



## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **SITE & BUILDING PLAN REVIEW**

**FILE NO:** 2613-16-12  
**APPLICANT:** MIDLAND TERRACE / CLASSIC CONSTRUCTION  
**LOCATION:** 3575, 3545 OWASSO STREET

#### **Presentation by Senior Planner Rob Warwick**

Midland Terrace consists of 10 building with 42 units in each building. The development is spread over approximately 80 acres, which includes the wetland known as Lake Shoreview. There are 11 detached garages in the complex. The proposal is to remove two garages and replace them with the same number of 22 parking stalls. There is approximately 84,000 square feet of parking area around the garages that would be repaved, and new concrete curb and gutter installed around the perimeter of the parking area. Surmountable curb will be used along the west, and barrier curb will be used in the remainder of the project. The exterior of the garages will have a shingled, hip roof with vertical cedar siding on the long sides of the buildings to compliment the apartment buildings. The short sides of the garage buildings will be concrete block. The same design used for a new garage in 2013 is being used.

The land use designation for this property in the Comprehensive Plan is high density residential, 8 to 20 units per acre. Adjacent land uses include the railroad to the north, light industrial to the east, low density residential to the south and institutional across Victoria Street to the west.

This complex was approved in 1967. There was no formal PUD designation, but the PUD concept was used during approval for the 10 apartment buildings, 11 detached garage buildings and future retail development in the northwest corner of the complex all on a single site. No setbacks were required at the time of approval.

There are currently 244 indoor parking stalls, which is less than the 420 required by current Code. The 1967 approval included a total of 745 stalls with 210 enclosed stalls. The proposal does not change the amount of parking provided. There is also no change to impervious surface. The maximum impervious surface allowed is 65%; the complex has approximately 60%.

Storm water flows directly to the pond. The paving project will allow drainage to be modified. Storm water management practices that would fit this site include filter strips and/or a wetland buffer, which better complies with current City standards.

Notice of the proposal was sent to property owners within 350 feet of the property. The Fire Marshall had no comment. No public comments were received. A permit is not required from the Ramsey Washington Metro Watershed District.

Staff finds the proposed improvements to be consistent with the policies of the Comprehensive Plan and recommends the proposal be forwarded to the City Council for approval.

Commissioner Ferrington asked if the garage design includes an enclosure for the trash receptacles. Mr. Warwick explained that the photo used for this presentation is an old one. In 2013, when the new 31-stall garage was constructed, one stall was dedicated for dumpster storage.

Commissioner Solomonson asked if future requests for upgrading buildings would address the lot lines within the site and the fact that there are buildings that straddle lot lines. Mr. Warwick stated that one requirement could be a re-plat of the property to reflect one principal building per lot. Another possibility would be to re-plat the property into a single parcel with rezoning to PUD.

Commissioner Solomonson noted that the property currently has 1.7 stalls per unit. Code requires 2.5 stalls per unit. He asked if there are any parking issues with the current amount of parking provided.

Commissioner McCool echoed Commissioner Solomonson in requiring the property to be replatted, if there should be further improvements in order to address the lot lines. He expressed concern about the direct drainage of storm water to the pond and asked if storm water will actually use the proposed infrastructure. Mr. Warwick stated that over 50% of runoff from the parking areas flows to the street. The remainder flows to the pond. Several years ago a filtration basin was constructed to capture sediment in runoff from the parking area. That basin has become a problem with water standing and the grass dies. Filter strips along the edge of the pond would prevent sediment and nutrients from entering the water. That would be at the expense of lawn area, which residents enjoy. The existing water patterns will remain. As water flows to the curb cuts, it enters the catch basins installed one of which will be replaced.

Commissioner asked if ultimately all the water eventually flows to the pond. Mr. Warwick answered that it does.

**Mr. Max Segler**, Tycon Companies, 321 University Avenue, Minneapolis, responded to questions by Commissioners:

- Trash enclosures are now located just outside the garages. The new garage will be similarly designed.
- He acknowledged a waiting list for inside parking stalls usually in the winter. Generally, residents do not want to pay the extra for inside stalls in the summer. There are no complaints regarding surface parking. There is no parking on the street. Management believes parking is adequate.
- There is discussion about future work on the site. It is difficult to re-plat, as the mortgage companies require the plats for collateral. It is complicated to move boundaries.
- The infrastructure for storm water that will be constructed in conjunction with the City is 42 feet long, 16 feet wide. There are baffles the whole length to filter out sediment and nutrients, so that clean water flows into the lake.

- Efforts will be made to increase the amount of storm runoff going to the City sewer.

Commissioner Ferrington noted that when Lakeview Terrace was upgraded, overflow parking was negotiated to be within Midland Terrace parking. She asked if any difference has been noticed for Midland Terrace with this arrangement. **Mr. Segler** stated that there has been no problem.

Commissioner Peterson thanked Mr. Segler and the owner for the reinvestment upgrade and the good maintenance of the complex.

**MOTION:** by Commissioner Solomonson, seconded by Commissioner Peterson to recommend the City Council approve the Site and Building Plan review application submitted by Terrace Apartments Company to demolish two existing garages and construct two new garages north and south of the apartment building at 3545 Owasso Street.

This approval is subject to the following:

1. This approval permits the construction of two 4,900 square foot garages to be used for tenant vehicle parking north and south of the apartment building at 3545 Owasso Street.
2. Approval of the final grading, drainage and erosion control plans by the Public Works Director, prior to the issuance of a building permit for this project. These plans shall include the practices used for treatment of storm water runoff.
3. The applicant is required to enter into a Site Development Agreement and Erosion Control Agreement with the City. Said agreements shall be executed prior to the issuance of any permits for this project.
4. The Building Official is authorized to issue a building permit for the project, upon satisfaction of the conditions above.

This approval is based on the following findings of fact:

1. The proposed land use is consistent with the designated Residential (8-20 units per acre) land use of the Comprehensive Plan.
2. The proposed development complies with the standards identified in the City's Development Code.
3. The proposed improvements meet the spirit and intent of the Comprehensive Plan and the Development Code.
4. The improvements further the goals outlined in the Housing Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan regarding neighborhood reinvestment and housing maintenance.

**VOTE:**                      Ayes - 6                      Nays - 0

## MISCELLANEOUS

### Council Meetings

Commissioners Peterson and McCool will respectively attend the May 2, 2016 and May 16, 2016 City Council meetings.

### Discussion Items Presented by City Planner Kathleen Castle

**Beekeeping Ordinance:** Ms. Castle stated that many questions were raised at the recent beekeeping workshop. Mr. Gary Reuters, University of Minnesota Bee Lab, was unable to attend. Ms. Castle will follow up with him on the questions asked. The group would like to go to the bee lab and talk more about beekeeping in the back yard and see an actual hive.

**Building Height:** Consideration is being given to modifying City regulations regarding height restrictions. Many development proposals exceed the maximum height now allowed at 35 feet across all zones. Height can be increased only if the minimum setback is increased by the same number of feet. Currently, City Code restricts height to the capability of the Fire Department, which is no longer a concern because of staff training and because taller buildings have fire suppression system.

There are three recommended provisions:

1. Increase maximum height in all districts except the R1, Single-Family Residential and R2, Attached Residential Districts:
  - The height for the R3 District is proposed to be 40 feet or 50 feet if the site is adjacent to I-694 or I-35W. The 40 feet is based on what has been permitted in newer residential complexes. The height of 40 feet would permit three stories with a hip roof.
  - The C1, Limited Retail and C2, General Commercial would be changed to a maximum of 45 feet to permit four stories.
  - Office, Business Park and Industrial zones would be allowed 55 feet or a 5-story building, or 65 feet (six-story building) adjacent to I-694 and I-35W.

In all instances there would be more flexibility for a site that is adjacent to I-694 or I-35W.

Commissioner McCool asked the rationale for the larger setbacks required for increased heights. Business Park, Industrial and Office often build buildings that are attractive and would look nice closer to the street. Ms. Castle stated that the current setback for Business Park is 75 feet. Staff will look further into this question.

Commissioner Solomonson stated that he would like to see a tiered system for buildings that are located closer to low density residential areas.

2. Establish minimum structure setback and height transition area when multi-family residential development adjoins property zoned for low density residential. Because multi-

family and single-family are both residential, the Code does not have a specified setback. Propose minimum structure setback of 30 feet. The transition area is where a tiered height could be implemented with a maximum of 40 feet in height.

One question is whether height can be increased along arterial roads, such as Highway 96 and Lexington. Staff proposes that once a development is out of a transition area, the maximum height can be used. The required setback for R3 in the Code is 75 feet and already creates a buffer to residential.

Commissioner Solomonson suggested that “adjacent to the freeway” needs to be specifically defined. His concern is the transition area adjacent to low density residential.

Chair McCool stated that a 40 foot of setback is required for a commercial building with a 50 foot in height; he would like to see the same setback applied from residential. Ms. Castle responded that the minimum structure setback can be increased, or the transition area can be increased.

Commissioner Ferrington agreed that adjusted requirements are to protect single-family homes. One of the main issues is for the transition from R3 to R1 not be too abrupt. She asked why there is a 50-foot setback from arterial roads. Ms. Castle stated that there are greater setbacks required on arterial roads already for Office and Industrial. Whether a side or rear setback, the greater restriction would apply.

Commissioner Peterson stated that it is assumed businesses and industrial will be unattractive, but the water treatment facility would not look out of place in a residential area. A tiered system in transition areas makes sense. Building construction standards make all buildings more acceptable than in the past.

Commissioner Solomonson noted that other cities allow higher residential buildings. Ms. Castle stated that generally on residential sites, the 35-foot height requirement is adequate. Multi-family residential varies, and many other communities allow taller structures than in Shoreview.

3. Improve landscape and screening requirements when higher density residential and non-residential uses abut low and medium density residential land uses. When non-residential is adjacent to residential, a 20-foot buffer is currently required. Landscaping, fencing or berming could be used. A minimum height of 6 feet for trees and fences. Plantings must be 6 feet for evergreens; deciduous trees are 2.5 inch caliper; ornamental trees are 1.5 inch caliper.

Commissioner McCool stated that he would like the Commission and City Council to have flexibility with landscaping requirements in order to address specific circumstances to maintain privacy.

Commissioner Solomonson stated that the intent of screening needs to be defined. Residents seem to expect landscaping to block new construction from view. The ordinance needs to be clear that the purpose of landscaping is to mitigate the impact but not necessarily block the view.

**Parking:** Ms. Castle stated that this issue comes up with all multi-family developments. Parking ratios are defined by the zoning district and by specified uses in those districts. The City can change regulations to reduce the parking required under certain criteria. One chart shows a range of 1 stall per dwelling unit at Scandia Shores to 2 stalls per dwelling unit at Applewood Point. In surveying multi-family developments in the City, it was found that most believe they have adequate parking with the exception of Meadowlands. Developers were also surveyed and it was found that in general, they believe adequate parking is less than what is required by the City. Developers are careful to not over develop or under develop parking. Too much parking does not add value to a development.

In comparison to other communities, Shoreview's requirements are at the high end. Many communities regulate parking according to the number of bedrooms in dwelling units. Ms. Hill noted that the data presented for commercial is general retail. However, many cities have pages of regulations that define parking requirements in terms of specific retail use.

Ms. Castle referred to a national parking study that was done by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. Sites are studied to determine parking needs according to land uses. Their data show that the range of parking provided for multi-family developments is 0.59 stalls per unit to 1.4 stalls. Ratios include guest parking.

Commissioner Solomonson stated that he would like to know if the data presented meets the parking needs most of the time.

Commissioner Ferrington noted that most regulations are based on the number of bedrooms while Shoreview's requirements are based on units. Regulation per unit may underestimate the need based on the number of bedrooms.

Commissioner McCool stated that he would like to see the City further define in Code parking needs for specific uses. He would prefer using bedrooms as a basis for determining parking rather than units. He referred to the regulations of Fridley and Woodbury that he likes. He would prefer to err on the high side so that multi-family developments do not push parking into neighborhoods. Commercial needs are vastly different depending on the use, and there needs to be flexibility for parking requirements. He also would like a review of size of parking stalls and drive aisles between rows of stalls.

Commissioner Peterson stated that all circumstances are different and each application will have to be looked at in terms of specific needs.

Commissioner Solomonson stated that he believes Shoreview's requirement of 2.5 spaces per unit is too high.

Addressing parking regulations will be divided into two areas--residential and commercial. Ms. Castle would like to address residential first and have new regulations in place within a few months.

**ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION: by Commissioner Ferrington, seconded by Commissioner Peterson, to adjourn the meeting at 8:55 p.m.

VOTE: Ayes - 6 Nays - 0

ATTEST:

---

Kathleen Castle  
City Planner