

City of Cottage Grove Planning Commission November 28, 2005

Pursuant to due call and notice thereof, a regular meeting of the Planning Commission was duly held at City Hall, 7516 – 80th Street South, Cottage Grove, Minnesota on the 28th day of November 2005 in the Council Chambers and telecast on local Government Cable Channel 16.

Call to Order

Chairperson Reese called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call

Members Present: Shane Bauer, Ken Brittain, Rod Hale, Rebecca Kronlund, Shannon Nitsch, Chris Reese, Alberto Ricart, David Thiede

Staff Present: Howard Blin, Community Development Director
John McCool, Senior Planner
Pat Rice, City Council Liaison

Approval of Agenda

Motion by Hale, seconded by Nitsch to approve the agenda. Motion approved unanimously (8-0 vote).

Open Forum

Chairperson Reese asked if anyone wished to address the Planning Commission on any non-agenda item. No one appeared to address the Commission.

Chair's Explanation of the Public Hearing Process

Chairperson Reese explained the purpose of the Planning Commission, which serves in an advisory capacity to the City Council, and the City Council makes all final decisions. In addition, he explained the process of conducting a public hearing and requested that any person wishing to speak should come to the microphone and state their full name and address for the public record.

Public Hearings

6.1 Graphic Resources – Case SP05-060

Vanguard Construction for Graphic Resources has applied for a site plan review of a 25,196 square foot building to be located in the Industrial Park north of 100th Street and east of DeGardners 1st Addition.

McCool summarized the staff report and recommended approval subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.

Hale asked about stormwater system. McCool responded that there is a large stormwater pond located on the south side of 97th Street across from American Agco. The applicant will be required to provide for a water treatment facility on site. The basin location has not yet been determined but it could be in the grass area on the northeast corner of the building or on the southwest corner of the building. Hale asked if 97th Street would be completely constructed. McCool responded only about 400 feet of 97th Street would be constructed next year.

Brittain asked where the trails/sidewalks would be located. McCool stated that the proposal includes a six-foot wide concrete sidewalk to be constructed on the east side of 97th Street and an eight-foot wide bituminous trail on the north side of 100th Street when that street is reconstructed. Brittain asked if the location of the monument sign been taken into consideration with the location of the trail. McCool responded yes, the monument sign is required to be on private property and the trail would be within the right-of-way. Brittain expressed concern that the sign would interfere with sight lines along the trail. Brittain then noted that the proposed trash enclosure looked too small and asked if trash would also be stored inside the building.

Craig Moss, Vanguard Construction, 2350 Wycliff, St. Paul, showed a color elevation of the proposed building. He stated that the majority of the waste is recycled and would be kept inside the building. Brittain asked about the flow of water in the loading dock area. Moss responded that they are working with their engineer and the city's engineer on the design.

Hale asked if there would be any hard surface or roadway access on the western side of the building. Moss stated no.

Reese asked about the tenant and what kind of resources would they need. Moss stated that the building was designed with a dock and a drive-in door on the west side. They have been in contact with a prospective tenant but the lease has not yet been signed.

Thiede asked for more detail on how the water would flow away from the building to the retention pond. McCool responded that there would be a storm sewer pipe system within the new roadway.

Reese asked how much truck traffic is anticipated and if trucks would be parked on site for storage. Moss responded that there would be very little truck traffic and there would be no storage of trailers.

Thiede asked about the contours on the west side of the building. McCool responded that they are earth berms that are four to five feet in height. Thiede asked if those berms would be landscaped. McCool responded that staff is recommending additional plantings on top of the berms.

Bauer asked how far the building was from the property line. McCool responded 100 feet, which is the minimum setback required by the city's zoning ordinance.

Reese opened the public hearing. No one spoke. Reese closed the public hearing.

Brittain made a motion to approve the applications subject to the conditions listed below. Ricart seconded.

- 1. All applicable permits (i.e., building, electrical, grading, mechanical) and a commercial plan review packet must be completed, submitted, and approved by the City prior to the commencement of any construction activities. Detailed construction plans must be reviewed and approved by the Building Official and Fire Marshal.**
- 2. Construction equipment, construction trailer, trailers, or construction materials are prohibited from parking or being stored on 100th Street.**
- 3. All outdoor lighting must be directed downward and away from abutting property owners. Reflected glare of spill light must not exceed five-tenths (0.5) foot-candle as measured on the property line.**
- 4. The grading and erosion control plan for the site must comply with NPDES II Permit requirements. Erosion control devices must be installed prior to commencement of any grading activity. Erosion control must be performed in accordance with the recommended practices of the "Minnesota Construction Site Erosion and Sediment Control Planning Handbook" and the conditions stipulated in Title 10-5-8, Erosion Control During Construction of the City's Subdivision Ordinance.**
- 5. A final grading plan and stormwater calculations must be submitted to the City Engineer for review and approval before a building permit will be issued.**
- 6. Final exterior construction materials and colors must be reviewed and approved by the Planning Division prior to the issuance of a building permit.**
- 7. All curbing for the project must be B618 concrete design and the concrete drive aprons compliant with city standards.**
- 8. The applicant must provide the City with an "as-built" survey of all private utilities.**
- 9. The developer is responsible for the cost of installing a "STOP" sign at each exit lane. The "STOP" sign must be 10 feet from the roadway edge and 2 feet from the driveway edge. The bottom of the sign must be 6 feet from the ground. The "STOP" sign must be a 30-inch sized sign having a high intensity reflective face. Said sign should be mounted on a six-foot No. 3 and eight-foot No. 2 steel post. The applicant may request the City's Public Works Department to install this sign, but must reimburse the City for actual costs incurred by the City.**
- 10. All signs must comply with the provisions of the sign ordinance and a building permit must be obtained prior to the installation of any new signs.**

- 11. A revised landscaping plan must be submitted to the city before a building permit is issued. The revised landscaping plan must conform to the minimum landscaping requirements imposed in Title 11-6-5, Landscaping Requirements of the City Codes. An underground irrigation system must be included in the plan.**
- 12. A bona fide cost estimate of the landscaping improvements must be submitted in conjunction with a letter of credit approved by the City in the amount of 150 percent of such estimate. Upon completion of the landscaping requirements, the applicant shall in writing inform the City that said improvements have been completed. The City will retain the financial guarantee for a period of one year from the date of notice to insure the survival of the plantings. No building permit must be issued until the required letter of credit has been received and accepted by the City.**
- 13. Rooftop mechanical equipment must be screened from public view. Final exterior screening materials and colors must be reviewed and approved by the Planning Division prior to the issuance of a building permit.**
- 14. A radio-read water meter(s) must be installed.**
- 15. All ground-mounted mechanical equipment accessory to the principal structure over 30-inches or greater than 12 cubic feet shall be screened from public views with landscaping, berming, or a screen wall/fence. Screening materials must be similar to or compatible in design and color with those used on the principal structure. Screening material may include property maintained wood, vinyl, or metal screens or fencing as required in Title 11-6-4(3) of the City Codes.**
- 16. The property owner must agree to allow city personnel to enter upon the property to maintain, repair, and inspect all public utility systems that exist on the property. Flushing the fire hydrant internal to the property is the city's responsibility.**
- 17. Outdoor storage is prohibited.**
- 18. When the property is platted in the future, the applicant must sign the plat so that it can be recorded at Washington County Recorder's Office.**
- 19. The developer must comply with all city ordinances and policies.**
- 20. The applicant must remove the temporary construction access drive connecting to 100th Street once the new public roadway along the east side of the property is constructed and open for public access.**
- 21. A system for improving stormwater quality before leaving the site must be provided.**

Motion passed unanimously.

6.2 Anytime Fitness – Case CUP05-064

Anytime Fitness has applied for a conditional use permit to operate a 4,000 square foot fitness facility in the Shoppes at Gateway, 7750 Harkness Avenue South.

McCool summarized the staff report and recommended approval subject to the conditions stipulated in the staff report.

Fred Koch, Professional Fitness LLC, doing business as Anytime Fitness, stated that there are approximately 50 Anytime Fitness locations in the Twin Cities area and about 250 in the country, which gives them confidence in how the security system works. They looked very hard at the security aspect of the franchise, and they and their insurance carrier are comfortable with the concept.

Hale asked how the personal electronic security devices work. Koch stated that necklaces and wristbands are available for members, which can also be worn out to the parking lot. The monitoring system is operational 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. He explained that as soon as the button is hit, a signal goes to the monitoring panel, which is then forwarded to the local police. He stated that they have been told that the turnaround time is 60 seconds. Hale asked why there is not a public telephone in the facility. Koch responded that there will be a phone available outside the office for local calls only.

Reese asked if there have been any complaints or problems with the Snap Fitness facility, which is similar in operation to this proposal. McCool responded that there have been none.

Reese opened the public hearing. No one spoke. Reese closed the public hearing.

Bauer made a motion to approve the application subject to the conditions listed below. Hale seconded.

- 1. Security cameras must be in operation at all times to record activities on the premises.***
- 2. A closed circuit television, security cameras, and recording system must be operational the entire time the facility is open for business.***

Motion passed unanimously (8-to-0 vote).

6.3 South Service Center – Case SP05-063

Ankeny Kell Architects, on behalf of Washington County, has applied for a site plan review of the Washington County South Service Center building. The proposed 47,221 square foot building would be located at 90th Street and County Road 19 (Keats Avenue).

Blin summarized the staff report and recommended approval.

Thiede asked how much area would be between the parkway and Keats and what is that land intended to be used for. Blin stated that there would be a couple hundred between

Keats and the edge of the parkway and that would primarily be used for infiltration basins and ponding areas and will be extensively landscaped.

Hale asked if 90th Street would be an extension of the Ravine Parkway. Blin responded yes, noting that 90th Street in that location would be renamed Ravine Parkway.

Thiede asked if 90th Street would be realigned when the County building is built. Blin responded that 90th Street would be reconstructed starting in front of Christ the Lord Lutheran Church. He explained that as part of this project, the city will be acquiring about half an acre of street easement from the church.

Brittain expressed concern about the proximity of the trail to the employee area. Blin stated that the trail would be about 300 to 400 feet from the building on the other side of a tree grove. Brittain asked if turn lanes would be constructed on County Road 19 to accommodate access. Blin responded that initially there would be a temporary facility built there with striped turn lanes, including both left and right turn lanes.

Blin explained that the County intends to bid the project in late winter and begin construction by spring.

Thiede asked about signage. Blin responded that the proposal includes a monument sign.

Brittain expressed concern about the height of the landscaping at the end points of the driving lanes in the parking lot. Blin stated that staff would ensure that those concerns are considered during review of the final landscape plan.

Hale asked if the County needs to obtain a building permit from the City for this project. Blin responded yes. Hale asked why there are no recommendations of approval. Blin responded that conditions of approval could be added to the resolution, but this project is different as it has been more of a cooperative arrangement with the County.

Brittain asked what type of services are conducted at the County Service Center. Blin responded human services, community corrections, public health, assessor, and a school facility for troubled juveniles.

Thiede asked who is paying the assessment on the Parkway. Blin responded that the County is paying almost all of the cost of that section of the Parkway.

Hale asked if there is access from this facility to the Ravine Park. Blin responded that there would be no access at this time but the future access to the park would be on the other side of the Ravine where the city facilities are proposed to be built.

Reese opened the public hearing.

Mike Rygh, 505 Lakeside Drive, Bayport, expressed concern that the building would be located between the ravine bluff and Parkway. He noted that the initial plans were for the road to hug the ravine for the public to view.

No one else spoke. Reese closed the public hearing.

Blin explained that the proposed locations of the building and road are due to concerns about crossing the ravine, which gets wider and deeper as it goes further east. The current proposed location also disturbs fewer trees in the area. He stated as the road goes to the north it is up against the wooded area and the slope of the ravine.

Ricart expressed concern about the building design, noting the it looks more like a library.

Hale asked what public amenities the City is getting from this project. He asked if the Council raised any of those issues when they saw the plan. Blin stated that the Council's primary concern was the building's design and materials.

Reese asked how many employees would be at this facility. Blin responded initially around 140. Reese asked if the modifications made to the intersection of 90th and Keats would be able to handle that amount of traffic. Blin responded that a traffic study was performed and the traffic volumes in and out of the site are fairly light given the background traffic on Keats. Reese asked if holding areas would be part of the proposed facility. Blin responded no.

Councilmember Rice stated that while he was not at the meeting where the Council discussed the proposal, there have been discussions as far as the placement of the building and the road location. He believes that the location of the building should be left up to the County because they own the land and are paying for construction of that portion of roadway.

Hale stated that the County is only the custodian of the park and the funding for it came from of the Metropolitan Council parks and open space fund. He believes the City of Cottage Grove should get more amenities from of this project than just a road built through the principal part of the park.

Hale asked if the city would have to pay for the land for the proposed city buildings. Blin responded that the arrangement that has been worked out with the Met Council is that by 2015 the land that was taken will have to be replaced. He explained that both the City and the County would be responsible for the acquisition of additional land. There is an agreement that spells out who is responsible for what. The City believes that land surrounding the park can be acquired through park dedication.

Reese asked about security for the building and would there be fences on the back of the site. Blin responded that there will be the typical security on the exterior of the building but no fences will be built. Reese asked about the small area on the north side of the building. Blin responded that is the service entrance, which would be heavily screened by both a fence and extensive landscaping.

Kronlund asked if the County was receptive to taking steps to minimize the use of metal shingles on the exterior and to use more brick and stone. Blin showed the front elevation of the building noting that the County has agreed to add more of the stone product to the building.

Thiede asked if anyone has voiced any concerns about the building or its location. Blin answered that staff has received a lot of questions but no comments. Thiede asked if the Planning Commission hearing could be continued to the County explain their project. Blin stated that the Commission could scheduled a special meeting to continue the public hearing and the County and their architects could be invited to attend.

Reese asked for more information on the metal shingles. Blin responded that it has a zinc coating, is fairly durable and won't dent, and is textured. He stated that he could have them bring a sample to the special meeting. Ricart wants to also see the stone and brick.

Hale made a motion to continue the public hearing with the County in attendance. Ricart seconded.

Blin suggested that the Commission should schedule that meeting at this point. He asked if Monday, December 5, or Monday, December 12, would work for the Commission. He stated that either of those dates would allow the City Council to review the Commission's recommendation at their December 21, 2005, meeting. It was the consensus of the Commission that the special meeting should be held on December 12, 2005.

Brittain stated that the building should be in front of the Ravine Parkway so that the public would have access to view the ravine. Blin stated that the building would have to come forward considerably to get the road behind it because the road has to cross the ravine in a way that is feasible.

Motion passed unanimously (8-to-0 vote).

6.4 Temporary Sign Ordinance – Case TA05-054 (continued from 10/24/05)

The City of Cottage Grove has applied for a zoning text amendment to City Code Title 9-8-7, Temporary Signs.

Blin summarized the staff report and recommended approval.

Hale asked that the language regarding the 20-day cumulative limit for temporary signs on multi-tenant buildings be clarified from the proposed "individual business address" to "tenant."

Thiede asked why the change from 30 days for temporary signs to 20 days. Blin explained that each individual tenant would be allowed to have temporary signs for 20 cumulative days each calendar year. Current language allows only 30 days for the whole building. Thiede asked about the definition of temporary signs. Blin responded that that language should be changed to define a temporary sign as a banner affixed to a building.

Kronlund asked if special event signs could be put up prior to the event or are they only permitted during the duration of the event. Blin responded that the ordinance allows those signs 30 days prior to the event but no days after.

Reese asked if language regarding penalties could be added to discourage those temporary signs that seem to pop up everywhere. Blin stated that the ordinance allows the city to fine those companies \$100. Brittain asked if that is per sign. Blin stated that he would ask the city attorney if that could be the interpretation. Brittain stated that he would like to see the fine be enough to cover staff time to remove illegal signs.

Reese opened the public hearing. No one spoke. Reese closed the public hearing.

Ricart made a motion to continue the public hearing on the proposed ordinance amendment to the next Planning Commission meeting. Hale seconded. Motion passed unanimously (8-to-0).

Applications and Requests

7.1 Concept Plan for Aspen Grove (Ott and Rygh) – Discussion

Bauer recused himself from the discussion on this concept plan due to his company's working relationship with the principals of this plan.

Blin summarized the proposal and asked for comments from the Commission. Mike Rygh, 505 Lakeside Drive, Bayport, and Tom Ott, 7484 Granada Circle, thanked the Commission for the opportunity to present their concept plan for feedback before they formally make application. In response to a question from the developer, the Commission generally agreed that a plan with an average lot size of 85 feet could be considered. Under this concept, some lots would exceed 85 feet and some would be less. Trail corridors within the construction easements that surround the area proposed for development must be determined. These trails should connect to the future Camel's Hump Park and the existing residential area to the north. It was noted that the Fire Code prohibits more than 30 housing units without sprinklers to be located on a dead-end street. The developer is considering either reducing the number of lots or adding sprinklers.

7.2 Concept Plan for Posavad Property (Pulte Homes) – Discussion

Blin summarized the proposal and asked for comments from the Commission. If the adjacent 20-acre Bailey parcel is not acquired and incorporated into this development, the developer should prepare a ghost plat for the parcel. Similarly, if the two-acre parcel along 65th Street is not acquired by the developer, a ghost plat should be prepared to show how it could be subdivided in the future. A landscaped strip along 65th Street should be designed. Connections should be made to Peter Thompson Park, which serves as the neighborhood park for the area. More information will be necessary for the proposed homeowners association park proposed for the center of the development.

7.3 Comprehensive Plan Discussion

None.

Approval of Planning Commission Minutes of October 24, 2005

Motion by Thiede, seconded by Brittain to approve the minutes from the Planning Commission meeting on October 24, 2005. Motion passed unanimously (8-to-0).

Reports

9.1 Recap of November City Council Meetings

Blin reviewed the items discussed by the City Council at their meetings on November 2 and November 16, 2005.

9.2 Committee Reports

None.

9.3 Planning Commission Requests

Motion by Nitsch, seconded by Ricart, to move the December 26, 2005, Planning Commission meeting to December 12, 2005, at 6:00 p.m. Motion passed unanimously (8-to-0).

9.4 Response to Planning Commission Inquiries

None.

Adjournment

Motion by Hale, seconded by Nitsch, to adjourn. Motion carried unanimously (8-to-0). The meeting adjourned at 9:38 p.m.