



Approved: May 10, 2021

**CITY OF ARDEN HILLS, MINNESOTA
REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING
APRIL 26, 2021
7:00 P.M. - ARDEN HILLS CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Pursuant to due call and notice thereof, Mayor David Grant called to order the regular City Council meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Note: On March 20th, 2020 the Mayor signed a determination allowing Councilmembers to participate in City Council meetings via telephone pursuant to State Statute 13D.021

Present: Mayor David Grant, Councilmembers Brenda Holden, Fran Holmes, and Steve Scott

Absent: Councilmember Dave McClung (Excused)

Also present: City Administrator Dave Perrault; Interim Public Works Director David Swearingen; Finance Director Gayle Bauman; City Attorney Joel Jamnik; and City Clerk Julie Hanson

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION: Councilmember Holden moved and Councilmember Holmes seconded a motion to approve the meeting agenda as presented. A roll call vote was taken. The motion carried (4-0).

2. PUBLIC INQUIRIES/INFORMATIONAL

Chad Wakabayashi, 3182 Cleveland Avenue North, explained he had an issue with a water bill he received for the first quarter of 2021. He reported in the fourth quarter of 2020 there was a problem with the transmitter and the City was not receiving accurate information about the water usage. He commented this meant water usage was being estimated which led to a \$3,000 water bill. He stated it was his understanding there was no leak or continuous usage situation on the property and requested the City forgive the overage. He noted the average water bill per quarter ranged from \$250 to \$300. He recommended the estimated bill be based on historical averages and not continuous use.

Mayor Grant requested staff review this matter with Mr. Wakabayashi and report back at the next regularly scheduled City Council meeting. He explained he was aware that there was more than one water bill that staff was researching.

Gregg Larson, 3377 North Snelling Avenue, called to the Council's attention that the meeting packet appeared to have a different Zoom link for this meeting than the Zoom link included in a notice he had received.

Mayor Grant noted the City had four Public Hearings this evening. He requested staff investigate that the links were properly published for tonight's meeting.

City Administrator Perrault reported after checking each of the links within the Public Hearing notices it appears all of the links were posted correctly.

Interim Public Works Director Swearingen stated that residents may be referencing an earlier notice from the City about the Snelling Avenue project which would have had a Zoom link for a meeting that took place on another date and time. He concurred that this current mailing notice, which was provided to the properties that would be directly affected by special assessments, did in fact contain the correct Zoom link for tonight's meeting.

Councilmember Holden commented by that looking at the number of people that were attending the meeting virtually, she believed residents were finding the correct link for the meeting.

Mayor Grant thanked Mr. Larson for bringing this concern to the Council's attention.

3. RESPONSE TO PUBLIC INQUIRIES

None.

4. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

- A. Proclamation Recognizing May 16-22, 2021 as National Public Works Week

Mayor Grant read a proclamation in full for the record declaring May 16 through May 22, 2021 to be National Public Works Week in the City of Arden Hills.

MOTION: Councilmember Holden moved and Councilmember Holmes to approve the Proclamation Recognizing May 16-22, 2021 as National Public Works Week. A roll call vote was taken. The motion carried (4-0).

5. STAFF COMMENTS

- A. COVID-19 Update

City Administrator Perrault provided the Council with an update on how the City was responding to COVID-19. He encouraged residents to visit the City's website for the most current and up to date information regarding COVID-19. He reported the Minnesota Department of

Health and CDC also had websites with current guidelines and recommendations. He explained the City of Arden Hills remains in a peacetime state of emergency and City Hall will remain closed until further notice. He indicated City staff remains operational and can be reached via phone or email. He encouraged residents to monitor the State’s rollout for the COVID vaccine as rules and eligibility information can change frequently. He reported staff was waiting to receive guidance about the recently approved federal funding.

B. Transportation Update

Interim Public Works Director Swearingen reported Public Works crews have been out patching potholes the last few weeks. He stated information about this work plan was posted on the City’s website. He anticipated this work would be completed by the end of next week.

Interim Public Works Director Swearingen stated the MnPASS project would be completed in 2021. He discussed the Highway 96 closures that were planned for this summer. He encouraged residents to visit MNDOT’s website for additional information.

6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. April 12, 2021, Special City Council Executive Session (Closed)
- B. April 12, 2021, Regular City Council

Councilmember Holmes explained she requested a change to the Regular City Council minutes noting a resident’s name was misspelled. She noted she discussed this change with the City Clerk.

MOTION: **Councilmember Holden moved and Councilmember Holmes seconded a motion to approve the April 12, 2021, Special City Council Executive Work Session (Closed) meeting minutes; and April 12, 2021, Regular City Council meeting minutes as amended. A roll call vote was taken. The motion carried (4-0).**

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Motion to Approve Consent Agenda Item - Claims and Payroll
- B. Motion to Approve First Quarter Financials
- C. Motion to Approve 2022 Budget Calendar
- D. Motion to Approve Ordinance 2021-002 Amending the 2021 Fee Schedule in Relation to Tobacco Violation Fees and Authorize Publication of Summary Ordinance
- E. Motion to Approve Amendments to Development Agreement and Stormwater and Recreational Facilities Operation and Maintenance Agreement – Arden Hills Senior Housing (Trident Development) – PC 19-002
- F. Motion to Approve Resolution 2021-023 Ordering Preparation of Feasibility Report – Arden Oaks Street Improvements
- G. Motion to Approve Purchase of Replacement Pump for Lift Station No. 14
- H. Motion to Authorize Granting Permanent Easements for Sanitary Sewer Purposes located at 6 Pine Tree Drive and 8 Pine Tree Drive

- I. Motion to Approve Resolution 2021-024 Accepting Donation from Arden Hills Foundation for Park Bench at Crepeau Park

MOTION: Councilmember Holden moved and Councilmember Holmes seconded a motion to approve the Consent Calendar as presented and to authorize execution of all necessary documents contained therein. A roll call vote was taken. The motion carried (4-0).

8. PULLED CONSENT ITEMS

None.

9. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Snelling Avenue and County Road E Street and Utility Improvement Project

Interim Public Works Director Swearingen stated on April 12, 2021, the City Council adopted Resolution 2021-022 receiving the feasibility report and calling for a public hearing to consider proposed improvements for the Snelling Avenue North and County Road E Improvements Project. It was noted a complete copy of the feasibility report is provided on the City project webpage.

Interim Public Works Director Swearingen explained projects involving special assessments generally require two public hearings commonly known as an improvement hearing and an assessment hearing. The subject hearing for April 26 is the improvement hearing. The purpose of the improvement hearing is for the City Council to discuss a specific local improvement before ordering it done. The second assessment hearing would be scheduled after the project has received contractor bids to provide property owners an opportunity to express concerns about the actual special assessments.

Interim Public Works Director Swearingen reported at the improvement hearing, interested persons may voice their opinion regarding the proposed project improvements and whether or not they are in the proposed assessment area. A reasonable estimate of the total amount to be assessed and the description of the methodology used to calculate individual assessments for affected parcels is contained within the feasibility report, a copy of which is available for review on the City's website. Pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 429, notices of the public hearing were published in the Pioneer Press on April 13, 2021 and April 20, 2021. A notice was also mailed to each property within the draft assessment roll area on April 14, 2021. Staff commented further on the proposed improvements for Area 1, Area 2 and Cummings Lane, discussed the design alternatives, along with the estimated project costs, and recommended the Council hold a public hearing for the Snelling Avenue and County Road E Street and Utility Improvement Project.

Councilmember Holden asked if the Cummings Lane street bed had been enhanced to accommodate the number of buses turning around in the cul-de-sac.

Interim Public Works Director Swearingen stated he was notified of this issue by a resident in the area and he explained he could not speak if the amount shown covered the expense. He noted he would speak to the project designer regarding this manner to address this concern.

Councilmember Holden requested further information on the MSA streets.

Interim Public Works Director Swearingen explained MSA streets were designated based on car volume and had to be designed to certain standards. He noted the City receives State funding to assist with reconstructing MSA streets. He indicated Old Snelling was an MSA roadway.

Mayor Grant explained regardless of the option chosen, the road will be designed in such a manner that MSA funds could be applied in the future.

Interim Public Works Director Swearingen reported this was correct.

Further discussion ensued regarding how MSA roadways were designed and engineered.

Mayor Grant opened the public hearing at 7:49 p.m.

Elyse Farnsworth, 1487 Lametti Lane, urged the Council to choose Option 1 with the trail. She believed this was the better option and would allow her neighborhood to be included in the City's trail system. She understood this would come at a higher cost, but believed this was the best way to move the project forward.

Gregg Larson, 3377 North Snelling Avenue, stated he lives on one of the streets planned for improvement. He explained he wants a trail that has been promised for decades along with the same safety features other City trails have. He did not believe the residents in this project area were less deserving than other Arden Hills residents. He did not want to be left on the shoulder anymore. He was of the opinion the feasibility study was flawed with only two alternatives. He believed that both alternatives were unacceptable. He indicated the report rejects Option 1 as being too expensive and Option 2 has been rejected by residents because it does not include a trail. He recommended the City consider an option that was somewhere in between. He suggested the current 40 feet of roadway along Old Snelling Avenue be reconsidered. He noted the lane widths could be reduced to 11 feet, which would provide two feet. He explained reducing the width of the shoulder on one side by four feet would create four additional feet for a trail, leaving 14 feet on the trail side. He reported full depth reclamation would reduce the cost for Option 1, as would a trail on the east versus the west side of the street. He suggested curbs be placed between the roadway and the new trail for safety purposes. He indicated creative design on the trail side would allow for the current rural ditch drainage to be utilized without needing to invest in costly stormwater improvements. He stated if the design does not MSA standards, a variance could be requested or this portion of Old Snelling could be delisted on the MSA network. He commented this may be a better option than trying to construct this roadway to meet MSA standards considering no dollars were available to assist with this project. He encouraged the City to improve the safety for the pedestrians walking along this roadway and that rumble strips and ballards not be considered. He wanted to see a safe trail design approved for this project.

Bobby Goldman, 1290 County Road F W #309, noted he does not live in the immediate area, but he walks and bikes across Arden Hills quite often. He stated this was an area of concern for him. He recommended a comprehensive park and trail infrastructure plan be considered. He reported this trail segment has been in planning stages for decades. He understood the trail would come at a higher cost, but believed it was in the City's best interest to complete the trail.

Amy Hoffman, 3500 Glen Arden Road, stated she supported Option 1. She encouraged the Council to create a safe pedestrian safe for the pedestrians that live in this area. She indicated this roadway needs a curb separated trail and suggested the Council have a solution mindset to get this project done.

Stephen Nelson, 3475 Siems Court, asked if this was the correct time to talk about the roundabout.

Mayor Grant reported now would be the correct time.

Mr. Nelson explained a trail was necessary along this roadway but recommended the City work within the current footprint of the roadway. He commented he saw no advantages to pursuing a roundabout and noted it would be difficult for pedestrians to cross to cross the roundabout. He indicated the roundabout was quite costly and he recommended the four-way stop remain in place. He believed the real problem was the street lights at McDonald's which created backups. He encouraged the City to save the money and not pursue the roundabout.

Todd Mueller, 1429 Lametti Lane, asked if the City would reconsider how the turn lane along Highway 51 at Old Snelling Avenue was laid out within this project.

Interim Public Works Director Swearingen reported this particular turn lane was within MNDOT right of way and was not included in these improvements.

Mr. Mueller encouraged the City to speak to the State about the layout of this turn lane.

Interim Public Works Director Swearingen explained MNDOT was consider improvements for the Highway 51 corridor and noted he could bring this concern to their attention.

Mr. Mueller commented the proposed trail would benefit so many people in the neighborhood. He questioned if there would there ever be a connection along Highway 51 to provide a loop around the lake.

Interim Public Works Director Swearingen commented the PTRC has contacted Roseville and MNDOT regarding this trail connection. He noted preliminary discussions were being held.

Christy Jacob, 4192 Arden Place W, stated she supported Option 1 or any solution focused option that would include a trail. She explained she had children that liked to ride their bikes and she would like to see a trail for safety purposes.

Jill King, 1483 Bussard Court, reported she moved to Arden Hills in 2010. She discussed how many young people have moved into her neighborhood over the years and believed that the

proposed trail was extremely pivotal for safety reasons. She commented on how much more her children have been biking since COVID happened, because the level of traffic on the streets was lower. She stated she would love for her children to be able to experience all of Arden Hills, but this was being hindered due to the lack of a trail along Old Snelling Avenue. She encouraged the City to pursue more than two options in order to find the best and most affordable solution for the City. She commented further on the benefit of having a complete route around Lake Johanna.

Doug Lieser, 1434 Bussard Court, supported Option 1 for Area 1. He explained he had safety concerns and would like to see a trail completed. He noted he has two small children and noted his kids and all people in the neighborhood would benefit from a trail. He recommended a curbed trail system be pursued.

Patrick Burlingame, 3590 Snelling Avenue North, thanked the Council for their time. He questioned why his property was not being assessed for this project. He indicated the City cannot promise anything and also cannot take bribery from residents because they want a trail. He explained this roadway has a shoulder where people can walk. He noted he lives on the end of a frontage road that is awkward. He discussed the design of Highway 51 and reported there was shoddy planning and poor soils under this roadway. He did not believe the City could be trusted to finish a project. He recommended the shoulder be used for walking. He suggested if a trail was considered that it be built from County Road E and Snelling Avenue to Lake Johanna. He indicated he was not resistant to a roundabout. He reported studies show that roundabouts were a safer option. He supported a roundabout being built per State guidelines. He stated he did not support paying more money in order to get a trail.

Ms. Hoffman expressed her concern with the current state of the intersection. She noted she has three young children and reported there was little to no room for walkers to safely cross this intersection. She suggested the lane widths be repainted in order to improve pedestrian safety.

Kathy Nelson, 3475 Siems Court, encouraged the City to consider Gregg Larson's suggestions. She stated she did not want to see any trees lost along this roadway or that the trail be brought closer to homes. She discussed how the installation of curb and gutter would impact the street. She requested the speed limit for this roadway be reduced from 40 miles per hour to 30 miles per hour. She suggested the City reconsider the options for this project prior to moving it forward.

Mayor Grant closed the public hearing at 8:22 p.m.

B. Amended Planned Unit Development and Site Plan – Boston Scientific – 4100 Hamline Avenue N – PC 21-001

Planning Consultant Kansier stated the Boston Scientific campus at 4100 Hamline Avenue North operates under a Planned Unit Development (PUD) that was originally approved in 2002 for the Guidant Corporation. The last update to the PUD and Campus Master Plan took place in 2020 when the City approved a loading dock addition to the South side of Building 10. Before that, in 2017, the City approved a 5,330 square foot building addition on the northeast corner of Building 9 (Planning Case 17-013). New building construction or site modification identified on the approved Campus Master Plan requires the submittal of a Site Plan Review application prior to construction. For building construction or site modifications not included on the Master Plan, a

PUD Amendment is required. The proposed addition to Building 14 is not shown on the current Master Plan and a PUD Amendment is therefore being requested. Staff commented further on the request and recommended the Council hold a public hearing for the requested Amended PUD and Site Plan for Boston Scientific.

Mayor Grant opened the public hearing at 8:33 p.m.

Bryan Mills, 1288 Wynridge Drive, reminded the Council that this was the only industrially zoned property adjacent to a residential neighborhood. Because of this, he encouraged the Council to take into consideration the concerns of the neighborhood. He asked if the removal of the existing industrial equipment on the northwest corner had been formalized or was this a line item that might happen at some point in the future.

Planning Consultant Kansier reported the way it was worded, once the expansion was completed, the HVAC equipment may be removed. She explained the City Council could create a condition or place timeframes on this work.

Mayor Grant recommended any comment from the applicant be addressed under Item 10B on the agenda.

Mayor Grant closed the public hearing at 8:38 p.m.

C. Conditional Use Permit Amendment and Site Plan – Bethel University (Football Field) – 3900 Bethel Drive – PC 21-002

Planning Consultant Kansier stated Bethel University (“The Applicant”) is requesting a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Amendment and Site Plan Review to update the existing football and practice fields located in the southern quadrant of their main campus at 3900 Bethel Drive. The Applicant is proposing to convert the existing grass football field into a synthetic turf stadium field with a new track constructed around it and the existing grass practice field into a synthetic turf multi-purpose field. The Applicant is also proposing changes to the lighting around the two fields, scoreboards, the spectator plazas, the perimeter fencing, and the grandstand and press box. Seating capacity will remain as is.

Planning Consultant Kansier explained Bethel University operates under a CUP Master Plan. As the university comes forward with plans, they are reviewed against the Master Plan for consistency. Building plans that are consistent with the Master Plan require a Site Plan Review. A CUP Amendment is required when plans are not included in the approved Master Plan. The two proposed improvements to the football field and the practice field are not included on the Master Plan and a CUP Amendment is therefore required. Staff commented further on the request and recommended the Council hold a public hearing for the CUP Amendment and Site Plan for Bethel University for the changes proposed to the football field.

Councilmember Holden reported the plans before the Council had a plaza, scoreboard, perimeter fencing and other items that were not being requested at this time. She questioned how the Council should address this concern.

Planning Consultant Kansier stated she understood these items were on the plan and in the pictures provided by Bethel University. She explained she had called Bethel University to request updated plans. She recommended that if this item were approved that the motion be very specific to the items being approved.

Mayor Grant opened the public hearing at 8:50 p.m.

Rob Carlson, 3377 Snelling Avenue North, asked if the lighting would have a time limitation. He inquired if the lights would have to be shut off by a certain time at night.

Planning Consultant Kansier indicated she was not aware of any set requirement but this could be a made a condition for approval.

Mr. Carlson reported he lived in between Bethel University and Northwestern University. He explained Roseville has requirements on when the lights have to be shut off. He encouraged the City Council to also have a requirement in place as to when the lights must be shut off.

Mayor Grant closed the public hearing at 8:52 p.m.

D. Amended Planned Unit Development and Site Plan – 3787 Lexington Avenue – PC 21-004 (Lexington Station Phase 3)

Planning Consultant Kansier stated in 2013, the City approved a Master Planned Unit Development (PUD) for Roberts Management’s proposed Lexington Station redevelopment project, located at the southwest corner of Lexington Avenue North and Red Fox Road. The total project area is 7.57 acres and is comprised of three parcels. The proposed development would be completed in three (3) phases. Phase I of the redevelopment was completed in 2013-2014 and included the demolition of the former Blue Fox Restaurant and the construction of a 15,340 square foot multi-tenant commercial building with a drive through. Phase II consisted of removing the existing building at 1120 Red Fox Road and constructing a new 16,922 square foot multi-tenant commercial building with a drive through. Phase II was completed in in the fall of 2018. Staff commented further on the request and recommended the Council hold a public hearing for the Amended PUD and Site Plan request for Lexington Station Phase 3.

Councilmember Holden stated after visiting the site on numerous occasions she has never seen the parking lot full. She asked where snow was stored in the parking lots during the winter months.

Mayor Grant commented he did not recall where snow was stored for Phase 1 and Phase 2. He requested further information regarding the cross access agreement and traffic flow to the south of this development.

Planning Consultant Kansier reviewed the Site Plan with the Council and explained the property to the south was not interested in a cross access agreement. She noted if the property to the south were to redevelop in the future, a cross access agreement could be considered. She noted the main purpose for this cross access agreement would be to have access to the stoplight.

Mayor Grant opened the public hearing at 9:09 p.m.

Lynda Hanni, 4211 Shirley Lane N in Shoreview, stated her concerns with this project was that the traffic study was completed in February of 2021 during the COVID timeframe. She explained she traveled this roadway every day and she feared that the traffic levels were not accurate. She encouraged the City to take this into consideration.

Mayor Grant closed the public hearing at 9:12 p.m.

10. NEW BUSINESS

A. Resolution 2021-025 Ordering Improvement and Preparation of Plans and Specifications – Snelling Avenue N and County Road E Street and Utility Improvement Project

Interim Public Works Director Swearingen stated following the public hearing under agenda item No. 9A, the next step in the project delivery process is to approve a Resolution ordering the improvements and the preparation of plans and specification for the Snelling Avenue North and County Road E Improvements Project. The Resolution would order the improvements and plans in accordance with the recommendations provided in the project feasibility report. The Council must formally decide on the Alternative within Area 1 to move forward with design, in which, this decision will be inserted into the Resolution. Upon approval of the resolution, a Request for Proposals (RFP) for producing project design plans and specifications will go out to respected consulting firms whom have recently completed successful projects with the City of Arden Hills.

Mayor Grant asked if staff looked at other options for Area 1.

Interim Public Works Director Swearingen explained two options were included within the feasibility report and noted both met MSA standards. He commented further on the improvements that would have to be completed in order to comply with MSA requirements. He was of the opinion that other options were considered within the feasibility study, but noted the two most feasible options were presented to the Council.

Councilmember Holden discussed the option provided by Mr. Larson and asked if the City could request a variance to the MSA standards. She indicated she would be willing to postpone action on this item if this were the case.

Interim Public Works Director Swearingen indicated MSA does allow variances. He reported he was not experienced enough to understand what type of variances they do and do not allow. He stated he would have to communicate with State Aid representatives for clarification on this matter.

Mayor Grant noted Mr. Larson's commented were provided to the Council in Appendix J.

Councilmember Holden stated without knowing what MSA would waive, she questioned if the City could narrow the roadway with a curb and trail.

Interim Public Works Director Swearingen stated he does not have any reason to believe that the feasibility report that was presented wouldn't have taken that into consideration, if it were allowed.

Mayor Grant discussed Design Alternative 2 for Area 1. He questioned further information regarding the lane and shoulder widths for this alternative. He asked if MSA would allow for 11 foot wide roadways.

Interim Public Works Director Swearingen read through the recommendations within the feasibility study and stated 11 feet would be allowed for the traveling lanes on MSA roadways. He commented the City was proposing to shrink the shoulder on the east side, to shrink the driving lanes and then to create a walking shoulder on the west side of the roadway.

Mayor Grant questioned what the shoulder width would be on the east side of the roadway.

Interim Public Works Director Swearingen indicated this would be up to the City but given the steep slope of the land adjacent to the shoulder, staff was recommending the shoulder not be any less than six feet.

Mayor Grant reported this would create a 12 foot shoulder on the west side of the roadway.

Interim Public Works Director Swearingen stated this was correct.

Councilmember Holden asked if it was traffic safety engineers that put the two options together for the City to consider.

Interim Public Works Director Swearingen explained this was the case.

Councilmember Scott questioned if the assessment to the residents was the same between Option 1 and Option 2.

Mayor Grant reported this was correct.

Councilmember Holden commented she received calls and emails from residents that want the trail as well as calls and emails from residents that do not want the trail. She stated she would be willing to postpone action on this project in order to allow staff to speak with MSA staff to see if the roadway can be narrowed and a trail created on the existing roadway that would meet everyone's needs. She indicated it was a goal to have trails throughout the entire City, but noted the franchise fee was defeated by the residents. She reported the Council tries to partner with people and that was how trails have been completed. She explained the City has worked to complete a lot of trails in the past 10 years. She stated she did not feel guilty about installing a shoulder trail if it was safe.

Mayor Grant stated he was surprised by the number of people who said a wider shoulder would be sufficient and did not want the trail. He indicated he wanted the shoulder to be safe. He explained if the Council had more questions that had to be brought to the MSA, he did not have a problem postponing action on this item. He commented it was clear this roadway had to be

redone and was beyond its serviceable life. He stated he would rather delay action than rush the project through without having an optimal decision.

Councilmember Holmes indicated staff needed direction on how to proceed for Area 1, whether that be Option 1 or Option 2. She questioned if the Council could move Option 2 forward directing staff to speak with the MSA to see if narrowing travel lanes and a shoulder trail option was viable.

Mayor Grant asked how things were looking in terms of the project timeline.

Interim Public Works Director Swearingen explained this project was slated to be bid in February of 2022 with construction beginning in April of 2022.

Councilmember Holmes stated she did not believe it would take staff too long to speak with individuals at the MSA to see if this proposal was viable.

Interim Public Works Director Swearingen commented he has discussed the proposed options with MSA and it was recommended the trail not be made too wide so as to be confused as a travel lane.

Councilmember Scott stated his overwhelming concern was safety for residents. He indicated he did not want to see the project delayed another year given the existing condition of the roadway. He was of the opinion the residents in the area overwhelmingly supported Option 1.

Councilmember Holmes discussed the comments from the public that were provided to the Council in Appendix J. She anticipated about 50% of the residents wanted Option 1 and 50% supported Option 2.

Councilmember Holden asked if the City could put any type of markings on the pavement they choose.

Interim Public Works Director Swearingen stated this was possible and commented on the type of buffer strips that could be painted on the roadway.

Mayor Grant noted this meant a person walking symbol could be painted on the pavement, along with a double white line.

Interim Public Works Director Swearingen reported this was the case.

Mayor Grant asked if the Council was comfortable moving forward allowing staff the flexibility to have further conversations with MSA.

Councilmember Scott inquired if a date would be set for approval.

Mayor Grant commented he did not have a specific date or deadline in mind. Rather he was hoping staff could speak with MSA and report back to the Council.

Councilmember Holmes supported the Mayor’s suggestion with Option 2 moving forward and directing staff to discuss alternative options with MSA. She indicated she did not want this project further delayed.

Interim Public Works Director Swearingen stated this item would need four votes in order to move it forward.

City Attorney Jamnik explained State law requires a 4/5 vote of the City Council to order improvements that do not come to the City under a petition.

Councilmember Holden stated she was in favor of moving the project forward with Option 2. She discussed how Option 1 would change the look and feel of the neighborhood.

Councilmember Scott reported in the interest of moving this project forward he will reluctantly support Option 2.

MOTION: **Councilmember Scott moved and Councilmember Holmes seconded a motion to adopt Resolution #2021-025 – Ordering Improvement and Preparation of Plans and Specifications – Snelling Avenue N and County Road E Street and Utility Improvement Project to incorporate Alternative 2 for Area 1. A roll call vote was taken. The motion carried (4-0).**

B. Amended Planned Unit Development Site Plan Review – Boston Scientific – 4100 Hamline Avenue N – PC 21-001

Planning Consultant Kansier stated following the public hearing under agenda item No. 9B, the next step in the process is to approve a PUD Amendment and Site Plan Review for Boston Scientific. Staff provided the following Findings of Fact:

1. The Boston Scientific campus at 4100 Hamline Avenue North operates under a Planned Unit Development (PUD) that was originally approved in 2002 for the Guidant Corporation.
2. The last update to the PUD and Campus Master Plan took place in in 2020 when the City approved a loading dock addition to the South side of Building 10 (Planning Case 19-018).
3. New building construction or site modification identified on the approved Campus Master Plan requires the submittal of a Site Plan Review application prior to construction.
4. For building construction or site modifications not included on the Master Plan, a PUD Amendment is required.
5. The proposed addition to Building 14 is not shown on the current Master Plan.
6. A public hearing for a PUD Amendment request is required before the request can be brought before the City Council.
7. The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on April 7, 2021.

Planning Consultant Kansier explained the Planning Commission reviewed this application at their April 7, 2021 meeting. At that time, they recommended approval of the Boston Scientific application for an Amended Planned Unit and Site Plan by a 6-0 vote. Staff recommended a

motion to approve Planning Case 21-001, for a PUD Amendment and Site Plan Review of 4100 Hamline Avenue based on the findings of fact and submitted plans, subject to the following conditions:

1. All conditions of the original Planned Unit Development shall remain in full force and effect.
2. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, all items identified in the February 17, 2021 Engineering Division memo shall be addressed. All comments shall be adopted herein by reference.
3. The project shall be completed in accordance with the plans submitted as amended by the conditions of approval. Any significant changes to these plans, as determined by the City Planner, shall require review and approval by the Planning Commission and City Council.
4. The proposed structures shall conform to all other regulations in the City Code.
5. A Grading and Erosion permit shall be obtained from the city's Engineering Division prior to commencing any grading, land disturbance or utility activities. The Applicant shall be responsible for obtaining any permits necessary from other agencies, including but not limited to, MPCA, Rice Creek Watershed District, and Ramsey County prior to the start of any site activities.
6. Heavy duty silt fence and adequate erosion control around the entire construction site shall be required and maintained by the Developer during construction to ensure that sediment and storm water does not leave the project site.
7. The Applicant shall be responsible for protecting the proposed on-site storm sewer infrastructure and components and any existing storm sewer from exposure to any and all stormwater runoff, sediments and debris during all construction activities.
8. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a landscape financial security equal to 125% of the cost of the landscaping to be installed on the site shall be submitted. The Applicant must submit a detailed cost estimate for the landscaping so staff can determine the final amount. Landscape financial security shall be held for two full growing seasons.
9. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Applicant shall submit a materials board to be approved in writing by staff.
10. All light poles, including base, shall be a maximum of 25 feet in height and shall be shoebox style, downward directed, with high-pressure sodium lamps or LED and flush lenses. Other than wash or architectural lighting, attached security lighting shall be shoebox style, downward directed with flush lenses. In addition, any lighting under canopies (building entries) shall be recessed and use a flush lens. The applicant must provide photometric calculations for the lighting at the west property line.
11. Once construction is complete and the equipment is operational, the Applicant must conduct a noise study to ensure the facility does not exceed maximum noise standards. If necessary, steps shall be taken to correct any deficiencies.
12. Boston Scientific to complete yearly noise studies on Building 14 and to report these findings to the City of Arden Hills.

Planning Consultant Kansier reviewed the options available to the City Council on this matter:

1. Recommend Approval with Conditions
2. Recommend Approval as Submitted
3. Recommend Denial
4. Table

Mayor Grant requested the applicant address the question that was raised during the public hearing.

Jeff Hejl, Facility Engineer at Boston Scientific, explained the existing equipment on the north side of the building, which included an HVAC chilling unit would be replaced in order to reduce noise levels at Building 14.

Councilmember Holden requested further clarification on which pieces of equipment would be replaced.

Mr. Hejl stated the equipment on Building 14 that was included in the noise study included compressor units and vacuum pumps that have been mitigated since the 2006 study. He indicated there was also a chiller unit on top of the roof that supports the HVAC system, along with air cold units that service the controlled environment in the manufacturing area of the building. He explained the chiller unit on the far north end of the building was past end of life and causes the most noise from the study. He reported this one unit would be removed and replaced.

Councilmember Holmes commented this has always been a confusing issue for her. She indicated only the chiller would be removed but it would be replaced with a new chiller.

Mr. Hejl stated that was correct.

Councilmember Holmes questioned when this would happen.

Mr. Hejl explained this would happen during the duration of the expansion project. He stated the project was expected to be done by December of 2022.

Councilmember Holden asked if both chillers would be operating at any one time.

Mr. Hejl stated this would not occur.

Further discussion ensued regarding the future mechanical needs for Boston Scientific.

Councilmember Holden requested further information regarding the tree replacement plan. She understood the applicant was interested in planting more trees and reported the area down by the adjacent homes does not have a large number of trees currently. She questioned where the additional trees would be placed.

John Larson, RSP Architects, reviewed the tree replacement plan in further detail with the Council. He noted only a portion of the trees that would be planted on the westerly side of the building were shown on the plan. He explained he had submitted an updated landscaping plan (Sheet L161) to staff, but this drawing was not included in the packet. He indicated more trees would be planted to the north along the western edge of the building.

Councilmember Holden requested staff changing the drawing on the screen to show where the clusters of trees would be located.

Councilmember Scott stated for a point of order, the City Council had reached its three hour time limit for this meeting.

Mayor Grant explained the Council had to make a motion to extend the meeting.

MOTION: **Mayor Grant moved and Councilmember Holden seconded a motion to extend the meeting to 11:00 p.m. A roll call vote was taken. The motion carried (4-0).**

Mr. Larson reviewed the site plan in further detail with the Council noting the location of the additional trees.

Councilmember Holden asked if the majority of these trees would be evergreens.

Mr. Larson reported this was the case, noting the trees would be a variety of cedars and pines.

Councilmember Holden questioned what size trees were being planted.

Mr. Larson reviewed the caliper inches of the trees that would be planted. He estimated 63 caliper inches of trees would be planted.

Councilmember Holden supported an additional condition that would require the applicant to plant additional trees in order to put this requirement into writing.

Mr. Larson stated he supported the Council adding this condition.

MOTION: **Mayor Grant moved and Councilmember Holmes seconded a motion to approve Planning Case 21-001 for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) Amendment and Site Plan Review of 4100 Hamline Avenue based on the findings of fact and submitted plans, and the twelve (12) conditions in the April 26, 2021, Report to the City Council.**

Councilmember Holden stated the applicant was asking for a variance of five feet. She questioned how high the roof would be without the equipment.

Mayor Grant reported the building would be 21 feet high.

Mr. Hejl commented with the mechanical penthouse the roof would be 39 feet above the grade level. He explained if the full enclosure was not around the HVAC units a screen wall would be constructed 33 feet above grade level. He stated that if only a screen were constructed, this building would not meet the City's noise requirements and the entire HVAC system would have to be reconstructed.

Councilmember Holden stated if noise standards were exceeded, would there be any way to insulate the mechanical penthouse against sound.

Tony Baxter, Acoustical Engineer with ESI, explained he has discussed what else can be done if this building exceeds the L50 requirement for noise. He reported these changes would not be to the penthouse, but rather would be to the screening around the chiller units. He stated he did not anticipate this building would have a problem.

Mr. Hejl commented he has also made mention that post project Boston Scientific would do additional noise readings to ensure the building has met the MPCA limits. He proposed following up with this six months later to ensure the building was meeting the limits.

Councilmember Holden questioned what the screen would be made of around the new chiller unit.

Mr. Larson reported the screening would be made from a heavy gauge corrugated ribbed metal panel. He stated this material was akin to a sound wall.

Councilmember Holden asked if better fencing could be placed around the chiller now.

Mr. Larson explained Boston Scientific has been working with Mr. Baxter to find the right material in order to get the desired effect and to reduce sound coming from the building.

Mr. Baxter indicated the barrier wall material had sufficient mass that to attenuate the noise. He stated if the material were thicker or stiffer, there would be no improvement. He commented the proposed material was already sufficient.

Councilmember Holmes requested Condition 11 be amended to require the applicant to complete a noise study six months after the building was completed to ensure the building was still compliant with MPCA requirements.

AMENDMENT: **Councilmember Holmes moved and Mayor Grant seconded a motion to amend Condition 11 requiring the applicant to conduct a noise study six months after the building was completed.**

Councilmember Holden stated these noise studies would be completed when the equipment was most new and efficient. She anticipated the equipment would increase in noise over time and she would like to see Boston Scientific required to conduct more studies over time.

Councilmember Holmes discussed Condition 12 noting this would require the applicant to complete an annual noise study.

Councilmember Holden indicated this addresses her concern. She called the question.

A roll call vote was taken. The amendment carried 3-1 (Councilmember Scott opposed).

Councilmember Holmes stated she would like to add Condition 13 requiring the applicant to replace the original chiller by December of 2022.

AMENDMENT: Councilmember Holmes moved and Councilmember Holden seconded a motion to add Condition 13 requiring the applicant to replace the original chiller by December of 2022.

Councilmember Holden questioned when occupancy would be granted for this building.

Mr. Hejl stated certificate of occupancy and start date would be quarter one of 2023.

A roll call vote was taken. The amendment carried 3-1 (Councilmember Scott opposed).

Councilmember Holmes stated she would like to see a condition that addresses the trees.

Planning Consultant Kansier explained Condition 3 states the project shall be completed in accordance with all plans submitted.

Councilmember Holmes reported the applicant has proposed doubling the number of trees on the current plan, which meant there would be 74 trees with a total replacement of 127 caliper inches.

Planning Consultant Kansier recommended specific numbers not be referenced. She found the resubmitted plans dated February 8, 2021, and stated these could be referenced on a new condition.

Councilmember Holden stated this does not help as the Council has not seen these plans. She asked if the applicant would be installing eight to twelve foot trees on the north side.

Planning Consultant Kansier explained according to the submitted plans, the applicant was proposing to install twelve foot trees on the north side.

AMENDMENT: Councilmember Holmes moved and Mayor Grant seconded a motion to add Condition 14 noting the tree preservation plan (L001, L060, L160, and L161) that will be followed for this project will be from the plans submitted to the City dated February 8, 2021.

A roll call vote was taken. The amendment carried (4-0).

Mayor Grant called the question on the amended motion.

A roll call was taken. The amended motion to approve Planning Case 21-001 for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) Amendment and Site Plan Review of 4100 Hamline Avenue based on the findings of fact and submitted plans, the proposed conditions as stated in the April 26, 2021, Report to the City Council and the amended conditions as stated above carried (4-0).

- C. Resolution 2021-026 Conditional Use Permit Amendment and Site Plan – Bethel University (Football Field) – 3900 Bethel Drive – PC 21-002

Planning Consultant Kansier stated following the public hearing under agenda item No. 9C, the next step in the process is to approve a Conditional Use Permit Amendment and Site Plan for Bethel University for the changes being proposed to the Football Field. Staff provided the following Findings of Fact:

General Findings:

1. The Bethel University main campus at 3900 Bethel Drive is located in the Institutional Zoning District.
2. A Higher Education, College Campus is a Conditional Use in the Institutional District.
3. Bethel University operates under a Conditional Use Permit Master Plan.
4. The proposed additions are not included on the Master Plan and a CUP Amendment is required.
5. Bethel University has requested Site Plan Review approval for the proposed changes to the football and practice fields.
6. The proposed changes to the football and practice fields would be in compliance with all provisions of the Zoning Code.
7. A public hearing for a PUD Amendment request is required before the request can be brought before the City Council.
8. The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on April 7, 2021.

Conditional Use Permit Evaluation Findings:

9. The proposed plan is not anticipated to have any impact on traffic or parking conditions because the additions do not include an increase in football field seating.
10. The proposed plan includes the addition of LED lights and will increase illumination around the football fields.
11. The proposed plan will not produce any permanent noise, odors, vibration, smoke, dust, air pollution, heat, liquid, or solid waste, and other nuisance characteristics.
12. The proposed plan will impact drainage on the site.
13. The proposed plan will not impact population density.
14. The proposed plan is not expected to have a visual impact on surrounding properties or on land use compatibility with uses and structures on surrounding land or adjoining land values because the new additions will not be easily visible from outside the Bethel University campus.
15. Park dedication requirements are not applicable.
16. The proposed plan does not conflict with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Code or the Comprehensive Development Plan for the City.

Planning Consultant Kansier explained the Planning Commission reviewed this application at their April 7, 2021 meeting. At that time, they recommended approval of the Bethel University application for a Conditional Use Permit Amendment and Site Plan by a 6-0 vote. Staff recommended adopting of Resolution 2021-026 approving the Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan Review for Planning Case 21-002 at 3900 Bethel Drive, based on the findings of fact and the submitted plans, subject to the following conditions:

1. All conditions of the original Conditional Use Permit shall remain in full force and effect.

2. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, all items identified in the March 11, 2021 Engineering Division memo shall be addressed. All comments shall be adopted herein by reference.
3. The project shall be completed in accordance with the plans submitted as amended by the conditions of approval. Any significant changes to these plans, as determined by the City Planner, shall require review and approval by the Planning Commission and City Council.
4. The proposed structures shall conform to all other regulations in the City Code.
5. A Grading and Erosion permit shall be obtained from the city's Engineering Division prior to commencing any grading, land disturbance or utility activities. The Applicant shall be responsible for obtaining any permits necessary from other agencies, including but not limited to, MPCA, Rice Creek Watershed District, and Ramsey County prior to the start of any site activities.
6. Heavy duty silt fence and adequate erosion control around the entire construction site shall be required and maintained by the Developer during construction to ensure that sediment and storm water does not leave the project site.
7. The Applicant shall be responsible for protecting the proposed on-site storm sewer infrastructure and components and any existing storm sewer from exposure to any and all stormwater runoff, sediments and debris during all construction activities.
8. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a landscape financial security equal to 125% of the cost of the landscaping to be installed on the site shall be submitted. The Applicant must submit a detailed cost estimate for the landscaping so staff can determine the final amount. Landscape financial security shall be held for two full growing seasons.
9. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, a landscaping letter of credit or escrow shall be required.
10. The Applicant shall be required to provide photometric calculations for the lighting at the property lines of all adjacent residential properties indicating the plan meets ordinance requirements.

Planning Consultant Kansier reviewed the options available to the City Council on this matter:

1. Recommend Approval with Conditions
2. Recommend Approval as Submitted
3. Recommend Denial
4. Table

Councilmember Holmes reported this Planning Case was a little confusing because it wasn't clear what the Council was approving. She believed the applicant should make it clear what was being approved with this case.

Jay Pomeroy, Landscape Architect with Anderson Johnson Associates, thanked the Council for its consideration. He reported the proposal before the Council was for a nine lane running track, a synthetic football field within the track, a practice field adjacent to the track and the four light poles, flag poles, scoreboard, plazas, and fencing. He stated the items that were not included was any work on the bleachers or the press box. He explained the plans submitted by Bethel University were rather lengthy and addressed the details of the project.

Councilmember Holmes reported the Council does not know anything about the scoreboard. She supported this item being tabled because the Council did not have enough information regarding this request.

Councilmember Holden commented she thought Planning Consultant Kansier had stated the plaza was not included in the plans that were being approved. She indicated she was confused as well.

Mayor Grant questioned how the Planning Commission approved this request without understanding the request.

Councilmember Holmes stated she watched the Planning Commission meeting and wrote down her questions and noted the Planning Commission did not address the items that were being approved.

Councilmember Holden indicated she was the Council Liaison at the recent Planning Commission meeting and the items that were presented to the Commission were the track, the turf field, the practice field and the lighting. She stated she too was confused as to what was being approved.

Mr. Pomeroy reported he was surprised by this conversation. He explained he has had his plans into the City since February and noted a neighborhood meeting was held. He indicated he has answered questions of staff and everything was spelled out in the plans. He stated he was not trying to hide anything within this project. He commented the lighting was typically the issue that requires the most investigation but noted all foot candle information had been provided to the City.

Councilmember Holden agreed the Council had the plans, but did not understand why staff was stating Bethel would not be moving forward with some aspects of the plan.

Mr. Pomeroy indicated in this instance, staff was incorrect. He noted the information was presented correctly at the Planning Commission meeting.

Planning Consultant Kansier explained she does not have plans for the scoreboard. She stated she called today to get additional information and was told the sound system was not moving forward.

Mr. Pomeroy commented this project could come down to budgeting but noted all items would be included.

Councilmember Holden questioned where the plans for the scoreboard were.

Mr. Pomeroy reported these plans were detailed on Sheet C 2.3 detail 12, noting the exact type was specified. He commented the general height and I-beam size was spelled out on this page. He indicated he originally submitted his plans to Mike Mroska.

Councilmember Holden asked if the original scoreboard was being replaced.

Mr. Pomeroy stated the college would be replacing the existing scoreboard with a new scoreboard that had video technology. He noted the existing scoreboard was 20 feet high and 20 feet wide. He understood the new scoreboard would be 25 feet high and 25 feet wide. He reported the back of the scoreboard would face the railroad tracks and residential area. He indicated the existing scoreboard was approximately 240 feet from the property line and the new scoreboard would be about 35 feet closer to the SRC building.

Mayor Grant questioned what the City's timeline was for approval.

Planning Consultant Kansier explained the 60 day time limit for this request ends May 23, 2021.

Mayor Grant inquired if the Council wants to move forward with this item.

Councilmember Scott stated he did not understand what the Council was debating given the fact one of the conditions for approval required the project to conform with all City Code requirements.

Councilmember Holmes reported she did not understand what the Council was being asked to approve. She understood these plans were provided to the City but staff has since changed. She expressed concern with the fact the Council had zero information regarding the scoreboard and would like clarification on this matter. She stated the Council was used to receiving complete presentations on Planning Cases and what was being requested. She supported this matter being tabled to allow for a more complete presentation to be made to the City Council.

Councilmember Holden agreed stating she would like to find out more information about the scoreboard, the fencing height, etc.

Councilmember Holmes recommended action on this item be tabled to the next City Council meeting.

Mr. Pomeroy stated the perimeter fence would be a black six foot high chain link fence. He understood the presentation needed to be more succinct but he didn't see where he was at fault. He reported he has a very defined construction schedule and he has to get this project completed this summer.

Mayor Grant asked if the Council would be open to discussing this one item at a Special City Council meeting. He then noted the Council had met the time limit for their meeting extension and asked if the Council wanted to take action on this items this evening or delay them both to a Special City Council meeting.

Councilmember Scott supported the Council taking action on Items C and D at this meeting.

Councilmember Holmes stated she wanted to accommodate the applicant, but she would much appreciate a detailed presentation on this item 10C and 10D at a Special City Council meeting given the late hour.

Councilmember Holden supported this recommendation, noting she needed more information on Item 10C.

Mayor Grant asked what the deadline was for Lexington Station Phase 3.

City Administrator Perrault explained the Lexington Station project had a very tight timeline. He indicated the applicant was proposing to close on this property and needed action from the City.

MOTION: Mayor Grant moved and Councilmember Holmes seconded a motion to table action on Resolution #2021-026 – Approving a Conditional Use Permit Amendment and Site Plan for Planning Case 21-002 for Bethel University (Football Field) at 3900 Bethel Drive allowing staff to set the meeting date. A roll call vote was taken. The motion carried 3-0-1 (Councilmember Scott abstained).

MOTION: Mayor Grant moved and Councilmember Holmes seconded a motion to extend the City Council meeting to 11:30 p.m. A roll call vote was taken. The motion carried (4-0).

D. Amended Planned Unit Development and Site Plan Review – 3787 Lexington Avenue – PC 21-004 (Lexington Station Phase 3)

Planning Consultant Kansier stated following the public hearing under agenda item No. 9D, the next step in the process is to amend the Planned Unit Development and Site Plan Review for the property at 3787 Lexington Avenue. Staff provided the following Findings of Fact:

1. The Lexington Station development located at 3787, 3833 and 3845 Lexington Avenue operates under a Planned Unit Development (PUD) that was originally approved in 2013.
2. New building construction or site modification identified on the approved Master Plan requires the submittal of a Site Plan Review application prior to construction.
3. For building construction or site modifications not included on the Master Plan, a PUD Amendment is required.
4. The proposed change to the Master Plan from two buildings to a single building is a significant change to the current Master Plan.
5. A public hearing for a PUD Amendment request is required before the request can be brought before the City Council.
6. The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on April 7, 2021.

Planning Consultant Kansier explained the Planning Commission reviewed this application at their April 7, 2021 meeting. At that time, they recommended approval of the Boston Scientific application for an Amended Planned Unit and Site Plan by a 6-0 vote. The following are motion language options for the City Council to consider. Staff recommended approval of Planning Case 21-004 for a PUD Amendment and Site Plan Review of Lexington Station III at 3787 Lexington Avenue, based on the findings of fact and the submitted plans, subject to the following conditions:

1. All conditions of the original Planned Unit Development shall remain in full force and effect.
2. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, all items identified in the March 4, 2021 Engineering Division memo shall be addressed. All comments shall be adopted herein by reference.
3. The project shall be completed in accordance with the plans submitted as amended by the conditions of approval. Any significant changes to these plans, as determined by the City Planner, shall require review and approval by the Planning Commission and City Council.
4. The proposed structures shall conform to all other regulations in the City Code.
5. A Grading and Erosion permit shall be obtained from the city's Engineering Division prior to commencing any grading, land disturbance or utility activities. The Applicant shall be responsible for obtaining any permits necessary from other agencies, including but not limited to, MPCA, Rice Creek Watershed District, and Ramsey County prior to the start of any site activities.
6. Heavy duty silt fence and adequate erosion control around the entire construction site shall be required and maintained by the Developer during construction to ensure that sediment and storm water does not leave the project site.
7. The Applicant shall be responsible for protecting the proposed on-site storm sewer infrastructure and components and any existing storm sewer from exposure to any and all stormwater runoff, sediments and debris during all construction activities.
8. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a landscape financial security equal to 125% of the cost of the landscaping to be installed on the site shall be submitted. The Applicant must submit a detailed cost estimate for the landscaping so staff can determine the final amount. Landscape financial security shall be held for two full growing seasons.
9. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Applicant shall submit floor plans for review by staff.
10. Separate sign permits shall be submitted for all signs on the site.

Planning Consultant Kansier reviewed the options available to the City Council on this matter:

1. Recommend Approval with Conditions
2. Recommend Approval as Submitted
3. Recommend Denial
4. Table

Councilmember Holmes discussed the sidewalk along Lexington Avenue at Lexington Station Phases 1 and 2. She questioned if Phase 3 would have sidewalk.

Planning Consultant Kansier reported a sidewalk was included in the County's plans along Lexington Avenue.

Councilmember Holden questioned if there was a sidewalk to the building for bicyclists or pedestrians. She recommended a trail or sidewalk be considered from Lexington Avenue into the parking lot.

Dan Rea, Kensington, stated this was brought up at the Planning Commission meeting and noted the plan was to bring an extension of the sidewalk in the County right-of-way into the site.

Councilmember Holden recommended a bicycle rack be required at the building entrance.

Mr. Rea reported a bike rack would be included.

Councilmember Holmes questioned how snow removal on this site would be managed given the limited amount of parking onsite.

Mr. Rea explained there would be some snow piling in the southeast corner and along the southern property line. He commented further on how the snow piles would not hinder any truck movement on the site.

Councilmember Holden thanked the developer for having windows on the south side of the building. She inquired if the monument and wall signs for this building was comparable to the signs on the other Lexington Station phases.

Planning Consultant Kansier reported the monument sign was very similar but noted she was unsure if the wall sign was comparable.

Mr. Rea discussed the proposed signage that would make up the 180 square foot wall sign. He reported he would be seeking a separate sign permit from the City. He indicated 180 square feet would be smaller than the Cub Foods sign down the street.

Councilmember Holden recommended Condition 11 be added to require the applicant to construct a sidewalk connection from Lexington Avenue to the parking lot.

Mayor Grant asked if the Council should require the applicant to construct a sidewalk along Lexington Avenue.

Planning Consultant Kansier reported this sidewalk was included in the County's plans for Lexington Avenue.

Councilmember Holden indicated she did not believe the City could require the applicant to construct a sidewalk in County right-of-way.

City Attorney Jamnik reported if the Council puts a condition in the approval, the agreement will then address the connectivity from the Lexington Avenue sidewalk constructed by the County into this development. He indicated this would be a sufficient way to address this concern.

MOTION: **Councilmember Holden moved and Councilmember Holmes seconded a motion to approve Planning Case 21-004 for a PUD Amendment and Site Plan Review of Lexington Station III at 3787 Lexington Avenue, based on the findings of fact and submitted plans, and the ten (10) conditions in the April 26, 2021, Report to the City Council. The motion carried (4-0).**

AMENDMENT: Mayor Grant moved and Councilmember Holden seconded a motion to add Condition 11 requiring the applicant to provide connecting sidewalk and trail extensions from the north/south Lexington Avenue County constructed sidewalk in a subsequent submittal and approval.

A roll call vote was taken. The amendment carried (4-0).

AMENDMENT: Councilmember Holden moved and Mayor Grant seconded a motion to add Condition 12 requiring the applicant to install a bike rack near the entrance of the building.

A roll call vote was taken. The amendment carried (4-0).

A roll call vote was taken. The amended motion to approve Planning Case 21-004 for a PUD Amendment and Site Plan Review of Lexington Station III at 3787 Lexington Avenue, based on the findings of fact and submitted plans, and the ten (10) conditions in the April 26, 2021, Report to the City Council and the above amended conditions No. 11 and No. 12 carried (4-0).

11. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

12. COUNCIL COMMENTS

Councilmember Scott discussed National Public Works week which would be observed May 16-22, 2021. He thanked the City's Public Works staff for their dedicated service to the community.

Councilmember Scott reported the first week in May was National Public Servants week and May 9-15, 2021 was National Police Week.

Councilmember Holmes requested Interim Public Works Director Swearingen to thank his staff for their great work on behalf of the community.

Councilmember Holmes thanked the Arden Hills Foundation and Dan Reichert of State Farm for donating another bench to the City.

Councilmember Holden thanked Planning Consultant Kansier for her great work.

Mayor Grant thanked Planning Consultant Kansier for filling in after Mike Mroska left the City. He stated he appreciated all of her hard work.

ADJOURN

MOTION: Mayor Grant moved and Councilmember Holden seconded a motion to adjourn. A roll call vote was taken. The motion carried (4-0).

Mayor Grant adjourned the Regular City Council Meeting at 11:25 p.m.

Julie Hanson
City Clerk

David Grant
Mayor