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OPEN MEETING AND WELCOME

Vice Chairperson Martin Jokinen called the Regular Meeting of the Vadnais Heights Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. on March 24, 2020.

ROLL CALL

Evan Cordes, Chairperson Absent
Linda Bigelbach Absent
Edward Caillier Present
Brian Carnes Present
Curt Cooper Present
Martin Jokinen, Vice Chairperson Present
Joseph Stumph Absent
Jerry Moynagh, First Alternate Absent
Terri Dresen, Second Alternate Absent

Also present: Kevin Watson, City Administrator; Nolan Wall, Planning/Community Development Director; Jeff Melcoch, Cable Producer.

Commissioner Carnes noted several members were absent due to social distancing and the COVID-19 pandemic and the need for only a quorum to be present.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Upon motion by Commissioner Cooper, seconded by Commissioner Carnes, it was

“RESOLVED, to approve the March 24, 2020, Regular Meeting Agenda as presented.”

Ayes – 4 Nays – 0

The motion carried.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Vice Chair Jokinen requested spelling corrections for Commissioner Dresen’s name.

Upon motion by Commissioner Cooper, seconded by Commissioner Caillier, it was

“RESOLVED, to approve the minutes of the February 24, 2020, Regular Meeting as corrected.”
A. Case 20-002: Dakota UPREIT LP – Planned Unit Development Amendment and Site Plan Review at 905-955 East County Road E (Vadnais Square)

Planning/Community Development Director Wall shared the applicant is requesting to divide the 32,500-square-foot “minor anchor” tenant space at Vadnais Square into up to three retail suites through a Planned Unit Development (PUD) Amendment and Site Plan Review. He said the subject property contains the Vadnais Square shopping center development and was rezoned from City Center (CC) to Planned Unit Development (PUD) in 2016. Dakota UPREIT LP purchased the shopping center in 2016. He spoke how market trends were changing and the need to split the tenant space into several spaces versus larger big box stores and instead have smaller destination retail stores. As a result of the vacancy created in the former Xperience Fitness tenant space, the property owner is proposing to split the space into up to three retail suites. One tenant, Foss Swim School, has been identified, but no other tenants have lease agreements for the remaining space(s), as of yet.

Wall noted that the original Development Agreement was executed in 1995 and approved a 27,500-square-foot minor anchor retail store at the southwest corner of the retail building. Subsequent amendments have changed the exact size of the space, but it has always been considered as an anchor tenant. Use of that space, as approved, continued until November 2019 when the tenant vacated. A similar process was followed in 2014 to reconfigure the former Festival Foods space into several smaller suites to accommodate a new grocery tenant that didn’t need all the vacant space. He stated the review process to split the former Festival Foods into five retail suites six years ago triggered a deliberate conversation about the changing retail environment and the intent and vision for the Vadnais Square development in the larger context of the City Center District. The same circumstances are facilitating the requests in this case. The importance of the entire City Center area depends in large part on maintaining a vibrant multi-tenant shopping center that is viable in the current retail market. The property owner shares the same goal. To that end, they are reacting to losing Xperience Fitness as the minor anchor tenant and the current market to fill it. Wall stated plans show the proposed layout for Foss Swim School, which would occupy approximately 12,000 square feet and provides a similar use to the former fitness club. The applicant/property owner is requesting to split the
remaining 22,000 square feet into at least two more retail suites for future tenants. The request offers them flexibility in attracting tenants, but would still allow for one larger tenant to lease all the remaining space.

Vice Chairperson Jokinen opened the public hearing at 7:09 p.m.

As no one wished to address the Commission, Vice Chairperson Jokinen closed the public hearing at 7:09 p.m.

Upon motion by Commissioner Carnes, seconded by Commissioner Cooper, it was

“RESOLVED to approve the proposed comprehensive plan amendment, rezoning, and planned unit development amendment requests, based on the finding of fact that the applicant is responding to the current retail market in an attempt to keep the shopping center viable and leased.

Subject to the conditions:

1. A development agreement amendment between the property owner, and all others with interests in the subject property, shall be entered into with the City, to be recorded at the applicant’s cost with the offices of the Ramsey County Recorder and/or Register of Titles, prior to issuance of a building permit.

2. Building and demolition permits in compliance with all applicable code standards shall be submitted prior to commencement of any construction activities on the subject property, to be reviewed/approved administratively.

3. Sign permits in compliance with all applicable code standards shall be submitted prior to any sign(s) being installed/relocated on the subject property, to be reviewed/approved administratively.

4. The existing “minor anchor” space shall not be divided into more than three separate tenant spaces without approval by the City Council, after review by the Planning Commission.”

Ayes – 4 Nays – 0

The motion carried.

B. Case 20-003: At Home Apartments, LLC – Rezoning, Final Planned Unit Development Plan, Site Plan Review at Unaddressed Parcel at County Highway 96/McMenemy Street

Vice Chairperson Jokinen stated the public hearing for At Home Apartments, LLC – Rezoning, Final Planned Unit Development Plan, Site Plan Review at Unaddressed Parcel at County Highway 96/McMenemy Street would be opened but continued and action postponed to the April 2, 2020, special meeting. He said no formal action would be taken this evening and encouraged the public to review the City’s website for public input opportunities for the continued public hearing.
Vice Chairperson Jokinen opened the public hearing at 7:09 p.m.

Planning/Community Development Director Wall shared that At Home Apartments, LLC, is proposing to re-zone the subject property to PUD to allow for construction of a multi-family residential development, including final PUD and site plan reviews. At the January 21 meeting, the City Council approved the applicant’s request to rezone the subject property’s future land use designation from Office-Business to Mixed Use, which is currently being reviewed by the Metropolitan Council and we expect action on it next month.

Wall noted that the proposed development is a rental community that includes a mix of two-story, attached townhomes and a four-story apartment building, totaling 163 units. Several revisions were made to the proposed plans resulting from the Concept PUD Plan public testimony and subsequent City Council and Planning Commission discussions. If approved, construction would occur in multiple phases, commencing late spring/early summer this year to be completed by the fall of 2021. The proposed development includes 14 buildings (1 apartment/13 townhomes) on one platted lot. The proposed development includes two housing types, attached townhomes and an apartment building. The pitched roofs would complement the dwellings in the adjacent single-family residential neighborhood, as opposed to flat roofs which may better complement the surrounding office/warehouse uses and often evoke a more urban-feel. In addition, the two-story townhome design offers a transition between the height of the adjacent dwellings and the four-story apartment building. The townhomes would be constructed in three phases, with completion estimated for spring, summer, and fall of 2021, respectively.

Wall noted that the proposed development does not include any land dedicated to the public, so the applicant will likely be required to pay the applicable park dedication fee in lieu of dedication, as allowed by the City Code. The proposed development would include outdoor amenities for residents and guests, including an outdoor pool, gazebo, grilling areas, and a covered bar area with outdoor TVs. The proposed apartment building will have a fitness room, yoga room, and community space. In addition, trail connections to the existing off-street trail facility on the south side of County Highway 96 were proposed from within the development on the north and west sides. Wall shared existing developments within surrounding communities were analyzed for density for comparison and the main points included: gross density range for certain existing/approved developments in surrounding communities is approximately 8–51 units/acre; gross density range for existing developments in Vadnais Heights is 8–29 units/acre; proposed development has a gross density of 12.2 units/acre and is significantly less dense than comparable developments in the City and the surrounding area.

Wall said the subject property and proposed apartment building’s location are generally isolated from surrounding structures, therefore it is not anticipated that any significant view-sheds will be interrupted. The Vadnais Heights Fire Department has reviewed the proposed plans and does not have any concerns with the building’s height, as they have appropriately-trained staff and equipment to respond to a fire event in a tall building. In addition, the proposed development provides the required fire access around most of the building and is required to install fire suppression/alarm systems. For comparison
purposes, the R-3 District’s maximum building height standard is 36’, which generally only allows for a three-story building and is consistent with most existing multi-family residential buildings in the community. Most new suburban multi-family residential construction is three or four stories tall, but can vary in overall height depending on the roof design (pitched vs. flat) but noted there was a growing trend in suburban communities to allow taller buildings in appropriate locations to increase density.

Wall said in response to the comments received as part of the Concept PUD Plan review process, the applicant incorporated the following revisions into the Final PUD Plan: removed ingress/egress from McMenemy Street; consolidated ingress/egress to one driveway on Oak Grove Parkway as far from the intersection as possible; enhanced the exterior building materials (more colors, stone, and brick); provided berming and robust landscaping to provide screening to/from surrounding properties; enhanced the outdoor amenity space by including more pedestrian trails throughout the site and an outdoor gazebo/pergola area; provided an emergency-only access easement in the southeast corner of the site.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed rezoning, final planned unit development plan, and site plan requests, based on the following findings of fact:

1. The City Council has already approved the required comprehensive plan amendment to re-guide the subject property from Office-Business to Mixed Use and provided comments on the Concept PUD Plan.

2. The proposed development allows for the following:
   a. Multi-family residential development that meets the current market demands.
   b. Additional housing units to assist in meeting the 2040 population/household forecasts.
   c. A range of housing choices in terms of style, size, location, tenure and cost.
   d. A balanced housing supply with housing available for people at all income levels.
   e. A variety of housing types for people in all stages of the life-cycle.

3. The proposed development is compatible with other surrounding uses and, through thoughtful design, provides appropriate transitions/buffers and access that mitigates potential impacts.

4. The proposed development is consistent with the applicable density ranges.

5. The proposed development is consistent with the purpose and intent of the Planned Unit Development District by encouraging zoning flexibility that enhances the project without negatively affecting surrounding land uses, natural resources, or the public.

6. The flexibility being requested as part of the Planned Unit Development process is justified and allows for reasonable development of the subject property.

Subject to the following conditions:

1. The proposed comprehensive plan amendment approved by the City Council, as in Resolution 20-01-016, shall be approved by the Metropolitan Council, in accordance with the required procedures.

2. A development agreement between the applicant, and all others with interests in the subject property, shall be entered into with the City, to be recorded at the
3. Building permits shall be submitted for administrative review/approval, prior to commencement of any construction activities on the subject property.

4. Construction shall be completed and ready for occupancy according to the approved plans and specifications within one (1) year following issuance of the building permit, unless within that time an extension is granted by the City Council as part of the development agreement.

5. A Fire Certificate of Occupancy shall be obtained annually from the Fire Department by the responsible party, in compliance with the City Code.

6. A sign permit shall be submitted for administrative review/approval, prior to any sign(s) being installed on the subject property.

7. The applicant shall work with the City to erect a city monument/gateway sign at the corner of the McMenemy Street/County Highway 96 intersection.

8. If construction of the proposed development has not commenced within twelve (12) months from effective date of the approval ordinance granting the proposed rezoning, the City Council shall consider commencement of proceedings to rezone the subject property back to the original classification, in compliance with the applicable procedures and with notice to the property owner/applicant.

9. A portion of the parking near the front of the apartment building shall be marked as visitor parking.

10. Ground-mounted mechanical units and building utility areas shall be adequately screened by plant material and/or fencing and shall not obstruct fire department connections or hydrants, to be administratively reviewed/approved as part of the building permit.

11. Existing vegetation proposed to be preserved shall be done so in compliance with the applicable requirements of Chapter 38, Article IV, Section 601(11) of the City Code.

12. Trash/recycling containers housed within the building’s underground parking garages are only permitted to be stored outside on a temporary basis to be emptied.

13. Trash/recycling containers and dog-waste stations shall be provided around the exterior of the development for use by residents and visitors.

14. The applicant shall provide an emergency cross-access easement to the adjoining property to the east, to be shown on the site plan as part of the development agreement, and recorded by document at the applicant’s cost with the offices of the Ramsey County Recorder and/or Register of Titles, prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

15. Exterior off-street parking stalls shall not be used for parking/storage of boats, trailers, or recreational vehicles.

16. Compliance with the conditions included in the Consulting City Engineer’s memorandum, dated February 28, 2020.

17. Compliance with the conditions included in the Fire Technician’s memorandum, dated March 2, 2020.

18. Compliance with the conditions included in the VLAWMO memorandum, dated March 13, 2020.

19. Compliance with the conditions included in the Director of Public Works/City Engineer memorandum, dated March 13, 2020.
Wall said the action requested at this meeting is to table the requests and continue the public hearing to the April 2, 2020, special meeting, for public input and action and extend the application review period an additional 60 days, in compliance with Minn. Stat. Sec. 15.99. He outlined the public process included a project webpage, electronic comment forms, and emails for the record from those who do not want to attend as well as an online sign-up sheet to allow residents to schedule a time to testify in five-minute blocks to limit public attendance and provide an orderly process but noted staff encouraged online input instead. He said a letter was provided beyond the required meeting notice that stated the hearing would be continued and once input was taken at the Planning Commission meeting another opportunity would be provided for comments at a City Council meeting.

Vice Chairperson Jokinen confirmed the proposed irrigation pond would be aerated.

Pete Keely, Collage Architects, recapped design considerations made regarding access, traffic, and design, and said they kept with the motif of the modern farmhouse design and developed more materials such as stone and accents and dropped to three stories on the corners. He outlined the outdoor spaces and balconies, gable approach to match the townhomes, different coloring for different looks throughout, then reviewed the proposed landscaping and materials mix between buildings for different looks with rustic wood, lap siding, stone, metal roofing and shingles throughout. Keely spoke about the three-foot berming, gables differing throughout to mimic a series of homes, then shared images of amenity spaces inside and outlined the plan of more one-bedroom units and one-bedroom with den units, fitness room, wine bar, and package/mail room and shared how they worked to get access off Oak Grove and connect to the parking lot to the east with the pond designed as a wet pond with bounce.

Commissioner Carnes said he appreciated the changes from the initial proposal as they are well done and thanked the applicant for their work.

Leanna Stefaniak, At Home Apartments, stressed how they wanted to be collaborative partners and hoped that goal was reflected in the design changes. She said they amended their plans based on the public input received and described the amenities for the outdoor spaces and said they anticipate more feedback at the continued public hearing and would work to incorporate changes to develop a better project.

Commissioner Caillier thanked the applicant for the changes and asked about the definition of transient housing and how At Home vests their long-term renters and activities such as Air B&B-type rentals and not allowing sublets and the corresponding parking impacts. Stefaniak explained how all residents (anyone over the age of 18) must submit applications for criminal and financial background investigations which is why they do not allow subletting. She said this project is a huge investment for both us and their tenants and if someone was living onsite who was not a resident, they are made aware of the fact through onsite management whom will be living onsite and will know the residents. She outlined the seven-night guest policy and the need to sign lease addendums in order to get on a current lease to ensure property rules are followed, vehicle registrations received, and fees paid, adding the 1.8 parking ratio was based on current market trends and was still adequately parked with the average being 1.4.
Commissioner Cooper asked for more information on the market At Home will be going after and the unit costs. Stefaniak responded they anticipate their residents to be baby boomers who are downsizing and right sizing as well as older millennials who may want more space and be closer to work. She spoke about Class A new market apartments and blended averages of approximately $2/square foot for suburban units and $3/square foot for urban units.

Upon motion by Commissioner Carnes, seconded by Commissioner Cooper, it was

“RESOLVED, to table consideration of At Home Apartments, LLC – Rezoning, Final Planned Unit Development Plan, Site Plan Review at Unaddressed Parcel at County Highway 96/McMenemy Street and continue the public hearing and action to the April 2, 2020, public hearing, and extend the application review period an additional 60 days, in compliance with Minn. Stat. Sec. 15.99.”

Ayes – 4  Nays – 0

The motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

REPORTS

A. Council Liaison

Councilmember Patricia Youker was absent.

B. Planning Commissioners

None.

C. Staff

Planning/Community Development Director Wall shared the Rush Line group will be conducting virtual meetings and has postponed public engagements at this time and noted that residents who live on the corridor should be very aware of the proposed project due to the group’s active communication.

City Administrator Watson shared an update regarding the City’s response to COVID-19 and how staff is continuing to serve the public as always but not with any in-person services. He said staff are working onsite and from home and splitting shifts to do its best to mitigate cross infections. He commented on the impact these actions are having and
how staff is working to respond to needs as they arise and he said that he appreciates the 
public’s patience during this time. He encouraged anyone from the public to share their 
ideas, especially the business community, and shared one example of flexibility provided 
around temporary signage for activities such as restaurant take-out and thanked the public 
for their support during this time.

NEXT MEETING

Planning/Community Development Director Wall said the next meeting would be held in 
April at a date to be determined.

ADJOURN MEETING

Upon motion by Commissioner Carnes, seconded by Commissioner Cooper, the meeting 
was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cathy Sorensen, TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.
OPEN MEETING AND WELCOME

Chairperson Evan Cordes called the Regular Meeting of the Vadnais Heights Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. on April 15, 2020.

ROLL CALL

Evan Cordes, Chairperson    Present
Linda Bigelbach    Present
Edward Caillier    Present
Brian Carnes    Absent
Curt Cooper    Present
Martin Jokinen    Present
Joseph Stumph    Absent
Jerry Moynagh, First Alternate    Absent
Terri Dresen, Second Alternate    Absent

Also present:   Kevin Watson, City Administrator; Nolan Wall, Planning/Community Development Director; Jeff Melcoch, Cable Producer.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

“RESOLVED, to approve the April 15, 2020, Regular Meeting Agenda as presented.”

Ayes – 5  Nays – 0

The motion carried.

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Chairperson Cordes opened the floor to the public at 7:02 p.m. for questions and comments on items not on the agenda.

As no one wished to address the Commission, Chairperson Cordes closed the meeting to the public at 7:02 p.m.

CONTINUE PUBLIC HEARING

A.  Case 20-003:  At Home Apartments, LLC – Rezoning, Final Planned Unit Development Plan, Site Plan Review at Unaddressed Parcel at County Highway 96/McMenemy Street
Chairperson Cordes reconvened the public hearing from March 24 at 7:03 p.m. and stated emails had been received and that the Commission had reviewed all public comments received.

Planning/Community Development Director Wall stated copies of formal email comments received by staff as of April 9 concerning the proposed development and were forwarded and additional emails submitted today were printed for each member.

Chris Messerly, 317 Timberline Trail, said he and his family have been long-time residents of Vadnais Heights and feel the project is a threat to public safety with regard to traffic safety, adding traffic accidents were the number one cause of death per the CDC. He shared concerns about taking a left onto McMenemy with current traffic and said this project would add much more traffic with the a projected additional 1,000 vehicles per day and create further congestion. He said that he feels that the City is ignoring the volume increase and spoke about the need to identify the risks and asked that the City do something to address those risks. He suggested the possibility of closing McMenemy as one option and while there would be a cost it would not be a cost of life or serious injury.

Heather Gustafson, 99 Southwoods Drive, said this development was a hot button issue in her neighborhood and she would like more information from the applicant regarding the project and commented how the City should listen more to the residents as they feel they have been ignored. She asked if housing would address all income levels and asked about rent and income requirements and then asked about the process for the Metropolitan Council’s approval.

As no one else wished to address the Commission, Chairperson Cordes closed the public hearing at 7:15 p.m.

Leanna Stefaniak, At Home Apartments, addressed the questions on income requirements stating that the project was designed for general occupancy with no demographic limitations such as seniors, and explained applicants incomes would need to be three times the monthly rent. She noted that at $2/square foot a 700-square foot unit would be $1,400 per month.

Commissioner Caillier referred to the Oakwood Terrace and McMenemy intersection and asked for input provided by Ramsey County or staff on traffic impacts. Wall said staff received a response from Ramsey County regarding Mr. Messerly’s concerns about how they intend to evaluate that intersection should the development be approved which included restriping and signal timing improvements but that the County would first have to see what the impacts would be before any changes were made. He said since these were both County roads it is not the City’s jurisdiction but noted that the City does collaborate with and work with the County to include recommendations for improvements but they are not recommending any additional improvements at this time outside of what has been included in the packet.

Commissioner Caillier asked about Oakwood Terrace and if the City would consider restrictions around Oakwood Terrace such as northbound turn restrictions onto McMenemy. Wall said that could occur in collaboration with the County and neighborhood, adding a left-hand turn will be an issue regardless of the outcome of this project.

Chairperson Cordes asked about comments made regarding closing this intersection. City Administrator Watson referred to comments regarding the potential closing of this intersection that were made which laid out extremes of options to mitigate the concerns neighbors had but added that any decisions with Oakwood/McMenemy would have to be collaborated with the County, adding there were no proposals from the County to close the intersection at this time but modifications would be good over time.
Commissioner Bigelbach asked about the Metropolitan Council’s process for approval. Wall explained the Council approved the land use amendment earlier this year and noted the process is taking longer with the Metropolitan Council but they approved the amendment through their land use committee and will be meeting as a full Council to review and make final recommendations for any changes. He explained the tracts with the first concept as a PUD and land use amendment with no action needed for the PUD but for the land use amendment which was approved by the City Council, pending Metropolitan Council final approval. He then outlined next steps that included rezoning to the PUD district, final PUD plan, and site plan review of the development which was separate from the concept review process.

Upon motion by Commissioner Caillier, seconded by Commissioner Bigelbach, it was

"RESOLVED to approve the proposed rezoning, final planned unit development plan, and site plan requests, based on the following findings of fact:

1. The City Council has already approved the required comprehensive plan amendment to re-guide the subject property from Office-Business to Mixed Use and provided comments on the Concept PUD Plan.

2. The proposed development allows for the following:
   a. Multi-family residential development that meets the current market demands.
   b. Additional housing units to assist in meeting the 2040 population/household forecasts.
   c. A range of housing choices in terms of style, size, location, tenure and cost.
   d. A balanced housing supply with housing available for people at all income levels.
   e. A variety of housing types for people in all stages of the life-cycle.

3. The proposed development is compatible with other surrounding uses and, through thoughtful design, provides appropriate transitions/buffers and access that mitigates potential impacts.

4. The proposed development is consistent with the applicable density ranges.

5. The proposed development is consistent with the purpose and intent of the Planned Unit Development District by encouraging zoning flexibility that enhances the project without negatively affecting surrounding land uses, natural resources, or the public.

6. The flexibility being requested as part of the Planned Unit Development process is justified and allows for reasonable development of the subject property.

Subject to the following conditions:

1. The proposed comprehensive plan amendment approved by the City Council, as in Resolution 20-01-016, shall be approved by the Metropolitan Council, in accordance with the required procedures.

2. A development agreement between the applicant, and all others with interests in the subject property, shall be entered into with the City, to be recorded at the applicant’s cost with the offices of the Ramsey County Recorder and/or Register of Titles, prior to issuance of a building permit.

3. Building permits shall be submitted for administrative review/approval, prior to commencement of any construction activities on the subject property.

4. Construction shall be completed and ready for occupancy according to the approved plans and specifications within one (1) year following issuance of the building permit, unless within that time an extension is granted by the City Council as part of the development agreement.

5. A Fire Certificate of Occupancy shall be obtained annually from the Fire Department by the responsible party, in compliance with the City Code.
6. A sign permit shall be submitted for administrative review/approval, prior to any sign(s) being installed on the subject property.

7. The applicant shall work with the City to erect a city monument/gateway sign at the corner of the McMenemy Street/County Highway 96 intersection.

8. If construction of the proposed development has not commenced within twelve (12) months from effective date of the approval ordinance granting the proposed rezoning, the City Council shall consider commencement of proceedings to rezone the subject property back to the original classification, in compliance with the applicable procedures and with notice to the property owner/applicant.

9. A portion of the parking near the front of the apartment building shall be marked as visitor parking.

10. Ground-mounted mechanical units and building utility areas shall be adequately screened by plant material and/or fencing and shall not obstruct fire department connections or hydrants, to be administratively reviewed/approved as part of the building permit.

11. Existing vegetation proposed to be preserved shall be done so in compliance with the applicable requirements of Chapter 38, Article IV, Section 601(11) of the City Code.

12. Trash/recycling containers housed within the building’s underground parking garages are only permitted to be stored outside on a temporary basis to be emptied.

13. Trash/recycling containers and dog-waste stations shall be provided around the exterior of the development for use by residents and visitors.

14. The applicant shall provide an emergency cross-access easement to the adjoining property to the east, to be shown on the site plan as part of the development agreement, and recorded by document at the applicant’s cost with the offices of the Ramsey County Recorder and/or Register of Titles, prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

15. Exterior off-street parking stalls shall not be used for parking/storage of boats, trailers, or recreational vehicles.

16. Compliance with the conditions included in the Consulting City Engineer’s memorandum, dated February 28, 2020.

17. Compliance with the conditions included in the Fire Technician’s memorandum, dated March 2, 2020.

18. Compliance with the conditions included in the VLAWMO memorandum, dated March 13, 2020.

19. Compliance with the conditions included in the Director of Public Works/City Engineer memorandum, dated March 13, 2020.

Chairperson Cordes spoke about comments received on building height and how no apartment buildings were higher than three stories as it would be the highest in the City.

Commissioner Bigelbach referred to the proposed landscape plan which was different than the County Road E and Centerville Road project and said this site was flatter and how that building appears taller because of the hill. She said the plans show an attractive development and she thanked the applicant for addressing concerns from the beginning and how this project would add value to the surrounding area.

Commissioner Cooper said the townhomes were supposed to match roof elevations to give it the same look throughout. Pete Keely, Collage Architects, explained the roof height is 28 feet at the front and because apartments are so far back the line of sight blocks the view from McMenemy.

Commissioner Cooper asked for comparisons to the IC Systems building nearby. Ms. Stefaniak said that she believes that building was 54-57 feet and their project is 54 feet to the mid-point of the gable, so approximately the same.
Commissioner Caillier said the height issue was site specific and with this property having an apartment adjacent to a commercial area he did not have concerns about height as the project was far enough away from the current single-family homes.

Chairperson Cordes referred to traffic and safety concerns and reiterated we cannot do anything outside changes to Oakwood Terrace. Wall said that was not entirely true as some changes were included to the roadways and if the Commission felt differently he would return and ask for reconsideration but staff feel comfortable with the recommendations being made today and would rely on the County to come back with recommendations to implement.

Commissioner Caillier encouraged the City to enter into whatever collaboration would be needed to make changes on Oakwood Terrace.

Chairperson Cordes agreed and said we need to push the County to restripe and redo signal timings based on resident input as it will be necessary as this project is completed.

Commissioner Cooper suggested another signal on McMenemy be considered to allow for two paths of traffic, left and right out of the complex, for an additional safety control measure. Wall said that staff has had those discussions with the County before this project but noted that Highway 96 is for moving traffic and adding more access points has a domino effect across the entire regional roadway system.

Chairperson Cordes commented about the recommendation for 163 trees and how the applicant had only 112 trees and that additional trees were not included in the conditions to increase screening coverage. Wall explained that City Code requires four standards for minimal planting and would always be the greater amount and stated based on square footage At Home would be required to plant 302 trees but based on the number of units they would be required to plant 163 trees and how staff recommended the landscape plan be accepted at 112 trees because the existing drainage and utility easement has many trees that were not inventoried but would count towards the 163. He said that since they trees are being preserved staff felt additional trees were not necessary as this was not a dense site and too many trees could be a concern and that this number offered the appropriate amount of screening.

The motion carried.

Wall noted the process included an additional public hearing to be held by the City Council on May 5 and that staff would adjust the process as necessary to comply with any Stay at Home order.

NEXT MEETING

Planning/Community Development Director Wall said the next Planning Commission meeting would be held on April 28, 2020.

ADJOURN MEETING

Chairperson Cordes adjourned the meeting at 7:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cathy Sorensen, TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.
Re: At-Home High Density Rental Complex

Dear Planning Commission Members:

I attach a letter sent to the City Council in February. To the best of my knowledge, the Council has chosen to do nothing to assess the traffic safety harm that will be caused by At-Home's high density rental complex.

If this complex is to be built, one suggestion to lessen the harm to public safety is to require all vehicles going to and from the rental complex to use Oak Grove Parkway to access Highway 96. In other words, cars and trucks going to and from the complex would be prohibited from using McMenemy. Vehicles leaving the complex would be required to turn left on Oak Grove Parkway (right turn prohibited) to Highway 96 and vehicles going to the complex would be required to do so on Oak Grove Parkway via Highway 96 (i.e., no left turn from McMenemy to Oak Grove Parkway).

While this plan will do nothing to lessen the present traffic burden and safety risks on McMenemy between Highway 96 and Oak Grove Parkway, it would hopefully reduce the threat of injury and death, particularly to those attempting to enter McMenemy from Oakwood Terrace.

Chris Messerly

February 24, 2020

Re: High Density Rental Complex is a Safety Risk to the Public

Dear Mayor Gunderson and City Council Members:

Your approval of At-Home’s high density rental complex at the southeast corner of Highway 96 and McMenemy Street presents an unreasonable risk of injury and death to the public; most notably, people attempting to enter McMenemy Street from Oakwood Terrace. (This is important to a significant number of residents because it is our only direct access to and from our so-called “Oaks of Vadnais” neighborhood.)

This area is presently unsafe to motorists for three reasons: the proximity of McMenemy Street’s intersections with Oakwood Terrace and Highway 96, the hill on McMenemy south of Oakwood Terrace, and confusing and inadequate lane configurations.

The distance between Oakwood Terrace and Highway 96 is presently unsafe and in violation of Minnesota’s Traffic Safety Fundamental standards. Our state sets safety standards for minimum sight distances at intersections. See Traffic Safety Fundamentals Handbook, Minnesota Department of Transportation, Office of Traffic, Safety and Technology (Rev., June 2015). Minimum sight distances are required to allow motorists the time to safely enter an intersection. Failure to have adequate sight distances deprives motorists of the time to safely enter an intersection, thus increasing the likelihood of injuries and death from crashes.

“The actual length of the recommended distance is a function of the major street operating speed.” Id. at C-29. Here, the “major street” is McMenemy. The speed limit on McMenemy is 40 miles per hour. According to Traffic Safety Fundamentals, a minimum sight distance is 475 feet (providing a motorist eight seconds to see oncoming traffic).
Id. (It is important to note that even this minimum distance is inadequate and unsafe given the complex nature of McMenemy’s lane configurations and its hill to the south of Oakwood Terrace. See below.)

However, the distance between McMenemy and Highway 96 is only 255 feet (measured from curb apexes). Thus, motorists attempting to enter McMenemy from Oakwood Terrace do not have a safe time interval to enter the intersection.

Motorists attempting to enter McMenemy from Oakwood Terrace cannot see vehicles turning south on McMenemy from eastbound Highway 96 until they are about 255 feet away. Those vehicles turning south on McMenemy from westbound 96 (at a higher rate of speed due to the larger turning radius) likewise cannot be seen due to northbound traffic stopped on McMenemy to turn east or west on Highway 96.

The inherent lack of safety to motorists is further aggravated by the limited sight distance looking south on McMenemy from Oakwood Terrace. This is because vehicles traveling north on McMenemy travel uphill as they approach Oak Grove Parkway. In fact, those vehicles do not crest the hill until after they pass Oak Grove Parkway about 250 feet from Oakwood Terrace. Viewing northbound vehicles on McMenemy is further obstructed by traffic going south on McMenemy.

The unsafe nature of the proximity of McMenemy’s intersections with Highway 96 and Oakwood Terrace is made worse by the lane configurations. In the 255 feet on McMenemy between Highway 96 and Oakwood Terrace, there are four lanes (northbound left turn, northbound right turn, and two lanes southbound). On McMenemy south of Oakwood Terrace, there are abruptly only two lanes.

Vehicles turning south on McMenemy from eastbound Highway 96 turn into that most westerly southbound lane. Also, drivers turning south on McMenemy from westbound Highway 96 know that they are legally entitled to turn into the far (most westerly) lane on McMenemy. See Appeals court: Minnetonka driver not wrong to go wide right while making left turn. Minneapolis Star Tribune, 2/20/20. (Even before this was publicized, vehicles regularly turned into that lane.)

The problem is that the McMenemy’s most westerly southbound lane between Highway 96 and Oakwood Terrace is only 151 feet long. It then abruptly ends in what traffic engineers refer to as a “lane drop.” Once that lane disappears, it becomes a right turn only lane to Oakwood Terrace. That right turn lane is only 104 feet long. Drivers do not have the time to recognize the lane drop. As a result, vehicles continuing south on McMenemy from Highway 96 travel through some or all of the short right turn lane at Oakwood Terrace despite the fact that they are continuing south on McMenemy.

Present congestion aggravates an already unsafe situation. Ramsey County, in a November 18, 2019 letter to Mr. Wall, told the City that northbound traffic on McMenemy already regularly backs up south of Oakwood Terrace and that the “potential for rear-end crashes at this location exists.”

Traffic engineers refer to “decision sight distances,” which relate to drivers needing time to “make complex decisions, when information is difficult to perceive or when unexpected or unusual maneuvers are required.” See MnDOT Road Design Manual, 2-5.08.03 (2012). It is well known that sight distances must be even greater in complex situations “such as lane drops.” Id.

For vehicles wishing to turn in either direction from Oakwood Terrace onto McMenemy, this makes it nearly impossible to predict if the southbound vehicles on
McMenemy plan to turn right on Oakwood Terrace or continue south on McMenemy.

2 Crash data dramatically underestimates the number of crashes in this area. I have driven through this intersection more than 25,000 times in the past 34 years and I have seen countless accidents and close calls that were not likely reported to authorities.

Combining this confusion with the limited sight distances to both the north and south makes it hazardous for vehicles to enter McMenemy from Oakwood Terrace. Motorists have too little time to safely judge gaps between northbound, southbound and turning (?) traffic on McMenemy. Under these circumstances, there is no amount of traffic re-engineering that can make this intersection safe for motorists.

By approving this traffic configuration many years ago, the City created this unsafe condition for its residents. Now, despite being warned of safety hazards during your January 7, 2019 public meeting, you have approved a zoning change to pave the way for a high density rental complex of 16-18 building and 180 units which will increase daily traffic by more than 1000 vehicles.

Every one of those vehicles will be required to use northbound McMenemy to gain access to westbound Highway 96 (because the other end of Oak Grove prohibits access to westbound Highway 96). Also, all vehicles westbound on Highway 96 will be required to use southbound McMenemy to access the complex (because no left turn is permitted from Highway 96 onto Oak Grove).

The January 29, 2020 Vadnais Heights Press reported on page one that the City Administrator “cautioned the council against considering existing and potential traffic issues near the site as reasons to deny the application. Regardless of the development scenario on the subject property, traffic in the area will increase . . . .” Such advice is dangerous and ill advised. That is like saying: “You should ignore the consequence of At-Home’s proposed development because it will not injure or kill any more people than other developments will.”

The City Code mandates that the “planned unit development zoning district (PUD) procedures are here set forth in order that the public . . . safety . . . be furthered . . . .” Ch. 38, Div. 15, Sec. 38-483. However, by approving this high density rental complex and the increased congestion that necessarily comes with it, you have chosen to further aggravate this unsafe condition and place the public at an increased risk of injury and death. Your decision, without any safety study, amounts to a deliberate disregard for the safety of Vadnais Heights’ citizens and those who work and visit here. There are significant limitations to governmental immunity when the City is aware of a threat to public safety and chooses to ignore it. Your refusal to take reasonable steps to assess the safety hazards to the public places the City at risk for liability, the cost of which will be borne by the residents.

I understand that my opinion may receive no more respect that you gave to the unanimous vocal position of your constituents or the near unanimous conclusion of our Planning Commission, but I just want to make this part of the public record for future reference.

Sincerely,

Chris Messerly
Chris Messerly
317 Timberline Trail Vadnais Heights, MN 55127

90382956.1

From: noreply@civicplus.com
To: Nolan Wall
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Public Input: At Home Apartments/Townhomes Project
Date: Sunday, March 29, 2020 11:17:01 AM

Public Input: At Home Apartments/Townhomes Project

Caution: This email originated outside our organization; please use caution.

Please submit your public comments regarding the At Home Apartments/Townhomes Project. All comments will be read in to the record at the Planning Commission Meeting on Thursday, April 2.

First Name Janice and Mike
Last Name Weum
Address 4488 Foothill Trail
City Vadnais Heights
State Minnesota
Zip Code 55127

Public Comment We are submitting this comment in favor of the proposed rezoning and PUD plan to allow for the residential development proposed by At Home Apartments. The Staff Presentation on March 24th shows a strong case for the changes and it appears neighborhood concerns have been addressed. The units are attractive, and the buffer landscaping and trail connections will be a positive addition to the neighborhood. We appreciate the developer’s commitment to bringing a residential alternative to the site.

Caution: This email originated outside our organization; please use caution.

Email not displaying correctly? View it in your browser.

Craig and Claire Moritz
244 Meadowood Lane
April 12, 2020

Mr. Nolan Wall,
Planning Commission Members,
Mayor Gunderson,
City Council Members
800 East County Road E
Vadnais Heights, MN 55127

Re: Rezoning, Final Planned Unit Development (PUD) Plan, and Site Plan Review SE Quadrant - Highway 96 and McMenemy Street by At Home Apartments, LLC
Planning Case 20-003

Dear Mr Wall, Mayor Gunderson and City Council Members,

This letter is intended for the meeting on April 15th. In the current environment, attending “public” meetings is not practical for us older folks and our comments are restricted to letters and email that we hope you will properly consider.

We are in general agreement with the updated project plans and At-Home is doing a good job of addressing concerns. However, we are still very concerned about the proposed 4-story height of the apartment building and continue to object to that part of At Home’s proposed development as we have stated in previous correspondence.

As stated previously, there is no apartment construction in Vadnais Heights greater than 3 stories that we know of and minimal apartment construction of greater heights in neighboring communities. On a drive down Highway 96 from White Bear Lake to I-35W, we did not find any buildings taller than 3 stories. A drive up I-35E from County Road E to Highway 96 now shows the Aster Meadows project towering over the western sound walls since the building topped out and a similar visual is apparent when driving north on Centerville Road or east on County Road F due to site elevation changes and the appearance of the building.

Approval of a 4-story apartment building will set a precedent for this type of construction anywhere within the City without proper consideration or public policy debate other than the Aster Meadows objections that apparently were short lived and now visually obvious from the 3-story construction being completed.

Now that the plans are more complete (although still visually misleading in our opinion), we determined the following:

- The existing elevations at the SW, NW, NE, and SE corners of the property are EL. 917, 921, 920, and 930 respectively.
The proposed apartment garage floor elevation is EL. 922 and the proposed first floor (ground floor) elevation is El 933.

The apartment building first/ground floor is approximately 10'-11’ higher than the town house first floor elevations on the west and south west side and as much as 16’ higher than the roads in the southwest corner and 12’-13’ higher than Highway 96.

In our opinion, the proposed 4-story building will visually present itself as a 5+ story building height from the southwest, west, and north sides given the proposed grading of the property and will only look like a 4-story building from the office park to the east and southeast where it least matters. While a 3-story building would look taller as well, the precedent for 3-story buildings is at least clear and allows for more flexibility in grading that can still result in a tall appearance.

In any case, the proposed height is without precedent in Vadnais Heights and will appear to be much taller when constructed, something the renderings do not accurately depict and are misleading to the casual reader of such documents. We had hoped that Aster Meadows had set a precedent for such projects but that does not seem to be the case and every project is subject to the whims of the City Council as opposed to a zoning plan or other such building constraints determined on a consensus basis over time.

Thank you for your consideration of our request to limit the proposed apartment building construction to 3-stories for the reasons stated. Please feel to contact us at any time.

Sincerely yours,

Craig Moritz, PE (retired)
Claire Moritz
Public Input: At Home Apartments/Townhomes Project

Please submit your public comments regarding the At Home Apartments/Townhomes Project. All comments will be read into the record at the Planning Commission Meeting on Wednesday, April 15.

First Name Regan
Last Name Carlson
Address 3935 Elmwood St.
City Vadnais Heights
State MN
Zip Code 55127

Public Comment Originally, my preference for the land use at this site was to keep it slated for business park development, hopefully higher job-creating office space. At this stage of the process I do support the At-Home project going forward, as I believe it will be of high quality, will serve a market demand for housing choice in the area, and will be a welcome addition to the city's tax base. I think the developer has been responsive in addressing traffic concerns. Other potential uses definitely could have created more local impacts, including traffic impacts, than this project. In the future, other traffic adjustments such as lowering the speed limit on Mcmenemy should be considered as needed.
Memorandum:

TO: Chair Cordes and Planning Commission Members
FROM: Nolan Wall, Planning/Community Development Director
DATE: April 28, 2020
SUBJECT: Staff Report: Planning Case 20-004
Zoning Code Amendment: R-3 District Ancillary Buildings
Gasparre Westwood Park, LLC

Description of the Request
The applicant is proposing amendments to City Code Chapter 38, Article III, Division 4 concerning the Residence Three (R-3) District.

Discussion
The City is using its legislative authority when considering action on a City Code amendment request and has broad discretion; the only limitations are that actions must be constitutional, rational, and in some way related to protecting the health, safety and general welfare of the public.

Action Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Received</th>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>60-day Deadline</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>120-day Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/23/2020</td>
<td>03/23/2020</td>
<td>05/22/2020</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>07/21/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background
The applicant owns and operates the Westwood Park Apartments located at 669 County Road D. The development contains two buildings with 48 total units on approximately three acres. The applicant is requesting a zoning code amendment to allow construction of an ancillary rental office/residential unit on the property.

Analysis
DRAFT Ordinance 742 (attached) adds “ancillary building as part of a multi-family residential development” as a conditional use in the R-3 District, with several conditions. The proposed conditions were drafted by staff and include the following:

• Only one such building is allowed on the property.
• Uses are limited to offices, one residential unit, attached garage/storage, and community facilities.
• Building height is limited to 35’ or no greater than the adjacent apartment buildings.
• Exterior materials have to match the existing apartment buildings.
• Size limited to 5,000 SF.
• Building setback 10’ from property boundary lines.
The proposed request in this case does not approve the actual construction of a building on the subject property, but creates the opportunity to pursue it further. As proposed, if approved, the property owner is required to submit separate conditional use permit and site plan applications prior to construction.

**Public Hearing Notice**
City Code Chapter 38, Article II, Section 38-35(c) requires a public hearing notice be published in the official newspaper and mailed to property owners within 350 feet of the subject property at least ten (10) days prior to the date of the hearing. The required notice was published in the April 15 edition of the Vadnais Heights Press and mailed to surrounding property owners on April 17.

**Recommended Commission Action**
Staff recommends approval of DRAFT Ordinance 742, as proposed or with any additional revisions recommended by the Planning Commission.

**Action Requested**
Following the public hearing, the Planning Commission may consider the following actions:

1. Recommend *approval* of DRAFT Ordinance 742.

   OR

2. Recommend *denial* of DRAFT Ordinance 742, based on findings of fact determined by the Planning Commission.

   OR

3. *Table* the request and advise staff to extend the application review period an additional 60 days, in compliance with Minn. Stat. Sec. 15.99.

Attachment(s):
- DRAFT Ordinance 742
- City Code Chapter 38, Article III, Division 4
- Application, including supporting materials
- Public Hearing Notice
The City Council of the City of Vadnais Heights does hereby ordain:

I.

Chapter 38, Article III, Division 4, Section 38-155(c) (Residence Three District) of the City Code is hereby amended to read as follows (strikethrough indicates deletions; underline indicates additions):

(8) Ancillary building as part of a multifamily residential development, subject to the following conditions:

a. No multifamily residential development shall have more than one (1) such building on the property.

b. Uses within the building shall be limited to office(s) for current employee(s) of the property management and/or leasing company, one residential unit for a current employee of the property management and/or leasing company, attached garage/storage space, or laundry and/or community facility for residents.

c. Building height shall not exceed 35 feet or the height of the existing multifamily residential building(s) on the property, whichever is less.

d. Building design and exterior materials shall match the existing multifamily residential building(s) on the property.

e. Building shall not exceed 5,000 square feet of total floor area.

f. Building shall be at least ten feet or more from all lot lines of adjoining lots and shall not be located within a drainage and utility easement.

II.

This Ordinance shall take effect and be enforced from and after its passage and publication.

PASSED by the City Council of the City of Vadnais Heights, Minnesota, this _____ day of __________, 2020.

______________________________
Heidi Gunderson, Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
Kevin Watson, City Administrator
DIVISION 4. - RESIDENCE THREE (R-3) DISTRICT

Sec. 38-154. - Purpose.

The purpose of the R-3 district is to provide for medium- to high-density housing in multiple-family structures and directly related complementary uses.

(Code 1999, § 11.010)

Sec. 38-155. - Uses in the R-3 district.

(a) **Permitted uses.** Permitted uses are as follows:
   (1) Multifamily residential structures containing four or less dwelling units.
   (2) All permitted uses in the R-2 district.

(b) **Accessory uses.** Accessory uses are as follows:
   (1) All accessory uses in an R-1 district.

(c) **Conditional uses.** Conditional uses are as follows:
   (1) Multifamily residential structures containing five or more dwelling units including apartments.
   (2) Housing intended for the elderly, which may include independent living, assisted living or memory care housing, congregate dining rooms, rooms or facilities shared among the residents, shops selling gifts or sundries, nursing services and help with daily activities.
   (3) Nursing homes, in compliance with section 38-159.
   (4) Public buildings.
   (5) Churches.
   (6) Schools.
   (7) Small wireless facilities, in compliance with section 38-606 and chapter 30, article III.


Sec. 38-156. - Lot area and dimension standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Minimum Lot Area Per Dwelling Unit</th>
<th>Minimum Lot Width</th>
<th>Minimum Lot Depth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-family detached dwelling</td>
<td>8,400 square feet</td>
<td>70 feet; 90 feet (corner lot)</td>
<td>120 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-family dwelling</td>
<td>5,000 square feet</td>
<td>80 feet; 100 feet (corner lot)</td>
<td>120 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three to eight-family dwelling</td>
<td>4,000 square feet</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Front Yard Setback</td>
<td>Side Yard Setbacks₁</td>
<td>Rear Yard Setback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family detached dwelling and two-family dwelling</td>
<td>25 feet; 40 feet (arterial street)</td>
<td>10 feet; 25 feet (corner)</td>
<td>40 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three to eight-family dwelling and townhouse</td>
<td>30 feet; 40 feet (arterial street)</td>
<td>20 feet²; 30 feet (corner)</td>
<td>30 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Senior housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>30 feet</th>
<th>20 feet (^2); 30 feet (corner)</th>
<th>30 feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apartment building</strong></td>
<td>No less than 35 feet, or 40 feet on an arterial street, or the average height of the building, whichever is greater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Measured from roof projections, as in section 38-101(3), for single-family detached and two-family dwellings.

\(^2\) Add six inches for each one foot over 20 feet that the average height of the building exceeds.


Sec. 38-159. - Nursing home regulations.

The following standards will be considered when reviewing an application for a conditional use permit for a nursing home:

1. Access will be via a collector or arterial street, as defined in the comprehensive plan.
2. Nearby housing will be buffered from parking, loading, pick-up areas and trash handling by location, orientation, setback, plantings, fencing and building.
3. Nearby housing will be shielded from exterior lighting glare.
4. Parking will be provided in compliance with section 38-610(e).


Sec. 38-160. - Wetland setbacks.

For purposes of the above setbacks, a delineated wetland edge shall be considered the same as a property line or right-of-way line; provided that rear yard attached decks up to ten feet in depth may intrude into the rear yard setback area. Variances to wetland setbacks may be considered by the city council where reasonable use of the land would be difficult or impossible if the standard were strictly adhered to considering the following factors:

1. When the lot is a minimum of 16,800 square feet and a large proportion of non-wetland area exists on the site;
2. When the proposed structures could be shown to minimize effects on the surrounding neighborhood and blend in with the character of the locality;
3. When the slope of the yard from the structures to the wetland is six to one or less;
4. When existing significant trees or vegetation could be saved by reducing setbacks;
5. The need for protection for various types of wetland;
6. When the intrusion into the wetland is minimal, as determined by the appropriate watershed district; or
7. When the applicant can mitigate any intrusion on or off site, as determined by the appropriate watershed district.

(Code 1999, § 11.055)
Sec. 38-161. - Minimum buildable area.

At least 4,200 square feet of the minimum lot area shall be non-wetland.

(Code 1999, § 11.057)

Sec. 38-162. - Parking requirements.

Off-street parking shall be provided in accordance with section 38-610. Parking areas or circulation drives shall be setback at least five feet from any lot line.

(Code 1999, § 11.060)

Sec. 38-163. - Accessory buildings.

Accessory buildings shall observe the same setback requirements established for the multiple-residence building, except that accessory buildings located within the rear yard of the multiple-residence building may be located to within ten feet of the rear or interior side property line. The city council may require common walls for accessory buildings where common walls will eliminate unsightly and hazardous areas.

(Code 1999, § 11.070)

Sec. 38-164. - Condominiums.

Condominiums, as defined and regulated by M.S.A. ch. 515, shall be considered as multiple-family dwelling structures in this chapter and shall be subject to all residence three district requirements, except as modified by the following:

1) Approval of condominiums floor plan. The condominium floor plan required in M.S.A. § 515.13 shall not be filed with the register of deeds until the same has been tendered to and approved by the city. A transparency of the floor plan shall be given to the city along with a copy of declaration required by M.S.A. § 515.11.

2) Converting existing structure to condominium use. Where any existing multiple-family dwelling is proposed for conversion to a condominium use:
   a. The proposed condominium use shall comply with all present zoning and building requirements.
   b. A certificate of occupancy for each unit shall be obtained under section 8-107 prior to approval of the floor plan.

3) Condominium minimum unit size. Each unit of a condominium shall have minimum dimensions and minimum number of rooms as set forth in section 8-57.


Secs. 38-165—38-181. - Reserved.
Dear Planning Commission and City Council:

Pursuant to Section 38-155; I’m requesting an approval for a conditional use permit to build a rental office/single residential unit for staff to work and live onsite. Currently there is no staff living at Westwood Park Apartments. The proposed office building will be consistent with the current property design. The purpose of this would be to foster a harmonious working relationship with the onsite residents by having staff visible and working onsite. Also, it will protect and enhance the property values, promote the safety, peace, comfort and convenience of its onsite residents.

I’m writing to ask that you consider my request for a Zoning Code Amendment to Section 38-155 Uses in the R-3 district.

I welcome any questions and hope that you seriously consider my request.

Mark Gasparre
Owner
### ZONING CODE AMENDMENT APPLICATION

The City of Vadnais Heights  
800 East County Road E • Vadnais Heights, MN 55127  
Phone: 651.204.6015 • Fax: 651.204.6100  
www.cityvadnaishights.com

**Applicant:** Gasparre Westwood Park, LLC.  
**Address:** 669 & 689 County Road D.  
**City:** Vadnais Heights  
**State:** MN  
**Zip:** 55109  
**Phone:** 612 _315 _5316  
**Cell:** 612 _655 _0542  
**E-mail:** stephen@mgmmgmt.net

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section of Zoning Code requested to be amended:</th>
<th>Sec. 38-155 Uses in the R-3 district</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed language or text requested to be added/deleted (attach a separate sheet if necessary):</th>
<th>Pursuant to Sec. 38-155 approve a conditional use permit to build a rental office/single residential unit structure.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons(s) for amendment request:</th>
<th>To build an auxiliary building with a rental office/single residential unit for staff to work and live onsite.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How will the community’s goals be furthered by the proposed amendment?:</th>
<th>Westwood Park Apartments would have staff living and working on the property.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justify or explain how this proposed amendment will not be injurious to or is keeping with the spirit and intent of the City Code:</th>
<th>Foster a harmonious working relationship with the onsite residents. Protect and enhance the property values. Protect and promote the safety, peace, comfort, and convenience of its onsite residents.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Mark [Signature]**  
**Date:** 3 - 9 - 2020  
**Applicant Signature**  
**3 - 9 - 2020**  
**Date**
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Vadnais Heights City Planning Commission will meet and conduct a public hearing on Tuesday, April 28, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall, 800 E. County Road E, to consider an Amendment to the Zoning Code application submitted by Gasparre Westwood Park, LLC, to allow for an accessory structure to serve as rental office/community space.

The legal Parcel Identification Number is 323022440003, Ramsey County, Minnesota.

The subject property is located at 669 County Road D East, Vadnais Heights.

Anyone wishing to be heard in regard to this matter will be given an opportunity at this time. The application is available for public review at City Hall during normal business hours. Questions or comments should be directed to Nolan Wall, Planning and Community Development Director, at 651-204-6027 or nolan.wall@cityvadnaishights.com.

FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF VADNAIS HEIGHTS

Kevin P. Watson
City Administrator

Dated: April 9, 2020
Memorandum:

TO: Chair Cordes and Planning Commission Members

FROM: Nolan Wall, Planning/Community Development Director

DATE: January 28, 2020

SUBJECT: Staff Report: Planning Case 20-005

Variances and Site Plan Review: 3590 Arcade Street
Davis Real Estate Services Group, LLC: Midwest ENT Parking Expansion

Description of the Request

The applicant/property owner is requesting the following actions to construct a parking lot expansion at the Midwest ENT property:
1. Setback variances.
2. Site plan review.

City Code Chapter 38, Article II, Section 38-38(a) allows departures from the literal provisions of the Code by the granting of a variance. City Code Chapter 38, Article II, Section 38-39(a) requires site plan review for all commercial developments prior to issuance of a building permit.

Discussion

The City is using its quasi-judicial authority when considering action on zoning requests and has limited discretion; a determination regarding whether or not the request meets the applicable code standards is required.

Action Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Received</th>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>60-day Deadline</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>120-day Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/26/2020</td>
<td>04/08/2020</td>
<td>06/07/2020</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>08/06/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The application and supporting materials were received on March 26 and the applicant was notified in writing on April 6 that the application was incomplete. Upon receipt of the required additional materials, the request was determined to be complete on April 8. In accordance with Minnesota Statutes Section 15.99, the required 60-day action deadline is June 7.

Development Summary

Site Size: 27,105 SF (+/- 0.62 Acres)
Zoning District: City Center (CC)
Existing Land Use: Public, Institutional, or Utility
Adjacent Existing Land Uses: North/South/West: Commercial
East: Public, Institutional, or Utility

Future Land Use:
City Center

Adjacent Future Land Uses:
North/South/East/West: City Center

Wetlands:
None present

Background
The subject property is an undeveloped remnant parcel from the park-and-ride facility to the east and was recently purchased by the applicant from the Metropolitan Council. The applicant also owns and developed the Midwest ENT medical-office building on the adjacent parcel to the west in 2018. The proposed parking lot expansion is intended to be utilized by employees and for overflow, as needed.

Analysis
The requests in this case include the following analysis:

Comprehensive Plan
The subject property is guided “City Center” in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. The proposed use is a permitted accessory use within the applicable zoning district.

Site Plan Review
According to City Code Chapter 38, Article II, Section 38-39:

In consideration of site plan applications under this section, the planning commission and city council shall consider the following: interrelationship with the site plan elements to conditions both on and off the property; conformance to the city's comprehensive plan; the impact of the plan on the existing and anticipated traffic and parking conditions; the adequacy of the site plan with respect to land use; pedestrian and vehicular ingress and egress; building location and height; architectural and engineering features; landscaping; lighting; provisions for utilities; site drainage; open space; loading and unloading areas; grading; signage; screening; setbacks; and other related matters. The planning commission may recommend, and the city council may impose, conditions of approval that are deemed necessary.

The applicable standards are analyzed as follows:

Interrelationship with Surrounding Properties/Land Uses
The surrounding area includes Wal-Mart to the north; Summit Orthopedics to the south; Metropolitan Council park-and-ride facility to the east; and Midwest ENT to the west (see attached aerial map). No adverse impacts to surrounding properties are anticipated.

Traffic
No adverse impacts to the existing traffic patterns in the surrounding area are anticipated.

Parking
The proposed project adds 51 parking spaces for use by the adjacent medical-office building. The existing parking lot contains 53 spaces and was compliant with the applicable standards when developed. The proposed parking lot will be utilized by employees and for overflow, as needed. The City Code requires 90-degree parking spaces to be 9’ wide by 19’ long, drive lane width of 24’, and curb cut no wider than 24’; the proposed parking facilities meet the applicable standards.
In addition, the access driveway to the proposed parking lot is greater than 40’ from the nearest intersection and no parking spaces have direct access from the street, as required by the City Code. The parking lot grade, surfacing, striping will be required to meet the applicable City Code standards and will be reviewed in greater detail as part of the building permit process.

Pedestrian and Vehicular Ingress/Egress
The proposed project adds sidewalk extensions around the east and north sides of the existing building. A new curb cut is proposed from the existing private/shared driveway, which is mostly used as a secondary access point for the surrounding uses. Staff does not anticipate any issues accommodating the increased traffic.

Building Location and Height
Not applicable, there is no building being constructed.

Architectural Features
Not applicable, there is no building being constructed.

Screening/Landscaping
According to the City Code, concerning the minimum required major/over-story trees, commercial developments shall contain at a minimum the greater of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Required Trees</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One (1) tree per 1,000 square feet of gross building floor area</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One (1) tree per 800 square feet of landscaped area</td>
<td>7,100 SF/800 = 9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One (1) tree per 50 lineal feet of site perimeter</td>
<td>693 LF/50 = 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source(s): City Code Chapter 38, Article IV, Section 601(b)(2); Landscape Plan (sheet L1-1)

The proposed project removes all existing vegetation on the subject property and the Landscape Plan (see sheet L1-1) includes 14 deciduous and coniferous major/over-story trees, which is compliant with the required amount based on the applicable standard above. In addition, five existing trees along the northern property boundary line are proposed to be temporarily removed for construction of the storm sewer connection and will be re-planted. VLAWMO and SEH both expressed concerns about the proposed plantings within the bio-filtration basin and recommended that they be relocated to other areas of the site.

The City Center District requires that plantings are one-thirds conifers and two-thirds deciduous of certain species, and the proposed Landscape Plan is not entirely compliant with the applicable ratios, required species, or planting sizes (see table below). Staff has included a condition that requires the proper coniferous-to-deciduous ratio and planting sizes in a revised landscape plan. However, the species match those allowed for the original development, as part of the PUD Overlay process, and should be allowed as proposed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Planting</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deciduous</td>
<td>Sienna Glen Maple</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>River Burch</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skyline Honeylocust</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coniferous</td>
<td>Austrian Pine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black Hills Spruce</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source(s): Landscape Plan (sheet L1-1)
The Code requires planting islands and at least 4% landscaping within off-street parking lots to visually break-up expanses of hard surface areas, allow safe and efficient traffic movement, and define rows of parking. The proposed parking lot includes landscape islands and approximately 28% of the lot is landscaped/pervious surface (see sheet L1-1).

**Lighting**
Staff included a recommended condition of approval that a photometric plan with lighting specifications is submitted to be included in the subsequent development agreement amendment.

**Utilities**
The proposed project includes new storm sewer facilities, a connection to the existing system, and drain tile. All new and existing facilities are privately-owned and maintained.

**Site Drainage**
The applicant submitted a Stormwater Management Plan for the proposed project that was reviewed by VLAWMO and SEH (see attached memos). As proposed, the site drains to a bio-filtration basin in the northeast corner of the site that is designed for rate control and water quality prior to discharging off-site.

**Open Space/Lot Coverage**
The lot coverage of the site is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impervious – Existing</td>
<td>0 SF</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impervious – Proposed</td>
<td>19,522 SF</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pervious – Existing</td>
<td>27,105 SF</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pervious – Proposed</td>
<td>7,583 SF</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source(s): Site Plan (sheet C2-1)

The proposed project provides ample pervious surfaces to reduce/manage drainage and provide for adequate landscaping. The flexibility granted as part of the PUD Overlay for the original development concerning lot coverage/screening/landscaping standards are recommended to be observed in this case.

**Loading/Unloading Areas**
Not applicable, there are no new loading/unloading areas being proposed.

**Grading**
The Director of Public Works/City Engineer and VLAWMO reviewed the proposed Grading and Erosion Control Plans (see sheets C3-1 and C3-2) and their comments are included in the attached memos and acknowledged in the recommended conditions of approval.

**Signage**
Not applicable, there is no new signage being proposed.

**Setbacks**
The City Center District requires a 10’ setback from interior lot lines, which is the only applicable standard in this case since the proposed parking lot borders private driveways and parking lots, not any public streets. The proposed parking lot includes the following setbacks (see sheet C2-1):

- North = 4.3’
- South = 7.4’
- East = 2.9’
- West = 10’
Variances
The proposed project requires three variances from the applicable interior lot line setback standards for a parking lot/circulation drive. When considering the proposed variance requests in this case, the City is required to find that:

1. *The requests are in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the ordinance and comprehensive plan and the applicant proposes to use the property in a reasonable manner.*

The proposed use is a permitted accessory use in the applicable zoning district and is compliant with the comprehensive plan.

2. *The applicant establishes there are practical difficulties with complying with the ordinance due to circumstances that are unique to the property, which are not created by the applicant or based on economic considerations.*

The subject property is under an acre and has limited development potential on its own, particularly when accounting for surface parking and stormwater management. As such, a parking lot expansion for the existing adjacent development is the likely the highest-and-best use. In an effort to maximize the number of spaces and comply with the required drive-aisle width and parking space dimension standards, the proposed setback variances are necessary and warranted.

In addition, the existing Midwest ENT development was approved under the PUD Overlay process and was granted flexibility from the parking lot setbacks due to some of the same site constraints as in this case. The proposed setbacks are consistent with those previously-granted and compliance with the applicable standards would decrease the amount of available parking spaces and potentially would make the project infeasible. The site’s size and location are constraints that create practical difficulties for other potential development scenarios.

3. *The requests will not alter the essential character of the locality.*

The subject property is currently undeveloped and is bordered by an existing building and other parking lots. Therefore, the proposed project will not alter the essential character of the area.

Agency/Department Review
The following agencies/departments provided comments on the requests in this case.

*Consulting City Engineer (SEH)*
See the attached memorandum, which is acknowledged in the recommendations section.

*VLAWMO*
See the attached memorandum, which is acknowledged in the recommendations section.

*Fire Department*
See the attached memorandum, which is acknowledged in the recommendations section.

*Public Works/Engineering Department*
See the attached memorandum, which is acknowledged in the recommendations section.
Public Hearing Notice
City Code Chapter 38, Article II, Sections 38-38(c) and 38-39(d), respectively, requires a public hearing notice be published in the official newspaper and mailed to property owners within 350 feet of the subject property at least ten (10) days prior to the date of the hearing. The required notice was published in the April 15 edition of the Vadnais Heights Press and mailed to surrounding property owners on April 17.

Recommended Commission Action
Staff recommends approval of the proposed variance and site plan requests, based on the following findings of fact:

1. The proposed project will be integrated into the adjacent development and adds parking capacity for employees and overflow, if needed.
2. The proposed use is a permitted accessory use in the applicable zoning district and is compliant with the comprehensive plan.
3. The subject property is likely too small to support a viable, stand-alone development and the proposed parking lot setbacks closely match those approved for the adjacent development under the PUD Overlay process.
4. The proposed project will not alter the essential character of the area.

Subject to the following conditions:

1. A development agreement amendment between the property owner, and all others with interests in the subject property, shall be entered into with the City, to be recorded at the applicant’s cost with the offices of the Ramsey County Recorder and/or Register of Titles, prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. A grading permit in compliance with all applicable code standards shall be submitted prior to commencement of any construction activities on the subject property, to be reviewed/approved administratively.
3. A stormwater operation and maintenance agreement between the property owner, and all others with interests in the subject property, shall be entered into with the City, to be recorded at the applicant’s cost with the offices of the Ramsey County Recorder and/or Register of Titles, within six (6) months of completion of the proposed project.
4. The off-street parking lot and driveways shall be constructed and operated in compliance with the applicable code standards, to be reviewed/approved administratively as part of the building permit.
5. Retaining walls in excess of four (4) feet in height shall require engineering design, to be reviewed/approved administratively as part of the building permit.
6. A photometric lighting plan shall be submitted for inclusion in a subsequent development agreement amendment.
7. The landscape plan shall be revised to comply with the required standards and agency/department comments, to be included in a subsequent development agreement amendment.
8. The property owner shall re-plant any vegetation removed to construct the required utility connections.
9. The subject parcel shall be combined with the adjacent parcel to the west, to be recorded at the applicant’s cost with the offices of the Ramsey County Recorder and/or Register of Titles.
10. Compliance with the conditions included in SEH’s memorandum, dated 04/16/2020.
11. Compliance with the conditions included in VLAWMO’s memorandum, dated 04/16/2020.
12. Compliance with the conditions included in the Fire Chief’s memorandum, dated 04/15/2020.
13. Compliance with the conditions included in the Director of Public Works/City Engineer memorandum, dated 04/21/2020.
Action Requested
Following the public hearing, the Planning Commission may consider the following actions:

1. Recommend approval of the proposed variance and site plan requests, based on the findings of fact, with conditions.

   OR

2. Recommend denial of the proposed variances and site plan requests, based on the findings of fact determined by the Planning Commission.

   OR

3. Table the request and advise staff to extend the application review period an additional 60 days, in compliance with Minn. Stat. Sec. 15.99.

Attachment(s):
- Aerial site map
- SEH memorandum, dated April 14, 2020
- VLA/MO memorandum, dated April 14, 2020
- Fire Department memorandum, dated April 15, 2020
- Director of Public Works/City Engineer memorandum, dated April 21, 2020
- Applications, including supporting materials
- Public Hearing Notice
I have reviewed the Stormwater Management Plan, dated April 7, 2020, and the construction plans, dated April 8, 2020 for the proposed Midwest ENT facility located south of Walmart on Arcade Street in Vadnais Heights, Minnesota. The proposed development will add approximately 0.45 acres of new impervious surfaces. I have the following comments:

1. A bio-filtration basin is being proposed. Provide information on if the feasibility of infiltration was investigated.
2. The drain tile flow arrows connected to CB 1 (sheet C4-1) indicate that water may be draining away from the basin. Identify where this water draining to.
3. There are three trees proposed in the filtration basin. Comment on any concerns with how the tree roots may affect the drain tile or filtration integrity and future filtration basin maintenance.
TO: Nolan Wall
FROM: Brian Corcoran Vadnais Lake Area WMO (VLAWMO)
DATE: April 16, 2020
SUBJECT: Comments – Vadnais Heights ENT Parking Addition (Case 20-005) – Vadnais Heights

Nolan,

Below are our comments to Vadnais Heights ENT Parking Addition Stormwater Management Plan & Site Plan received 4-9-2020.

- Volume and runoff rates meet current VLAWMO standards for this project.
- VLAWMO recommends no trees be planted within the proposed filtration basin.
- A Stormwater System Operations & Maintenance agreement is required by VLAWMO for the proposed bio-filtration basin and will go through the City of Vadnais Heights.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Brian Corcoran
Memorandum:

FROM: Dustin Kalis, Fire Technician

DATE: April 15, 2020

SUBJECT: Midwest ENT Parking Expansion

The Vadnais Heights Fire Department has reviewed the plans submitted for the Midwest ENT Parking Expansion. The following are our requirements:

- All roads and drive lanes shall meet the Minnesota State Fire Code and Vadnais Heights Fire Department requirements for widths and turning radiuses.
Memorandum:

TO: Nolan Wall, Planning/Community Development Director
FROM: Jesse Farrell, Director of Public Works / City Engineer
DATE: April 21, 2020
RE: Midwest ENT Vadnais Heights Parking Expansion
Site Development Plan Review Comments

I have reviewed the plans dated April 8, 2020 and received April 9, 2020 and offer the following comments:

The plan set consists of a 9 sheet plan document from Loucks,Inc. from Maple Grove, MN.

**Sheet C2-1 Site Plan:** Remove “Ed Leier” and replace with Interim Fire Chief “Chris Hearden”. Remove note from subsequent sheets. If necessary, depict pavement removal extents for forming concrete driveway apron. Carry gutter slope through the apron. Depict dimension from proposed wall (near SE property line) to lot line.

**Sheet C3-1 Grading Plan:** Revise FFE.

Overall, the information provided is very thorough and appropriate for the Development Plan. The proposed biofiltration basin will need an operation and maintenance agreement, or needs to be properly incorporated into any existing operation and maintenance agreement.

I am familiar with the high quality services Loucks provides, and I am confident in their engineer’s abilities for the civil engineering aspects of this project.

Please forward this memorandum to the applicant and let me know if there are any questions.
VARIANCE APPLICATION
The City of Vadnais Heights
800 East County Road E • Vadnais Heights, MN 55127
Phone: 651.204.6015 • Fax: 651.204.6100
www.cityvadnaisheights.com

Mark A. Davis - Davis Real Estate Services Group, LLC

Applicant: ____________________________________________

Address: 33 South 6th Street, Ste. 4650

City: Minneapolis State: MN Zip: 55402

Phone: 612 341 3242 Cell: 612 889 0641 E-mail: mdavis@davishe.com

Fee Owner: Arcade MOB Partners, LLC - Mark A. Davis, Manager

Address: 33 South 6th Street, Ste. 4650

City: Minneapolis State: MN Zip: 55402

Phone: 612 341 3242 Cell: 612 889 0641 E-mail: mdavis@davishe.com

Property Address: 3590 Arcade Street

Legal Description of Property (attach separate sheet if necessary):

Lot 1 Block 1 of Vadnais Heights City Center 3rd Addition

Zoning: CC - City Center District Land Use Designation: CC - City Center District

Present Use of Property: Vacant Land

Description of Variance Request: Additional Parking for Midwest ENT. To add the additional parking, a variance is being requested for parking setback. The plan is to match setbacks that were approved for the Existing Midwest ENT parking lot.

City Code Section: Sec. 38-452 - Setback Standards for City Center District

Applicant’s Signature 3/26/20

Property Owner’s Signature (if different from applicant) 3/26/20

Page 1 of 6
Updated 1/16/2019
Section 38-39 of the City Code requires all proposed multi-family dwellings of three or more units, developments in the Water Management Overlay District, and all commercial/industrial developments to have site plan approval obtained prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Applicant: Mark A. Davis - Davis Real Estate Services Group, LLC
Address: 33 South 6th Street, Ste. 4650
City: Minneapolis State: MN Zip: 55402
Phone: 612.341.3242 Cell: 612.889.0641 E-mail: mdavis@davishe.com

Fee Owner: Arcade MOB Partners, LLC - Mark A. Davis, Manager
Address: 33 South 6th Street, Ste. 4650
City: Minneapolis State: MN Zip: 55402
Phone: 612.341.3242 Cell: 612.889.0641 E-mail: mdavis@davishe.com

Project Name: Midwest ENT Parking Expansion
Property Address: 3590 Arcade Street

Legal Description of Property (attach a separate sheet if necessary):
Lot 1 Block 1 of Vadnais Heights City Center 3rd Addition

Zoning: CC - City Center District Land Use Plan Designation: CC - City Center District
Present Use of Property: Vacant Land
Proposed Use of Property: Additional Parking for Midwest ENT

Applicant Signature: [Signature]
Date: 3/20/20

Property Owner Signature (if different from applicant): [Signature]
Date: 3/20/20
DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY SURVEYED

The property depicted on the survey and the measurements hereon are the same as the property and the measurements made in the commitment for title insurance issued by Commercial Partners Title, Inc. as agent for

TITLE COMMITMENT EXCEPTIONS

1. The easements described in the Commitment for Title Insurance issued by Commercial Partners Title, LLC as agent for

2. The easements described in the Commitment for Title Insurance issued by Commercial Partners Title, LLC as agent for

3. The easements described in the Commitment for Title Insurance issued by Commercial Partners Title, LLC as agent for

4. The easements described in the Commitment for Title Insurance issued by Commercial Partners Title, LLC as agent for

5. The easements described in the Commitment for Title Insurance issued by Commercial Partners Title, LLC as agent for

6. The easements described in the Commitment for Title Insurance issued by Commercial Partners Title, LLC as agent for

7. The easements described in the Commitment for Title Insurance issued by Commercial Partners Title, LLC as agent for

8. The easements described in the Commitment for Title Insurance issued by Commercial Partners Title, LLC as agent for

9. The easements described in the Commitment for Title Insurance issued by Commercial Partners Title, LLC as agent for

10. The easements described in the Commitment for Title Insurance issued by Commercial Partners Title, LLC as agent for

11. The easements described in the Commitment for Title Insurance issued by Commercial Partners Title, LLC as agent for

12. The easements described in the Commitment for Title Insurance issued by Commercial Partners Title, LLC as agent for

13. The easements described in the Commitment for Title Insurance issued by Commercial Partners Title, LLC as agent for

14. The easements described in the Commitment for Title Insurance issued by Commercial Partners Title, LLC as agent for

15. The easements described in the Commitment for Title Insurance issued by Commercial Partners Title, LLC as agent for

16. The easements described in the Commitment for Title Insurance issued by Commercial Partners Title, LLC as agent for

17. The easements described in the Commitment for Title Insurance issued by Commercial Partners Title, LLC as agent for

18. The easements described in the Commitment for Title Insurance issued by Commercial Partners Title, LLC as agent for

19. The easements described in the Commitment for Title Insurance issued by Commercial Partners Title, LLC as agent for

20. The easements described in the Commitment for Title Insurance issued by Commercial Partners Title, LLC as agent for

ALTA/NSPS OPTIONAL TABLE A NOTES

1. Monuments placed or a reference monument or centerline to the center or middle course of the boundary of the property, unless already marked or otherwise existing existing monuments or structures on or adjacent to the property are identified by a reference to such monument, centerline, or structures or by a reference to the record location of such monument, centerline, or structures.

2. The site plan is dated

3. The site plan is dated

4. The site plan is dated

5. The site plan is dated

6. The site plan is dated

7. The site plan is dated

8. The site plan is dated

9. The site plan is dated

10. The site plan is dated

11. The site plan is dated

12. The site plan is dated

13. The site plan is dated

14. The site plan is dated

15. The site plan is dated

16. The site plan is dated

17. The site plan is dated

18. The site plan is dated

19. The site plan is dated

20. The site plan is dated

SURVEY REPORT

The bearings for this survey are based on the Ramsey County Coordinate System NAD 83 (1986 Adjust).

ALTA/NSPS LAND TITLE SURVEY

(04/03/2020)
PROPOSED BIOFILTRATION BASIN

LEGEND

- CENTRAL MASC
- STORM DRAIN
- SHARPLY SLOPED
- SANITARY SWALE
- SOIL
- LID
- PWV
- LID SWALE
- SMALL SWALE
- LARGE SWALE
- SWALE
- FENCE
- TELEPHONE TRENCH
- ROAD
- POWER
- WATER MAIN
- HYDRANT
- FENCE

GRAVING, DRAINAGE & EROSION CONTROL NOTES

1. EROSION CONTROL REQUIREMENTS SHOWN ARE BASED ON A 95% LIKELIHOOD OF OCCURRENCE OVER A 10 YEAR PERIOD. SMALLER CATCHMENTS ARE TO BE DETERMINED BASED ON LOCAL EXPERIENCE.
2. CHECKDRAIN AND SHARPLY SLOPED AREAS WILL BE BOUND WITH EROSION CONTROL STRIPS TO MEET REQUIREMENTS. NO ELECTRICAL BOXES OR OVERHEAD STRUCTURES ARE TO INTRUDE THE BOUNDARY OF THE SHARPLY SLOPED AREAS.
3. GRAVING OF THE INFLUENTS MEANS WILL BE ACOMPLISHED USING CONVEYOR BELTING EQUIPMENT TO MINIMIZE CONTACT OF THE CONVEYING MEANS. SMALL CATCHMENTS AND SHARPLY SLOPED AREAS ARE TO BE ACCOMPLISHED USING MACHINERY OR EQUIPMENT RECOMMENDED BY THE CONTRACTOR.
4. FOR SITE RAINFALL 50% OF GRAVING AREA IS TO BE COVERED WITH TOPSOIL. TOPSOIL IS TO BE COVERED WITH DEBRIS MATERIAL OR PROVIDE A DEBRIS SCREEN AS RECOMMENDED BY THE CONTRACTOR.
5. DRAINAGE OF THE EROSION CONTROL STRIPS ARE TO BE PAVED WITH PAVEMENT QUALITY MATERIAL. SITE UV STABILITY IS TO BE TESTING ON A SITE BASED ON DRAINAGE STRIPS.
6. DRAINAGE IS TO BE LIDDED AS REQUIRED. SITE UV STABILITY IS TO BE TESTING ON A SITE BASED ON DRAINAGE STRIPS.
7. SITE UV STABILITY IS TO BE TESTING ON A SITE BASED ON DRAINAGE STRIPS.
8. ALL DRAINAGE REINFORCED AREAS ARE TO BE ACCOMPLISHED USING REINFORCEMENT MEANS PERMITTED BY THE CONTRACTOR.
9. SITE UV STABILITY IS TO BE TESTING ON A SITE BASED ON DRAINAGE STRIPS.
10. SITE UV STABILITY IS TO BE TESTING ON A SITE BASED ON DRAINAGE STRIPS.
11. SITE UV STABILITY IS TO BE TESTING ON A SITE BASED ON DRAINAGE STRIPS.
12. SITE UV STABILITY IS TO BE TESTING ON A SITE BASED ON DRAINAGE STRIPS.
13. SITE UV STABILITY IS TO BE TESTING ON A SITE BASED ON DRAINAGE STRIPS.
14. SITE UV STABILITY IS TO BE TESTING ON A SITE BASED ON DRAINAGE STRIPS.
15. SITE UV STABILITY IS TO BE TESTING ON A SITE BASED ON DRAINAGE STRIPS.
16. SITE UV STABILITY IS TO BE TESTING ON A SITE BASED ON DRAINAGE STRIPS.
17. SITE UV STABILITY IS TO BE TESTING ON A SITE BASED ON DRAINAGE STRIPS.
18. SITE UV STABILITY IS TO BE TESTING ON A SITE BASED ON DRAINAGE STRIPS.
19. SITE UV STABILITY IS TO BE TESTING ON A SITE BASED ON DRAINAGE STRIPS.
20. SITE UV STABILITY IS TO BE TESTING ON A SITE BASED ON DRAINAGE STRIPS.

WARNING:

THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR CALLING FOR LOCATIONS OF ALL EREETING UTILITIES. THEY SHALL COOPERATE WITH ALL UTILITY COMPANIES IN WITHDRAWN THEIR SERVICES AND LOCATION OF LINES.

THE CONTRACTOR SHALL CONTACT Gopher State One Call at 651-444-6000 AT LEAST 48 HOURS IN ADVANCE FOR THE LOCATIONS OF ALL UNDERGROUND WIRLINES, CABLES, CONDUITS, PIPELINES, VALVES OR OTHER RE-BURIED STRUCTURES BEFORE ENGAGING. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL REPAIR OR DEFINE THE LOCATIONS WHEN DAMAGED DURING CONSTRUCTION AS NECESSARY TO THE OWNER.
SITE PLAN LEGEND

- Existing Building
- Parking Stall Count
- Parking Setback Line
- Direction of Flow
- Chain Link Fence
- Storm Manhole
- Retaining Wall
- Spot Elevation
- Water Service
- Storm Sewer
- Soil Boring
- Light Pole
- Building
- Tree Line
- No Parking
- Force Main
- Erosion Control Blanket
- Bio-Blanket
- Biological Blanket

EROSION CONTROL NOTES

1. All disturbed areas shall be revegetated at a rate of 75% topsoil + 25% subsoil. Erosion control measures shall be undertaken to ensure all disturbed areas are stabilized within 30 days following construction.

2. Storm water shall be flushed and deep washing of sediment collectors and retention ponds shall not be allowed until 30 days following construction. Alternatively, sediment basins shall be constructed and sod or erosion control blankets installed as needed.热敏色带用于标记。

3. All construction sites shall be stabilised immediately after construction is completed.

4. A street shall be closed to ensure no vehicles in or out of the site.

5. The contractor shall ensure all storm water basins are installed per manufacturers’ instructions and approval by the local authorities.

6. Rip rap protection shall be installed after construction is completed.

7. Erosion control measures shall be installed before construction is completed.

8. All areas within the construction site shall be considered as disturbed areas.

9. All disturbed areas shall be protected with all means of potential erosion control measures.

10. The contractor shall maintain and protect all erosion control measures.

CONTRACTOR TO CALL CITY FIRE DEPARTMENT ONCE CURB STAKES HAVE BEEN INSTALLED TO VERIFY CITY FIRE TRUCK CAN MANEUVER THROUGH THE SITE. CONTACT ED LEHER, FIRE CHIEF FOR COORDINATION AT 651-204-6032.

WARNING:

The contractor shall be responsible for calling for locations of all existing utilities. They shall cooperate with all utility companies in maintaining a clear service area and/or relocation of lines.

The contractor shall contact Gopher State One Call at 651-454-6035 at least 24 hours in advance for the location of all underground wires, cables, conduits, pipes, manholes, valves or other buried structures before excavation. The contractor shall be responsible for additional costs when damaged during construction as well as the cost to repair.

OWNER.
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Gopher State One Call
**LANDSCAPE PLAN**

**PLANT SCHEDULE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Betula nigra</td>
<td>Retaining Wall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **GENERAL NOTES**
  - Existing trees shall be protected and preserved as needed. Any trees to be removed shall be approved by the City of Maple Grove prior to removal. All existing trees shall be marked to indicate the location and size.

- **IRRIGATION NOTES**
  - Irrigation systems shall be installed in accordance with the approved irrigation plans. All irrigation heads shall be installed by the contractor.
  - Irrigation systems shall be tested and adjusted to ensure proper coverage and efficiency.

- **LANDSCAPE REQUIREMENTS**
  - The number of trees shall be determined by the landscape architect. Trees shall be planted in accordance with the approved tree planting plan.

**WARNING:**

The contractor shall be responsible for notifying the City of Maple Grove of any changes to the planting plan. Any trees to be removed shall be approved by the City of Maple Grove prior to removal.
CONIFEROUS TREE

PLANT MATERIAL INSTALLATION

ALL PROPOSED PLANTS SHALL BE LOCATED AND STAKED AS SHOWN IN THE DESIGN. A REVIEW DATE

CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR TESTING THE SOIL AND MATERIALS MAY BE NEEDED IN FIELD. SHOULD AN ADJUSTMENT BE

ALSO MENTIONED IN THE SPECIFICATIONS AND SHALL BE FOLDED INTO THE SPECIFICATIONS PRIOR TO COMPLETION AND PLANTING.

CONSTRUCTION DETAILS

SOD DIFFERENT PLANT MATERIALS ARE SET OR LOCATED, REMOVE ALL PLANT MATERIALS EXCEPT FOR PLANTS.

SOD INSTALLATION

ANY STAKING IS OPTIONAL. CONSIDERED PRACTICAL

CIVIL ENGINEERING

Landscape Drawing Presentation
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NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Vadnais Heights City Planning Commission will meet and conduct a public hearing on Tuesday, April 28, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall, 800 E. County Road E, to consider applications submitted by Davis Real Estate Services Group, LLC, obo Midwest ENT, for a Site Plan and Variance, for the purpose of a parking lot expansion.

The legal Parcel Identification Number is 333022220037, Ramsey County, Minnesota.

The subject property is located at 3590 Arcade Street, Vadnais Heights.

Anyone wishing to be heard in regard to this matter will be given an opportunity at this time. The application is available for public review at City Hall during normal business hours. Questions or comments should be directed to Nolan Wall, Planning and Community Development Director, at 651-204-6027 or nolan.wall@cityvadnaisheights.com.

FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF VADNAIS HEIGHTS

Kevin P. Watson
City Administrator

Dated: April 9, 2020

Mailed 4-17-20