

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

The Ramsey Planning Commission conducted a regular meeting on Thursday, January 27, 2022, at the Ramsey Municipal Center, 7550 Sunwood Drive NW, Ramsey, Minnesota.

Members Present: Chairperson Randy Bauer
 Commissioner Bruce Anderson (via Zoom)
 Commissioner Andrew Dunaway
 Commissioner Cheri Gengler
 Commissioner Eric Peters
 Commissioner Gary VanScoy
 Commissioner Brian Walker

Members Absent: None

Also Present: Senior Planner Chloe McGuire Brigl
 City Planner Chris Anderson
 Planning Technician Brian McCann
 City Council Liaison Matt Woestehoff
 Community Development Director Brian Hagen
 Utilities Supervisor John Nelson

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

Chairperson Bauer introduced the new Community Development Director.

Community Development Director Hagen introduced himself to the Commission.

Chairperson Bauer commented that this will be the last meeting for Senior Planner McGuire Brigl who has accepted a position in a larger community. He thanked her for her contributions to Ramsey while a part of the team.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion Carried.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

None.

6. COMMISSION BUSINESS

6.01: Review Design Concepts for the New Water Treatment Plant

Presentation

Utilities Supervisor Nelson presented the Staff Report stating that staff and representatives from AES2 and Oertel Architects are in attendance to review concept plans for the new water treatment plant proposed for the City of Ramsey.

Steve Nelson, AES2, commented that they would like the form to follow the function because of the purpose of the water treatment plant.

Daniel England, Oertel Architects, identified the location for the water treatment plant.

Mr. Nelson and Mr. England reviewed the different elements of the concept diagrams, explaining how different features incorporate the equipment needs of the facility.

Mr. England reviewed renderings of the proposed facility and explained how materials and landscaping will be used to help soften the façade and blend with the public works facility.

Commission Business

Chairperson Bauer asked the timeframe for the project.

Mr. Nelson replied that the facility is anticipated to be complete in October of 2023.

Commissioner Walker asked the cost for the facility.

Mr. Nelson stated that the budget cost was \$30,000,000. He stated that they have not completed a detailed cost estimate but believes that the project would fit within that budget. He estimated that the treatment plant itself would be about \$25,000,000 noting the additional work that would be needed to support the facility.

Commissioner Walker referenced the statement that 12,000,000 gallons of water are flushed when hydrant flushing is completed and asked the cost to the City to do that.

Utilities Supervisor Nelson commented that the water itself does not have a substantial cost, noting that it is more the labor associated with that task.

Commissioner Walker explained that he is attempting to justify the cost for the water treatment plant versus flushing water.

Utilities Supervisor Nelson commented that the biggest issue is the manganese in the drinking water. He stated that currently the City has eight well and three of those are below the health-based guidance for manganese, which are the main wells used. He explained that the wells with the lowest manganese are the wells highest in iron, which results in the most complaints from residents. He stated that the water treatment facility will remove the manganese and iron from the drinking water.

Commissioner Walker commented that it seems that every time there is a project, someone says the City is spending money it does not have and therefore he would like to have an educated response on why this is needed.

Mr. Nelson stated that the impotence for this type of project has been based on the need to meet the health-based value, such as manganese removal, and noted that an added value is aesthetics such as the removal of iron.

Commissioner Walker commented that he is not against the water treatment plant. He stated that many residents are upset with the 17 percent increase to property taxes and therefore would like to have the facts to support this request.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated that the Council has approved the design specifications for this project already. He noted that Ramsey has anticipated this project for many years and \$27,000,000 has already been set aside through utility funds and the remainder would be bonded and paid back with utility funds, therefore it will not be an additional cost to residents.

Community Development Director Hagen stated that at the last worksession the Council added a legislative priority to request additional funds for this project.

Commissioner VanScoy asked what would happen to the iron and manganese that is removed.

Utilities Supervisor Nelson explained the process noting that ultimately those materials would go through the sanitary sewer system and end up at a larger water treatment facility.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl asked for feedback on the massing diagram, elevations, and architectural renderings.

Commissioner Gengler stated that she appreciates the attention to detail and elements that pull the facility together with its surroundings and make it aesthetically pleasing.

Commissioner Anderson asked the purpose of the bump outs and whether that is just an aesthetic element. He stated that he does not prefer those bump outs.

Mr. England stated that the bump outs are for aesthetic purposes to add relief and break up that single elevation that faces the public works facility and Highway 10. He stated that it brings dimensionality to a single material face.

Chairperson Bauer noted that there are design requirements in The COR and agreed that the bump outs break up that façade. He stated that if this side were just one continuous material, that wall would not be aesthetically pleasing.

Commissioner Anderson commented that this is an expensive building and was unsure that feature was needed. He stated that he would prefer to not have the bump outs.

Chairperson Bauer asked a rough estimate for the bump outs.

Mr. England commented that the cost difference to exclude the bump outs would be fairly minimal as it is just a bit of framing to bring out that material. He stated that perhaps it is not a series of patterned bump outs but something else that breaks up that façade. He believed it would draw more attention to not having anything along that wall.

Commissioner Anderson commented that part of the building faces the public works building and did not think attention should be drawn to a water treatment plant. He commented that if attention is drawn to the facility, it could create a security issue. He stated that he would prefer the building to appear plain.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that staff can work with the architect to review options to break up that façade. She stated that the City would still want to follow its design requirements.

Commissioner Walker commented that he likes the appearance of the building. He noted that he does understand the concern of Commission Anderson but wants the facility to look nice and not like a large garage. He referenced the landscaping and ongoing maintenance costs. He commented that he thinks the building looks fabulous.

Chairperson Bauer thanked staff for the presentation and acknowledged that this is a need for the community because of the issues with water quality.

7. PUBLIC HEARINGS/COMMISSION BUSINESS

7.01: Consider Site Plan and Variance Request for Northstar Marketplace Multi-Tenant Retail Building at 7912 Sunwood Drive NW (Project No. 22-101); Case of Northstar Marketplace LLC

Public Hearing

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 7:31 p.m.

Presentation

City Planner Anderson presented the staff report stating that staff recommends approving the requested variance as well as the Site Plan, contingent upon compliance with the staff's review comments in ProjectDox.

Commissioner VanScoy asked about the elimination of parking spots.

City Planner Anderson replied that the applicant proposes nine stalls for the building, noting shared parking for the overall site throughout the campus node. He stated that originally in the mid-2000s there were 468 stalls constructed as part of the site and this would reduce the number of stalls to 452. He stated that originally the site was in excess of the required parking and would remain in excess of the parking. He noted that the original parking constructed anticipated the build out of this node.

Commissioner VanScoy commented that he has been in that area in the evenings, and it is already tight for parking in the evening. He asked if additional parking could be added on the north side, noting the potential for additional restaurants.

City Planner Anderson stated that is something that could be explored but was unsure of the potential issues with the location of the trunk utilities. He commented that the proposal is in line with what the expectation for the site was. He acknowledged that losing parking stalls is less than desirable. He stated that if something could be done, perhaps they could work that into the plan.

Commissioner VanScoy asked if the exit lane would still remain. He commented that is the primary access he uses to exit the parking lot.

City Planner Anderson commented that two-way traffic would remain for that access point.

Citizen Input

Andrew Javosky, representing the applicant, commented that they could explore the potential for parking north of the building with staff.

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

A roll call vote was performed:

Commissioner Walker	aye
Commissioner Dunaway	aye
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 7:44 p.m.

Commission Business

Motion by Commissioner Peters, seconded by Commissioner Gengler, to adopt Resolution #22-09 Grant a Variance to the Build to Requirement.

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion Carried.

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Walker, to recommend that City Council adopt Resolution #22-030 Approving the Site Plan.

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion Carried.

7.02: Public Hearing: Review Comprehensive Plan Amendment Creating New Urban Residential Low (URL) District and Re-Guiding Subject Properties

Public Hearing

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 7:47 p.m.

Presentation

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl presented the staff report stating that staff recommends approval of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

Chairperson Bauer asked if in order to provide City services, the City would need to be at a certain level not only for the parcels but city-wide.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl confirmed that in order to stay on the Metropolitan Council's wastewater , the City would need to have three units per acre as a whole. She stated that the City is already close to three units per acre as a whole. She stated that this is about placing the right densities in the right locations.

Chairperson Bauer commented that it is important for the City Council to review the ability to allow smaller lots in other parts of the community in order to ensure the City does not fall below three units per acre. He stated that placing more density near The COR will allow the City to allow lesser density in other areas.

Councilmember Woestehoff commented that is something on the radar of the Council. He stated that the Council had a unanimous decision to not allow for smaller lots in the Trott Brook development. He stated that generically speaking the majority of the Council agrees that higher density and medium density should remain around The COR.

Commissioner VanScoy asked why there are issues with density. He asked if this is net density.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl confirmed that it is net density.

Commissioner VanScoy asked the issues with this development, at it would seem that if the areas of parks and wetlands are excluded, they would only be looking at developable land.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl replied that when calculating density, the Metropolitan Council allows exclusion of wetlands and park but roads, wetland buffers, easements, density transitioning, and those types of items are not allowed to be excluded from the density calculation. She explained that because of that formula, with quarter acre lots, the City is not meeting four units per acre. She stated that Andover ran into the same issue. She stated that this is a large site which requires more ponding, and the layout is odd because of wetlands and related buffers. She stated that there is also the density transitioning buffer and pinch points at both sides of the development. She stated that because of those site constraints they are not able to meet the density requirements. She stated that this site and the North Brook Crossings site will also not meet the density requirements.

Commissioner VanScoy asked how many of these sites can be approved before the City does not meet the density requirements of the Metropolitan Council.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that the City completes plat monitoring each year to review the overall density. She stated that the City would allow more of these developments but would have to provide denser development in other areas to offset. She stated that the City cannot continue to allow sewer development less than three units per acre. She noted that Riverstone South will provide the City with a bump in terms of density. She noted that continued development in The COR should allow the City to continue to allow more rural development in other areas.

Commissioner VanScoy asked if a variance could be used rather than a Comprehensive Plan.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that a Comprehensive Plan amendment would be necessary in order to be in compliance with the Metropolitan Council. She noted that the alternative would be to allow smaller lots in order to increase the density.

Commissioner VanScoy expressed concern with the future impact of the amendment as written. He commented that some of the measures are subjective, which is a concern.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that in order to use this, an applicant would need to request a Comprehensive Plan amendment based on the criteria and the decision would then be of the City Council and Metropolitan Council. She stated that even though some of the language may seem subjective, it is the same language within the variance criteria. She stated that the areas where this could be used need to be mapped and that has been done very narrowly only incorporating the two properties where the City would like to use this.

Commissioner VanScoy referenced the required density of three units per acre and asked if a unit could be an apartment or townhouse.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl confirmed that to be true.

Commissioner VanScoy referenced the current moratorium that the City Council has on high density residential for City owned property within The COR and commented that would seem to create a potential issue.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that if this passes tonight, the City would still be over the three unit per acre threshold. She stated that apartments typically come in around ten to 15 units per acre which does help to boost the City's density calculation. She stated that if the City Council wanted to allow the City to seek development of apartments that would help the density calculation but commented that is not a need at this time. She noted that there is available land within The COR that could be developed into apartment buildings that is not City owned.

Commissioner VanScoy commented that part of the issue that drove the development of The COR and its density was to allow the City to development while maintaining its rural character.

Chairperson Bauer commented that he believes that a buffer should be created to prevent the City from dipping below the three units per acre threshold. He asked if an applicant could meet two criteria to apply.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl confirmed that an applicant could apply for a Comprehensive Plan amendment if two of the criteria are met.

Commissioner Dunaway stated that he has a similar concern with the proposed language, noting that E and F are very similar in meeting a threshold. He asked why similar criteria were added. He stated that if only two criteria are required, if an applicant met E, it could most likely also meet F.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl provided clarification noting that the intent was related to existing rural residential development. She suggested merging E and F into one criteria.

Commissioners VanScoy and Dunaway confirmed that they would prefer to merge those items.

Commissioner Walker commented that the City Council has stated that it does not want smaller lots in this area. He stated that only two options are provided, and he does not like either option. He stated that he was told that once there is an open development case, the Comprehensive Plan and/or zoning could not be changed, yet here is a request to change both. He asked if this would be a great time to try to come up with a compromise to have larger lots on the outside and smaller lots on the inside to create the desired density.

Commissioner VanScoy commented that was the initial proposal.

Commissioner Walker disagreed and believed that the original proposals included 55-, 65-, and 75-foot lots. He commented that there has never been a compromise for the existing residents and asked if this would be the perfect time to provide larger lots on the outside of the development. He stated that if the density could be increased, the Comprehensive Plan would not need to be changed and everyone would get what they want. He stated that he would not even say full acre lots on the border, although ideally that would be preferred, but stated perhaps 120 foot lots are placed on the border to protect the existing residents. He noted then perhaps 70 or 65 foot lots are placed in the middle of the development.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that they did review that option with the applicant and even with larger lots they cannot get over the density threshold. She stated that the Preliminary Plat has already been approved and therefore the discussion tonight is related to density and whether the Commission would support the Comprehensive Plan amendment. She noted that the alternative would be to amend the zoning to allow smaller lots to meet the three units per acre threshold of the Metropolitan Council and the City Council has already stated it will not support that option. She stated that if nothing is done, that would be considered a taking and therefore these are the only two options to consider at this time. She stated that staff supports the lower density as that is desired by the existing residents and City Council.

Councilmember Woestehoff acknowledged the comments of Commissioner Walker. He stated that this is paperwork to a certain extent as the plan has not changed from what was approved and is something required by the Metropolitan Council at this time. He commented that the Metropolitan Council provides a huge cost savings to the City even just in terms of sewer. He noted that the only way to meet density threshold on this site with one acre lots on the outside would be to have an apartment building on the inside, which would not be approved.

Commissioner Walker asked what would happen if the Comprehensive Plan amendment were not approved and the zoning were not changed to allow for smaller lots.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl replied that the City could not grant the sewer permit to the final project and the City would get sued. She believed that the option of lesser lots should be chosen to benefit the existing residents.

Citizen Input

Jeff Uecker, 17121 Variolite Street, commented that this meeting seems pointless as the City Council has already approved everything and is not going to go back and change what has been done. He expressed frustration in the process and wanted to continue to express his opposition. He stated that there was one lot that could have been rezoned in an area where no one lives and stated that could have been rezoned to allow the additional lots in the density calculation. He stated that the residents have always been told that the density would remain in the town center to maintain the rural feel and yet this development destroys the rural feel. He noted that the park has always been sold to the residents as an amenity, but it recently was discovered that the park would have a price of over \$1,000,000 and would come with an event center. He stated that while he would ask the Commission to do something, it seems pointless.

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

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion Carried.

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 8:25 p.m.

Commission Business

Commissioner Walker commented that the more he thinks about this, the problem was created in 2011 when the City decided to place this property in the MUSA district. He stated that time should have been spent determining the density that could be created before the rezoning occurred. He stated that he is frustrated as this is an action he was told could not be done.

Motion by Commissioner Dunaway, seconded by Commissioner VanScoy, to recommend that City Council adopt the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, combining points E and F into one.

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion Carried.

7.03: Consider Ordinance #22-12 Amending City Code Section 117-124 to Allow Restaurants in the E-3 Employment District

Public Hearing

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 8:28 p.m.

Presentation

Planning Technician McCann presented the staff report stating that staff recommends approval of Ordinance #22-12 Amending City Code Chapter 117-124 regarding the E-3: Employment District.

Chairperson Bauer asked the districts in which restaurants are currently allowed.

Planning Technician McCann commented that currently that use is allowed in the B districts.

Commissioner Anderson asked for a map showing the E-3 districts are located.

City Planner Anderson displayed the map highlighting those properties.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl provided additional explanation on the location of the E-3 district parcels. It was confirmed that is the only location of E-3 parcels in the community.

Chairperson Bauer asked if there is interest to have additional areas zoned E-3.

City Planner Anderson replied that to the knowledge of staff there is no desire to have additional areas zoned E-3.

Commissioner Anderson asked if bars would be allowed in that area.

Chairperson Bauer commented that a restaurant could serve alcohol as long as it falls below a certain percentage of its business.

Commissioner Anderson commented that there are enough issues with people breaking into buildings or vandalizing and would not want to add an establishment serving alcohol into that area.

Commissioner Walker asked if there is a restaurant wanting to go into this area.

City Planner Anderson commented that this is being driven by an attempt to create more opportunity for restaurants to come into the community. He was unsure that there was a specific ask by a tenant but noted that this is more of a response for the request of residents to have more eating establishments. He stated that creating opportunity within another district would provide more opportunity.

Community Development Director Hagen stated that although there are not any current applications driving this request, there would be thought to the plans for the Anoka Ramsey Athletic Association and its dome. He stated that the dome website mentions a desire for a large indoor turf area to hold sporting events, other public events, etc. He stated that the website also identifies a potential restaurant. He again confirmed that there are no active applications, but staff is attempting to be ahead of that type of ask.

Chairperson Bauer asked the potential location for the dome.

City Planner Anderson identified the parcel that has been in discussion. He confirmed that the property is not presently in the E-3 district. He stated that the property is currently guided COR and would allow restaurants.

Commissioner Dunaway asked if there are other districts in the City that do not allow restaurants.

City Planner Anderson confirmed that none of the employment zoned districts allow restaurants. He noted that E-3 was created to minimize outdoor storage but still allow land for manufacturing purposes. He reviewed some of the uses in that zone including Adrenaline Sports Center, noting that families are dropping children off for sports and therefore having a restaurant in that area could be beneficial.

Commissioner Gengler stated that a restaurant would be allowed as a Conditional Use Permit. She noted that there are a lot of restaurants that serve alcohol but would not be considered a bar. She asked staff for details on how a liquor license application is reviewed.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that if a restaurant desired to come into this area, it would need to apply for a CUP. She stated that if alcohol were to be served, a liquor license would be required and described that process. She stated that a restaurant would be allowed as a conditional use, which would mean certain conditions would apply and it would not necessarily be allowed on all properties in that district, noting that it would have to be a good fit for the property.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated that after reviewing the packet, he asked if there was a proposal coming. He referenced the Blaine Sports Center, and its related brewery and restaurant uses. He stated that he saw this case and the next as preparation for what may come with a sports dome facility.

Citizen Input

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

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion Carried.

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 8:42 p.m.

Commission Business

Motion by Commissioner Peters, seconded by Commissioner Gengler, to recommend that City Council introduce Ordinance #22-12 Amending City Code Chapter 117-124 Regarding the E-3: Employment District.

Further discussion

Commissioner Dunaway commented that he does not believe the allowed uses within E-3 lends itself to a bar or restaurant. He stated that district is close enough to The COR that users could frequent the establishments within The COR. Commissioner Walker commented that he will be taking the stance of Councilmember Heineman on this and the next case and will allow people to do what they wish on the land they own.

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion Carried.

7.04: Public Hearing: Consider Ordinance #22-11 Amending City Code Sections 117-116, 117-117, and 117-124 to Allow Taprooms and Breweries

Public Hearing

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 8:45 p.m.

Presentation

Planning Technician McCann presented the staff report stating that staff recommends approval of Ordinance #22-11 Amending City Code Sections 117-116, 117-117, and 117-124 to Allow Taprooms and Breweries.

Commissioner VanScoy asked if the taprooms are currently allowed in any districts.

Planning Technician McCann commented that he did not believe taprooms or breweries are currently allowed in any zoning districts.

Commissioner Dunaway asked if there would be special requirements for parking.

Planning Technician McCann replied that would be part of the Conditional Use Permit process, noting that each case would be reviewed to determine what is necessary.

City Planner Anderson commented that there are commercial off-street parking requirements. He stated that manufacturing has its own regulation, which would be applied to brewing activities and then other standards would be used for the taproom portion of the request.

Chairperson Bauer asked how the conditions would be determined for the use.

City Planner Anderson welcomed any specific conditions or criteria the Commission may have, noting that site specific conditions could be added to the review of the request.

Commissioner Peters asked if this would allow for food trucks to serve food with the taproom.

City Planner Anderson replied that staff has been looking at food truck standards. He stated that this ordinance does not specifically address that element. He noted that it is pretty common for a taproom to offer a food truck, either regularly or on occasion.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that the City does not currently have anything that addresses food trucks but does allow food trucks through transient licenses.

Commissioner VanScoy asked for details on licensing for this type of business.

City Planner Anderson replied that taprooms are regulated through the State and therefore proper licensing would be required from the State.

Commissioner Dunaway asked if staff has researched the districts these businesses are allowed in other cities.

Planning Technician McCann confirmed that information was included in the case and displayed the information for the Commission to review noting that some cities allow the use as a permitted use within certain districts while others allow as a conditional use.

Commissioner VanScoy commented that while he likes the graph layout, he found the headings confusing.

Chairperson Bauer commented that it seems the use is allowed in different districts, but staff would recommend only the industrial districts at this time.

Planning Technician McCann commented that the Commission could recommend additional districts.

Chairperson Bauer commented that it would seem The COR would be appropriate.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that breweries have a lot of equipment and can emit smells. She explained why staff did not recommend the other districts and felt that an industrial district would be more appropriate.

Commissioner Walker commented that he would be in favor of adding The COR, noting that conditions could be added to address any potential smells or other elements of the business.

Chairperson Bauer commented that there are breweries located in retail areas.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated that perhaps a CUP could be allowed in The COR for a brew pub rather than a brewery or taproom.

Citizen Input

Wes Makowsky, Illinois resident, stated that he used to be a resident of Ramsey and believed that this use should be allowed in The COR utilizing the people that use the light rail.

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

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion Carried.

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 8:58 p.m.

Commission Business

Motion by Commissioner Gengler, seconded by Commissioner VanScoy, to recommend that City Council introduce Ordinance #22-11 Amending City Code Sections 117-116, 117-117, and 117-124 to Allow Taprooms and Breweries and to add The COR District to allow brewpubs and taprooms as a conditional use.

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion Carried.

7.05: Public Hearing: Consider Ordinance #22-08 Amending City Code Section 117-51 Regarding Conditional Use Permits

Public Hearing

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 9:00 p.m.

Presentation

Planning Technician McCann presented the staff report stating that staff recommends adoption of Ordinance #22-08.

Chairperson Bauer acknowledged that the Commission has discussed this concept in the past.

Citizen Input

No comments.

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

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion Carried.

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 9:02 p.m.

Commission Business

Commissioner Anderson asked if this would only be the decision of the City Council and not the Planning Commission.

Chairperson Bauer explained that it would be the opposite. He noted that it would be the decision of the Planning Commission and not require consideration of the City Council, similar to the process of a variance request.

Planning Technician McCann stated that the existing procedure was included in the case and then there was more information on how the process would be held if this were approved.

City Planner Anderson noted that if the Planning Commission denied a request, the applicant could take the request to the City Council for appeal, similar to a variance.

Commissioner Anderson commented that he found the language in the staff report confusing. He stated that he does support having the Planning Commission make the decision on a Conditional Use Permit.

Commissioner VanScoy asked if there has even been a situation where the Council has overturned a recommendation from the Commission on a CUP.

Planning Technician McCann commented that he was not aware of such a case.

City Planner Anderson replied that perhaps over the course of time it has happened once or twice but noted that it would be uncommon.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated that he has not experienced overturning but has seen additional conditions added by the City Council.

Commissioner VanScoy commented that there is value in shortening the process but stated that there is also value in having additional review by two sets of eyes.

City Planner Anderson commented that an applicant would still have the ability to appeal the decision of the Commission and take that to the City Council.

Chairperson Bauer commented that he can recall a variance the Commission denied which was taken to the City Council and gained approval.

City Planner Anderson commented that he could also recall a Home Occupation Permit that was denied by the Commission and appealed to the City Council where it was approved.

Commissioner Dunaway asked how the process would work if the Planning Commission were to approve a CUP. He asked the mechanism that would be used if the City Council did not agree with the decision or wanted to add additional conditions.

City Planner Anderson replied that the Council could choose to actively participate in the public hearing as a resident or member of the City Council. He stated that if something were approved, a resident could potentially appeal the decision through the same process an applicant would have. He commented that without an official appeal, the decision at the Planning Commission level would be final.

Commissioner VanScoy stated that the case mentions that this was brought forward by discussion at a City Council worksession. He asked if the Council supports this action.

Councilmember Woestehoff stated that generically he believes there is support but believed that direction came about before he joined the Council. He noted that this action tonight would still need to be approved by the City Council, therefore that consideration will be provided.

Motion by Commissioner VanScoy, seconded by Commissioner Peters, to recommend that City Council introduce Ordinance #22-08 Amending City Code Chapter 117-51 Regarding Conditional Use Permits.

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion Carried.

**7.06: Public Hearing: Consider Ordinance #22-09 Amending City Code Section 117-56
Regarding Easement Vacations**

Public Hearing

Chairperson Bauer called the public hearing to order at 9:12 p.m.

Presentation

Planning Technician McCann presented the staff report stating that staff recommends adoption of Ordinance #22-09.

Citizen Input

No comments.

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

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion Carried.

Chairperson Bauer closed the public hearing closed at 9:13 p.m.

Commission Business

Commissioner Gengler asked if this would change the process from a public hearing and two additional meetings to one meeting in front of the City Council.

City Planner Anderson commented that the public hearing process at the Planning Commission would remain the same. He noted that through ordinance, two separate readings are required by the City Council whereas a resolution only needs to be considered once by the City Council, therefore it would eliminate one additional meeting of the City Council.

Commissioner Dunaway asked for information on the process of why two meetings of the Council are required.

City Planner Anderson stated that currently easement vacations are done via ordinance and an ordinance requires two readings, one to be introduced and the second for adoption. He stated that an ordinance involves anything related to City Code and therefore two readings provides additional opportunity for review and consideration. He stated that when dealing with drainage and utility easements, they are not impacting City ordinances and therefore that process could be expedited by cutting out the second meeting. He noted that drainage and utility easements are technical reviews more so rather than regulation of City Code.

Commissioner Dunaway stated that currently a request comes before the Planning Commission and then two meetings of the City Council.

City Planner Anderson provided additional explanation. He noted that if the request were strictly for a drainage and utility easement vacation, that would not come to the Planning Commission. He noted that often, that type of request is related to another development project and therefore comes before the Planning Commission. He stated that in either instance this action would shorten the process by one City Council.

Chairperson Bauer noted the actions taken tonight where the Commission held a public hearing related to an ordinance and noted that the ordinance would now go to the Council for two readings at two separate meetings.

City Planner Anderson clarified that this change would only apply to requests for easement vacation.

Commissioner Walker asked if a request for an easement vacation would have come before the Commission in the past.

City Planner Anderson replied that if the request were only for a drainage and utility easement, it would not come before this body.

Commissioner Walker asked why the Commission is being asked to vote on this.

City Planner Anderson commented that City Code specifies this process in ordinance and therefore the Commission is reviewing a request to change that process.

Motion by Commissioner Dunaway, seconded by Commissioner Gengler, to recommend that City Council introduce Ordinance #22-09 Amending City Code Chapter 117-56 Regarding Easement Vacation Procedure.

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion Carried.

8. COMMISSION / STAFF INPUT

Chairperson Bauer commented on the business breakfast event that has hosted by the EDA the previous week. He noted that there was discussion to the impact that COVID had on food related businesses and suggestion that the City review regulations that would not allow drive thru service. He stated that a presentation was also provided on the Highway 10 project and its anticipated timeline. He stated that there should be a plan in place for how people can access businesses during that construction time.

Commissioner Walker asked if staff could review the areas slated for development to ensure similar problems do not occur as to the cases that were reviewed tonight.

City Planner Anderson confirmed that staff could complete that review.

Commissioner VanScoy asked for a timeline on the joint meeting requested by the Commission with the City Council and EDA noting that the request was made in March of 2021.

City Planner Anderson commented that he could verify that schedule with City staff and the Council. He believed that a joint meeting was held last fall.

Chairperson Bauer commented that while there was a joint meeting, the primary agenda item and purpose for the meeting were not discussed. He stated that the intention was to discuss the overall COR while the majority of discussion focused on a request from PACT Charter School. He noted that PACT had stated they had interest in another parcel but did not want to disclose the location and advised that location has come out as being the parcel owned by the Church of Saint Katherine Drexel, which placed he and Commissioner VanScoy in a difficult position as they could not disclose the information at the meeting. He stated that this meeting was a good example of why the joint meeting is needed. He noted that a developer was interested in the parcel for the intended use, commercial and yet the Council was swayed by the idea of a school. He stated that too often the City is reacting to what comes before it rather than staying with the intended vision.

City Planner Anderson stated that he will work to schedule that meeting.

Community Development Director Hagen provided an update on the staffing changes within the department. He stated that two members are leaving and in response staff proposed a restructuring of that department, providing additional details.

9. ADJOURNMENT

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

A roll call vote was performed:

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

Motion Carried.


The regular meeting of the Planning Commission adjourned at 9:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian Hagen
Deputy City Administrator/Community Development Director

ATTEST:



Nicole Laubach
Planning Administrative Assistant

Drafted by Amanda Staple
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.