



Approved: December 8, 2021

---

---

**CITY OF ARDEN HILLS, MINNESOTA  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2021  
6:30 P.M. - ARDEN HILLS CITY HALL**

---

---

**CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

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

**ROLL CALL**

Present were: Chair Paul Vijums, Commissioners Marcie Jefferys, Subbaya Subramanian, Kurtis Weber, and Jonathan Wicklund.

Absent: Commissioners Steven Jones and Clayton Zimmerman.

Also present were: City Planner Jessica Jagoe and Councilmember Fran Holmes.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA – NOVEMBER 3, 2021**

**Chair Vijums moved, seconded by Commissioner Wicklund, to approve the November 3, 2021, agenda as presented. The motion carried unanimously (5-0).**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

*October 6, 2021 – Planning Commission Regular Meeting*

**Commissioner Wicklund moved, seconded by Commissioner Weber, to approve the October 6, 2021, Planning Commission Regular Meeting as presented. The motion carried unanimously (5-0).**

**PLANNING CASES**

- A. Planning Case 21-025; 4200 Round Lake Road – Site Plan Review – *Public Hearing Not Required***

**City Planner Jagoe** stated Scannell Properties was approved Resolution 2020-045 for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) subject to 35 conditions on October 12, 2020 that was part of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) for the subject property in order to operate a warehouse use in the facility to be constructed. The approximate 21 acre site is located south of the cul-de-sac on

Gateway Boulevard and north of Interstate 694 and east of 35W. The Subject Property had been vacant since 2006 with wetlands located adjacent to Interstates (“35W and 694”). The site is highly visible from 694 and 35W. Separate access points to the site are provided via Gateway Boulevard for employee parking and deliveries. The site development will include office space, warehousing, ground level unloading access with 38 dock doors located on the north side of the building, and at-grade office parking lots located on the south side of the building. One of the conditions from Resolution 2020-045 stated “Site Plan approval shall be required for the construction of the proof of parking area”. The Applicant has a prospective tenant that will occupy two-thirds of the building which also necessitates the need for construction of this future parking area. Therefore, the Applicant is pursuing the Site Plan Review for expansion of the parking area.

**City Planner Jagoe** reviewed the surrounding area, the Plan Evaluation and provided the Findings of Fact for review:

1. The Applicant has submitted an application for Site Plan Review to construct additional parking previously identified as “proof of parking” at the subject property 4200 Round Lake Road.
2. The Subject Property is located with the Gateway Business (“GB”) District and is guided as Light Industrial & Office on the 2040 Land Use Plan.
3. The Applicant operates under a Master Planned Unit Development and has been approved for construction of a 250,000 square foot office and warehouse facility on the Subject Property.
4. Flexibility through the PUD process was granted in the following areas: parking setbacks, minimum caliper inches, and perennials and shrubberies.
5. The proposed plan does not conflict with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Code or the Comprehensive Development Plan for the City.
6. The application is not anticipated to create a negative impact on the immediate area or the community as a whole.
7. The proposed plan will not produce any permanent noise, odors, vibration, smoke, dust, air pollution, heat, liquid, or solid waste, and other nuisance characteristics.
8. The proposed plan is not anticipated to have any impact on traffic or parking conditions.
9. The accessory off-street parking would be in compliance with all provisions of the Zoning Code.
10. A public hearing is not required for Site Plan Review.

**City Planner Jagoe** stated staff recommends approval of f Planning Case 21- 025 for Site Plan Review at 4200 Round Lake Road, based on the findings of fact and the submitted plans, as amended by the conditions in the November 3, 2021, Report to the Planning Commission:

- 1) All conditions of the original Conditional Use Permit and Planned Unit Development shall remain in full force and effect.
- 2) That 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.
- 3) The proposed parking area shall conform to all other regulations in the City Code.
- 4) A building permit shall be obtained for the proposed parking lot expansion.

- 5) Prior to the issuance of a land disturbance permit, engineering staff shall approve in writing the final design of parking lot expansion and underground retention system.
- 6) 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.
- 7) A right of way permit shall be required for work performed within the City right of way.
- 8) A grading as-built and utility as-built plan shall be provided to the City upon completion of grading and utility work.
- 9) 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.
- 10) A Grading and Erosion permit shall be obtained from the City's Engineering Department 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.
- 11) 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.
- 12) Prior to the issuance of a land disturbance permit, the Applicant shall submit an amended stormwater facilities operation and maintenance plan for the long-term care of all on-site and off-site stormwater facilities 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.
- 13) An amended Stormwater Facilities Operation and Maintenance Agreement shall be presented to the City Engineer for review by the City Attorney and subject to City Council approval. The Stormwater Facilities Operation and Maintenance Agreement shall be fully executed prior to release of a land disturbance permit and building permit.
- 14) Prior to the issuance of a land disturbance permit, all items identified in the Engineering Division memo shall be addressed. All comments shall be adopted herein by reference.
- 15) Prior to issuance of land disturbance permit, the Applicant shall be required to fully execute the vacation and/or dedication of easement(s) as determined by the Public Works Director/City Engineer prior to commencement of any site activities associated with the expanded "proof of parking" area.
- 16) The Applicant shall be required to submit revised site plans prepared in accordance with city code to the Zoning Department for approval prior to issuance of the building and/or land disturbance permits. Site Plan Review does not include approval of setback flexibility as shown.

**City Planner Jagoe** 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 Vijums** opened the floor to Commissioner comments.

**Commissioner Weber** asked if the parking lot was adequately sized given the size of the building.

**City Planner Jagoe** stated the parking lot will accommodate the entire capacity of the building. She discussed the required number of stalls and noted the site would be properly parked.

**Chair Vijums** noted 362 parking spaces were required. He questioned why an additional 198 spaces were being added.

**City Planner Jagoe** explained the City's calculation for parking was based on the floor area of the building. She reported the developer has a tenant that is going to necessitate additional parking.

**Chair Vijums** requested further comment from the applicant regarding the proposed parking.

**Dan Salzer**, Scannell Properties, explained the 362 stalls was to meet the building square footage requirements for the City. He commented now that he has tenants, there was a need for more parking. He discussed how he was working to meet the needs of his tenant.

**Chair Vijums** questioned if the change to working from home, or working virtually would create a shift in the parking needs for this property.

**Mr. Salzer** indicated his tenant has looked into this but based on the tenants other location, the proposed parking would remain as is.

**Councilmember Holmes** stated she was confused with why the tenant would require such a large number of parking spaces given the fact the chart shows a large portion of the building would be warehouse.

**Mr. Salzer** discussed how the building would be divided between office, warehouse and lab space. He stated the additional 198 parking spaces were based on the tenants needs. He noted he could provide staff with an updated chart for the building space breakdown prior to the City Council meeting.

**Chair Vijums** questioned if the additional 198 parking spaces were needed given the fact this would come at a great cost and disrupts a wetland.

**Mr. Salzer** explained the site would have 40,000 square feet of office. He reported the tenant would be bringing a lot more employees to the building than was anticipated in the spec building.

He commented whether 10 or more parking spaces were built, the underground stormwater system would still have to be built on this property.

**Commissioner Subramanian** asked how the parking would be shared.

**Mr. Salzer** stated the first tenant would have a pro-rata share of the parking spaces and the other tenant would receive the pro-rate share plus the additional 100 spaces.

**Commissioner Subramanian** inquired if the proposed parking was based on the number of people proposed to be coming into the building and not the office/lab square footage.

**Mr. Salzer** reported this was the case.

**Commissioner Subramanian** commented this was a difficult matter for the Commission to consider because based on the size of the building, the proposed number of parking stalls was too high.

**Mr. Salzer** indicated he was not proposing to impact any wetlands, rather he would be changing the way the water is treated on the site within a manmade structure.

**Commissioner Wicklund** stated he may be interested in adding Condition 18 to read: The developer to confirm tenant usage and office/industrial split so that it aligns with current Arden Hills parking standards.

**Chair Vijums** supported this recommendation.

Further discussion ensued regarding the parking needs for the two tenants within this building.

**Commissioner Jefferys** requested further information regarding how traffic patterns would be impacted with an additional 198 cars in this lot.

**Mr. Salzer** commented given the location of this building the traffic would come in and out the same way. He stated he was asking for an additional access point.

**Chair Vijums** suggested Condition 18 read: The applicant to provide City staff with information regarding additional employee numbers to confirm the need for 198 additional parking spaces.

**Councilmember Holmes** reviewed the language within City Code regarding parking requirements.

**Mr. Salzer** indicated the code was written as a minimum which meant he did not have to exactly hit this number. Rather, he was requesting to have more parking because his tenant would be bringing in more jobs to the community.

**Councilmember Holmes** stated the City did not want too much parking on the site if it was not needed. She supported the applicant providing the City with additional information on why so many additional parking spaces were needed.

**Chair Vijums** commented based on the discussion it appears the chart needs to be updated and the City needs proof for the additional parking spaces. He questioned if the Commission could take action on this item with these matters unresolved, or should the Planning Case be tabled.

**City Planner Jagoe** stated she would leave this up to the Planning Commission. She noted additional conditions could be added to the Planning Case if the item were to move forward to the City Council for final approval.

**Chair Vijums** indicated he was comfortable moving the item forward with conditions.

**Commissioner Weber** stated if all of the additional spaces were not needed, then the infiltration basin would not be needed which would change the plans for the site. However, he understood the applicant has requested the parking based on the needs of their tenant.

**Mr. Salzer** indicated he was asking for something that fell within code. He stated once his chart was updated, he would be meeting code, with a request for additional parking stalls given the number of new jobs that would be brought into the community.

**Commissioner Wicklund** commented he believed the setbacks were adequate and noted he could support adding an additional 198 parking spaces. He recommended a condition be added to require the applicant to provide the City Council with additional information regarding the need for the extra parking spaces.

**Chair Vijums** supported this recommendation.

**City Planner Jagoe** reported staff would look for the applicant to provide a breakdown of uses within the building with the new tenants along with information as to why additional parking spaces were necessary.

**Commissioner Wicklund** asked if there was a time constraint to make this decision tonight versus in a month.

**Mr. Salzer** reported he would like to keep the project moving along because work on the stormwater treatment basin would be done over the winter months.

**Chair Vijums moved and Commissioner Wicklund seconded a motion to recommend approval of Planning Case 21-025 for a Site Plan Review at 4200 Round Lake Road based on the findings of fact and the submitted plans, as amended by the conditions in the November 3, 2021, report to the Planning Commission, adding Condition 17 (The applicant shall be required to verify the caliper inches of trees to be planted and in necessary submit and updated landscaping plan reflective of the minimum caliper inches approved under the PUD) and Condition 18 (The Applicant shall confirm tenant usage in conformance with the Arden Hills parking standards and provide any explanation to exceed that standard). The motion carried unanimously (5-0).**

#### **UNFINISHED AND NEW BUSINESS**

None.

---

---

**REPORTS****A. Report from the City Council**

**Councilmember Holmes** provided the Commission with an update from the City Council. She noted on October 11<sup>th</sup> the Council considered the Aldi proposal and did not approve given the high level of flexibility that was requested. She explained at the October 18<sup>th</sup> worksession the Council discussed the Ridgewood Road project. She commented on October 25<sup>th</sup> the Council recognized Jason Isaacson and Kelly Moeller for providing the City with State funding to assist with the Lexington Avenue watermain project. She reported Jessica Jagoe was promoted to City Planner and the City was now hiring for a Senior Planner. In addition, Grace Arel was hired as the City's new Communications Coordinator.

**B. Planning Commission Comments and Requests**

Commissioner Jefferys asked that the Commission receive background information on the Comprehensive Plan at a future Planning Commission meeting.

**ADJOURN**

**Chair Vjums moved, seconded by Commissioner Subramanian, to adjourn the November 3, 2021, Planning Commission Meeting at 7:36 p.m. The motion carried unanimously (5-0).**