this process.

Commissioner Anderson referenced the case and believed that would be appropriate to follow this new process.

Commissioner VanScoy commented that changing the meeting date would be problematic for him as he is committed on Tuesdays and he has another commitment the first Monday of the month. He stated that any other Monday or Thursday would work.

Chairperson Bauer confirmed that the first Monday or third Thursday would not work for him.

Commissioner Gengler stated that she would support a pilot project to try out these alternative methods of approval. She stated that she would also support changing the meeting date.

Chairperson Bauer noted that staff could poll the Commission to determine which date would be a good fit. He noted that most IUP requests are pretty straightforward and asked for input from staff as to why that is not included.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill replied that IUP's are unique in that they have an expiration date and is typically something not allowed by Code and therefore is something subjective that would continue to be reviewed by the Council and not included in the pilot project.

5. CONSENT AGENDA (Continued)

5.01: Approve the April 8, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes:

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

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion Carried.

7. COMMISSION BUSINESS (Continued)

7.03: Review Request for Auto Repair at 6588 141st Avenue NW

Presentation

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl presented the Staff Report stating that the purpose of this case is to review a request from Kiryl Sachok for a zoning question related to 6588 141st Avenue NW. The site is zoned E-1 Employment District. Kiryl is looking to purchase the property for Auto Body Repair, Painting and Detailing. The vehicles are planned to be stored both inside and outside. They plan to use 51 percent of the building for repairs. They are currently not selling vehicles, but it is something they would like to consider in the future. Under the current code, auto repair and sales are allowed but only in a business incubator or multi-tenant building and no outside storage is allowed related to the use. Staff is requesting policy direction from the Commission on the proposed use.

Commission Business

Chairperson Bauer asked if one of the conditions could be a time limit on how long a single vehicle could be stored on the property. He recognized that there could be a delay in repairing a vehicle but would not want to see a vehicle stay for a long period of time.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl confirmed that could be added.

Commissioner Gengler asked if the only zone that would allow for single tenant auto body repair would be along Highway 10.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl confirmed that the commercial district along Highway 10 and a few locations along Highway 47.

Commissioner VanScoy asked what the applicant would want to do, whether it would be auto body repair or automotive repair in general.

Allison Kirilsachok spoke in representation of the applicant and explained that the business is labeled as an auto repair shop. She stated that they purchase vehicles through a third party to repair the damaged vehicles, detail them, paint them and then those vehicles are taken to a different site for sale. She stated that they do not sell from the shop but from another location. She stated that they also have clientele that find their business for repair and bring their own vehicle for repair. She stated that business is currently located in Blaine.

Chairperson Bauer asked the percentage of vehicles that are purchased for repair compared to the percentage of vehicles brought in for repair by owner.

Ms. Kirilaschok estimated that they have more vehicles brought in from clientele than through purchase. She estimated 40 percent of work is done through purchase and 60 percent from clientele bringing in their own vehicles.

Commissioner VanScoy stated that he drove by the proposed location and it appears it could work well. He asked what the applicant would intend to do to mitigate the visual impact of damaged vehicles.

Ms. Kirilaschok replied that they do have car covers that could be used for vehicles stored outdoors. She stated that they tend to stick with minor damaged vehicles as those take less time to repair. She stated that at the current location there are three vehicles outdoors and six or seven inside. She stated that the vehicles stored outdoors have already been repaired or are covered.

Commissioner VanScoy asked if the applicant would be open to using a fence for screening.

Ms. Kirilaschok stated that they would be open to a fence if that were to become a condition.

Commissioner Dunaway stated that his concern was with the number of vehicles that would be stored outdoors but that was answered by the applicant.

Commissioner Anderson stated that he has an issue with the E-1 district. He stated that this would be a request to change the Code and he does not prefer to change the Code to meet the request of one business. He stated that in the E-1 district this activity is only allowed in a multi-tenant building with no outdoor storage and he cannot support changing the Code in this manner. He stated that he would be more in favor of looking to add more commercial areas where this activity could occur. He stated that making these changes to the district would simply open up additional issues.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl displayed a zoning map and identified the areas where this use is currently allowed.

Commissioner Gengler asked if this were to come forward as a case, would it be through CUP or a Code change for the entire district.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl replied that the easiest way to do this would be a Code change to remove the multi-tenant requirement for this type of use. She noted that the outdoor storage could be addressed through a CUP.

Chairperson Bauer asked the rationale that this activity occur in a multi-tenant building.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that she believed the thinking was to allow this use to begin in a smaller scale in a multi-tenant building which could grow into its own freestanding business. She displayed the related section of City Code for business incubator/multi-tenant facility. She stated that the section is very confusing and regardless of the action tonight, the language should be cleaned up.

Commissioner VanScoy stated that he does not ever recall an applicant coming forward to use anything in the E-1 district as a business incubator.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that there are a few larger buildings that rent out suites within the building and take advantage of this section of Code. She stated that the only other example would be in the business district where a business owner rents out individual units for vehicle sales. She stated that building has consistent turnover from tenants.

Commissioner VanScoy commented that the only concern he would have with this use is aesthetically and would support a revision of Code to allow this activity as long as outdoor storage is limited and screened appropriately.

Chairperson Bauer echoed the comments. He stated that if there have not been incubator businesses within the E-1 district, that section of the Code should be cleaned up. He stated that there are very industrial uses adjacent to this site but to the east the use is cleaner. He encouraged staff to work with the applicant and see if they can make it work. He agreed that screening would make this much more acceptable. He stated that access would also be easier for customers to bring their vehicles in for repair compared to the businesses located on Highway 10.

Ms. Kirilaschok replied that the business is currently renting and has never had any issues with the landlord. She stated that they would be open to conditions the Commission may place upon the request and would be happy to meet conditions for screening and car covers for outdoor storage.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl confirmed the direction of the Commission for the E-1 district. She asked if the Commission would want staff to look into removing auto repair from the Highway 10 corridor to improve that aesthetic.

Chairperson Bauer commented that it is often difficult to enter and exit those businesses.

Commissioner Anderson commented that he would be opposed to adding new uses of those types but would be fine allowing the existing uses to continue operating as they are.

Chairperson Bauer stated that perhaps the Commission review adding that use to other zoning districts to remove it from Highway 10 as that is not an ideal location.

Commissioner VanScoy stated that he really does not see the need to eliminate that use, although he understands the issue of access. He stated that as Highway 10 is improved, that access would also improve. He noted that some of the businesses will have to move anyway as the Highway 10 improvements move forward and therefore did not see a need to remove that use from the district. He agreed that the Commission should review the possibility of expanding the districts in which the use is allowed, but with good control.

Commissioner Gengler agreed with the comments of Commissioner VanScoy that the Commission should review other areas where the use may be appropriate. She stated that she would be inclined to not have new auto repair businesses allowed on Highway 10.

Colton Brausen spoke in representation of the applicant and asked the timeline that the Commission would estimate, as his contract for the sale of the property would be contingent upon City approval.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that this would involve an ordinance change and CUP. She stated that this could be included on the June Commission meeting and if approved could go forward on the July Council meeting.

Mr. Brausen replied that the business would not be doing fluid changes and noted that the proper air exchange would be provided for the paint work.

8. COMMISSION / STAFF INPUT

Commissioner VanScoy commented that the recently completed recycling day held at ACE Solid Waste ran well and asked if staff has any comments on the event.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that City Planner Anderson commented that the event was successful and appreciated the staff members that assisted.

Commissioner VanScoy commented that the event was well organized and appreciated the ability to drop off a few items.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that the project on the north side of Bunker Lake industrial park submitted a formal application today and will come before the Commission in June, along with the case just discussed by the Commission. She provided a brief update on the status of other projects previously approved by the Commission including GiGi's Salon, O'Reilly's Auto Parts, and Storyteller Café. She also provided an update on ongoing residential development projects.

9. ADJOURNMENT

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

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion Carried.

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission adjourned at 8:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Chloe McGuire Brigl
Senior Planner

ATTEST:

JoAnn Shaw
Community Development Assistant

Drafted by Amanda Staple
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.