

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

The Ramsey Planning Commission conducted a regular meeting on Thursday, January 7, 2021, 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

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Senior Planner Chloe McGuire Brigl
 Deputy City Administrator Tim Gladhill
 City Council Liaison Debra Musgrove
 City Planner Chris Anderson
 Park and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Mark Riverblood
 City Engineer Bruce Westby

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

A roll call vote was performed:

Commissioner Gengler aye
Commissioner Anderson aye

Commissioner Peters aye
Commissioner VanScoy aye
Chairperson Bauer aye

Motion carried.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

- 5.01: Approve the December 3, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes**
- 5.02: Review Revised Sketch Plan for Hunt Addition, Case of Platinum Land (Project 20-105)**
- 5.03: Consider Resolution #21-014 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**
- 5.04: Provide Feedback for Site Plan and Final Plat for Gigi’s Salon (Project #20-140)**

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

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion carried.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS/COMMISSION BUSINESS

- 6.01: Public Hearing: Review Resolution #21-007 Approving Preliminary Plat for Northfork Meadows, Case of Lennar (Project #20-135)**

Public Hearing

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 7:04 p.m.

Presentation

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl presented the staff report stating that staff recommends adoption of Resolution #21-007.

Chairperson Bauer stated that it was indicated that the number of trees were less than required and asked for more information.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl replied that per the applicant's calculations they would be approximately 14 trees short on the shared property line, which would equate to being about one tree short per lot in the backyards along that line. She stated that staff has not had an extensive amount of time to review the information as it was submitted earlier today.

Commissioner VanScoy asked the number of trees listed.

Councilmember Musgrove asked for information on the tree growth and coverage as the trees grow and whether that is a factor in the proposal before the Commission.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl replied that 133 trees would be required on the shared property line and the applicant is proposing 119 trees on the shared property line. She stated that part of the request is to allow slightly less trees in order to prevent trees from dying off as they grow. She stated that typically the City requires more smaller trees in order to provide screening with the understanding that some will die off in the process because of how closely packed together they are.

Commissioner VanScoy asked if there has been input from City Planner Anderson as to the trees.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that she did have a chance to speak with City Planner Anderson who recommended that input be obtained from the Planning Commission and that he be allowed additional time to review the request. She stated that he was open to a compromise, noting that had been done in Harvest Estates 2nd Addition, if adequate screening was provided and the neighbors were amenable.

Citizen Input

Josh Metzger, Lennar, stated that if approved they would like to begin grading activities in the early spring of this year with street and utility construction during the summer and hoped that a model could be ready for the fall parade of 2021. He stated that they would look for a mixture of three and four car garages with prices would begin in the mid-\$300,000's and go up from there. He estimated that overall construction would run about three years for all of the homes. He stated that they like to provide landscape buffers for the benefit of both their own residents and adjacent property owners. He stated that they would be exceeding the two trees per yard requirement by two trees. He stated that their initial landscaping plan showed less trees than the 119 proposed, simply from the recommendation on spacing trees from their landscape architect. He stated that in discussions with staff they made the decision to add quite a few more trees to the eastern boundary to get closer to the required number. He recognized that a buffer is needed but commented that they would like to create a buffer that will live and succeed to maturity. He stated that while more dense planting would provide a nice buffer when planted, once those trees get to maturity, trees will die off and need to be removed and the trees that remain will not be of the best quality because they were crowded as they grew and therefore not able to live to their full potential. He commented that by their calculation they are only 14 trees short of the requirement and hoped the Commission could support that. He stated that if the Commission feels strongly, they will find

space to plant those additional trees but would prefer to provide adequate spacing to allow the trees to grow.

Chairperson Bauer referenced the comment made during the beginning of the applicant's presentation that the homes would have three or four car garages and asked if that was meant to address the number of bedrooms.

Mr. Metzger stated that the homes would be a mix of three and four bedroom homes, noting that the basements would be unfinished and therefore an additional bedroom could be added. He confirmed that his previous statement was correct, the smaller lots would have three car garages while the larger lots would have four car garages.

Commissioner VanScoy asked the species of tree that would be planted along the buffer area.

Mr. Metzger review the mix of overstory, ornamental and evergreen trees that would be planted. He confirmed that a combination of the different types of trees would be planted to create the buffer. He stated that four of the six adjacent lots to the east have a significant number of trees in their yard, which also adds to the buffer. He stated that they would plan to plant more evergreen trees to buffer the two lots that do not have a lot of trees in their yards.

Councilmember Musgrove stated that as the trees are planted and grow, if there are trees that fail, would those be required to be replaced by the developer.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated that the standard Development Agreement includes a two year guarantee on all trees. She stated that agreement calculates a one third die off rate.

Councilmember Musgrove stated that planting, failing and requiring the applicant to replant and fail again could setup a cycle that does not provide a successful barrier.

Leslie Clark, 15150 Kangaroo Street, stated that her property is one of those referred to as one without trees. She stated that she would like to see as many trees planted as possible. She recognized that Lennar has just taken on this project but throughout the history of the site itself the residents have done a lot of compromising as to what could be developed on that parcel. She stated that she wants a buffer that provides a clear delineation between the properties.

City Planner Anderson commented that when landscaping is used as the tool for density transitioning there is a fine line in regard to survivability of trees. He stated that in the beginning the trees planted are small and even a fairly dense planting at the onset will not provide a tremendous visual barrier between the two neighborhoods. He agreed that 15 to 20 years down the road as the trees start to reach maturity there may be some overcrowding and some that dominate more than others. He commented that you do have to plant trees tighter in the beginning in order to provide that buffer. He stated that there is a 35 foot wide corridor and the trees can be staggered. He believed that there are ways to accomplish the goal with the recognition that some trees may be lost in the long-term due to overcrowding. He provided an example of the 4th Addition of Brookfield where trees were planted as density transitioning and 15 years later there

is still quite a bit of space between the trees. He commented that typically the Development Agreement requires a two year guarantee to replace trees that die. He stated that when speaking of density transitioning, that is intended to be there in perpetuity and are viewed differently than typical boulevard trees.

█ Brock, 15240 Kangaroo Street NW, stated that when she looked at the map, she did not notice the berm, but recognized that it was mentioned in the presentation. She asked if the berm would remain in perpetuity and when the homes adjacent to Kangaroo would be planned for construction.

Mr. Metzger commented that the entire site would be graded during the 2021 construction season and estimated less than one month for grading. He estimated that street and utility construction would take a few months, therefore there would be continual construction through the summer and fall with continual construction of homes for another two years. He stated that once the grading and street and utility construction is completed, the homes would be constructed individually with two or three homes constructed at a time. He stated that if they receive the approvals from the City, they would like to begin grading in late March or in April, depending upon weather conditions.

Ms. Clark asked when the berm would be constructed and whether trees would be removed to construct the berm.

Mr. Metzger replied that the grading would occur this year. He commented that they are not allowed to remove trees that are not on their property. He commented that the only existing trees that would be preserved are to the south end of the site. He stated that after grading is completed they would plant the trees, estimated that those buffer trees could be planted in late summer.

Ms. Clark asked if a tree partially over the property line would be removed.

Mr. Metzger replied that anything on the property in that area would be removed in order to complete grading. He stated that the homes would have full basements and therefore only two floors would be visible. He provided additional details on the grading and berm, noting that the berm would be four feet in height.

Ms. Brock asked if these homes would be connected to City sewer and water. She asked if the homes along Kangaroo would be able to connect to City services.

Mr. Metzger confirmed that these homes would be connected to City sewer and water.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that homes with private sewer and water would not be forced to connect to City services. She noted that she could follow up with Ms. Brock.

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

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion carried.

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 7:42 p.m.

Commission Business

Commissioner Gengler asked if the resolution as proposed would require the applicant to meet the full tree requirement.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl confirmed that to be correct.

Commissioner Anderson stated that he is disappointed to see that the berm is only four feet high as that seems like a small berm for that number of trees. He stated that he expected to see a minimum of ten feet for the berm. He stated that he is not happy with the berm because of all the compromise that has been done on this project.

City Planner Anderson commented that the plantings would occur on the berm and both sides of the crown of the berm. He stated that the higher the berm gets, the wider it must be in order to provide a safe slope and that would take up a larger piece of land and would press the required corridor. He believed that four feet is acceptable by City Code.

Commissioner Anderson stated that he would like that issue further explored. He asked how wide the berm would be.

Nate Hermer, ISG and engineer for the project, stated that with a four foot berm there would be a four to one side slope. He stated that a four foot berm would be 32 feet wide. He stated that you could not go much higher and remain within the buffer easement.

Commissioner Anderson asked if some of the trees would be going into the 80 foot lot yards in order to accomplish the number of trees being planted. He stated that a focus of this project has been on the density transition and the residents have made it clear that is something they want.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that the four foot berm does meet the City Code requirements for the density transition zone with the plantings on top. She noted that the additional 14 trees can be required and the applicant has stated that they can make that work, but the berm would meet the City requirements.

Commissioner VanScoy commented that the City has done a lot of work to ensure that the transitioning will be adequate and believed that the Commission should follow the requirements and recommendations of staff.

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Gengler, to recommend that City Council adopt Resolution #21-007 with the recommended number of trees.

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion carried.

6.02: Public Hearing: Consider Ordinance #20-01 Amending City Code Sections 117-111 (R-1 Residential District) and 117-112 (R-2 Residential District) Clarifying Subdistricts based on Lot Size

Public Hearing

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 7:51 p.m.

Presentation

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill presented the staff report stating that staff recommends adoption of Ordinance #20-01.

Citizen Input

No comments.

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

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion carried.

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 7:56 p.m.

Commission Business

Commissioner Anderson asked how these changes would affect projects like Trott Brook.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill commented that this would not change the outcome. He stated that this is a tool that would allow for smaller lots sizes. He confirmed that a zoning change would still be necessary to achieve this zoning and therefore the Council would have final control over any requests.

Commissioner VanScoy asked if in the past the smaller lots have been allowed that has been done through PUD. He asked if there would be an issue in terms of negotiations.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill confirmed that has been the process, which has been challenging in order to equate the tradeoff benefits. He commented that the zoning amendment, and often times Comprehensive Plan amendment, would be needed therefore the ability to negotiate would be available. He commented that this would be a better tool to use rather than attempting to go through a PUD process, which would also be less burdensome on applicants.

Commissioner VanScoy commented that he believes that this would be a helpful tool as the Commission has recommended approvals in the past that have in turn been denied by the Council because it did not believe that a PUD was achieved. He commented that he does see the benefit of having this tool available.

Commissioner Anderson stated that this would then open up R-1 to 55 foot wide lots, which he could see becoming an advantage for a developer. He stated that it is important to control where 55 foot wide lots are placed, especially in the northern part of Ramsey.

Chairperson Bauer commented that the City would still have control as this would be a subzone, therefore R-1 would still require 80 foot lots and smaller lots could only be achieved with a zoning change.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill confirmed that this would be a separate zoning district and would require a zoning amendment. He stated that this would only apply where the City allows and does not provide rights to a developer. He commented that nothing would actively be zoned for 55 foot lots, this would simply be a tool that could be used.

Motion by Commissioner Peters, seconded by Commissioner Gengler, to recommend that City Council adopt Ordinance #20-01.

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion carried.

**6.03: Public Hearing: Consider Ordinance #21-02 Amending City Code Section 117-148
Entitled Mississippi River Corridor Critical Area**

Public Hearing

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 8:06 p.m.

Presentation

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill presented the staff report stating that staff recommends adoption of the ordinance.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if staff has worked with other cities in this area and how those cities are adjusting to the changes.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill noted that there were two attempts at rule making, noting that the first did not go well and the DNR took a step back and reevaluated. He stated that the second attempt was much more successful with community input. He stated that staff worked extensively with communities on the upper pool of the Coon Rapids Dam (Anoka, Dayton, Brooklyn Park and Coon Rapids). He stated that while there was frustration in the beginning, throughout the process there was improvement. He commented that Ramsey may be one of the first to bring forward the ordinance amendment, but all cities should have submitted their Comprehensive Plan and will be updating their ordinance as well.

Citizen Input

No comments.

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, 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 VanScoy aye
Chairperson Bauer aye

Motion carried.

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 8:16 p.m.

Commission Business

Motion by Commissioner Gengler, seconded by Commissioner VanScoy, to recommend that City Council adopt Ordinance #21-02 amending City Code Section 117-148 (Mississippi River Corridor Critical Area).

Further discussion

Councilmember Musgrove asked if these changes could result in more project opportunities, such as riverbank stabilization and whether there would be additional funding opportunities for river property owners. Deputy City Administrator Gladhill stated that changing the zoning ordinance may not directly result in that action but having compliant regulations will assist. He advised of work that was done through the EPB that reviewed the condition of the shoreline and could result in additional funding opportunities for residents.

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion carried.

6.04: Public Hearing: Consider Recommendations Related to Riverstone South; Case of Capstone Homes/Riverstone Development

- 1. Adopt Resolution #21-015 Approving Comprehensive Plan Amendment from Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential for Detached Townhome Section and Preliminary Plat for Riverstone South**
- 2. Adopt Ordinance #21-03 Approving Zoning Amendment from R-1 Residential (MUSA – 80) District to R-1 Residential (MUSA – 65) District, R-1 Residential MUSA – 50) District and R-2 Residential (Detached Townhome) District**

Public Hearing

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 8:20 p.m.

Presentation

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill presented the staff report stating staff recommends approval of the project with the contingencies noted in the staff report.

Commissioner VanScoy stated that in general he likes the plan but is concerned with the safety of the residents on Bowers Drive. He recognized that those residents do not like the concept of an additional access but stated that he believes that is critical for safety and without that he cannot support this request.

Deputy City Administrator commented that originally staff proposed that connection, but it did not move forward. He stated that he would not want to tie that to this project as the developer is not responsible for that.

Chairperson Bauer commented that this development has nothing to do with a second access for Bowers Drive, as that will continue to be an issue regardless of this proposal.

Commissioner Anderson asked if this development would have an HOA and private streets. He commented that the street width seems narrow.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill commented that he would let the developer speak to whether there would be an HOA. He stated that in terms of road widths there is a menu of options that can be selected with different levels of parking allowed. He stated that a 32-foot width road would allow parking on both sides of the street, whereas parking would only be allowed on one side of the street for the road width proposed. He stated that the main street that goes through this development would be a little wider, whereas the spur roads would be 29 feet in width with no parking on one side of the street.

Commissioner Anderson commented that he has been plowing snow for the City this season and the narrower roads can be tough, therefore he would support wider streets where possible.

Councilmember Musgrove commented that she would also prefer a wider road. She asked if there would be sidewalks, and whether that would be on one side or both sides. She also asked if there would be fencing between the homes and solar garden.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill replied that sidewalks would be along one side of the road, as required by the City. He stated that the smaller lot homes will be adjacent to the solar garden and noted that he would allow the developer to provide details on the buffering between those homes and solar garden.

Citizen Input

Tom Bakritges, Capstone Homes, acknowledged the landowners noting that the Pearson family has trusted them with developing a project to preserve their legacy. He also expressed appreciation to City staff, the Commissions and City Council for the communication and cooperation throughout the past year of planning. He stated that the overall site is about 78 acres and it was

important for them to figure out the right transition of density transitioning throughout the site. He noted that the larger lots are proposed on the south side, adjacent the existing homes and preserved trees, transitioning to smaller lots as you move towards the solar garden. He stated that there would be a landscaping buffer along the length of Riverdale Drive. He stated that as you enter into the site onto Pearson Drive, people would pass the preserved area of trees and park area. He commented that there will be seven acres of tree preservation that will be dedicated to the City along with another eight acres of open space and ponding. He stated that they have created a 15-acre area to act as a buffer between this development and adjacent development. He stated that they developed this plan after receiving input from City staff, the City Council and advisory groups, and residents. He stated that the townhomes will have a lawn maintenance HOA while the single-family homes would be under a master that includes the buffer area along Riverdale Drive. He stated that the street widths proposed match the road width in Riverstone North and has worked very well. He stated that they are required to provide sidewalks on one side of the road and have those proposed on the plans. He stated that there is vegetation on the other side of the existing fence around the solar garden site. He noted that with the existing vegetation they would not propose additional screening for that area.

Steve Bona, Capstone Homes, stated that throughout the site they would have homes similar to Riverstone North but noted that they would have more of the larger homes in this development. He commented that there will be a great variety of homes throughout the development. He provided details on the townhome product offerings that they would propose for this development in order to match the desires of home buyers. He stated that there is a large variety of front elevations and home plans included in the preliminary plat for the detached townhome product, noting that they have been selling extremely well in their other developments. He commented that the 29-foot width for streets has worked well in Riverstone North, noting that this would be similar with amenities provided in return for the 29-foot-wide streets. He commented that Unicorn is proposed for a street name. He recognized that the City has a street naming policy but asked that a different name be selected for that roadway in order to assist in marketing.

Commissioner Peters stated that he lives in the Brookfield development, in a Capstone home, and asked if the front porches would be wood or concrete.

Mr. Bona replied that they do wood front porches because they continue building in the winter and therefore concrete cannot be poured in the winter months.

Commissioner Peters asked if the wood would be treated or left raw.

Mr. Bona was unsure but noted that he could follow up on that.

Commissioner Peters stated that in his neighborhood some of the homeowners were not aware of how to treat a porch and used paint, which does not hold up well. He suggested that the porches be stained/treated to ensure they look the same.

Mr. Bona commented that he would be happy to pass those comments on and can recommend that to their production team. He stated that it is a significant process to make a change to every home but would be happy to share the comment and get feedback.

Commissioner Anderson referenced the northeast corner, specifically lots 16 through 20, noting that those lots appear to be less than 40 feet in width and asked for details.

Mr. Bakritges stated that those lots are not less than 40 feet, as they are measured at the setback and not the right-of-way.

Chairperson Bauer commented that he lives in Riverstone North and has not had a problem with the 29-foot width.

Mr. Bona commented that the narrower road provides a benefit to calming traffic, as traffic travels at higher speeds on wider roads.

John **Dionne**, 14806 Bowers Drive, stated that he was previously a member of the Ramsey City Council before transitioning to being a District Court Judge. He commented that virtually no one along Bowers Drive likes the density higher than it needs to be. He recognized the concept that if someone does not want something to be built next to them, they should purchase the land themselves. He commented that with the required amendments, it is an ability for the City to follow the plan that was set forth before them. He asked why the number of houses is being packed in above what is allowed by the Comprehensive Plan and zoning. He used the example of 29-foot roads, which developers like because they are less costly and allow more lots, but they are not good for cities and maintenance. He believed that higher density housing should continue to be concentrated around The COR rather than increasing the density in this area. He stated that often sidewalks are setback into yards with tree planting between the road and sidewalk while other times sidewalks are against the road and asked which option this plan would propose. He stated that this is an opportunity for the Commission to require the developer to follow the guidance of the Comprehensive Plan and not increase the density in this more rural area. He appreciated the architectural considerations included in this plan to ensure that all the homes would not look the same. He commented that developers will come and go but residents often remain in the community for longer terms. He asked the Commission to deny the amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and require the developer to rework its plan to meet the guidance of the Comprehensive Plan.

Dave Nathe, 14453 Llama Street, stated that he owns the adjoining property. He asked what would happen with Lazy Dayz RV, as that business parks on both sides of the street. He asked if there would be a buffer zone or fence buffering his property. He asked if the ponding area on the site would be increased or whether another ponding area would be added.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill commented that he will work with Lazy Dayz to evaluate the parking as he believed the intent was to only allow parking on one side of the street. He commented that as the connection for this development is made that parking issue will become more important. He stated that the Nathe property is undeveloped and abuts 65-foot lots. He

stated that he could follow up with Mr. Nathe to speak in further detail. He stated that this development will need to treat its own stormwater and its plans will be reviewed by the City and Lower Rum River Water Management Organization and confirmed that new ponds will be created on the site.

Mr. **Dionne** commented that anyone coming out of Bowers Drive would need to travel one mile down onto Armstrong to get onto Highway 10 to head west to Elk River, which would dramatically change the access to the highway for those residents.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill commented that is not a Capstone improvement but a highway planning process for the City and encouraged residents to continue to provide input as they continue to walk through the design for Riverdale Drive.

Eric Nathe, 14453 Llama Street, asked for clarification on the lift station on the east. He stated that the plot shows Pearson Drive almost coming into their property and commented that he would love to see a buffer zone between this development and his property. He stated that people from Bowers Drive often come onto their property and believed that additional residents in this area would only increase this problem.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill commented that the lift station is the sanitary sewer connection for wastewater and provided details on that system. He stated that the connection is shown in order to provide a connection in the case the property to the east is developed. He stated that pavement could be put in or a sign could be placed stating of a possible connection in the future, noting that it is important for residents to know of a possible road connection to prevent issues in the future.

John Jacobson, 14691 Bowers Drive, stated that he is concerned with vehicles entering Highway 10 to go towards Anoka from Bowers Drive, noting a slight turn to the northwest which makes it difficult to see if cars are coming from the Elk River direction. He asked if there would be a way to add an acceleration lane to allow Bowers Drive traffic to reach the traveling speed.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill provided details on the Riverdale Drive project which would be setup before new motorists are added to the area. He noted that the City would develop plans and specifications which would be reviewed and approved by MnDOT. He agreed that an at grade acceleration lane could be considered, as there is right-of-way available. He stated that the constraining factor will be the distance between Bowers Drive and Armstrong on Highway 10. He stated that staff will discuss that option as the Riverdale Drive process moves forward and hoped that process would begin later this year.

Gretchen Morris, 14820 Bowers Drive, commented that she believes the issue of density was previously discussed. She stated that while she is not a fan of ten feet between townhouses, she recognizes that there is a return on investment that is necessary to make a project feasible. She asked the number of homes that would be needed to make the development work.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill commented that there were multiple open houses for the project, which incorporated a lot of input from residents on Bowers Drive. He stated that changes were made to the design to increase the lots sizes for the properties nearest Bowers Drive along with the additional buffer in order to provide a compromise. He stated that this is the model that the Planning Commission and City Council agreed to move forward in terms of neighborhood design and variety of housing products.

Mr. Bona stated that they have been working on this process for one year with six or more meetings with neighbors on the design along with concept design meetings with the Planning Commission and City Council. He stated that the tree preservation land and buffer area was provided as a compromise, removing 21 lots, in order to address the input received from the Bowers Drive residents. He stated that the five-foot side yard setback is the typical setback for detached townhome products. He noted that he would be willing to meet with the Nathe family to discuss buffering concerns. He noted that they do not have buffering proposed in that area because of existing vegetation and the tree preservation and landscaping that would be provided on the overall plan.

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

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion carried.

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 9:31 p.m.

Commission Business

Commissioner VanScoy stated that he expressed his concern with the disregard for public safety and feeling very strongly about that. He stated that staff made the comment that the issue is not related to this case and asked for clarification.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill stated that the Commission could take action on this proposal, and if desired could provide a second motion asking the City Council to reconsider a second access for Bowers Drive.

Chairperson Bauer commented that a second access for Bowers Drive is a separate issue from this specific development. He noted that although that connection was part of one of the original sketch plans, it was removed as a result of the input from the Bowers Drive residents and not the position of Capstone.

Motion by Commissioner Gengler, seconded by Commissioner Peters, to recommend that City Council adopt Ordinance #21-03 and Resolution #21-015 approving actions related to the Riverstone South Preliminary Plat.

Further discussion

Commissioner Anderson asked for a friendly amendment to the motion to request the Council to review the second access to Bowers Drive as he is also opposed to not having a second access for that neighborhood. Chairperson Bauer asked for input from the Council discussion on that topic. Councilmember Musgrove commented that the consensus was divided, but overall, the Council respected the concerns from the Bowers Drive residents related to safety concerns that would arise from adding additional traffic onto the narrow Bowers Drive. Deputy City Administrator Gladhill commented that there was a strong consensus from the Council to not have that connection. He noted that there were even concerns from the Bowers Drive neighborhood with a pedestrian connection because of the narrow road and lack of sidewalk. He stated that while one or two members of the Council may have still favored the connection, the strong majority opposed that. Chairperson Bauer stated that the issue of a second access to Bowers Drive is separate of this request and stated that this action should first be considered and then a separate action could be taken related to a secondary access for Bowers Drive.

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion carried.

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Anderson, to recommend that City Council reconsider the connection to Bowers Drive, at some form, for public safety reasons.

Further discussion

Commissioner Peters stated that he thought he recalled different ways to manage an emergency pathway for vehicles and asked what happened with that. Deputy City Administrator Gladhill stated that option was discussed internally but there was not enough support to move anything forward that would allow pedestrians or vehicles.

A roll call vote was performed:

Commissioner Anderson	aye
Commissioner VanScoy	aye

Commissioner Gengler nay
Commissioner Peters nay
Chairperson Bauer aye

Motion carried.

Chairperson Bauer asked that Councilmember Musgrove share the input from the Commission when the issue is considered by the Council.

7. COMMISSION BUSINESS

7.01: Center Street Framework and Policy Plan

Presentation

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood presented the Staff Report and highlighted the Center Street Area Framework and Policy Plan and welcomed any comments or feedback the Commission may have on draft plans or its elements.

Commission Business

Commissioner Gengler commented that this is a great plan and appreciated the thought and details that went into the plan. She stated that the pumphouse treatment stands out as being something that will add so much value to the center of the city. She also appreciated the thoughtful amenities and stormwater treatments. She asked where public art might come into this as it could be an additional amenity that could attract more visitors.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood provided an example of public art/display. He stated that he appreciated the notion of more traditional public art and identified concrete placeholders that could be foundational elements for public sculpture that could become wayfinding areas and provide a sense of community. He stated that he is excited about public art in this location as well as throughout the park system. He recognized that there would need to be additional discussion on possible funding for public art elements in the parks.

Commissioner Anderson stated that he also likes the plan. He stated that if he were asked to prioritize, he would suggest beginning with the pumphouse and then Municipal Plaza as that was promised to Affinity. He stated that the remaining items could fall in line after those two items.

Chairperson Bauer commented that some of the projects within The COR are on hold right now with the challenges of the past year and stated that perhaps this would be the right time to begin on these elements which would continue to attract people to this area. He stated that housing in this area continues to fill up as soon as it is built and that increase in population will continue to attract the interest of retailers when the economy opens up more and restrictions are lifted.

Parks and Assistant Public Works Superintendent Riverblood commented that activity within The COR has continued regardless of the economic climate, between public improvement and infrastructure and housing developments which shows retailers the confidence that the City and residents have in this community.

7.02: Consider Water Treatment Plant Site Selection Recommendation

Presentation

City Engineer Westby presented the Staff Report stating that based on the tabulated information in the staff report, as well as other operational benefits and cost savings that would be realized over time, engineering and public works staff recommend locating the proposed WTP on the public works site. It was noted that the City has been primarily running only two to four of its municipal wells to supply water to the City since mid-2019. Since these wells are constantly in operation they are not able to be taken off-line for routine maintenance. Staff therefore recommends proceeding with the proposed WTP construction in as timely a manner as possible to ensure that the City is able to continue providing water in compliance with the MDH HBV for manganese. If the City elects to proceed with construction of the WTP, it could be operational by spring of 2023.

Commission Business

Chairperson Bauer commented that the construction costs are the same no matter the site but when looking at operation, convenience and ease it would make the most sense to locate on the public works site.

Commissioner Peters and Gengler agreed.

Commissioner Anderson agreed that this site would be the most efficient of the choices and that it would make sense to have the buildings close together for staff. He asked if they have considered placing the facility on the west corner as that would leave the east portion for sale/development in the future.

City Engineer Westby replied that the west side would be more marketable as it has access from two different roads and provides more development/redevelopment opportunities. He stated that the proposed location would also be across from Moline Concrete and therefore the uses would be compatible. He noted that Moline also provided concrete panels for the public works facility and would perhaps do the same for this facility, as it also provides Moline with the opportunity to easily show those panels to customers.

Commissioner Anderson asked if the City is considering pulling water from the river for treatment, on a longer-term scale.

City Engineer Westby stated that the City just completed a study that looked at using surface water, in conjunction with the Metropolitan Council and nearby communities but the cost for each community would be many times over the \$32,000,000 for a water treatment plant. He noted that

the other communities all have their own water treatment facilities and have no desire to move to surface water systems. He confirmed that the option was reviewed but the cost was prohibitive.

Chairperson Bauer confirmed the consensus of the Planning Commission to support the public works site for the proposed Water Treatment Plant.

8. COMMISSION / STAFF INPUT

8.01: Receive Update on Ramsey Gateway Project (US Highway 10/169 Plan)

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill provided a brief update on the status of the preliminary engineering efforts by Anoka County on the Ramsey Gateway Project. The update focused on history, recent progress and the schedule moving forward. It was noted that over half of the funding for the project has been secured and is now a reality for a 2023/2024 construction start date.

9. ADJOURNMENT

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

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion carried.

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission adjourned at 10:39 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Chloe McGuire Brigl
Senior Planner

ATTEST:

JoAnn Shaw
Planning Division Secretary

Drafted by Amanda Staple
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.