

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

**REGULAR MEETING
OF THE
VADNAIS HEIGHTS PLANNING COMMISSION
OCTOBER 23, 2018**

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

OPEN MEETING

Chairperson Joseph Stumph called the Regular Meeting of the Vadnais Heights Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. on October 23, 2018.

23
24
25
26
27
28

ROLL CALL

Joseph Stumph, Chairperson	Present
Dave Anderson	Present
Linda Bigelbach	Present
Edward Caillier	Present
Brian Carnes	Present
Evan Cordes, Vice Chair	Present
Martin Jokinen	Present
Curt Coper, First Alternate	Present
Jerry Moynagh, Second Alternate	Present

Also present: Nolan Wall, Planning/Community Development Director; Kevin Watson, City Administrator; Kendra Lindahl, Consulting Planner; Erich Hartmann, City Attorney; Jeff Melcoch, Cable Producer.

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Upon motion by Commissioner Cordes, seconded by Commissioner Jokinen, it was

“RESOLVED, to approve the October 23, 2018, Regular Meeting Agenda, as presented.”

Ayes – 7 Nays – 0

The motion carried.

39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Bigelbach noted a change was needed on Line 230 correcting the Council Liaison to Council Member Urban.

Upon motion by Commissioner Cordes, seconded by Commissioner Jokinen, it was

“RESOLVED, to approve the minutes of the August 28, 2018, Regular Meeting as corrected.”

Ayes – 6 Nays – 0 Abstain – 1 (Carnes)

The motion carried.

50 **CONSIDER PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE JUNE 26, 2018, MINUTES**

51
 52 Planning/Community Development Director Wall said staff was proposing revisions to the June
 53 26, 2018 minutes to include additional discussion, correct some minor typos and change vote
 54 tally from 5-3 to 4-3 on line 667. He noted the principal changes concerned discussion regarding
 55 the proposed Aster Meadows project at Lines 415-445.

56
 57 Upon motion by Commissioner Carnes, seconded by Commissioner Bigelbach, it was

58
 59 “RESOLVED, to approve the June 26, 2018, Regular Meeting Minutes as amended.”

60
 61 Commissioner Caillier asked why the amendment is being proposed. Planning/Community
 62 Development Director Wall said that the proposed amended minutes are the result of comments
 63 made by the public that some of the discussion was not recorded and staff also noted some typos.

64
 65 Ayes – 6 Nays – 0 Abstain – 1 (Anderson)

66
 67 The motion carried.

68
 69 **OPEN TO THE PUBLIC**

70
 71 Chairperson Stumph opened the floor to the public at 7:03 p.m. for questions and comments on
 72 items not on the agenda.

73
 74 No one wished to address the Commission. Chairperson Stumph closed the meeting to the public
 75 at 7:03 p.m.

76
 77 **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

78
 79 A. Case 18-012: Tyr Development, LLC, Rezoning, Planned Unit Development, Site Plan,
 80 and Preliminary Plat at 4107/4085 Centerville Road (Aster Meadows Apartments)

81
 82 Planning/Community Development Director Wall introduced Kendra Lindahl, Consulting
 83 Planner with Landform, who presented the request from Tyr Development, LLC for a Planned
 84 Unit Development (PUD) as an alternative to standard zoning on properties greater than five
 85 acres. The process that allows for flexibility in exchange for additional benefits to the City. She
 86 described the project and provided a presentation with detailed background information on the
 87 site. She also explained that the applicant is requesting the following approvals to construct a
 88 multi-family residential development on the subject property:

- 89
 90 1. Rezoning from Residence Three (R-3) to Planned Unit Development District (PUD)
 91 2. PUD for a multi-family residential development.
 92 3. Site Plan/Detailed Development Plan review for a multi-family residential development.
 93 4. Preliminary Plat.
 94

95 Ms. Lindahl explained the property is guided by HDR (High Density Residential) and zoned R-3
 96 (Residence Three) with a large wetland in the western portion of the site and the bulk of the
 97 project will be located on the east side of the property adjacent to Centerville Road. She said the

98 site totals 23 acres with several parcels proposed to be combined to create three new parcels; two
99 parcels for the proposed development and one out lot. She noted that portions of the site are
100 being farmed and it includes a greenhouse, farm buildings, and a vacant single-family dwelling.
101 She explained that the proposed project includes two 70-unit three-story apartment buildings for
102 a total of 140 units which would have a central shared access from Centerville Road with surface
103 and underground parking under each building. Ms. Lindahl said the complex would include
104 studio, 1- and 2-bedroom units with a mix of size and rents ranging from \$1,000-2,000/month
105 with high-end common area amenities such as a coffee bar, fireplace, exercise space, tot lot,
106 plaza/gathering space, walking path and a potential connection to the trail on County Road F.
107 She stated that apartments are an allowed use in the R-3 Zoning District permitted by a
108 Conditional Use Permit (CUP), but the applicant is requesting a PUD to allow some flexibility
109 that would meet the policies and goals of the City with no requested change to land use
110 designation. She said the PUD zoning district allows: flexibility from density issues; provides for
111 better housing opportunities; provides for creative solutions; and is warranted due to the large
112 wetland, in exchange; and allows the City the opportunity to request additional items. She noted
113 that all discussions have been based on the standards of the underlying R-3 Zoning District
114 which would allow apartments with a CUP. She further summarized that the minimum base lot
115 size is 9.46 acres under the R-3 standards and that the applicant is proposing 16 gross acres so
116 they exceed the minimums and provides credits for underground parking and other density
117 bonuses. As a result, the minimum base lot size is further reduced to 7.5 gross acres. She noted
118 that the net density provided by the proposed development is 25.8 units/acre and that the
119 Comprehensive Plan limits density within the HDR designation to 9-22 units/acre. She explained
120 how the City Code allows for flexibility from the required density standards, based on certain
121 circumstances to be reviewed by the Planning Commission and City Council.

122
123 Ms. Lindahl explained that the proposed development is 84% open space so there is a lot of
124 buffer and she described the physical characteristics of the site that minimizes potential
125 disturbance of natural areas. She also reviewed the building height averages and flexibility for
126 the interior lot line for both buildings and the parking area. The building meets all setbacks. She
127 explained that the proposed landscaping will provide additional buffering to the home located to
128 the north of the site and that the Development Agreement would have several conditions. She
129 outlined the active recreational space provided on-site and said the remainder would be around
130 the perimeter with the bulk as a wetland complex and would serve as a recreational purpose,
131 but that the intent of the 10% requirement was not fully met. She noted that the developer would
132 still have to provide park dedication in full as cash in lieu of land as no park was being
133 developed and outlined other conditions recommended by the Park, Recreation and Trails
134 Commission.

135
136 Ms. Lindahl stated the biggest issue is the proposed density and while it complies with R-3
137 zoning district standards, it is not in compliance with the density standards allowed in the
138 Comprehensive Plan. She referenced the City Attorney's letter that outlined where the City has
139 discretion, which is what the developer is requesting. She reviewed the 13.5 acres of open space
140 included within the proposed development that includes the wetland complex, building heights
141 that are lower than PUD requirements, and the proposed architecture of the proposed project. She
142 further noted no brick or stone is included on the proposed buildings and that staff are
143 recommending that be revised as a condition.

144

145 Ms. Lindahl spoke about the proposed landscaping plan with 161 overstory trees provided and
146 nine specimen trees preserved on the site. She expressed that staff have some concerns about the
147 locations of the preserved trees being too close to the construction zone and that has been
148 addressed as a condition. She further described the proposed landscaping and berming planned
149 along the north property boundary line to provide screening from the adjacent use and that the
150 owner shall continue maintenance of the berm through perpetuity. She noted that the applicant is
151 requesting flexibility from the minimum planting size for one tree species, based on the nursey
152 recommendation, and that the proposed parking lot islands percentage complies with the Code
153 requirements. Ms. Lindahl outlined the limited parking lot lighting and described the building
154 lighting in detail along with the proposed security camera system and light shielding. She also
155 outlined the proposed signage plan that includes both a development sign and address/directional
156 sign. The development sign near the driveway entrance requires flexibility from the size
157 standards, which is acceptable because of the number of buildings. She further described the
158 specifics of the preliminary plat request and the two parcels. She concluded by summarizing the
159 proposed flexibility within the PUD and the additional conditions that are being recommended.

160
161 Scott Haupt, Consulting Engineer with SEH, described the infrastructure of the proposed
162 development and the connection into current facilities that were planned to accommodate future
163 growth. He said water would be served off the Centerville Road connection and that two services
164 are proposed for each building, one for fire suppression and one for drinking water. He further
165 described the on-site private storm system, surface ponding, and the Watershed Management
166 Organization (WMO) and Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) standards with items
167 such as rate control, addressing suspended solids, and the need to address any area that is not
168 grass to treat and retain on-site through infiltration chambers. He said the WMO requirements
169 are met and that they reviewed the drainage report and conditions were recommended to address
170 the inspection and maintenance of the underground chambers to ensure compliance for
171 perpetuity. He noted the proposed development is compliant with the applicable wetland buffer
172 standards.

173
174 Mr. Haupt outlined traffic impacts and turn lanes, existing traffic volumes of 8,400 vehicles/day
175 on Centerville Road and 3,700 vehicles/day on County Road F. He said that the existing
176 intersection has a three-way stop and turn lanes. The traffic plans have been reviewed by Ramsey
177 County. He noted that they would anticipate 5-6 vehicle trips per day per unit with 140 units of
178 762 vehicles/day or one vehicle/minute during AM/PM peak hours. He stated they are proposing
179 only one access onto Centerville Road and that the County had no concerns with the project but
180 would require a new southbound right turn lane onto Centerville Road into the proposed
181 development.

182
183 Chairperson Stumph opened the public hearing at 7:48 p.m.

184
185 Tom Truhler, 4157 Centerville Road, shared a map of his home and Bridgewood Park and
186 outlined the impact of this project on his home. He said he would not have purchased this
187 townhome if he had known of the proposed project and explained how he attended several
188 neighborhood group meetings to help get a petition against the initial project circulated that
189 resulted in the developer withdrawing their application. He asked how the rezoning occurred in
190 the first place and said he has started a new petition to get the site rezoned back to R-2. He has
191 gotten 250 signatures. Mr. Truhler commented on the difficulty in getting documents from staff
192 to do research on this project and shared the *Reflections on the Lake* publication that described

193 the farmland in the City from 1975-2005 and made comments on how former administrators saw
194 development go from farming to business but did not feel that apartments fit aesthetically in this
195 neighborhood. He noted there had been no attempts to construct apartments before and
196 commented on the previous proposed developments that have been attempted and suggested that
197 the developer again withdraw the application. He said that this project doesn't fit aesthetically in
198 the neighborhood, and for Mr. Stalland to make a profit, it has to be big enough, and it's too big
199 for the property. He shared comments on terms used throughout the staff report that allowed
200 changes such as flexibility, rezoning, alternative, consideration, reasonable, discretion, and
201 conditional constraints, and asked the Commission to use a high level of discretion to simply
202 deny the application in its entirety as there are more reasons to say no than yes. Mr. Truhler said
203 he is not trying to harm either the applicant or the property owner but this project does not fit. He
204 suggested these apartments should be constructed closer to the City Center as that location would
205 provide residents access to businesses, 35E, restaurants, and public transportation. He then
206 commented on Mr. Wall's previous comments about how it is assumed there will be a market
207 correction in the future which may slow down luxury apartment development trends and how the
208 City may miss the opportunity to add this type of housing stock to the community. Mr. Truhler
209 asked that the Commission not approve the request and encouraged the developer to immediately
210 withdraw their proposal or develop one that fits the neighborhood and the City's history.

211

212 Chairperson Stumph asked Mr. Truhler to submit his materials to the City Council.

213

214 Remy Bourne, 4136 Thornhill Lane, deferred his public speaking time to Feryle Borgeson.

215

216 Gary Skunberg, 4141 Thornhill Lane, said he chose his townhome after four years of looking
217 and said he was happy until the past year because of this project.

218

219 Feryle Borgeson, 4140 Thornhill Lane, said he has been a resident for 24 years and thanked staff
220 for the well-designed zoning chart. He shared comments on decreased property values because of
221 the location in a nice quiet neighborhood and how he has never seen a project like this in a
222 residential area. He said this type of project needs to be near a shopping area to allow residents to
223 walk to the stores or by a college for students. He commented on State Statute and the required
224 economic impact statement and asked why all City officials and employees do not have to
225 complete the form.

226

227 Patricia Youker, 883 Evergreen Court, commented on environmental impacts and potential
228 traffic flow patterns. She said Lambert Creek runs adjacent to County Road F past the proposed
229 site and is part of the Mississippi headwaters and how the wetland drains into Lambert Creek.
230 She shared comments on the City's drinking water being sourced from Vadnais Lake and others
231 sources with the Vadnais Lake treatment facility as groundwater. She shared how the creek had
232 been placed on DOD 3's impaired waters list as it no longer meets standards for E-coli
233 contaminant and shared a report that listed current pollutants. Ms. Youker commented on how
234 81% of contaminants come from urban stormwater runoff such as from roofs or collects on
235 pavement areas and said that the bacteria loads are well over standards and there needs to be
236 reduction standards for retention pond retrofits, etc.. She stated storm sewer outfalls have not
237 been inspected and the illicit discharge is currently unknown and stated pollution prevention
238 should be the first consideration on this site. Ms. Youker said she is not opposed to development
239 but is opposed to the environmental impact by this type of housing and talked about traffic
240 patterns and the flow as Highway 96 and Centerville Road are already congested and this

241 development would put undue strain on an already busy intersection. She said there aren't
242 enough traffic controls in place to control the flow and asked that the Aster Meadows project be
243 denied for this location.

244

245 Chairperson Stumph asked Ms. Youker to provide a copy of her information to the City Council.
246 Chad Lang, 3973 Centerville Road, shared comments regarding property value loss as he is very
247 close to the proposed site. He said while there would be tax dollars generated he prefers the
248 semi-rural feel of the City and is opposed to the project.

249

250 Lloyd Hansen, 4079 Alpine Avenue, shared an aerial view of the site with his home 800 feet
251 away. He said he placed a down payment on his home seven weeks ago and was unaware of the
252 project coming back. He commented on the flexibilities that are in reality variances and
253 encouraged denial of this development.

254

255 Greg Martz, 858 East County Road F, shared concerns about property values, traffic, and storm
256 sewer capability and said he does not want to see the project built and asked the City to listen to
257 the people who are here.

258

259 Gail Maudal, 4185 Centerville Road, said she moved here one year ago. She made two points: 1)
260 The Plan says an attempt will be made to save nine specimen trees as well as the 160 large
261 diameter trees which may be destroyed and that she believes a different type of development
262 could help save these trees. She said that this development is not appealing because of the dark
263 charcoal and brass color scheme, which is different from other buildings in the area.

264

265 Richard Robinson, 4197 Thornhill Lane, asked how many Planning Commission members were
266 part of the Commission when the dome project on Highway 61 was approved and asked the
267 Commission not to make the same mistake again that could cost the City money and its bond
268 rating or at least create an eyesore.

269

270 Karol Underwood, 4187 Centerville Road, said she and her husband moved into their home five
271 years ago because of the beautiful land in the back with birds and wildlife and shared concerns
272 about the public access by youth to a nature trail they are proposing just north of their home. Ms.
273 Underwood asked the Commission to say no to the project.

274

275 Kim Westerholm, 4450 Oakhurst Avenue, concerns about setbacks and emergency vehicle
276 access as there will be regular fire calls at this complex. She said while she knew the rural
277 community would change and grow, an apartment complex this close to homes does not work
278 and should be placed in the City Center instead.

279

280 Ron Pierson, 4015 Alpine Avenue, explained how a heavy rain event 21 years ago resulted in
281 runoff from their development and caused water in the basement of a property owner that had to
282 be addressed and corrected. He said this shows that when original construction and planning is
283 done you cannot always foresee the future with environment and runoff. He also commented on
284 the need to consider emergency access off County Road F.

285

286 Ashley Wilke, 3531 Centerville Road, said while she is a new homeowner she is not a new
287 resident to the City. She expressed her disappointment with how she learned about the proposed
288 development and suggested that a compromise be found by working together.

289 Erik Goebel, 952 Heritage Court E, said the project is neither an asset or a liability and high-
290 density housing such as this is good if in a walkable area or near transit and stated new residents
291 will walk and spend money in our City and that this project was located in an area not near
292 anything and therefore a liability. He asked that the Commission, please deny this proposal.

293 Elaine Anton, 4171 Centerville Road, said she loves the City and their home as it is near nature
294 and wildlife and said the apartment complex does not belong in our neighborhood.

295

296 Gary Eddy, 4144 Thornhill Lane, said he purchased his townhome in the area five months ago
297 because of the rural area and shared concerns about light and noise pollution as well as property
298 value impacts and encouraged the Commission to vote against the project.

299

300 William Mulroy, 4087 Thornhill Lane, asked the audience to demonstrate their support for the
301 project by standing and no one stood.

302

303 Ron Garceau, 3453 Centerville Road, said Vadnais Heights is a beautiful community and wants
304 to stay that way. He said he has nothing against Mr. Urban or the developer, but that the
305 Commission should deny this project.

306

307 Gerhardt Pareigat, 4146 Thornhill Lane, said he worked at 3M for 34 years and spent many years
308 looking for a place to retire, which he found in Vadnais Heights - his paradise. He said this
309 project would take the spirit of his neighborhood away from him and his family and asked the
310 Commission to reconsider.

311

312 Troy Kunze, 500 Bear Avenue North, shared his support of the Urban family but said he is
313 against the proposal.

314

315 Mr. Truhler said a tragic accident was the impetus for the traffic lights at County Road 96 and
316 Centerville Road and that a Ramsey County traffic study should be demanded because he would
317 not want to see another tragic accident occur as a result of this development.

318

319 Dave DeJarlais, 4223 Centerville Road, said the market research on proposed residents of this
320 complex being young professionals and retirees is not realistic because he believes young
321 professionals and retirees would prefer to be near downtown or in a one-level home. He shared a
322 map of County Road 96 and Centerville Road that he had drawn that showed lack of outlets in
323 the area and asked what is being planned 5-10 years from now. He shared a map showing how
324 Stockdale Road has 3-4 ways to access the freeway and this development would not. He
325 commented on the traffic impacts during construction and asked why there are not two exits onto
326 Centerville Road.

327

328 Chairperson Stumph asked Mr. DeJarlais to submit his map to the City Council.

329

330 Linda Wigdahl, 1059 Greenhaven Drive, said she drives Centerville Road each day and
331 experiences back-ups now and asked the Commission to consider voting against the project
332 because it would bring more traffic and pollution to the area and is not good for the community.

333

334 Lloyd Hanson, 4709 Alpine Avenue, shared how he came to City Hall to learn more about the
335 project and complimented Mr. Wall on his well-done explanation, adding this was the same
336 builder as Conifer Ridge on County Road D and asked the Commission to look at that project.

337 He spoke about the possibility of increased number of residents with roommates and said that
338 could happen here as well.

339
340 Ling Becker, Executive Director of Vadnais Heights Economic Development Corporation
341 (VHEDC), said the VHEDC has been promoting economic vitality for 35 years and has seen lots
342 of business investment in the City. She recalled the new medical uses and restaurants and the
343 community's disappointment when Festival closed and the need for another grocer. She said
344 change is challenging but can be good when it brings convenience of retail and medical services.
345 Ms. Becker said they have done substantial business surveys which show the need for more
346 workforce housing that provides a better housing mix with the current 2.9% unemployment rate.
347 She said various housing types are good for all communities and was the reason it was included
348 in the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Becker said businesses are interested in increasing the number
349 of residents in the City and that 140 households is significant traffic for businesses as they will
350 live, work and shop in the community. She shared how she personally spends a lot of time in the
351 City and how she works to serve the community well.

352
353 Mr. Truhler agreed with Ms. Becker's report and said there is a need for economic development
354 but just not in this location.

355
356 Dan Tilsen, G-Cube Engineering and Land Planning, responded to some of the questions raised
357 during the public testimony, stating they listened and considered the neighborhood's input last
358 time and redesigned the project with less stories, more trees preserved, reduced number of units,
359 and the parking lot on the interior and not seen from the road. He said the project fronts both
360 Centerville Road and County Road F, as sprinkled, and will be state of the art in design. Mr.
361 Pilsin applauded the neighborhood for being so involved and said as a former Planning
362 Commissioner in his community he understands both sides of a project such as this.

363
364 Teresa McCormack, CRW Architects, reiterated how they are working through the community
365 concerns and agreed with the consultants' points regarding materials. She said the project was
366 proposed on the fringe road right next to the highway and that density was addressed by the
367 consultants and staff and stressed the importance of including ADA-accessible housing as a
368 ready-made product to the community.

369
370 No one else wished to address the Commission, Chairperson Stumph closed the public hearing at
371 9:08 p.m.

372
373 Commissioner Bigelbach said the Commission has received a lot of information and thanked the
374 public for their input. She said she learned some facts that she was previously unaware of and
375 while she is not in favor of this project, she would like more time to look at all of the information
376 and is not prepared to make a decision this evening.

377
378 Commissioner Moynagh stated the importance of ensuring that the City has proper housing
379 choices in the City and said that he appreciates the preparation and comments from the
380 neighborhood but said the result is about property rights. He said the revisions made by the
381 developer are good and accommodates the wishes of the neighborhood and while he was not a
382 voting member of the Commission this evening he believes the project would contribute to the
383 tax base and lowers taxes which increases property values of homes. Commissioner Moynagh
384 said he lives near the proposed development and appreciated the reduction from five stories to

385 three and the trail connections. He stated while there would be more cars, county roads are
386 designed to move traffic with the expectation of more cars and that this project would increase
387 that capacity from 50% to 55% capacity. He said the project needs to include the brick accents
388 and that the 140 units will help the small businesses, adding our role is to ensure a good end-
389 product that may encourage others to improve their homes. He said he supports the project.

390

391 Commissioner Caillier said the proposal falls under the City's existing Comprehensive Plan and
392 relates to the existing zoning that has been in place for 7-8 years. He said he appreciated the fact
393 that the developer made modifications from the previous proposal to decrease density and
394 request less deviations. He said he was sensitive to all viewpoints and had reviewed all the
395 information and had a reasonable sense for what it all means and is reluctant to consider
396 approving the project for all the reasons brought forward.

397

398 Commissioner Cordes asked how far the developer was from an approved use versus the PUD.
399 Ms. Lindahl outlined the components that could have been done to avoid the PUD consideration
400 that included acquiring more land to make the density in the Comprehensive Plan comply, the
401 planting of 2.5-inch trees and eliminate the common lot line.

402

403 Upon motion by Commissioner Caillier, seconded by Commissioner Bigelbach, it was
404 "RESOLVED, to recommend denial of Ordinance 730 for Rezoning, Planned Unit Development,
405 Site Plan, and Preliminary Plat requests, as presented by staff, based on the finding of fact that
406 the flexibility being requested as part of the Planned Unit Development process is not justified
407 and the proposed project is an unreasonable development of the subject property, including any
408 additional findings as determined by the Planning Commission.

409

410 Commissioner Cordes said he spent a lot of time reviewing all the comments both here and on
411 social media and said he did not think this was much different from other complexes in other
412 communities. He said without the PUD there would be no oversight or direction to include
413 amenities such as a dog run, brick, or overstory trees and that if the project is denied we could
414 eventually get a less favorable plan with less oversight and that he believed the best route would
415 be to support the project and include controls now. He will vote in favor of the apartments and
416 against the current motion.

417

418 Chairperson Stumph said he lives near the development and that Vadnais Heights is a unique
419 community only 10 minutes from St. Paul. He said he believes there is a need in this community
420 for transitional housing. He said he did not support the Garceau project in the past but does
421 support this project as he believes that renters would stay 3-4 years and move out of the City or
422 purchase a home in the City. He said these will be higher-end rents and can see this project
423 working well in the City with the outlined parameters. Chairperson Stumph said he believed this
424 was a viable project and there is a need for this type of building and that he will be supporting
425 the project.

426

427 A member of the audience inquired about addressing the Commission. City Attorney Erich
428 Hartmann shared comments on the formal hearing process set forth under state law and how this
429 is not a debate. He said no one should speak unless recognized by the Chair and the Planning
430 Commission is acting in a quasi-judicial capacity and that the public comment period was closed
431 and how the Chair has the ability to remove people if necessary.

432

433 Commissioner Cordes requested a point of personal privilege regarding not being able to share
 434 the Mayor’s comments by proxy and said he would get an opportunity to vote at the City Council
 435 meeting, adding that the Commission has not yet completed their debate. Chairperson Stumph
 436 agreed.

437
 438 Commissioner Carnes said the process is outlined by State Statute and that the PUD allows
 439 flexibility and that the City needs this type of housing. He said the project is in a good location at
 440 two county roads and said while the Garceau project was proposed at an angle this is a straight
 441 shot to Centerville Road at a controlled intersection. He said there are many intersections that are
 442 worse and that is a county road and shared comments about trying to limit access points and how
 443 the property is zoned for this use with the PUD providing even more control by the City. He
 444 further commented on Mr. Truhler’s calculations on land sales for the Urban family and how the
 445 PUD will allow for brick façade and parking lot location. He noted a that the City does not get its
 446 water from Vadnais Lake but from the aquifer.

447
 448 Commissioner Anderson said he lives relatively close to the proposed project and is sympathetic
 449 to traffic pressures, but the site seems to be the best fit for this type of project. He said leverage
 450 exists that provided redesigns to the project already and the opportunity to identify problems and
 451 address them now.

452
 453 Commissioner Cordes thanked staff for their work on responding to the residents’ concerns
 454 throughout this process.

455
 456 Ayes – 2 (Bigelbach, Caillier) Nays – 5 (Stumph, Carnes, Anderson, Cordes, Jokinen)

457
 458 The motion failed.

459
 460 Upon motion by Commissioner Jokinen, seconded by Commissioner Carnes, it was
 461 “RESOLVED, to recommend approval of Ordinance 730 for Rezoning, Planned Unit
 462 Development, Site Plan, and Preliminary Plat requests, as presented by staff, based on the
 463 following findings of fact:

- 464
 465 1. The proposed use is allowed within the underlying Residence Three District and is
 466 consistent with the goals/policies and future land use designation of the current
 467 Comprehensive Plan.
 468 2. The proposed development assists in meeting the City’s forecasted population/household
 469 projections, will help support local businesses, and increase the tax base.
 470 3. The proposed development provides for a housing option that currently does not exist in
 471 the community and supports current market trends.
 472 4. The proposed development is consistent with the purpose and intent of the Planned Unit
 473 Development District by encouraging zoning flexibility that enhances the project without
 474 negatively affecting surrounding land uses, natural resources, or the public.
 475 5. The flexibility being requested as part of the Planned Unit Development process is justified
 476 and allows for reasonable development of the subject property.

477
 478 Subject to the following conditions:

- 479 1. A Development Agreement between the applicant, and all others with interests in the
 480 subject property, shall be entered into with the City, to be recorded at the applicant’s cost

- 481 with the offices of the Ramsey County Recorder and/or Register of Titles, prior to issuance
 482 of a Building Permit.
- 483 2. Building and Demolition Permits shall be submitted for administrative review/approval,
 484 prior to commencement of any construction activities on the subject property.
- 485 3. Construction shall be completed and ready for occupancy according to the approved plans
 486 and specifications within one (1) year following issuance of the Building Permit, unless
 487 within that time an extension is granted by the City Council.
- 488 4. A Fire Certificate of Occupancy shall be obtained annually from the Fire Department by
 489 the responsible party, in compliance with the City Code.
- 490 5. Driveway and Right-of-Way Permits shall be submitted for review/approval by the Ramsey
 491 County Public Works Department, to be provided to the City as part of the Building Permit.
- 492 a. The access location shown on the revised site plan is acceptable and will not require
 493 modification of the southbound right-turn lane at the Centerville Road/County Road
 494 F intersection.
- 495 b. A right-turn lane will be required for the new access. This can be addressed as part of
 496 the access permit process.
- 497 6. A Sign Permit shall be submitted for administrative review/approval, prior to any sign(s)
 498 being installed on the subject property.
- 499 a. PUD flexibility is granted to allow one 20 square foot sign where 16 square feet is
 500 permitted.
- 501 b. The 2nd sign located in the parking lot must comply with the ordinance standards for
 502 a directional address sign.
- 503 c. The plans must be updated to ensure compliance with the 5-foot setback from the
 504 property line.
- 505 7. The applicant shall revise the plans to comply with Park, Trail and Commission
 506 recommendations, which include:
- 507 a. The applicable park dedication fee, in lieu of land, shall be paid prior to the issuance
 508 of any permits for commencement of construction activities on the subject property.
- 509 b. An off-street trail connection along County Road F to Centerville Road shall be
 510 constructed and coordinated with Ramsey County.
- 511 c. Marked crosswalk signs shall be installed in the off-street parking lot to aid in safe
 512 pedestrian movements to the tot lot/plaza area.
- 513 d. Fencing shall be installed around the tot lot.
- 514 8. Ordinance 730, rezoning Lots 1 and 2 of Block 1 of the proposed Preliminary Plat from R-
 515 3 to PUD, shall become effective upon filing of the Final Plat.
- 516 9. If construction of the proposed development has not commenced within twelve (12)
 517 months from effective date of Ordinance 730, the City Council shall consider
 518 commencement of proceedings to rezone the subject property back to the original
 519 classification, in compliance with the applicable procedures and with notice to the property
 520 owner/applicant.
- 521 10. The parking as proposed is adequate, however, a portion of the parking in the front of the
 522 building shall be marked as visitor parking. The final plan shall be submitted for review
 523 and approval by staff.
- 524 11. The applicant shall provide cross access and maintenance agreements for the shared drive
 525 aisles, parking and common areas as part of the development agreement.
- 526 12. The proposed nature trail connection on the subject property to the existing off-street trail
 527 to Bridgewood Park along the wetland shall be a mowed or wood-chip surface and located

- 528 to cause minimal disturbance or removal of existing vegetation, to be reviewed and
 529 approved by the City Engineer and VLAWMO.
- 530 13. Existing noise from Interstate 35E is assessed and reasonable mitigation measures shall be
 531 included as part of the proposed building’s construction, as referenced in the MnDOT
 532 letter, dated May 11, 2018.
- 533 14. Ground-mounted mechanical units and building utility areas shall be adequately screened
 534 by plant material and/or fencing and shall not obstruct fire department connections or
 535 hydrants, to be administratively reviewed/approved as part of the Building Permit.
- 536 15. A revised landscape plan must be provided to:
- 537 a. rock, mulch, wetland buffer and sod areas and details for these improvements
 - 538 b. update the materials list on the table and plan to match
 - 539 c. The Spring Snow Crabapple is an understory tree and must be replaced with an
 540 overstory tree to provide a minimum of 161 overstory trees.
 - 541 d. The landowner documents must contain a provision to ensure maintenance of the
 542 north perimeter landscaping in perpetuity.
- 543 16. PUD flexibility is granted to allow 1.75-inch trees where 2.5 is required for the Armstrong
 544 Maples.
- 545 17. Existing vegetation proposed to be preserved shall be done so in compliance with the
 546 applicable requirements of Chapter 20.020(2)(5)(h) of the City Code. Hand digging may be
 547 required to protect the trees in the construction zone.
- 548 18. An outdoor recreation/activity space(s) shall be provided on the subject property that meets
 549 the needs of children of all ages, including playground equipment. Additional details about
 550 the tot lot and plaza area must be submitted for City review as part of the development
 551 agreement.
- 552 19. The developer shall provide a diversity of building materials that includes the meaningful
 553 addition of stone, brick, and similar other materials to provide visual interest and break up
 554 building massing. Revised elevations shall be submitted for City review as part of the
 555 development agreement.
- 556 20. If dogs are allowed in the buildings, a fenced off-leash dog area is required within the
 557 proposed development. Any off-leash area that’s visible from the right-of-way shall be
 558 screened. Details about dog ownership shall be addressed in the Landowners Agreement.
- 559 21. Trash/recycling containers housed within the building’s underground parking garage are
 560 only permitted to be stored outside on a temporary basis to be emptied.
- 561 22. Trash/recycling containers shall be provided around the exterior of the development for use
 562 by residents and visitors.
- 563 23. Light fixture details shall be provided for review and approval by the City.
- 564 24. Drainage and Utility Easements of ten feet on the front yard and five feet on each side yard
 565 of Parcel B (Lot 1 and Lot 2, Block 1) (as noted on the proposed Preliminary Plat) shall be
 566 dedicated to the City, to be filed at the applicant’s cost with the offices of the Ramsey
 567 County Recorder and/or Register of Titles, prior to issuance of a Building Permit.
- 568 25. The landowner’s association documents must be submitted for review by the City.
- 569 26. The plans sheets have a number of inconsistencies between sheets. The plans must be
 570 updated to address all required conditions and ensure consistency between plan sheets.
- 571 27. A Final Plat shall be submitted for staff review and City Council approval within two (2)
 572 years from the date of approval of the Preliminary Plat, to be recorded at the applicant’s
 573 cost with the offices of the Ramsey County Recorder and/or Register of Titles, prior to the
 574 issuance of any permits for commencement of construction activities on the subject
 575 property.

- 576 28. Compliance with the conditions included in the MnDOT letter, dated May 11, 2018 and
 577 October 4, 2018.
 578 29. Compliance with the conditions included in the Consulting City Engineer’s memorandum,
 579 dated October 16, 2018.
 580 30. Compliance with the conditions included in the Fire Chief’s memorandum, dated October
 581 2, 2018.
 582 31. Compliance with the conditions included in the VLAWMO memorandum, dated October
 583 15, 2018.

584
 585 Commissioner Cordes suggested two more changes regarding the number of outdoor parking
 586 spaces now at 140 outdoor spots and suggested 708 be removed and converted to greenspace or
 587 recreational space.

588
 589 Upon motion by Commissioner Cordes, seconded by Commissioner Anderson, it was
 590 “RESOLVED, to recommend an amendment to approval of Ordinance 730 for Rezoning,
 591 Planned Unit Development, Site Plan, and Preliminary Plat requests, to remove 70 stalls and
 592 convert that space to green or recreational space.”

593
 594 Commissioner Carnes said he is concerned that 70 is a little light with a total of indoor and
 595 outdoor stalls at 210 for 140 units. Planning/Community Development Director Wall said the
 596 potential ratio was two stalls per dwelling unit, as required by the Code, which would now be
 597 approximately 1.5 stalls per unit. He suggested the developer continue the discussions with the
 598 City Council as to the appropriate reduction that still accomplishes the goal as a reasonable
 599 reduction of off-street parking to increase recreational space and suggested if parking is a
 600 challenge that area could be converted to off-street parking to avoid unintended consequences of
 601 needing additional parking.

602
 603 Commissioner Cordes agreed the 70 stalls could be a recommendation that would be confirmed
 604 with the developer once properly calculated and agreed to accept Mr. Wall’s proposed revised
 605 condition based on his previous statements as part of an additional proposed condition to the
 606 original motion

607
 608 Ayes – 4 (Carnes, Cordes, Anderson, Stumph) Nays – 3 (Bigelbach, Caillier, Jokinen)

609
 610 The amendment passed.

611
 612 Mr. Truhler commented from the audience on the proposed changes that were occurring in order
 613 to approve the proposed project. Chairperson Stumph outlined the Planning Commission’s role
 614 in this process and that the Planning Commission is an advisory board to the City Council.

615
 616 Upon motion by Commissioner Jokinen, seconded by Commissioner Carnes, it was
 617 “RESOLVED, to recommend approval of Ordinance 730 for Rezoning, Planned Unit
 618 Development, Site Plan, and Preliminary Plat requests, based on the findings of fact with
 619 conditions, including the additional condition regarding a potential reduction of the proposed off-
 620 street parking stalls.

621
 622 Ayes – 5 (Stumph, Carnes, Cordes, Anderson, Jokinen) Nays – 2 (Bigelbach, Caillier)

623

624 The motion carried.

625

626 **NEW BUSINESS**

627

628 None.

629

630 **OLD BUSINESS**

631

632 None.

633

634 **REPORTS**

635

636 A. Council Liaison

637

638 Council Liaison Urban was not present.

639

640 B. Planning Commissioners

641

642 None.

643

644 C. Planning and Engineering Staff

645

646 Planning/Community Development Director Wall recapped current construction projects
647 including Midwest ENT that opened October 15 with a grand opening to be held soon and said
648 that progress on the Spire Credit Union development is moving forward with completion before
649 year-end. He noted the City Council adopted the new City Code that becomes effective
650 November 1. He stated this was a long process that resulted in the City Code being posted
651 online and will make the Code more user-friendly for staff, residents and businesses and easily
652 searchable. He concluded that the Draft 2040 Comprehensive Plan is still out for review by
653 adjacent cities with the comment period ending mid-December.

654

655 Upon question by Commissioner Bigelbach, Mr. Wall stated the Aster Meadows Apartment
656 project would be before City Council for the second public hearing as soon as November 20. He
657 said the public hearing would be fully noticed.

658

659 Chairperson Stumph thanked staff for their work on this proposal.

660

661 **NEXT MEETING**

662

663 The next Planning Commission meeting will be held on November 27, 2018.

664

665 **ADJOURN MEETING**

666

667 Upon motion by Commissioner Cordes, seconded by Commissioner Anderson the meeting was
668 adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

669

670 Respectfully submitted,

671 Cathy Sorensen, *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*