

# NorthOaks 

Building on a tradition of innovation

## CITY OF NORTH OAKS

Regular Planning Commission Meeting<br>Thursday, January 06, 2022<br>7 PM, Community Meeting Room, 100 Village Center Drive MEETING AGENDA

Remote Access - Planning Commission members will participate by telephone or other electronic means pursuant to Minn. Stat. §13D.021. Any person wishing to monitor the meeting electronically from a remote location may do so by calling the following Zoom meeting videoconference number: 1-312-626-6799, Webinar ID: 87587674475 or by joining the meeting via the following link: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87587674475. Individuals wishing to monitor the meeting remotely may do so in real time by watching the livestream of the meeting on North Oaks Channel 16 and on the City's website. Due to the existing COVID-19 Health Pandemic, no more than five (5) members of the public may be in Council Chambers (Community Room, 100 Village Center Drive, MN) during the meeting. Once room capacity is met, anyone wishing to attend the meeting above the five (5) members of the public who may be present in the room during the meeting will be required to monitor the meeting remotely.

## 1. Call To Order

## 2. Roll Call

3. Pledge
4. Citizen Comments - Members of the public are invited to make comments to the Planning Commission during the public comments section. Up to four minutes shall be allowed for each speaker. No action will be taken by the Commission on items raised during the public comment period unless the item appears as an agenda item for action.

## 5. Approval of Agenda

## 6.Approval of Previous Month's Minutes

6a.Approval of Planning Commission Meeting minutes of September 30, 2021
Planning Commission Minutes 9.30.2021 - Draft.pdf

## 7. Business Action Items

7a.Public Hearing on a Conditional Use Permit for a home in excess of 35 feet in height located at 3 Eastview Lane. Discussion and possible action on CUP.

7b. Continued Public Hearing on a Conditional Use Permit for a home in excess of 35 feet in height located at 6 Sherwood Trail. Discussion and possible action on CUP.
6 Sherwood Trail - Guanzini - Elev for CUP - 1-3-22 Update.pdf
6 Sherwood Trail-2021 CUP Application - North Oaks.pdf
6 Sherwood Trail - CUP Narrative.pdf
GH1258-Tract H RLS 634(EAST PRESERVE)-COS 010422 (003).pdf
Ramsey County Countours - Aerial.JPG
Ramsey County Countours.JPG
Staff Report 6 Sherwood Trail height updated kkjwm1-5-22.pdf
8. Commissioner Report(s)
9. Adjourn

# North Oaks Planning Commission <br> Meeting Minutes <br> City of North Oaks Via Electronic Means and Community Room 

September 30, 2021

## CALL TO ORDER

Chair Azman called the meeting of September 30, 2021, to order at 7:00 p.m.
Pursuant to Minnesota Statute 13D.021, the meeting was conducted with attendees and Commissioners participating both in the Community Room and via Zoom.

## ROLL CALL

Present via electronic means: Chair Mark Azman Commissioners, Commissioners Nick Sandell, Joyce Yoshimura-Rank, Stig Hauge
Present in the Community Room: Commissioners David Cremons, Grover Sayre III, Absent: Anne Conroy
Other Staff Present: City Administrator Kevin Kress City Engineer Tim Korby, Council Liaison Jim Hara
A quorum was declared present.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Administrator Kress led the Pledge of Allegiance.

## CITIZEN COMMENTS

There were no citizen comments.

## APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION by Sayre, seconded by Cremons, to approve the agenda. Motion carried unanimously by roll call.

## APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MONTH'S MINUTES

a. Approval of August 5, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

MOTION by Cremons, seconded by Sayre to approve the previous months minutes. Motion carried unanimously by roll call.

## BUSINESS ACTION ITEMS

a. Public Hearing on Conditional Use Permit \#21-12 for a home in excess of $\mathbf{3 5}$ feet in height for property located at 20 Evergreen Road. Discussion and possible action on CUP.
Chair Azman called the Public hearing to order at 7:06 p.m.

Administrator Kress stated the applicant on this project is looking to build a new home with a height in excess of 35 feet on a vacant lot. The subject parcel is 1.71 acre, zoned RSL, with the
request for a home height of 42 feet and inches at the highest elevation. The application meets conditions required for a CUP, the only item to note is grading near the bluff.

Engineer Morast of HR Green mentioned there is 1 grading item on the eastside of the property that is within the bluff setback. He mentioned they will work with the applicant on the grading to reduce or eliminate that grading possibly with extension of the landscaping wall. The 30 -foot bluff setback exists to minimize potential impact within the Shoreland. The City ordinance requires 30 feet setback from bluffs, however it outlines there can be limited activity within the between the 20-30 foot farthest from the bluff.

- Cremons mentioned he'd be more comfortable with formal conditions to minimize disturbance near bluff being stated in the Resolution.
- Kress confirmed that the bluff ordinance is part of the Shoreland ordinance.
- Chair Azman mentioned the excess height is on corner of house with least impact to others.
- Colby Mattson, the designer speaking on behalf of the applicant, mentioned they have no problem leaving the contour back to the original location so there is no bluff impact. They have already made this change to the plans based on recommendation from City staff.
- They worked hard to keep to keep the roofline low, as they accommodated the desire to have a window egress in lower level basement bedroom. This is the cause of the excess height request.
- If approved, they plan to submit for permit shortly and then commence construction in 2021.
- Yoshimura-Rank asked whether there are both primary and secondary septic sites designated. The applicant confirmed that both septic areas are designed side by side without a variance required. They also noted they are working with arborist to keep as many large trees as possible.

Chair Azman called the Public hearing to order. MOTION by Yoshimura-Rank, seconded by Sandell, to open the public hearing at 7:20 p.m. Motion carried unanimously by roll call.

- There were no public comments.

MOTION to close the public hearing by Yoshimura-Rank, seconded by Hauge. Motion carried by roll call vote at 7:21 p.m.

- There were no further comments by Commissioners or staff.

MOTION by Yoshimura-Rank, seconded by Cremons, to approve the CUP application \#21-12 for height in excess of 35 feet at the property located at 20 Evergreen Road, with bluff and other conditions as listed by City Staff. Motion carried unanimously by roll call.

Chair Azman noted that the recommendation for approval will go before the Council at their next meeting on October 14, 2021 for final consideration.
b. Public Hearing Conditional Use Permit \#21-13 for a garage in excess of $\mathbf{1 , 5 0 0}$ square feet for property located at 3 Eastview Lane. Discussion and possible action.

Administrator Kress stated the applicant is looking for a two-stall garage in excess of 1,500 square feet, with total 1,900 square feet requested. This property is 1.40 acres with RSL zoning. This application meets conditions for CUP as outlined in the staff report and staff recommends approval.

Chair Azman called the public hearing to order at 7:25 p.m.

- Azman noted that they are just 400 square feet over the threshold, which is lower than other garage CUP applications in the past.
- Yoshimura-Rank asked what the square foot is of 1.4 -acre lot. Kress stated it converts to 60,984 square feet.
- Applicant Ben Schmidt stated there is an existing house they will be tearing down. The new home will have slightly bigger garage, as they are looking to have additional space to store cars for their family of five.
- Azman noted that it appears the garage is well integrated into the visual of the home. He has no other questions.

MOTION by Sayre, seconded by Cremons, to open the public hearing/public comment portion at 7:30 p.m. Motion carried unanimously by roll call.

There were no public comments in person or submitted to Administrator Kress by the public.

MOTION by Hauge, seconded by Yoshimura-Rank, to close the public hearing/public comment time at 7:31 p.m. Motion carried unanimously by roll call.

- Yoshimura-Rank asked for clarification regarding the FAR ratio based on the size of the lot and home. Applicant Schmidt indicated that the FAR ratio is . 1148 - within the total max allowed . $12 \%$.
- Administrator Kress displayed the FAR worksheet calculations.

There were no further comments by Commissioners.

MOTION by Cremons, seconded by Sayre to approve Conditional Use Permit application \#21-13 for 3 Eastview Lane for excess garage space to accommodate a garage of $\mathbf{1 , 9 0 0}$ square feet, with conditions as listed by City Staff. Motion carried unanimously by roll call.

Chair Azman noted for the applicant, this recommendation for approval will be presented the City Council at the October $14^{\text {th }}$ meeting for their consideration.

## COMMISSIONER REPORTS

- Commissioner Cremons mentioned the proposed public wetland ordinance on the agenda for the City Council. He asked if the Planning Commission will have any formal role to provide commentary on this.
- Council Liaison Hara mentioned this originated during a meeting with the DNR last summer, in which they suggested that the City consider having a wetland ordinance. City engineer modeled the draft ordinance after Minnetonka. The public hearing at the Council meeting is the first discussion for feedback, and then next steps will be considered.
- Cremons would like to see the Natural Resources Commission and Planning Commission consider having a formal discussion within those two bodies to provide feedback to the Council on the ordinance, as this could have direct impact on their review of future applications that come before them.
- Administrator Kress mentioned that residents should remind neighbors to keep their garage doors closed and take safety precautions.

Chair Azman noted that the next meeting of the Planning Commission will be on October 28th, 2021.

## ADJOURN

## MOTION by Hauge, seconded by Yoshimura-Rank, to adjourn the Planning Commission

 meeting at 7:42 p.m. Motion carried unanimously by roll call.Kevin Kress, City Administrator

Mark Azman, Chair

Date approved $\qquad$


No. $\qquad$
CITY OF NORTH OAKS, MINNESOTA
APPLICATION FOR CUP, VARIANCE, APPEAL, AMENDMENT, PLAN REVIEW
Location of Property: (address) $\qquad$
Legal Description of Property: $\quad$ Tract H RLS 634
Fee Owner:
Gonyea Homes
1000 Boone Ave N, Ste 400
Name
Address

| Golden Valley | Mn | 55427 | 763-452-6235 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| City | State | Zip | Contact Number/s |

Signature of Fee Owner: Gennifer Otto Date 11-23-21

Applicant:
(if different from owner) Name Address

|  |  |  |  | jotto@gonyeahomes.com |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| City | State | Zip | Contact Numbers/s | Email Address |

Signature of Applicant: $\qquad$ Date $\qquad$
Type of Request: (Please circle correct request)
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (as provided for in Chapter 151.076 of Code of Ordinances)
VARIANCE

APPEAL

## AMENDMENT

## BUILDING / SITE PLAN REVIEW

## OTHER

Please attach fifteen (10) copies of detailed written and graphic material fully explaining the proposed request and include the reason for the request, present zoning classification and existing use of the property.

## (For office use)

Application received with $\$ 450$ application fee (or per fee schedule) on Escrow (per fee schedule) received on $\qquad$
$\qquad$ Check \#

Amt \#
Check \# Amt \#

Date for review of completeness fifteen (15) business days from initial receipt $\qquad$

* If application is deemed incomplete, written notice must be sent to the applicant by above date stating the items that need to be submitted for the application to be deemed complete.

Deadline for action sixty (60) days from initial receipt $\qquad$

## Extended deadline

$\qquad$
** City may extend the review period by up to sixty days from the end of deadline for action only if applicant is notified in writing prior to the end of the initial sixty (60) day review period. The deadline may be extended beyond sixty days with applicant's approval.

## Conditional Use or Amendment request - Public Hearing date

$\qquad$
Planning Commission action:
Approval or disapproval on $\qquad$ with conditions $\qquad$
City Council Action:
Approval or disapproval on $\qquad$ with conditions $\qquad$

## Variance, Appeal, Building/Site Plan Review, Other

Action of Board of Adjustment and Appeals:
Approval or disapproval on $\qquad$

Bond Required $\qquad$ Bond Received on $\qquad$

## APPLICANT RESPONSIBILITY FOR PAYMENT

As authorized in Chapter 151.083 of the Ordinance Code, an applicant will be responsible for full reimbursement of incurred costs to the City of North Oaks. (A copy of this section of the Ordinance is available upon request**)

A typical process for reviewing a zoning action may include the following: City employee help in explaining the application process, City employee receipt of completed application and proper scheduling on appropriate agenda, one legal notice for a public hearing (if applicable), written notice to abutting property owners (if applicable), generation of a staff report, presentation of the staff report to the Planning Commission and presentation of the staff report and Planning Commission recommendation to the City Council.

City reimbursement policy: An applicant can withdraw their request at any time during the review process, however the application fee is non-refundable. Any remaining escrow deposit that is not needed to pay incurred costs to the date of application removal will be refunded to the applicant within sixty days.

I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the above statements.


Date 11-23-21
** § 151.083 FEES. (A) To defray the administrative costs of processing applications for conditional uses, amendments, variances, or appeals, a nonrefundable base fee, as established by the city from time-to time, per application shall be paid by all applicants when the application is filed. (B) (1) In order to defray any additional cost over and above the normal processing of an application for a conditional use, an amendment, a variance, an appeal, or in determining the adequacy of off-street parking, loading, unloading, and service entrances, or when an amended plan must be reviewed by the city, the applicant shall reimburse the city for the costs the city may incur in employing the services of engineers, attorneys, and/or other professional consultants in connection with the application. (2) An initial deposit, as established by the city from time to time, may be requested by the Zoning Administrator for these services. (3) If this amount does not cover all the costs, the applicant will be so advised and full reimbursement hereunder shall be made whether the application is approved or denied. (C) A nonrefundable fee, as established by the city from time to time, for each certificate of occupancy shall be paid when the application is filed. (Ord. 94, § 8.9, passed 2-111999; Am. Ord. passed 11-24-1999; Am. Ord. passed 7-24-2001; Am. Ord. passed 10-22-2002; Am. Ord. passed 4-12003; Am. Ord. passed 12-23-2003)

## Conditional Use Permit Cover Letter - Tract H, RLS No. 634 6 Sherwood Trail

November 23, 2021

## To Whom it may concern:

Gonyea Homes, Inc., builder representative of Steven \& Amanda Guanzini, respectfully requests a Conditional Use Permit as it relates to the maximum allowable building height in the RSL-PUD district of the East Preserve (NORD) Development in the City of North Oaks. The current ordinance as written in the Development Guidelines, or Appendix 1 to the Planned Development Agreement between North Oaks Land Company and the City of North Oaks, allows for a maximum building height of 35 feet for principal and attached accessory buildings; and in lots suited for walkout homes 45 feet at the back and on the sides measured from the lowest finished grade established by the City approved grading plan, and otherwise measured consistent with the Zoning Ordinance. While we feel that the design of this home meets the above stated building height requirements of $35^{\prime}$, allowable at the front and $45^{\prime}$ allowable at the sides and rear of a walkout, due to the ambiguity of the language of the ordinance, we were instructed it is in our best interest to apply for a Conditional Use Permit to keep the project moving and receive the building permit.

Furthermore, for a Conditional Use Permit, this home also meets the following criteria:

- The front elevation of the building does not exceed 35 feet in height at any point
- The building height at any other elevation does not exceed 45 feet
- The environmental and topographical conditions of the lot prior to building development are naturally suited to the design of a building with an egress or walkout level
- Buildings shall be limited to a basement and 2 full stories. Finished areas within the roof structure will be considered a full story.
- Anytime the side or rear elevations of a building exceeds 35 feet in height within 50 feet of the adjacent lot lines, the building line shall be setback an additional 2 feet from the adjacent setback line for each foot in height above 35 .

Going forward, would it be possible for the language deemed ambiguous to be cleaned up and/or rewritten so that it is clear and concise for the future as this affects every walk-out lot out in the development. Having to apply for a Conditional Use Permit each time because the language is difficult to interpret is costly \& time consuming.

Thank you for your consideration,


Jennifer Otto
Architectural Designer



$14$

## PLANNING REPORT

| TO: | North Oaks Planning Commission |
| :--- | :--- |
| FROM: | Kevin Kress, City Administrator, Jim Thomson, City Attorney, Tim Korby, |
|  | City Engineer, Bob Kirmis, City Planner |
| DATE: | January 4, 2022 |
| RE: | 6 Sherwood Trail - Conditional Use Permit |
|  | Home in excess of 35 feet in height |

Date Application Submitted November 23, 2021
Date Application Determined Complete: November 23, 2021
Planning Commission Meeting Date: December 30, 2021
City Council Meeting Date: January 13, 2022
60-day review Date: January 22, 2022
120-day Review Date: March 23, 2022

## BACKGROUND

Ms. Otto has requested the approval of a conditional use permit to allow the construction of a new home at 6 Sherwood Trail which is in excess of 35 feet.

The subject 3.01-acre site is zoned RSL-PUD, Residential Single-Family Low Density. Within RSL Districts, homes in excess of 35 feet are subject to conditional use permit processing.

The applicant wishes to construct a home with side and rear elevations in excess of 35 feet at a total of 43 feet and 5 inches at the highest elevation.

Attached for reference:
Exhibit A: Site Location
Exhibit B: Applicant Narrative
Exhibit C: Grading, Drainage and Erosion Control Plan

Exhibit D: Site Plan
Exhibit E: Building Elevation

## ISSUES AND ANALYSIS

Property Description. As shown on the submitted survey, one individual parcel of land is illustrated which is presently unoccupied shown as Tract H RLS 634.

City Zoning Ordinance defines building height as "BUILDING HEIGHT. The vertical distance from grade as defined herein to the top ridge of the highest roof surface." City Zoning Ordinance defines building elevation as "BUILDING ELEVATION. A side view of the building representing the structure as projected geometrically on a vertical plane parallel to its chief dimension."

Evaluation Criteria. In consideration of conditional use permit applications to allow for a home greater than 35 feet in height, Section 151.050(D)(7) of the Zoning Ordinance states that certain criteria must be considered. Such criteria, as well as a Staff response, is provided below:
a. The front elevation of the building does not exceed $\mathbf{3 5}$ feet in height at any point.

Staff Comment. The proposed front elevation is 34 feet and 8 inches from grade. This condition has been satisfied.
b. The building height at any other elevation does not exceed 45 feet.

Staff Comment. The proposed side and rear elevation maximum is 43 feet 5 inches.
This condition has been satisfied
c. The environmental and topographical conditions of the lot prior to building development are naturally suited to the design of a building with an egress or walkout level

Staff Comment. Based on our engineering review of the plans, topography, site and the Ramsey County interactive property maps and contours, the site generally slopes towards the south from the 920 -elevation high point on the property (approximately where the house is situated) at approximately $3.5 \%-4 \%$. Based on these reviews, the proposed home appears conducive to the site's natural layout. Based on the site's location of wetlands, the ground water elevation in the proximity of the house needs to
northoaks@northoaksmn.gov
www.northoaksmn.gov

100 Village Center Drive, Suite 230
North Oaks, MN 55127
be established to confirm a three-foot separation to the basement elevation in compliance with the City's Surface Water Management Plan. In addition, the City will review all erosion control measures to ensure that the construction project does not adversely affect the surrounding environment. The City Engineer will make periodic site visits during construction to ensure all erosion control measures are fully complied with.
d. Buildings shall be limited to a basement and 2 full stories. Finished areas within the roof structure will be considered a full story.

Staff Comment. The proposed home is 2 full stories with a basement. This condition has been satisfied.
e. Any time the side or rear elevations of a building exceed 35 feet in height within 50 feet of adjacent lot lines, the building shall be setback an additional 2 feet from the adjacent setback line for each foot in height above 35 feet.

Staff Comment. The proposed side and rear elevation maximum is 43 feet 5 inches. The current home setbacks on the east side are 51.1, 48.4, and 50.1 feet. The proposed building height of $43^{\prime} 5$ " is $8.42^{\prime}$ above the $35^{\prime}$ threshold, requiring a minimum setback of 46.8'. Therefore, the setbacks are within the requirement, including two that exceed 50 '. The current rear setback is well over 100 feet. This condition has been satisfied
f. Section 151.083 related to cost responsibility is complied with.

Staff Comment. This condition has been satisfied.

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on the preceding review, Staff recommends approval of the requested conditional use permit to allow for a home located at 6 Sherwood Trail in excess of 35 feet subject to the following conditions:

1. The home shall be constructed in accordance to plan sets received 1-4-22.
2. The proposed home shall meet all required setbacks and other zoning standards prior to the issuance of a building permit.
3. Soil borings need to be performed to determine ground water elevation for basement elevation.
northoaks@northoaksmn.gov
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North Oaks, MN 55127
4. Plans shall be approved by the Building Official prior to the beginning of construction.
5. Any outstanding fees shall be paid prior to the issuance of a building permit.
6. Comments of other City Staff.

## PLANNING COMMISSION OPTIONS

In consideration of the conditional use permit application, the Planning Commission has the following options:
A) Recommend approval, with conditions, based on the applicant's submission, the contents of this report, public testimony and other evidence available to the Planning Commission.

- This option should be utilized if the Planning Commission finds the proposal adheres to all City Code requirements or will do so with conditions.
- Approval at this time means that, upon City Council approval, the applicant can construct the home, as proposed, subject to the satisfaction of all imposed conditions.
B) Recommend denial based on the applicant's submission, the contents of City Staff report, received public testimony and other evidence available to the Planning Commission.
- This option should only be utilized if the Planning Commission can specifically identify one or more provisions of City Code that are not being met by the conditional use permit proposal.
C) Table the request for further study.
- This option should be utilized if the Planning Commission feels the proposal is appropriate and should move forward, but that certain design aspects need to be amended and brought back before a recommendation for approval can be given.

cc: Jennifer Otto, Builder<br>Gretchen Needham, NOHOA

