



Approved: March 28, 2016

**CITY OF ARDEN HILLS, MINNESOTA
SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION
FEBRUARY 29, 2016
ARDEN HILLS CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Pursuant to due call and notice thereof, Mayor Grant called to order the special City Council work session at 8:20 p.m.

Present: Mayor David Grant; Councilmembers Brenda Holden, Fran Holmes, Dave McClung and Jonathan Wicklund

Absent: None

Also present: Interim City Administrator Sue Iverson; Community Development Director Jill Hutmacher; City Planner Ryan Streff; and City Clerk Amy Dietl

1. AGENDA ITEMS

A. Red Fox Business Center – Building 1 Façade Discussion

City Planner Streff explained on February 23, 2015, the City Council approved Planning Case 14-036 for a Master and Final Planned Unit Development (PUD) and Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the Red Fox Business Center located at 1235 Red Fox Road for the construction of two multi-tenant light industrial buildings.

City Planner Streff stated the approved PUD included a specific plan set for the development that addressed amongst other things, the façade materials to be used on the two buildings. The approved development plan set indicates where windows and doors will be located, areas where decorative metals and aluminum will be used, and where different colors and aggregate techniques will be used to reduce the monotony of large tilt-up panels and to provide architectural interest.

City Planner Streff reported at the City Council Work Session on June 15, 2015, the Council discussed a change in façade design for the two buildings. The discussion of this change was prompted by condition #18 of the PUD that stated “The Developer shall provide additional façade treatments on the south façade (loading dock area) of Building 2 similar to the north façade but not requiring use of the anodized aluminum materials”. The proposed façade change included a horizontal sand colored band along the top edge of the building wall and the removal of a third

color along with bottom edge of each building. The Council supported this change and the two buildings were constructed using this design.

City Planner Streff explained as with any building project, certain inspections are required as the developer nears the completion of the project. Staff conducted a façade inspection of the building shells on February 11, 2016, and found that the west elevation on Building 1 was missing a large bank of windows and other façade enhancement around the window opening area. The omission of the windows and façade enhancements were not included in the approved PUD plan set or the plan set that was submitted to the City for the building permit plan review. Staff believes that the change in façade for Building 1 is significant and requires a PUD Amendment in order for the change to be permitted.

City Planner Streff stated the developer has informed the City that the prospective tenant for this space is scheduled to begin moving in on March 1, 2016. The City Council is asked to provide direction on whether a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy could be issued in advance of this issue being resolved.

City Planner Streff indicated staff has consulted with the City Attorney on this matter and it has been determined that a PUD Amendment would be required for these façade changes. If the Council shows support for the façade changes as constructed, staff will work with the applicant and the City Attorney to prepare a PUD Amendment. The amendment in this case is not required to go back to the Planning Commission unless the Council directs staff to proceed to the Planning Commission first.

City Planner Streff requested the City Council discuss the façade changes to Building 1 of the Red Fox Business Center and provide feedback to the developer regarding these changes.

Councilmember Wicklund questioned how the City typically addressed minor changes to a PUD.

City Planner Streff explained all minor changes are submitted to staff and are reviewed by the building, engineering and planning departments.

Councilmember Wicklund asked how the City has managed a situation like this in the past.

City Planner Streff stated he was not aware of this happening in the past.

Community Development Director Hutmacher commented this was a very unusual situation and explained that commercial projects do not typically have any significant changes that occur during the actual construction without prior City approval.

Councilmember Holden inquired if the City could keep the building occupants off the premises.

City Planner Streff indicated it would be difficult for the City to require a business to vacate the premises if allowed to move into the space. He explained he spoke with the City Attorney regarding this matter and was advised that City staff should not be issuing a certificate of occupancy until the Council reviews the façade changes.

Nick Roberts, Red Fox Business Center representative, understood his tenant would not be able to move in until the issues were resolved with the City. He discussed why a change was made to the building and explained why changes were made during construction. He assumed the new windows would be fine; however, there were some design issues. In hindsight, he knew he had made a mistake and wished he had come to the City. It was his hope he would be able to find a solution that worked for everybody.

Mayor Grant discussed the previously approved plan and the process that was to be followed for changes to the approved plan. He asked if the Council had questions for Mr. Roberts.

Councilmember Holmes requested further information on the changes that were made to the building.

Mr. Roberts commented on the changes that were made to the building and noted several windows were omitted.

Councilmember Holmes asked if Mr. Roberts had any suggestions on how additional windows could be added.

Mr. Roberts stated windows could potentially be added, however, this would mean the existing panels would have to be removed. He stated a concrete wall would also have to be constructed between the windows and the electrical transformer.

Councilmember Holmes questioned if Mr. Roberts was thinking of leaving the building as is.

Mr. Roberts stated this was the case.

Councilmember McClung inquired where the transformer was supposed to be located.

Mr. Roberts indicated there was discussion of moving the transformer to the south side of the building, or move it within the building. However, this would have required the meters to be visible from the street.

Councilmember Wicklund understood a mistake occurred. He stated this whole situation was a non-issue for him. He encouraged the City and the Council to fast-track a solution and did not want to see this mistake happen again.

Mayor Grant discussed the City's options. He did not think it was reasonable to cut into the tip-up concrete panels. He understood that one option would be for the building to remain as is.

Councilmember Holden asked if the proposed tenant would be the only occupant of the building.

Mr. Roberts stated he had two tenants ready to occupy the building.

Councilmember Holden questioned if the occupancy of Building 2 could be tied to Building 1. She explained this building was on a prominent corner. She stated the windows were placed on

this building for a purpose and she believed a decorative element should be placed on the corner of this building. She was not in favor of leaving the building as is.

Mr. Roberts inquired if the City would support granting temporary permits and then allow the developer to plant additional landscaping at the corner of the building.

Councilmember Holden did not support this recommendation.

Mayor Grant believed that it was reasonable to assume there would be landscaping at this corner to screen the trucks. He indicated this would be far less expensive than trying to install windows at this point in time. He stated the windows were originally required to give the building more of an office look.

Councilmember Wicklund supported granting temporary permits requiring the applicant to plant additional landscaping.

Councilmember Holden wanted this corner of the building to have a more professional look and feel.

Councilmember Holmes would also support the additional screening and granting of temporary permits. She believed it would be too onerous to require the developer to install the windows at this time. It was her opinion this was the most reasonable way for the City and the developer to move forward.

Councilmember Holden understood there was 20 feet on the northeast corner where trees could be planted. She stated this would shade the entire building considerably.

Councilmember McClung wanted to review a screening plan from the developer. He did not believe the Council would be able to create this tonight. He understood the transformers created a problem for the developer.

Mayor Grant believed the developer would be able to adequately determine how to screen the transformers. He questioned if this matter could be turned over to staff.

Councilmember Holden discussed the fake windows that are placed on movie theaters and questioned if this could be used on this building, along with screening.

Mr. Roberts reiterated that the transformer location was known after the plans were approved by the City. He stated this had a substantial impact on the building plans.

Councilmember Holden felt the bank of windows was significant given the fact the City did not want a warehouse building on this corner.

Mr. Roberts wanted his building to look nice. He commented again on how the transformer impacted his plans for the building.

Mayor Grant asked if there was a window type that could be installed without cutting into the tip up panels.

Mr. Roberts commented on several window-type products that may work on this building.

Councilmember Wicklund believed there was consensus of the Council to grant the temporary occupancy permits and that the only issue that remained was with the screening of the building.

Mayor Grant agreed this was the direction of the Council.

Councilmember Holden requested that the developer still pursue some type of window medium that could be adhered to the exterior of the building.

Mr. Roberts supported the building being further screened and stated he did not want to attract undo attention to the building with fake windows. He wanted the building to blend into the corner.

Mayor Grant stated there was general agreement for staff to work with the developer on additional screening.

Councilmember Holden requested that this item be reviewed by the Council at a future meeting.

Councilmember Holmes did not believe the matter had to come back to the City Council. She encouraged the Council to work with Roberts Management on this issue given their level of commitment to the City of Arden Hills.

Mayor Grant agreed, stating Lexington Station was a high quality development in the City.

Councilmember McClung supported Councilmember Holmes. While he was upset the approved plans were not followed, he understood that Roberts Management had completed great work in the community. He did not anticipate the developer would make the same mistake again in Arden Hills.

Community Development Director Hutmacher reported this matter would have to come back to the City Council for a PUD amendment.

Mayor Grant recommended the item be brought back to the Council on a future Consent Calendar and directed staff to move forward with granting temporary occupancy permits.

Mr. Roberts thanked the Council for working with him to resolve this issue.

2. COUNCIL COMMENTS AND STAFF UPDATES

Councilmember Holden requested staff investigate the GreenStep Cities Program.

Mayor Grant was in favor of the Council reviewing its previous goals.

Councilmember Wicklund questioned what was required of him as the Ramsey County League of Local Government liaison for the City.

Mayor Grant discussed the expectations of Council liaisons.

ADJOURN

Mayor Grant adjourned the special City Council work session at 9:13 p.m.



Amy Dietl
City Clerk



David Grant
Mayor



Request for Special City Council Work Session

A special meeting may be called by the Mayor or by any two Councilmembers.

Reason for meeting: 1. PUD Amendment – Red Fox Business Center

Requested Date: 2/29/16

Requested time: Immediately following the regular City Council meeting.

Open meeting X

Closed meeting _____

Signature of person(s) making request:

David Grant

Mayor or Council Member

2 / 23 / 16
Date

Council Member

Date

-This section to be completed by City staff-

Date received: 2 / 23 / 16

Date meeting to be held: 2/29/16

Time of meeting: Immediately following the regular City Council meeting.

Location: City Hall

All necessary posting and notices have been completed.

Amy Dietz
Signature of City Clerk

2 / 23 / 16
Date