

## **COON RAPIDS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF APRIL 21, 2016**

---

### **CALL TO ORDER**

---

The regular agenda meeting of the Coon Rapids Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Schwartz at 6:30 p.m.

Members Present: Chair Wayne Schwartz, Commissioners Kathie Casey, Denise Hosch, Ray Knoblauch, Mary Schmolke, Zachary Stephenson and Julia Stevens.

Members Absent: None.

Staff Present: Planner Scott Harlicker; and, Assistant City Attorney Doug Johnson.

---

### **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

---

Chair Schwartz led the Commission in the Pledge of Allegiance.

### **OATH OF OFFICE**

---

Planner Harlicker administered the Oath of Office to newly appointed Planning Commission Kathie Casey.

### **ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

---

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER STEVENS, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER HOSCH, TO ADOPT THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

### **APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 17, 2016 REGULAR MINUTES**

---

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER HOSCH, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER STEVENS, TO APPROVE THE PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF MARCH 17, 2016, AS PRESENTED. THE MOTION PASSED 6-0-1 (CASEY ABSTAINED).

### **OLD BUSINESS**

---

1. PLANNING CASE 16-2 – PRELIMINARY PLAT – VISION 15 – 12 LOT TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT – 1005 COON RAPIDS BOULEVARD EXTENSION – VISION BANK – PUBLIC HEARING
- 

It was noted the applicant is requesting preliminary plat approval for a 12-lot townhouse development. Staff discussed the request in detail with the Commission and recommended approval.

Commissioner Stephenson asked if the open space would be fenced along the eastern property line. Planner Harlicker reported there was an existing fence in place, but understood it would be beneficial to have a fence between the property and the railroad property.

Commissioner Casey asked if the proposed trail would connect to a City trail. Planner Harlicker noted this trail would connect to the City trail system.

Chair Schwartz opened and closed the public hearing at 6:47 p.m., as no one wished to address the Planning Commission.

Chair Schwartz inquired if the road would be signed "No Parking". Planner Harlicker reported the roadway would be signed "No Parking" due to the fact it was only 24 feet wide.

Representative for the applicant reviewed several material boards with the Planning Commission. He noted the color palette would be pastel in nature and the units would have wooden doors. He explained the shingles would be beige or tan.

Commissioner Stephenson asked if the applicant would be placing a fence on the western property line. The applicant's representative reported there was not a plan to put up a fence, but he was willing to work with the City to see if this may work.

Commissioner Schmolke questioned if the townhomes would have individual trash service. The representative stated this would be the case.

Commissioner Schmolke inquired if the 24-foot road could accommodate garbage trucks and snow plows. Planner Harlicker reported both trucks would be able to use this street.

Commissioner Casey asked if the snowplowing for the units would be provided by a private vendor. Planner Harlicker stated this would be the case.

Chair Schwartz expressed concern with the applicants landscaping plan. He questioned if the applicant understood the City's landscaping requirements. The representative indicated he would be working with the City to adjust the landscaping plan in order to meet the City's requirements. Planner Harlicker commented that if the applicant were to plant oversized trees the number required could be reduced.

**MOTION BY COMMISSIONER STEPHENSON, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER SCHMOLKE, TO APPROVE PLANNING CASE 16-2, THE PRELIMINARY PLAT WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS**

1. PARK DEDICATION IN THE AMOUNT OF \$22,000 (11 UNITS X \$2,000/UNIT) BE PAID PRIOR TO RELEASING THE PLAT FOR RECORDING.
2. ALL ENGINEERING COMMENTS BE ADDRESSED.
3. THE AREA ENCUMBERED BY THE HIGHWAY EASEMENT SHOULD BE INCLUDED AS PART OF LOT 12.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

This is a recommendation to the City Council that will be considered at the May 3, 2016 City Council meeting.

2. PLANNING CASE 16-1 – SITE PLAN FOR 11 UNIT TOWNHOME DEVELOPMENT  
– 1005 COON RAPIDS BOULEVARD EXTENSION – VISION BANK – PUBLIC  
HEARING

---

It was noted the applicant is requesting site plan approval for an 11-unit townhouse development. Staff discussed the request in detail with the Commission and recommended approval.

Chair Schwartz opened and closed the public hearing at 6:47 p.m., as no one wished to address the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Stephenson questioned why only 30% of the open space would be sodded. Planner Harlicker stated this related to the grading of the property and noted the playground area would likely be sand or ground up tires. He recommended the Commission add a condition stating all disturbed areas, including the area around the common area, will be sodded.

Commissioner Stephenson recommended a condition be added requiring the applicant to construct a fence along the entire western property line.

Commissioner Stevens questioned if a fence should be required along the northern property line.

Commissioner Stephenson supported this recommendation and commented there was a fence along the northern property line at this time. He requested staff ensure the existing fence was adequate and that it be tied into the new fence along the western property line.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER STEPHENSON, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER STEVENS, TO APPROVE PLANNING CASE 16-1, THE SITE PLAN WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. ALL ENGINEERING COMMENTS BE ADDRESSED.
2. THE LANDSCAPE PLAN BE REVISED SO IT COMPLIES WITH THE BUFFER REQUIREMENTS, STREET TREE REQUIREMENTS AND OPEN SPACE LANDSCAPING REQUIREMENTS.
3. CHILDREN'S PLAY EQUIPMENT AND ADULT RECREATION AREA MUST BE IDENTIFIED.
4. HOMEOWNERS DOCUMENT MUST BE APPROVED BY THE CITY ATTORNEY.
5. THE PRELIMINARY AND FINAL PLATS BE APPROVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL.

6. ALL DISTURBED AREAS, INCLUDING THE AREA AROUND THE COMMON AREA, WILL BE SODDED.
7. A SIX-FOOT HIGH FENCE, APPROVED BY CITY STAFF, BE CONSTRUCTED ALONG THE ENTIRE NORTHERN AND WESTERN PROPERTY LINES.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

This is a decision made by the Planning Commission and shall stand unless appealed to the City Council within ten days after notification of the decision.

#### NEW BUSINESS

---

#### 3. PLANNING CASE 16-9 – AMENDMENT TO GATEWAY COMMERCE CENTER PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT – H&W, LLC – PUBLIC HEARING

---

It was noted the applicant is requesting approval to amend the final PUD to include additional land for the approved auto dealership site. Staff discussed the request in detail with the Commission and recommended approval.

Commissioner Stephenson asked if the applicant had taken a comprehensive look at the PUD. Planner Harlicker reported only the change to the car dealership was being requested. Staff believed the request was significant enough to warrant a PUD amendment.

Commissioner Casey questioned if the dealership would have only one point of access from the cul-de-sac. Planner Harlicker reviewed the two access points to the dealership from the cul-de-sac.

Commissioner Casey inquired what happened to the swim club. Planner Harlicker deferred this question to the applicant.

Chair Schwartz did not want to see the car dealership unloading vehicles on Gateway Commerce Drive. He asked if the transport vehicles would be able to drive onto the car dealership site in order to unload. Planner Harlicker reported this was the case.

Chair Schwartz questioned if the Fire Department supported the proposed access to the car dealership through the cul-de-sac. Planner Harlicker stated this was the case.

Chair Schwartz asked if the Commission should be making recommendations on the landscaping plan at this time. Planner Harlicker commented now would be the time to make those comments.

Johnathan Adam, H&W, discussed the site plan in further detail with the Commission. He noted he worked for several years with the swim school and this organization was not able to bring their plans to fruition. He reported Walser had recently contacted him and requested to expand their site. For this reason, he requested an amendment to the PUD.

Commissioner Stephenson questioned if the applicant was interested taking a more comprehensive look at the PUD at this time. Mr. Adam believed a comprehensive look was completed through the previous request.

Chair Schwartz opened the public hearing at 7:20 p.m.

Laurie Janson, 1221 118<sup>th</sup> Avenue NW, stated she has lived in Coon Rapids since 1988 and appreciated the open feel of the community at that time. She opposed the plan. She believed the property should remain open and was disappointed by the proposed development. It was her opinion the City had enough hotels and did not see why someone would want to stay in Coon Rapids. She did not see the need for another large car dealership in the City and was concerned for how the wildlife in the area would be impacted. She believed the City had more to offer than additional retail. She encouraged the Commission to deny the request.

Mary Standard, 1201 109<sup>th</sup> Lane NW, did not want to see another car dealership on this property. She was surprised by the fact that no one in the City knew about this development, which concerned her. She feared that the public had not had an opportunity to provide any feedback regarding this PUD. In addition, she did not want to see the wildlife in this area disrupted.

Assistant City Attorney Johnson reviewed the history of the project and explained a PUD has been in place on this property for the past 20 years. He discussed the previous lawsuit with the Army Corp of Engineers for this property. He indicated the City was stuck to the uses on this site. Chair Schwartz thanked staff for providing this information to the public.

Chair Schwartz closed the public hearing at 7:25 p.m.

Commissioner Hosch indicated she was frustrated by this amendment request. She explained the PUD was supposed to support diversity and did not like the one large use. She understood the market was not supporting diverse uses, but believed the City should be coming up with something more exciting. She stated she would probably support the request, but explained she was beginning to question the entire PUD process.

Commissioner Stephenson shared this same frustration. For this reason, he would not be supporting the PUD amendment request. He understood that some of the uses were no longer viable, but did not agree with a huge chunk of this land being a car dealership. He did not believe this was keeping in line with the original PUD request.

Commissioner Stevens agreed. She thought the PUD had been changed way too many times and believed other uses should be considered for this area. She stated she would not be supporting the PUD amendment.

Commissioner Knoblauch discussed the tradeoff between business development and use of land within the PUD. He asked if the Coon Creek Watershed would be considering the environmental impact on this property through the proposed development. Planner Harlicker stated when the PUD was originally approved, a stormwater management plan was created to address the environmental impact on the site.

Chair Schwartz was disappointed the Commission was being asked to consider another amendment, especially considering the fact the Commission had requested a comprehensive review of the PUD last year. He agreed the PUD should have a variety of uses and noted over half of the site would be a car dealership. For this reason, he would not be supporting the PUD amendment.

Commissioner Schmolke questioned how the applicant should proceed.

Chair Schwartz believed the applicant should find another user for the two lots and not increase the size of the current car dealership.

Mr. Adam appreciated the comments from the Commission. He discussed the history of the site and commented on the investment the developer has made in allowing this site to meet the PUD design guidelines. He explained the plan for this site had been in place for the past 10 years. He reported he requested more flexibility from the Council in 2015. He commented the market could support a dealership and understood the City was disappointed to see the swim school go away. He believed the portions of the development that had been completed to date were very well done and were being utilized by Coon Rapids residents. He requested the Commission support the PUD amendment in order to provide a high quality development.

Commissioner Casey reported she lived in this area of the City and wanted to see the site developed. She believed the petitioner was aware of the environmental issues. She supported the development moving forward as requested.

Commissioner Stevens commented bigger is not always better and stated she would still not be supporting the proposed PUD amendment.

Commissioner Knoblauch discussed the success of the businesses that have been developed within the PUD. He understood this was a beautiful area of the community and had a great deal of wildlife. He believed the proposed request was a good use of the space and thought this development would spur further development in this portion of the City. He encouraged the Commissioners to consider the benefits of the development.

Commissioner Stephenson commented development was coming to this area. He reported the decision to develop this land was made a long time ago. He indicated the Commission had the right to make a decision about what went on this land. He wanted the City to take a more comprehensive look at what was going onto this property. He did not want to see another large car dealership along this high visibility property. He understood the swim school did not work out, but wanted to see if another use could be found for this site.

**MOTION BY COMMISSIONER STEPHENSON, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER STEVENS, TO RECOMMEND DENIAL OF PLANNING CASE 16-9, THE AMENDMENT TO THE PUD.**

Commissioner Schmolke asked if the existing Walser dealership would be impacted by the new location. Mr. Adam was uncertain. He informed the Commission again that a dealership had already been approved through the previous PUD. He explained the request was being made to

expand the dealership to make it better for the City, and noted there were several other dealerships in the Coon Rapids that were the same size. He believed Walser would be supportive of site enhancements.

THE MOTION PASSED 4-3 (CASEY, KNOBLAUCH AND SCHMOLKE OPPOSED).

This is a recommendation to the City Council that will be considered at the May 3, 2016 City Council meeting.

#### OTHER BUSINESS

---

Planner Harlicker provided the Planning Commission with an update on current development taking place in the City of Coon Rapids.

#### ADJOURN

---

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER HOSCH, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER CASEY, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:51 P.M. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Recorded and Transcribed by,  
Heidi Guenther  
Planning Commission Recording Secretary