



**New Brighton Planning Commission
Agenda
New Brighton City Hall | City Council Chambers
803 Old Highway 8 NW, New Brighton, MN 55112
6:30 PM January 20, 2026**

Members of the Planning Commission will attend the meeting in person unless eligible to attend remotely per MN Stat. 13D.02.

To participate in this meeting, members of the public may:

- **Attend the meeting in person.**
- **Watch the meeting electronically.** Tune into CTV Channel 8023 (CenturyLink) or Channel 16 (Comcast). To observe the meeting as a livestream or a webcast, visit NBMN.info/View-A-Meeting

I. Call to Order

II. Roll Call

Chair Tim McQuillan

Commissioner Abby Bryant

Vice-Chair Eric Nelson

Commissioner Andre Kuiper

Commissioner Karen Collins

Commissioner Hailey McCain

Commissioner Ian Pirner

III. Approval of Agenda

IV. Approval of Past Minutes

1. October 21, 2025

V. Report from City Council Liaison

VI. Public Hearings

1. **Ordinance 925: An Ordinance to Amend the City of New Brighton Zoning Ordinance by Making Multiple Small Corrections Deemed Needed Following Adoption and Implementation of the New Zoning Code**

VII. Business Items

VIII. Adjournment



**MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION
October 21, 2025 City Hall
Council Chambers 6:30 p.m.**

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

II. Roll Call

Members Present: Commissioners Abby Bryant, Karen Collins, Andre Kuiper and Eric Nelsen

Members Absent: Chair Tim McQuillan and Commissioner Ian Pirner

Also Present: Ben Gozola – Assistant Director of Community Assets and Development and Mayor Kari Niedfeldt-Thomas

III. Approval of Agenda

Motion by Commissioner Collins, seconded by Commissioner Kuiper, to approve the October 21, 2025 agenda as presented.

Approved 4-0.

IV. Approval of Minutes

Minutes from September 16, 2025

Motion by Commissioner Kuiper, seconded by Commissioner Collins, to approve the September 16, 2025 meeting minutes as presented.

Approved 4-0.

V. Report from City Council Liaison

Mayor Niedfeldt-Thomas provided the Commission with an update from the City Council. She explained the Council has been working on creating visioning documents for proposed opportunities

which includes future plans for the Brightwood Hills Clubhouse. She was pleased to report that at the last Council meeting, the City's zoning code was approved. She thanked Assistant Director of Community Assets and Development Gozola for all of his efforts on this document.

VI. Public Hearing

(A) Ordinance 923: An ordinance to CONDITIONALLY re-guide and re-zone the Brightwood Hills Clubhouse and parking lot area of 1975 Silver Lake Road and the Grace Point Church property at 2351 Rice Creek Road to Mixed Use Neighborhood (MUN). Changes to guidance and zoning would ONLY occur if multiple conditions can be met by a future development proposal, including but not limited to, replacement of the clubhouse with space and amenities that ensure continued success of the golf course, addition of upper-level housing units that meet community housing goals, and addressing of drainage and parking concerns shared by the subject properties.

Assistant Director of Community Assets and Development Gozola reported a recent facilities study showed a need for major investment in the Brightwood Hills Clubhouse in the coming years, dictating that replacement of the building is the best long-term investment strategy for the community. Because of the expected price tag of such an improvement, the City intends to explore options for a public-private partnership to replace the clubhouse. The City would gain an economically advantageous pathway to replacing the clubhouse and position the golf course for continuous success, and a developer would gain the right to create housing units above or next to the new clubhouse. A development concept could also address parking, drainage, and access issues for both the golf course property and the Grace Point Church property to the north. The proposed changes to land use guidance and zoning proposed by Ordinance 923 would ONLY take effect on lands included in the development proposal, and only if a final development plan is acceptable to the City. Staff provided further comments on the proposed type of housing units proposed within this development and recommended approval of the Ordinance with conditions.

Commissioner Kuiper requested further information from staff regarding the project timeline. Assistant Director of Community Assets and Development Gozola explained this was a City driven project and this project would not apply to the 60-day timeframe.

Acting Chair Nelsen reported that if the City were to move forward with Option 2 and receive a proposal from a developer, what process would then be followed. Assistant Director of Community Assets and Development Gozola commented on the RFP process that would be followed by the City.

Commissioner Bryan inquired if this project could move forward if Grace Point Church was not interested. Assistant Director of Community Assets and Development Gozola stated Grace Point Church was interested, if the right project came forward to assist with addressing the drainage issues on their property.

The Public Hearing was opened at 6:58 p.m.

Brad Carlson, 1940 Rice Creek Road, explained he received a letter from the City and noted he was concerned about the housing that was proposed because the information was vague. However, after hearing staff speak at this meeting, he now strongly supported this project moving forward. He liked the idea of having nice condos, apartments or housing for seniors within this redevelopment project.

Steven Chase, 1773 26th Avenue NW, asked if the City had any ideas on how many housing units would be included in this development. He stated he did not want a ten-story building on this site.

Greg Warbacher, 115 13th Avenue SW, explained he was not too keen on the proposed housing, but he did appreciate the fact the site would be improved and the drainage issues would be addressed.

Pauline Alfors, 2440 Mounds Avenue, questioned how Silver Lake Road would be impacted by the proposed development if housing was included.

Joni Metz, 2423 Mounds Avenue, stated she supported the proposed project. She stated she has drainage issues in her backyard and indicated she did not want to see this get worse if the proposed development were to move forward.

Don Knopp, 1790 20th Avenue NW, explained he opposed the proposed project. He stated he would have liked to have seen more information on the actual project costs before this item move forward. In addition, he was concerned with how the public/private partnership would impact this recreational space. He feared that the City would not get out from under the expense of the future maintenance of this property.

Greg Warbacher, 115 13th Avenue SW, questioned if the golf course was self-sufficient at this time.

Mike Rafferty, 1762 20th Avenue NW, stated it would be beneficial to get a proposal for the proposed project, especially for Option 1. He explained the City could then better understand the costs if this project were to move forward. He indicated if this project were to move forward, he did have concerns regarding how the ownership would be modeled. He was of the opinion the City should own the property and not lease the space.

Brad Carlson stated if the housing units were condominiums that were privately owned, it may be difficult for the City to retain ownership of a space for the golf course.

John Grono, 1886 20th Avenue NW, asked if the zoning should hold off until the City receives a real proposal for this property.

Motion by Commissioner Collins, seconded by Commissioner Kuiper to close the Public Hearing.

Approved 4-0.

The Public Hearing closed at 7:09 p.m.

Assistant Director of Community Assets and Development Gozola addressed the questions that were raised by the public. He explained staff does not know how many housing units would be included in the development, but reported the project would have height restrictions that would limit the number of units that could be constructed. He reported the proposal at this time would be to have a first-floor clubhouse with three stories of housing above that. He indicated the future developer would be looking into the traffic patterns and the impacts on Silver Lake Road. He stated the proposed project was not urgent, but it would be good for the City to have a solid proposal for both the development and the parking lot to allow the City to compare what the best route forward would be. He explained he understood the City's golf course was financially stable. He indicated the City was lucky in that regard and would like to continue success at this site going forward. He commented on how the rezoning process would alert developers in the community to the future potential for this property.

Acting Chair Nelsen requested staff speak to the impact of this development on drainage for the neighboring properties. Assistant Director of Community Assets and Development Gozola explained the City would be speaking with residents with existing drainage concerns.

Acting Chair Nelson requested staff speak to the future ownership model for the proposed development. Assistant Director of Community Assets and Development Gozola indicated the ownership model has been a focus of the City Council. He reported the long-term health of the golf course has been the City's main concern and he understood the concerns that were raised by the residents in attendance. He reported staff and the Council understood the importance of getting the ownership model correct.

Commissioner Kuiper inquired if the City would be pursuing estimates for the cost of the maintenance versus the cost of the redevelopment. Assistant Director of Community Assets and Development Gozola indicated this was great feedback for staff to pursue to ensure the City moves forward in the manner that makes the most sense for the community.

Commissioner Kuiper stated he supported the conditionality of the proposal moving forward.

Commissioner Bryant spoke to how important the public private partnership would be in order to move this project forward.

Motion by Commissioner Kuiper, seconded by Commissioner Collins, to recommend the City Council approve staff Ordinance 923 with the recommended conditions.

Approved 4-0.

VII. Business Items

None.

VIII. Adjournment

Motion by Commissioner Collins, seconded by Commissioner Kuiper, to adjourn the meeting.

Approved 4-0.

Meeting adjourned at 7:23 PM

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ben Gozola". The signature is stylized and cursive.

Ben Gozola
Assistant Director of Community Assets and Development



Agenda Section:	Public Hearings
Meeting Date:	January 20, 2026

REQUEST FOR COUNCIL CONSIDERATION – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ITEM DESCRIPTION: Ordinance 925: An Ordinance to Amend the City of New Brighton Zoning Ordinance by Making Multiple Small Corrections Deemed Needed Following Adoption and Implementation of the New Zoning Code

Action Requested: <u>Public Hearing</u>
Form of Action: <u>Ordinance</u>
Votes Needed: <u>4 Votes</u>

Summary Statement:	Ordinance 925 will make several small corrections to the new zoning ordinance to address minor issues identified following adoption and use of the new Zoning Code.
---------------------------	---

Recommendations:	Approval of Ordinance 925
-------------------------	----------------------------------

Applicable Deadlines:	None (city-driven process)
------------------------------	----------------------------

Community Impact:	Changes will ensure current rules are consistent with past regulations.
--------------------------	---

Legislative History:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The new Zoning Code was adopted in October 2025, and went into effect on 11/3/25 - Two months of use allowed staff to identify the updates being made by this ordinance.
-----------------------------	---

Strategic Priority:	<u>Community Engagement & Belonging</u>
----------------------------	--

Fiscal Impact:	Financial Consideration?	<u>No</u>
	Revenue/Expenditure Amount:	\$0
	Financing Source:	<u>N/A</u>
	Notes:	none

Attachments:	1.	Staff Report
	2.	Ordinance 925
	3.	Draft Summary Publication Resolution

**Ordinance 925: AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CITY OF NEW
BRIGHOTN ZONING ORDINANCE BY MAKING MULTIPLE SMALL
CORRECTIONS DEEMED NEEDED FOLLOWING ADOPTION AND
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW ZONING CODE**

To: **Planning Commission**

From: Ben Gozola, *Assistant Director DCAD*

Meeting Date: **1-20-26**

INTRODUCTION

Upon completion of the new zoning code in 2025, staff informed all parties that the new code would be monitored over the course of the first year, and that staff would return with minor updates as needed to address issues as they arose. Ordinance 925 includes the first slate of minor updates recommended by staff.

SECTION 1:

- This section of Ordinance 925 would amend Table 3-5 which is the table containing zoning standards for RS-1 properties (formerly the R-1 zoning district).
- Footnote #3 in this table includes language from our previous code that allows for special setbacks on corner lots when a home was built before August 21, 1981.
- In moving this language into the new code, staff eliminated a sentence which stated all construction after August 21, 1981, had to meet the 30-foot setback requirement as we thought that requirement was already apparent in the table. Subsequent reading of this language though has convinced us that the deleted sentence must be reinstated within the new code to retain consistency with the prior regulation. Without this language, one could read the footnote language and come to the conclusion that the side yard setback on these lots is only 15 feet, and that has never been the intent of code.

SECTIONS 2 & 3:

- These sections would update Tables 4-4 and 4-5 which deal with freestanding sign heights, areas, and setbacks.
- Within these tables, staff accidentally left some special setback requirements in Table 4-4 that should be in Table 4-5. These two sections will relocate the misplaced language and make all requirements consistent with the former code.

SECTION 4:

- This section would update Section 5.3(D)(27) Retail Commercial Uses.
- The Business Neighborhood district (formerly B-1 & B-2) previously included a list of specific commercial uses that could only locate in this district. Upon creating the use tables, staff thought this specialty list of uses was now unnecessary as the tables could apply, but subsequent use of the tables indicates that greater specificity for the BR and BN districts is necessary.
- Section 4 of this ordinance would simply reinstate the former list of specialty uses to guide what can and cannot locate within a BR or BN district. This would prevent things like a liquor store from locating in these areas, and ensure future uses are more appropriate given their proximity to nearby residential homes.

SECTION 5:

- Proper oversight of group residential facilities continues to be a concern in the community, so after working with the City's new Fire Marshal, staff are proposing two new requirements for these homes:
 1. That all group residential facilities obtain and maintain a valid state license to be in operation. This will give us a specific city provision to cite and enforce should an active group residential facility fail to obtain their yearly license from the State or County; and
 2. That all group residential facilities register with the City on a yearly basis indicating the type of license being implemented, the number of residents being cared for, the number of on-site staff at peak shift, and up-to-date contact information (must provide a minimum of three points of contact including names, phone numbers, email addresses, and mailing addresses).
- These updates will provide the city with needed leverage and information to address any problems should they occur.

SECTION 6:

- The easiest and most straight-forward update in Ordinance 925 is in Section 6 which will update Zoning Code, Section 5.3(D)(32)(a).
- There are two references in this section that must be updated from "3.8" to "5.3" to ensure the reader is directed to the right location for the noted information.

RECOMMENDATION

Review the proposed zoning code revisions, ask questions as needed, and propose updates should any be necessary. Once ready, staff would recommend approval of the recommended changes.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. *Ordinance 925*
2. *Draft summary publication resolution for Ordinance 925*

ORDINANCE NO. 925

STATE OF MINNESOTA
 COUNTY OF RAMSEY
 CITY OF NEW BRIGHTON

**AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE CITY OF NEW BRIGHTON ZONING
 ORDINANCE BY MAKING MULTIPLE SMALL CORRECTIONS DEEMED
 NEEDED FOLLOWING ADOPTION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW
 ZONING CODE**

THE CITY OF NEW BRIGHTON ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. The City Council of the City of New Brighton hereby amends New Brighton Zoning Code, Table 3-5, as follows:

TABLE 3-5: RS-1 DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS							
	REQUIRED YARDS (in feet) [1]				Max Height (stories / feet)	Maximum Gross Impervious Surface Coverage	Maximum Gross Building Coverage
	Front [2]	Interior Side	Street Side [3]	Rear [4]			
All Structures and Buildings	30	5	30	5	Lesser of 2.5 stories or 30 feet	50%	30%
	<p>[1]: Any principal structure or building other than a single-family residence shall be located at least 30 feet from all property boundary lines.</p> <p>[2]: A required front yard setback may be reduced to 24' for a portion of a principal dwelling. The portion of the dwelling within the standard setback shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Not exceed 35 percent of the dwelling width (excluding an attached garage) or shall be no more than 12 feet in width, whichever is less. b) Include a base that is consistent in appearance with the base of the rest of the dwelling. c) Include a roof that is properly proportioned to and integrated with the roof of the larger dwelling. d) Utilize the same exterior structure materials and colors as the principal structure and accessories <p>[3]: A side street yard on a corner lot shall not be less than thirty feet in width for any construction after August 21, 1981. Any property already improved on August 21, 1981, by construction of a principal structure with a 15 foot side street yard setback shall not be considered nonconforming in regard to side street yard setback. In all cases, where adjacent properties are already improved, the City Council can grant special permission to change the setback requirements on a corner lot based on the criteria of visual compatibility with the surrounding properties.</p> <p>[4]: Rear yard setbacks for lakeshore lots shall be as outlined in Section 3.8(C)(10).</p>						

The remainder of Table 3-5 is incorporated herein unchanged.

SECTION 2. The City Council of the City of New Brighton hereby amends New Brighton Zoning Code, Table 4-4, as follows:

TABLE 4-4: MAXIMUM FREESTANDING SIGN AREA AND HEIGHT		
ZONING DISTRICT	Area (Square Feet) [1]	Height (feet) [1]
RS-1, RS-2, RM-1, and MHC [4]	6 sq ft [2]	4 ft
RM-2, RM-3, BR	35 sq ft	12 ft
BN	36 sq ft	20 ft
BG [2]	64 sq ft [3] [3][4]	20 ft
IR, IL, IH [2]	36 sq ft [3] [3][4]	20 ft
DT, NBE, MUN, MUR, MUE	See Section 4.5(K)	
<p>[1]: Residential freestanding signs may not be located closer than seven feet to the paved portion of a street and must be at least five feet from any other privately owned property.</p> <p>[1]: Institutional and Governmental uses may have one freestanding sign not to exceed 32 square feet in area, <u>and</u> not to exceed 10 feet in height, and be no closer than 10 feet from any street right-of-way.</p> <p>[2]: Freestanding signs that qualify as a freeway sign <u>in these districts</u> shall not exceed 170 square feet in area and not exceed 35 feet in height.</p> <p>[3]: On each street side of less than 100 feet, a single ground sign not exceeding 12 square feet in area shall be permitted.</p>		

SECTION 3. The City Council of the City of New Brighton hereby amends New Brighton Zoning Code, Table 4-5, as follows:

TABLE 4-5: FREESTANDING SIGN MINIMUM SETBACK			
ZONING DISTRICT	STREET [1]	SIDE	REAR
RS-1, RS-2, RM-1, RM-2, RM-3, MHC, BR, BN, BG	7' 10'	5'	5'
<u>BR, BN, BG</u>	<u>10'</u>	<u>5'</u>	<u>5'</u>
IR, IL, IH	13.5'	5'	5'
DT, NBE, MUN, MUR, MUE	No minimums, but placement is subject to approval by the Department of Community Assets & Development. Proposed locations may be denied if the proposed location is deemed unsafe to the general public, or the location would interfere with the site's use or future development.		
<p>[1]: <u>Institutional and Governmental signs shall be no closer than 10 feet from any street right-of-way</u></p>			

SECTION 4. The City Council of the City of New Brighton hereby amends New Brighton Zoning Code, Section 5.3(D)(27) Retail Commercial Uses as follows:

(27) Retail Commercial Uses

~~None.~~ Retail commercial uses in the BN and BR districts shall be limited to the following uses, or similar uses as determined by the Department of Community Assets and Development:

- (a) Specialty Eating Establishments and Delicatessens in permanent buildings only.
- (b) Restaurants with a maximum gross floor area of 5000 square feet.
- (c) Eating places, lunchrooms, restaurants, and cafeterias of any size when housed and used in conjunction with other businesses permitted in the District.
- (d) The sale of dry goods and variety merchandise.
- (e) The sale of books, magazines, newspapers, cigars, drugs, flowers, gifts, music, photographic goods, sporting goods, and stationery.
- (f) Personal & Professional Services.
- (g) Service establishments, barber or beauty shops, custom tailors, laundry facilities, and shoe repair.

SECTION 5. The City Council of the City of New Brighton hereby amends New Brighton Zoning Code, Section 5.3(A)(9) Group Residential Facilities as follows:

(9) Group Residential Facilities

~~All group residential facilities shall be issued and must maintain a valid state license to be in operation.~~

- (a) All group residential facilities shall obtain and maintain a valid state license to be in operation.
- (b) All group residential facilities must register with the City on a yearly basis indicating the type of license being implemented, the number of residents being cared for, the number of on-site staff at peak shift, and must provide a minimum of three points of contact including names, phone numbers, email addresses, and mailing addresses.

SECTION 6. The City Council of the City of New Brighton hereby amends New Brighton Zoning Code, Section 5.3(D)(32)(a) as follows:

(a) Conditional Use

Wireless telecommunication towers/antenna shall be subject to approval of a conditional use permit. A conditional use permit shall be considered provided it is determined that the location and size of the use and type of operation involved therein shall not be injurious to the public health, safety, convenience, or general welfare and shall not injure or adversely affect the adjacent area or property values. The Planning Commission, in making a recommendation, and the City Council, in acting upon the conditional use permit, shall consider the following factors:

- (i)** The application for conditional use permit shall be processed according to Section 2.4(D) of the Zoning Code.
- (ii)** Applications for conditional use permits must meet the standards of Section 2.4(D) of the Zoning Code.
- (iii)** Wireless telecommunication towers/antenna may be constructed to a height that exceeds the required setback up to 33 percent. As a condition of approval, the City must be provided with a licensed professional engineer's certification that the tower is designed to collapse or fail within a distance or zone shorter than the required setback distance as determined by the height of the structure or telecommunication tower. The required setback is specified in Section ~~3-8-5.3~~5.3(D)(32)(b)(i & ii).
- (iv)** Certain telecommunication towers/antenna may be exempt from the setback requirement of Section ~~3-8-5.3~~5.3 (D)(32)(b) and instead subject to a 10 foot setback by authorization of the City Council and when all of the following criteria are met:
 - 1. The tower/antenna is erected on a parcel zoned IL or IH.
 - 2. The tower/antenna is located in a side or rear yard.
 - 3. The reduced setback is measured only from the I-35W right-of-way.
 - 4. The applicant submits a fall zone letter stating that tower is engineered to fall in a distance not impeding traffic on I-35W.

SECTION 7. Effective Date

This ordinance shall take effect upon its adoption by the city council, its publication in the city’s official newspaper, and the completion of the listed conditions.

ADOPTED this 27th day of January 2026, by the New Brighton City Council with a vote of ___ ayes and ___ nays.

Kari Niedfeldt-Thomas, Mayor

Devin Massopust, City Manager

ATTEST:

Terri Spangrud, City Clerk

RESOLUTION _____
CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW BRIGHTON

**RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING PUBLICATION OF
ORDINANCE NO. 925 BY TITLE AND SUMMARY**

WHEREAS, the city council of the City of New Brighton has adopted Ordinance No. 925 an ordinance to amend the City of New Brighton zoning ordinance by making multiple small corrections deemed needed following adoption and implementation of the new zoning code; and

WHEREAS, the ordinance is lengthy and includes tables; and

WHEREAS, Minnesota Statutes, section 412.191, subd. 4, allows publication by title and summary in the case of lengthy ordinances or those containing charts or maps; and

WHEREAS, the City Council believes that the following summary would clearly inform the public of the intent and effect of the ordinance.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of New Brighton, that the City Clerk shall cause the following summary of Ordinance No. 925 be published in the official newspaper in lieu of the entire ordinance:

Public Notice

The City Council of the City of New Brighton has adopted Ordinance No. 925 which makes several minor updates to the City's new Zoning Ordinance put into effect on November 3, 2025. Changes include adding of language to ensure street side setbacks on corner lots remain consistent with the previous code, the relocation of sign setback information into the proper table within the new code, adding restrictions to uses in the Business Residential (BR) and Business Neighborhood (BN) districts, requiring the yearly registration of group residential facilities, and amending two references to ensure code users are directed to the correct information. All changes are for clarity, or to ensure that new rules are consistent with the previous code.

Mayor Kari Niedfeldt-Thomas

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of New Brighton that the City Clerk keeps a copy of the ordinance at city hall for public inspection, and that a full copy of the ordinance be posted in a public place within the city.

Adopted this _____ **day of** _____, **2026** by the City of New Brighton City Council with voting as follows:

Mayor Kari Niedfeldt-Thomas: _____

Jeanne Vint Frischman: _____

Graeme Allen: _____

Jason Steffenhagen: _____

Emily Dunsworth: _____

Kari Niedfeldt-Thomas, Mayor

Devin Massopust, City Manager

ATTEST:

Terri Spangrud, City Clerk