



Approved: September 4, 2019

**CITY OF ARDEN HILLS, MINNESOTA
PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, JULY 10, 2019
6:30 P.M. - ARDEN HILLS CITY HALL**

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Pursuant to due call and notice thereof, Chair Nick Gehrig called to order the regular Planning Commission meeting at 6:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Chair Nick Gehrig, Commissioners James Lambeth, Subbaya Subramnian, Paul Vijjums, Jonathan Wicklund, and Clayton Zimmerman.

Absent: Commissioner Steven Jones.

Also present were: Community Development Manager/City Planner Mike Mrosla and Councilmember Dave McClung.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA – JULY 10, 2019

Chair Gehrig stated the agenda will stand as published.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

June 5, 2019 – Planning Commission Regular Meeting

Commissioner Zimmerman moved, seconded by Commissioner Lambeth, to approve the June 5, 2019, Planning Commission Regular Meeting as presented. The motion carried unanimously (6-0).

PLANNING CASES

- A. Planning Case 19-002; Summit Development – Site Plan Review, Final Planned Unit Development, Rezoning, Comprehensive Plan, Preliminary and Final Plat, Conditional Use Permit – *Public Hearing***

Community Development Manager/City Planner Mrosla stated the proposed development site is approximately 5.32 acres in size and is comprised of four separate properties: 1718, 1720, and 1722 Parkshore Drive and 4177 Old Highway 10. The properties are currently vacant. The City owns an approximately 4-acre parcel of land that borders the site on the west and extends

north to the south side of Round Lake. This property is identified in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan as being part of the Arden Hills parks system, but it has not yet been developed by the City to include recreational amenities.

Community Development Manager/City Planner Mrosła explained the City previously approved a Final Plat and Planned Unit Development for the site in 1989 that would have allowed for the construction of four stand-alone apartment buildings, one on each of the four lots. Each building would have included 16 units for a total of 64 units. Due to financial constraints the developer was unable to move forward with the project and the PUD expired in January 1992.

Community Development Manager/City Planner Mrosła reported at their August 21, 2017 meeting the City Council reviewed a concept plan submitted by Pulte Homes. Pulte Home presented a proposal to construct 59 units of attached townhomes. The concept plan showed 11 separate buildings on the subject site. Each of the stand-alone buildings would have four to six individual units as shown below. Units would range in size from 1,580 to 2,500 gross square feet. In order to address stormwater management, two collection ponds are proposed. The larger of the two ponds would have a surface area of 15,200 square feet and was shown located on the adjacent City-owned park property. However, Pulte Homes didn't move forward with the project.

Site Data

Land Use Plan:	MDR – Medium Density Residential
Existing Land Use:	Undeveloped
Zoning:	R-1: Single Family Residential
Current Lot Sizes:	9.34 Acres (includes 5.32 Acres + 4 Acres of City Park)
Topography:	There are substantial grade changes on this site, with elevations ranging from the low point of 892'

Community Development Manager/City Planner Mrosła reviewed the surrounding area, detailed the land swap, summarized the Plan Evaluation and provided the Findings of Fact for review:

1. The property located at 1718, 1720, 1722 Parkshore Drive and 4177 Old Highway 10 is designated for Medium Density Residential uses on the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. The applicant has requested an amendment to designation this property for High Density Residential uses.
2. The applicant has proposed a Site Plan Review, Final Planned Unit Development, Rezoning, Comprehensive Plan, Preliminary Plat, and Final Plat in order to construct 120 units of independent living, assisted living, and memory care.
3. The applicant has submitted a preliminary and final plat to consolidate five (5) contiguous properties.
4. The Final PUD substantially conforms with the requirements of the City Code.
5. Where the plan is not in conformance with the City Code, flexibility has been requested by the applicant and/or conditions have been placed on an approval that would mitigate the nonconformity.
6. Flexibility through the PUD process has been requested in the following areas: lot size, minimum landscape coverage, building height and parking requirements.

7. The proposed development plan meets or exceeds the minimum requirements of the City Code in the following areas: building coverage, setbacks, street trees, perennials and shrubs, minimum caliper inches, tree selection, drainage, wetlands and flood plain, lighting, and screening.
8. The applicant has submitted a rezoning application and a comprehensive plan amendment.
9. The subject site is proposed to be rezoned from R-1 (Single Family Residential) to R-4 (Multiple Dwelling).
10. Nursing homes and assisted living facilities area allowed as a conditional use in the R-4 District.
11. The Arden Hills 2040 Comprehensive Plan designates the future land use of the subject property as Medium Density Residential.
12. The applicant has requested a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to change the future land use designation of the property to High Density Residential.
13. The adjacent properties to the north and east are zoned R-3 and R-1, respectively, and are guided for Medium Density Residential use in the Arden Hills 2040 Comprehensive Plan.
14. The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment would be compatible with adjacent land uses and the goals included in the Land Use chapter of the Arden Hills 2040 Comprehensive Plan.
15. The application is not anticipated to create a negative impact on the immediate area or the community as a whole.

Community Development Manager/City Planner Mroska stated staff recommends approval of Planning Case 19-002 for a Site Plan Review, Final Planned Unit Development, Rezoning, Comprehensive Plan, Preliminary Plat, and Final Plat at 1718, 1720, 1722 Parkshore Drive and 4177 Old Highway 10, based on the findings of fact and submitted plans, subject to the following conditions:

1. The project shall be completed in accordance with the plans submitted as amended by the conditions of approval. Any significant changes to the plans, as determined by the City Planner, shall require review and approval by the Planning Commission and City Council.
2. The Conditional Use Permit and Planned Unit Development approvals shall expire one year from the date of City Council approval unless a building permit has been requested or a time extension has been granted by the City Council.
3. The Preliminary Plat approval shall expire six months from the date of the City Council approval unless the Final Plat has recorded with Ramsey County or a time extension granted by the City Council.
4. Execution of the Final Plat is contingent upon approval of the Comprehensive Plan amendment by the Metropolitan Council.
5. Prior to the release of the Final Plat for recording, the Applicant shall enter into a Development Agreement.
6. The Final Plat shall be recorded prior to the issuance of a building permit.
7. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Applicant shall deed Outlot A to the City. Dedication shall occur free of encumbrances and at no cost to the City.
8. All disturbed boulevards shall be restored with sod.

9. All areas of the site, where practical, shall be sodded or seeded and maintained. The property owner shall mow and maintain all site boulevards to the curb line of the public streets.
10. The maximum number of units allowed on site is 120.
11. 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. If complaints are received the lighting adjacent to residential uses shall utilize house shields as directed by the City. In addition, any lighting under canopies (building entries) shall be recessed and use a flush lens.
12. The Applicant shall be financially responsible for all applicable water and sanitary charges. Rates applied shall be those in effect at the time of Final Plat approval and shall be memorialized in the Development Agreement.
13. A right-of-way permit shall be required for work performed within the City right-of-way.
14. No exterior storage shall be permitted.
15. Prior to the issuance of a land disturbance permit, the Applicant shall submit an operation and maintenance plan for the long-term care of all on-site and off-site stormwater, sanitary sewer, and water main to the City for review and approval. The Applicant will be responsible to carry out these operation and maintenance activities and to submit the appropriate documentation to the City as specified.
16. Any future trash enclosures shall utilize wooden gates and be constructed on three sides using the same materials and patterns used on the building. Locations shall be approved by the Planning Department.
17. This approval does not include signs. A separate sign permit is required for all proposed signage. All signage shall meet the requirements of Sign District 2.
18. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a landscape financial security of \$20,000.00 dollars shall be submitted. Landscape financial security is held for two full growing seasons.
19. Before construction, grading, or land clearing begins, trees or tree areas that are to be preserved shall be visibly marked and city-approved tree protection fencing or other method shall be installed and maintained at the critical root zones of the trees to be protected. The location of the fencing shall be in conformance with the approved tree preservation plan and approved by staff in writing.
20. All rooftop or ground mounted mechanical equipment shall be hidden from view with the same materials used on the building in accordance with City Code requirements.
21. All fencing and retaining wall materials shall be complementary to the building materials and shall be approved in writing by the Planning Division prior to issuance of a building permit. Retaining walls greater than four (4) feet in height shall be engineered and detailed calculations shall be submitted to the City.
22. Prior to City Council, the Applicant shall submit a materials board to be approved in writing by staff.
23. 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 Developer shall be responsible for obtaining any permits necessary from other agencies, including but not limited to, MPCA, Rice Creek Watershed District, and Ramsey County, MNDOT prior to the start of any site activities.

24. 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. Temporary stormwater facilities shall be installed to protect the quality aspect of the proposed and existing stormwater facilities prior to and during construction activities. Maintenance of any and all temporary stormwater facilities shall be the responsibility of the Applicant.
25. Prior to the issuance Grading and Erosion permit, the Engineering Department shall review and approve final grading and utility plans in writing.
26. All proposed workout station equipment shall be approved by staff prior to the issuance of a building permit.
27. The Applicant shall update the landscaping to meet the required tree mitigation prior to the issuance of a Grading and Erosion control permit.
28. The property owners shall complete snow removal, maintenance and replacement of all proposed sidewalks and trails unless a written agreement between the City and owner establishes a different requirement.

Community Development Manager/City Planner Mrosla reviewed the options available to the Planning Commission on this matter:

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

Chair Gehrig opened the public hearing at 7:01 p.m.

Chair Gehrig invited anyone for or against the application to come forward and make comment.

George Winnicke, 4175 Old Highway 10, explained this property has been in his family's name for 109 years. He indicated he has seen the whole area develop over his lifetime. He commented he put covenants in place to protect himself from apartments. He stated he was surprised by the size of the proposed 4.5-acre park and questioned where the stormwater pond would be located. He reported he originally had concerns with the proposed density but understood the site would develop. He stated overall, he believed this was the best use for the site and requested the City work with him further to iron out the outlot details.

Community Development Manager/City Planner Mrosla discussed how the City had received 4.5 acres of land for the proposed park. He then reviewed the location of the stormwater pond.

Justine Winnicke, _____, questioned how much lighting would be involved in the development.

Community Development Manager/City Planner Mrosla reported 25-foot-tall lighting would be used and explained accent lighting would be placed on the buildings. He explained all lighting would be downward facing.

Chuck McCann, 1682 Burberry, stated he lived in the adjacent townhouses. He asked if a noise barrier would be put in place along the highway.

Community Development Manager/City Planner Mrosła anticipated the building would act as a noise barrier. He reported federal action would be required to get a noise wall along the freeway.

Mr. Winnicke questioned what the height of the new building would be.

Jamison Polk, Summit Development, explained the height at the mid-point was 40 feet six inches and noted the highest point on the roof was roughly 47 feet.

There being no additional comment Chair Gehrig closed the public hearing at 7:17 p.m.

Chair Gehrig opened the floor to Commissioner comments.

Commissioner Zimmerman discussed the parking situation. He questioned if the site was adequately parked for guests and asked where employees would park.

Mr. Polk explained based on his experience senior housing developments require .6 to .75 parking stalls per unit. He indicated not all residents would have cars and estimated only 25% of the residents would still be driving. He noted the site would have 50 surface stalls for employees and visitors.

Commissioner Wicklund asked what the minimum requirements were for studio apartments.

Community Development Manager/City Planner Mrosła reviewed the size requirements for studio apartments. He explained the studio style memory care units were designed to protect the patients.

Mr. Polk indicated the memory care patients spent the majority of their time in the memory care unit and used their apartment strictly for sleeping purposes. He commented further on the size and purpose of the memory care unit.

Commissioner Wicklund inquired if the City had reviewed and approved the exchange process.

Community Development Manager/City Planner Mrosła reported the exchange had been reviewed by the City Attorney and he recommended approval of the process.

Commissioner Wicklund questioned if the City Council had a written policy for changing uses to increase or decrease density. He stated the City Council was typically averse to increasing density.

Community Development Manager/City Planner Mrosła explained the PUD process allows for development with a greater number of units while the City receives something in return for allowing the use. He indicated the Council had reviewed this application twice and originally had concerns with the density and noted the number of units had been decreased. He stated one of the City's goals was to have life cycling housing, which this plan would be providing.

Commissioner Wicklund asked if there was a reason a timeline had been placed on Conditions #2 and #3.

Community Development Manager/City Planner Mrosła reported these conditions were taken from City Code and noted the City Council could grant an extension. He commented further on the project timeline and stated he anticipated the project would not begin until 2020.

Commissioner Vijums inquired if the previously requested Pulte project was high density.

Community Development Manager/City Planner Mrosła stated the Pulte project was high density and the proposed project was medium density.

Commissioner Vijums questioned what type of surface the trail would have on the west end of the project.

Mr. Polk explained the walking loop would be an eight-foot-wide asphalt trail. He indicated the loop around the building would be 20 feet wide and would serve as a fire lane. He commented benches and six exercise stations would be featured throughout the trail.

Commissioner Vijums asked who would maintain the trail and exercise stations in the future.

Community Development Manager/City Planner Mrosła reported the applicant would maintain these items into the future and noted this was included as a condition for approval (Condition 28). He stated this Condition could be amended to read: The property owner shall complete snow removal, maintenance and replacement of all proposed sidewalks, trails and equipment, unless a written agreement between the City and owner establishes a different requirement.

Commissioner Vijums inquired if the other developments were approved with flexibility.

Community Development Manager/City Planner Mrosła stated this was the case.

Commissioner Vijums requested further information regarding the tree screening plans.

Community Development Manager/City Planner Mrosła reviewed the landscaping and tree planting plan with the Commission. He noted the trees would not be planted until the building was constructed.

Mr. Polk stated he was happy to plant trees to provide screening for the Winnicke property and to be a good neighbor.

Chair Gehrig commented the site would have roughly double the units allowed within high density developments.

Community Development Manager/City Planner Mrosła reported this was the case noting the site would have 120 units or roughly 24 units per acre. He provided further comment on the PUD process noting the City would receive the trails and other amenities in return for the increased density.

Mr. Polk explained many other communities allow for 16 to 25 units per acre for high density developments, while Arden Hills only allows 12 units per acre. He stated after speaking with the City Council he learned that this was done to require all larger projects to be brought through the PUD process.

Chair Gehrig asked how the public would access the proposed park.

Community Development Manager/City Planner Mroska explained the park would have public parking and could also be accessed via trail. He noted a trail connection would be completed to the west to Gateway Boulevard at some point in the future.

Chair Gehrig questioned how long this trail connection would be.

Community Development Manager/City Planner Mroska estimated the trail connection would be one-quarter of a mile long.

Chair Gehrig stated with rezonings the Commission was to consider if the parcel was underutilized and he believed this was the case. For this reason, he supported the proposed rezoning.

Commissioner Subramanian indicated he believed the development would be a good addition to the City. He asked if the senior living development would be run by a non-profit entity.

Mr. Polk explained Summit Development was a for-profit business and Walker Methodist, the care manager, was a non-profit entity.

Commissioner Subramanian questioned how the developer arrived at 120 units.

Mr. Polk stated if less than 120 units were constructed it would be difficult for the senior living development to have proper cash flow. He explained in terms of the market study for Arden Hills there was a need for 700 units. He stated the 120 units was the smallest building Summit Development would construct.

Commissioner Subramanian requested further information regarding the land swap.

Mr. Polk discussed the land swap and how it would be used for additional greenspace and an exercise loop.

Community Development Manager/City Planner Mroska commented the park dedication fees for this development would be roughly \$149,100. He reported in this case the applicant was proposing greenspace and park amenities, but anticipated a park dedication fee would still be due to the City.

Commissioner Subramanian questioned how the high-density project would impact the seniors living within the development. It was his opinion the seniors would do better in a low-density development. He asked if any of the trees onsite would be saved.

Mr. Polk reviewed the site plan and noted all of the trees on the outlot would remain in place. He explained 56 trees would be removed from the site out of 172 trees total. He noted three of these trees were dead and 12 were considered nuisance trees. He indicated he had a very thorough landscaping and tree replacement plan in place.

Commissioner Subramanian asked if the Fire and Police Departments were ready to take on more medical and emergency calls.

Community Development Manager/City Planner Mrosła reported this project had been reviewed by the Fire Department and they understood there may be an increase in calls.

Annalise Peterson, Vice President of Operations at Walker Methodist, discussed the benefits of bringing older adults together noting this increased their quality of life and life expectancy. She stated socialization was incredibly important for seniors. She discussed how seniors were encouraged to call for staff or a nurse versus dialing 911.

Commissioner Lambeth stated the site has substantial grade changes from low to high. He anticipated significant grading would be required to complete this development.

Mr. Polk reported there would be a significant amount of export from this site. He stated the lower southeast corner of the building would be at grade on the back side of the hill. He noted he would be excavating into the hill to accommodate the building and underground parking.

Commissioner Lambeth requested further information regarding the lighting plan.

Community Development Manager/City Planner Mrosła reviewed the lighting plan with the Commission.

Mr. Polk explained he would make adjustments to the lighting if any light was spilling off the site onto neighboring properties. He stated he would also be willing to make adjustments to the screening.

Commissioner Lambeth commented on the traffic impact from the proposed development noting it was his understanding not all residents would be driving. He stated he did not have any concerns with the traffic that would be generated by the proposed development.

Mr. Polk reported the development would have 24 memory care units and five enhanced assisted living units. He explained the residents in these units would not drive. He stated it has been his experience that the majority of the residents living in assisted living do not drive. He explained the development was a community experience.

Community Development Manager/City Planner Mrosła explained he had located the language within City Code regarding studio apartments. He stated the maximum unit size for studio apartments within the TRC was 475 square feet, however this excluded memory care, skilled nursing and assisted living units.

Chair Gehrig reviewed the considerations the Commission was to make for the Site Plan Review, Final Planned Unit Development, Rezoning, Comprehensive Plan Amendment,

Preliminary and Final Plat and Conditional Use Permit and noted he supported the proposed senior living development.

Commissioner Lambeth stated he supported the proposed exterior finishes for this development and appreciated the fact this building would blend in well with the adjacent communities.

Community Development Manager/City Planner Mrosla commented for the record that two neighborhood meetings were held for this project. He stated overall there was general support for the project.

Commissioner Subramanian recommended the maximum number of units be capped at 120.

Community Development Manager/City Planner Mrosla stated this could be done by adding a condition for approval to read: The maximum number of units allowed would be 120. This would require the applicant to go through the PUD process again if an amendment were requested.

Chair Gehrig recommended Condition 29 be added to read: The property owner and City shall come to an agreement on connecting the park trail upon opening the park space.

Commissioner Zimmerman moved and Commissioner Vijums seconded a motion to recommend approval of Planning Case 19-002 for Site Plan Review, Final Planned Unit Development, Rezoning, Comprehensive Plan, Preliminary Plat, and Final Plat at 1718, 1720, 1722 Parkshore Drive and 4177 Old Highway 10 based on the findings of fact and the submitted plans, as amended by the twenty-nine (29) conditions in the July 10, 2019, report to the Planning Commission. The motion carried unanimously (6-0).

UNFINISHED AND NEW BUSINESS

None.

REPORTS

A. Report from the City Council

Councilmember McClung provided the Commission with an update from the City Council. He noted a contract with CTV had been approved to upgrade the video equipment in the Council Chambers. He noted the Council considered an exemption for adult only tobacco shops noting a flavor ban was approved and would begin after December 31, 2019. He explained the Council approved the Boston Scientific and Brausen Planning Cases. He thanked the Planning Commission for the great work they do for the City of Arden Hills.

B. Planning Commission Comments and Requests

None.

C. Staff Comments

None.

ADJOURN

Commissioner Zimmerman moved, seconded by Commissioner Vijums, to adjourn the July 10, 2019, Planning Commission Meeting at 8:31 p.m. The motion carried unanimously (6-0).