



Approved: October 5, 2022

---

---

**CITY OF ARDEN HILLS, MINNESOTA  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 3, 2022  
6:30 P.M. - ARDEN HILLS CITY HALL**

---

---

**CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

Pursuant to due call and notice thereof, Vice Chair Jonathan Wicklund called to order the regular Planning Commission meeting at 6:30 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

Present were: Commissioners Shelley Blilie, Joshua Collins, Marcie Jefferys, Arlene Mitchell, Kurt Weber, and Vice Chair Jonathan Wicklund.

Absent: Chair Paul Vijums, Commissioners Steven Jones and Clayton Zimmerman.

Also present were: Community Development Director Jessica Jagoe and Councilmember Fran Holmes.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA – AUGUST 3, 2022**

**Commissioner Jefferys moved, seconded by Commissioner Weber, to approve the August 3, 2022, agenda as presented. The motion carried unanimously (6-0).**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

*July 6, 2022 – Planning Commission Regular Meeting*

**Commissioner Weber moved, seconded by Commissioner Mitchell, to approve the July 6, 2022, Planning Commission Regular Meeting as presented. The motion carried unanimously (6-0).**

**PLANNING CASES**

- A. Planning Case 22-014; 4200 Round Lake Road – Planned Unit Development Amendment – *Public Hearing***

**Community Development Director Jagoe** stated the applicant has submitted a land use application for a Planned Unit Development Amendment, proposing additional wall signage on the southwest elevation of the Gateway Interstate building. The original Preliminary/Final Plat,

Planned Unit Development, Conditional Use Permit, and Site Plan Review approvals from October 12, 2020, for the Subject Property did not include signage. It was stated in the approvals that a separate sign permit would be required for all proposed signage and that all proposed signage shall meet the requirements of Sign District 6. In July of 2021, it was determined that Sign District 6 would allow for a single wall sign for each tenant under 60 square feet on each of the corresponding tenant building elevations. The applicant is proposing additional signage on the southwest elevation.

**Community Development Director Jagoe** reviewed the surrounding area, the Plan Evaluation and provided the Findings of Fact for review:

1. The Applicant submitted an application for a Planned Unit Development Amendment.
2. The Subject Property is located within the GB Gateway Business District and is guided as Light Industrial and Office Use on the Land Use Plan.
3. The Subject Property is approximately 26 acres and is owned by Scannell Properties.
4. Adjustments to the requirements and standards for the height, number, type, lighting, area, and/or location of a sign or signs established by this Chapter may be approved with a Site Plan Review or a Planned Unit Development process as described for in Section 1320 and 1355 of the Zoning Code.
5. Flexibility through the PUD process has been requested for the location of the proposed wall signs.
6. The proposed signage plan will not result in a sign that is inconsistent with the purpose of the zoning district in which the property is located or the current land use.
7. A public hearing for a Planned Unit Development Amendment is required before the request can be brought before the City Council.

**Community Development Director Jagoe** reviewed the options available to the Planning Commission on this matter:

1. Recommend Approval with Conditions
  1. All conditions of the original Preliminary/Final Plat, Planned Unit Development, Conditional Use Permit, and Site Plan Review shall remain in full force and effect.
  2. A separate sign permit shall be required for all proposed signage.
  3. All signage shall meet all other requirements of Sign District 6.
2. Recommend Approval as Submitted
3. Recommend Denial
4. Table

**Vice Chair Wicklund** opened the floor to Commissioner comments.

**Commissioner Mitchell** asked if a total of eight signs were originally requested.

**Community Development Director Jagoe** stated this was the case with three tenants, but noted the sign plans have since changed given the building was now being built-out for two tenants. She explained the plans now show six signs, with two walls signs proposed for each tenant on the rear elevation.

**Commissioner Blilie** questioned if the building number would be visible from Gateway Boulevard.

**Community Development Director Jagoe** reported the applicants would comply with the Sign District 6 regulations for the free standing sign and noted the applicants have stated an intention of having a monument sign along Gateway Boulevard. She indicated the City also required the building to have address identification for emergency services.

**Commissioner Jefferys** inquired what the rationale was for the original sign placement.

**Community Development Director Jagoe** explained the original sign plan was compliant with the sign district standards with one sign per elevation of the building. She commented further on the sign requirements per City Code.

**Vice Chair Wicklund** opened the public hearing at 6:48 p.m.

**Vice Chair Wicklund** invited anyone for or against the application to come forward and make comment.

There being no comment Vice Chair Wicklund closed the public hearing at 6:49 p.m.

**Vice Chair Wicklund** invited the applicant to come forward at this time.

**Kevin Weiss**, Delkor Systems, commented on the proposed sign placement. He thanked staff for providing the Commission with a detailed staff report and noted he was available for further comments or questions.

**Commissioner Mitchell** asked how long the leases would be for the tenants in this building.

**Mr. Weiss** reported the leases would be for five to seven years.

**Patrick Gerst**, CPC, reported their lease would be for 12 years.

**Commissioner Weber** questioned if there would be signs directing visitors to the front of the building, if the wall signs were located on the rear elevation.

**Mr. Weiss** stated signage would be posted to direct traffic and visitors through the site.

**Commissioner Weber** inquired if CPC would be occupying the space that was proposed for a third tenant.

**Mr. Gerst** explained CPC would be occupying two-thirds of the space.

**Commissioner Collins** stated he supported the request along with the proposed sign placement.

**Commissioner Weber** agreed.

**Commissioner Jefferys** indicated her only concern would be if CPC were to move out of the building and two tenants were to occupy this space, new signage would have to be posted onto the building.

**Community Development Director Jagoe** stated the Commission could address this concern by adding Condition 4 that read: The subject property is allowed flexibility for wall sign location in accordance with the master sign plan as submitted and that any future changes to wall signage in the master sign plan shall require review and approval of the Planning Commission and City Council through a PUD Amendment.

**Commissioner Jefferys** supported the Commission adding this condition for approval.

**Commissioner Blilie** agreed.

**Commissioner Weber moved and Commissioner Jefferys seconded a motion to recommend approval of Planning Case 22-014 for a Planned Unit Development Amendment at 4200 Round Lake Road based on the findings of fact and the submitted plans, as amended by the conditions in the August 3, 2022, report to the Planning Commission, adding Condition 4 as stated by staff. The motion carried unanimously (6-0).**

#### **UNFINISHED AND NEW BUSINESS**

None.

#### **REPORTS**

##### **A. Report from the City Council**

**Councilmember Holmes** provided the Commission with an update from the City Council. She reported the Council passed the Launch Properties request at the end of July. She indicated the Mounds View High School was finishing up their renovation work in August. She explained the Council has been discussing the 2023 budget.

##### **B. Planning Commission Comments and Requests**

None.

#### **ADJOURN**

**Commissioner Mitchell moved, seconded by Commissioner Collins, to adjourn the August 3, 2022, Planning Commission Meeting at 7:01 p.m. The motion carried unanimously (6-0).**