

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

The Ramsey Planning Commission conducted a regular meeting on Thursday, February 4, 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
 Councilmember Matt Woestehoff
 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 VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Peters, to approve the agenda as presented.

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion carried.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

5.01: Approve the January 7, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Motion by Commissioner Gengler, seconded by Commissioner VanScoy, 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: Adopt Resolution #21-042 Granting a Variance to Platting Requirements to Facilitate a Metes and Bounds Subdivision of PID #23-32-25-21-0002 (Project No. 21-100); Case of Shade Tree Communities, LLC

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 adopting Resolution #21-042 granting a variance to the platting requirements to facilitate a metes and bounds subdivision.

Commissioner VanScoy asked why the applicant would prefer this method over platting.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl replied that the legal description is already drawn up with the metes and bounds description therefore it would add time and cost to the process without much benefit. She stated that this process would be efficient and a cost savings. She noted that the City also has the format in the metes and bounds description and confirmed that this would be consistent with the existing description. She noted that this only effects the west sliver, and the east side would be platted at a later time.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if this would help to cleanup tax payment for the individual properties.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl confirmed that would assist. She noted that because the County states the applicant owns both pieces it would most likely lower the applicant's taxes and appropriately tax the property to the west.

Citizen Input

Mark Strandlund, applicant, commented that staff provided an accurate description noting that this would help to cleanup something that was recorded with the County and would help to provide clarification to the City and both property owners. He stated that they will come back at a later time to plat the eastern portion of the property.

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

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion carried.

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 7:11 p.m.

Commission Business

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Gengler, to adopt Resolution #21-042 Approving the Issuance of a Variance to Platting Requirements to Facilitate a Metes and Bounds Subdivision of PID #23-32-25-21-0002 and Declaring Terms of Permit.

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion carried.

6.02: Public Hearing: Consider Request for Variance to Minimum Road Frontage for a Proposed Minor Subdivision (Project No. 20-141); Case of Lisa Becker

Public Hearing

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 7:12 p.m.

Presentation

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl presented the staff report stating that staff recommends adopting Resolution #21-040 granting a variance to minimum road frontage and approval of the lot split. Public Safety is comfortable with the access as it currently exists. Public Works is also comfortable from a maintenance standpoint.

Commissioner VanScoy asked who owns the land between the cul-de-sac and property in discussion.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl replied that is within the City right-of-way and would be the same as the properties around it.

Commissioner VanScoy asked and received confirmation that a special easement or agreement would not be needed.

Citizen Input

Jill Morris, 17305 Sapphire Street, asked if the applicant has shared the purpose of combining the lots specific to building intentions.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl confirmed that the intention would be to construct one single-family home on the lot with a driveway approaching from the cul-de-sac.

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

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion carried.

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 7:18 p.m.

Commission Business

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl noted that the Commission is the deciding body for the variance and the second action would be a recommendation to the Council related to the Final Plat.

Motion by Commissioner Anderson, seconded by Commissioner Peters, to adopt Resolution #21-040 Approving the Issuance of a Variance to Minimum Road Frontage in the R-1 Residential (Rural Developing) District and Declaring Terms of Permit.

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion carried.

Motion by Commissioner Peters, seconded by Commissioner Gengler, to recommend that the City Council adopt Resolution #21-041 Approving the Final Plat for Becker Rolling Pines Second Addition.

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion carried.

6.03: Public Hearing: Consider Request for Variance for Minimum Lot Size for a Proposed Minor Subdivision at 16736 St. Francis Boulevard (Project No. 21-101); Case of Jethro Carpenter

Public Hearing

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 7:21 p.m.

Presentation

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl presented the staff report stating that staff recommends adoption of Resolution #21-030 granting a variance to minimum lot size.

Citizen Input

Jethro Carpenter, applicant, commented that staff did a great job describing his request which is consistent with the surrounding neighborhood. He was available to address any questions from the Commission.

Gerald Ladwig, 5955 168th Avenue, stated that he is not concerned with the houses being built in that location. He commented that the noise from the gun range is a lot louder than he anticipated. He noted that the leaves in the summer help to mitigate that noise during the summer, but that noise increases in the winter. He asked if there would be something done to help mitigate that noise because it would be loud for the people that purchase the new homes.

Deputy City Administrator Gladhill stated that it has been several years since the gun range was approved. He stated that the soundproofing requirements were related to the building itself. He stated that staff has worked with the gun range in the past to work with the noise concerns. He stated that realistically the noise escapes through a Code required door. He stated that staff can speak with the gun range owners in attempt to discuss landscaping that could help to mitigate the noise.

Mr. Ladwig stated that a lot of the brush on the subject property helps to mitigate the noise, so when that is removed for the homes to be constructed that will increase the noise issues. He referenced the pond on his property and the path it follows. He asked if the property would be built up to create a ditch and not cause the water to flow back onto his property.

Mr. Carpenter stated that it is their intention not to remove more trees and brush than necessary and people tend to prefer that be used for screening. He appreciated the information from the neighbor and noted that they can attempt to plant additional landscaping to create a buffer for the new homes. He stated that both of the homes would have culverts under the driveway, noting that the water flows south and to the east to the Highway 47 ditch and through a culvert to the golf course. He stated that this would hopefully improve the drainage for the resident that spoke.

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

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion carried.

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 7:33 p.m.

Commission Business

Councilmember Musgrove commented that this appears to be a good and proactive step that will remove a driveway from Highway 47.

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Peters, to adopt Resolution #21-030 Approving the Issuance of a Variance to Minimum Lot Size in the R-1 Residential (Rural Developing) District and Declaring Terms of Permit.

Further discussion: Commissioner VanScoy stated that because this is a variance, he wanted to be clear about the uniqueness of this request. He noted that this would remove an access from Highway 47 and is also a piece of property between commercial and a PUD and would still be significantly larger than adjacent residential lots. He noted that this lot split would still create two lots significantly larger than neighboring lots. Chairperson Bauer noted that the resolution addresses the adjacent lots and sizes. Commissioner VanScoy confirmed that the resolution is adequate and simply wanted those points noted as discussion.

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion carried.

7. COMMISSION BUSINESS

7.01: Review Oppidan Concept Plans

Presentation

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl presented the Staff Report specific to the two-building concept stating that staff recommends that the applicant move forward with a formal application revised to include staff's comments and comments from the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Anderson asked what will be stored outdoors. He referenced the wetland on the site, noting that the Commission has previously discussed having a trail along that area to connect the neighborhoods.

Commissioner VanScoy asked where the storage would be located on the site.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl confirmed that the storage would be on the northeast corner of the building.

Commissioner VanScoy asked the timing of the screening for that area as it did not appear that would be installed immediately.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl confirmed that was her understanding as well but noted that perhaps the applicant could provide additional details.

Chairperson Bauer asked if there would be screening to the north.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl displayed an aerial photograph of the site, noting that the property to the north is residential but buffered by the large wetland complex.

Chairperson Bauer asked where the buildings would be proposed to be constructed.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl identified the proposed location of the first building and outdoor storage.

Councilmember Musgrove asked if the applicant has considered the winter weather and snow related to the outdoor storage.

Jay Moore, Oppidan, stated that they are excited to present this proposed project to the City of Ramsey and gain input from the Commission tonight. He stated that this site is 43 acres, which is a sizable industrial tract in the City. He stated that they identified Ramsey as a targeted community for this type of project. He displayed the site plan, noting that the wetland area is about ten acres and the pond area is about six acres. He stated that there is an expansion area identified that could be used for snow storage, along with the pond region and perimeter of the site. He believed there was sufficient space on the site for snow storage but commented that if there were too much snow, they would require the snow to be removed and hauled offsite. He displayed a concept elevation noting that the two-building concept shows building A as something designed for a specific Minnesota company that wants to expand into this location. He noted that part of that business operation requires pallets used to ship their materials. He stated that outdoor storage area could be fenced with a gate accessed through the parking lot. He stated that the outdoor storage would be integral for the success of that business. He stated that it is a sizable business that is considering relocating to Ramsey, but this would be part of their needs to operate their business.

Commissioner Anderson thanked the applicant for their response, noting that he simply wanted to ensure that the outdoor storage items would not cause a conflict later and stated that he is fine with pallet storage. He stated that he would prefer to see that area screened and likes the concept.

Chairperson Bauer stated that there are some businesses that stack pallets for residents to pick up for reuse. He noted that there may be benefit to the business to screen the pallets with fencing for the protection of the pallets from the general public.

Mr. Moore commented that this would be a very large building that would typically have 20 loading docks or more compared to the ten docks proposed on the south side. He noted that the business would also have four silos in that area for sawdust collection and once filled, that material would be hauled offsite. He stated that the silos are provided for safety and OSHA compliance

and therefore the silos are a necessary part of the business. He stated that the intent would be to have a screening wall and landscaping along the southern border. He stated that if the building to east were not constructed at the same time, they would construct a large berm with trees to provide additional screening until the second building is constructed.

Commissioner Gengler stated that she is also fine with the outdoor storage and agreed that fencing or screening would be great. She asked for clarification on what a wing wall would be. She referenced proposed building B, understanding that would be a second component or expansion, and asked if the backs of the buildings would face each other and where the access would be for building B.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated that she does not have an example for a wing wall but described it as a wall attached to the existing building.

Mr. Moore provided additional explanation on where the different entrances would be for the buildings along with the truck court for the buildings.

Commissioner Peters asked if there would be any sound coming from the silos that would impact the residential properties.

Mr. Moore commented that he did not know the exact details. He commented that there would probably be some level of noise but would meet the requirements of City Code similar to other businesses. He believed that the distance from residential would mitigate any potential noise concerns.

Councilmember Woestehoff asked if the intent would mainly be intended to have single occupancy in both buildings.

Mr. Moore replied that under this concept building A would be single occupancy as it is a custom design for that user. He stated that building B would be dependent upon the market demand.

Commissioner VanScoy stated that he appreciates the attitude of the applicant and their willingness to work with the City and address any concerns. He stated that he looks forward to this project moving forward.

Mr. Moore commented that Ramsey has a well-trained staff that has helped them through this process. He stated that they are looking forward to moving forward and hoped that this would work for all the parties.

Chairperson Bauer commented that he would drive past this site multiple times per day and thanked the applicant for proposing a good-looking product.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated that she believes that the City has an easement for the trail corridor, or an easement could be obtained, as the goal is to have a trail corridor in that location. She asked if the applicant prefers the two-building concept.

Mr. Moore commented that they do prefer the two-building concept if the proposed occupant of building A chooses to move forward. He stated that if that does not occur, they would then favor the three-building concept because of the additional flexibility that would create and the fact that the size of the buildings within the three-building concept would better match the typical industrial building sizes. He provided additional explanation of the three-building concept. He stated that this concept would be more of a progression and phased development, beginning with building A in the summer and continuing construction throughout the winter to lease in the spring and then continue with building B in summer of 2022 and then continue the process for building C. He commented that this is a sizeable industrial project that would not be completed in a matter of months, but more likely a number of years.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl continued to review the details of the Staff Report specific to the three-building concept.

Commissioner VanScoy commented that this also looks like a great concept and would be a great addition to the City.

Councilmember Musgrove asked for additional details on anticipated traffic and whether it would be similar for both concepts.

Mr. Moore replied that they are not proposing a distribution center, which would have trucks on both sides of the building a smaller number of employees but consistent truck traffic. He stated that this concept would be more of an office warehouse setting with a lower amount of truck traffic. He stated that they could use Bunker Lake Boulevard as that is designed to handle truck traffic and believed that the City road infrastructure is setup to handle this type of employee and truck traffic.

Chairperson Bauer stated that the Commission supports both concepts and appreciates the applicant looking at Ramsey for this potential opportunity.

8. COMMISSION / STAFF INPUT

8.01: Receive Staff Update

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl reminded the Commission of the worksession meeting scheduled for the following week in order for the group to review some potential projects that would like feedback similar to the Oppidan case tonight. She stated that the Commission is also invited to the Council Worksession on February 16th which will focus on general land use and zoning questions for the Riverstone South development. She stated that staff anticipates a lot of building requests continuing to come forward this year along with increases for Code Enforcement noting that the City is recruiting for a Code Enforcement Technician. She recognized Reshetar Systems of Anoka and ACE Solid Waste of Ramsey that have assisted the City with code enforcement cases and have donated time and resources to assist an elderly veteran in the community.

Chairperson Bauer referenced the Council Worksession and noted that he and Commissioner VanScoy would need to leave the meeting early as they have a Finance Committee meeting for Katherine Drexel at 7:00 p.m. that night. He noted that one item on the agenda is for Katherine

Drexel which places he and Commissioner VanScoy in an awkward position and asked that Commissioner Anderson Chair that portion of the Worksession.

Commissioner Anderson confirmed that he could do so, if it could be done remotely.

9. ADJOURNMENT

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

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion carried.

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission adjourned at 8:21 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Chloe McGuire Brigl
Senior Planner

ATTEST:

JoAnn Shaw
Community Development Assistant

Drafted by Amanda Staple
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.