1. **Call to Order**

   Mayor Brad Wiersum called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

2. **Pledge of Allegiance**

   All joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. **Roll Call**

   Council Members Susan Carter, Mike Happe, Tim Bergstedt, Bob Ellingson, Deb Calvert, Rebecca Schack and Brad Wiersum were present.

4. **Approval of Agenda**

   Bergstedt moved, Schack seconded a motion to accept the agenda, as amended with addenda to Items 13.B and 14.B; and removing Item 14.A per the applicant's request. All voted "yes." **Motion carried.**

5. **Approval of Minutes:**

   A. **April 1, 2019 regular council meeting**

      Calvert moved, Happe seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the April 1, 2019 regular council meeting, as presented. All voted "yes." **Motion carried.**

   B. **April 15, 2019 LBAE meeting**

      Calvert moved, Happe seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the April 15, 2019 Local Board of Adjustments and Equalization meeting, as presented. All voted "yes." **Motion carried.**

6. **Special Matters:**

   A. **Recognition of 2019 Police Citizens Academy**

      City Manager Geralyn Barone provided the council with a brief presentation on the Police Citizens Academy and noted 26 residents participated in 2019.
Wiersum recognized all members who recently graduated from the 2019 Police Citizens Academy and thanked each individual for their participation.

Police Chief Boerboom thanked all who participated in the academy. A round of applause was offered by all in attendance.

B. Presentation of annual community survey results

Peter Leatherman, The Morris Leatherman Company, presented the annual community survey results to the council. He explained 400 random households were contacted via telephone. He noted these individuals were contacted between Feb. 19 and March 12. It was noted the non-response rate was 5%. He summarized the quality of life responses for the past four years, noting that 62% of respondents rated the quality of life in Minnetonka as excellent. Forty percent of respondents said there were no serious issues in the city. Eighty-nine percent rated the value of city services favorably. Community characteristics were discussed in addition to how residents receive primary sources of information.

Wiersum thanked Mr. Leatherman for the presentation. He then thanked staff for all of their efforts on behalf of the community. He stated he was very proud of staff’s record.

7. Reports from City Manager & Council Members

City Manager Geralyn Barone reported on upcoming city events and council meetings. She noted rank choice voting would be addressed by the council at a worksession meeting in September. She commented further on the upcoming election and noted four ward members were up for election in 2019.

Calvert stated she picked up three garbage bags of trash on a one mile walk yesterday. She encouraged residents to assist in cleaning up the city this spring.

8. Citizens Wishing to Discuss Matters not on the Agenda

Commissioner Calison provided the council with a report from Hennepin County. She commented on the property value growth that has occurred since 2013. She noted Hennepin County was considering changing the purchase age for tobacco to 21. She thanked the City of Minnetonka for taking a strong stance on this issue. She reported child protective services were a focus for the county at this time. She commented on the legislative session noting transportation and county program aid were major concerns in 2019.
Wiersum thanked Commissioner Calison for her time and report. He stated he appreciated the good work being conducted by the county with respect to roads, law enforcement and human services.

9. **Bids and Purchases:**

A. **Bids for the Carlson Parkway project**

City Manager Geralyn Barone gave the staff report.

Bergstedt commented the low bid received was still considerably higher than the engineer's estimate and asked why this had occurred. City Engineer Will Manchester explained staff had spoken to other cities and noted higher bids were being received in 2019 than were anticipated. He reported staff had recalculated the numbers and recommended the council proceed with the project.

Happe moved, Calvert seconded a motion to award the contract. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

8. **Proposals for police and fire facility project**

City Manager Geralyn Barone gave the staff report, recommending that the council reject the proposals.

Calvert commented there was a slightly different bidding climate for general construction at this time. She questioned whether the council would be doing more harm than good by rejecting the proposals. Barone reported staff was watching the bidding environment closely and understood labor expenses were on the rise. She explained staff was working with the architect to fine tune the project details and recommended the project be rebid this fall.

Calvert thanked staff for taking this approach.

Bergstedt moved, Schack seconded a motion to reject all proposals. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

10. **Consent Agenda - Items Requiring a Majority Vote:**

A. **Conditional use permit for an accessory structure exceeding 12 feet in height and 1,000 square feet in total floor area at 19100 Old Excelsior Blvd**
Ellingson moved, Calvert seconded a motion to adopt Resolution 2019-041 approving the conditional use permit. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

B. Third Amended and Restated Lindbergh Center Joint Powers Ownership and Management Agreement

Ellingson moved, Calvert seconded a motion to approve the agreement. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

C. Hennepin County Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) grant

Ellingson moved, Calvert seconded a motion to authorize the fire department to accept the grant from Hennepin County and act as a fiduciary agent for the purchase and distribution of equipment to other cities. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

11. Consent Agenda - Items requiring Five Votes: None

12. Introduction of Ordinances:

A. Ordinance authorizing sale of city property adjacent to 3515 Park Valley Road

City Attorney Corrine Heine gave the staff report.

Calvert moved, Schack seconded a motion to introduce the ordinance. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

B. An Ordinance amending section 920.020, subdivision 2 of the Minnetonka City Code; amending the Minnesota state fire code; regulating storage and use of grills in apartment or condominium buildings two or more stories in height

Fire Chief John Vance gave the staff report.

Wiersum reported propane grills are not allowed on apartment or condo balconies. He asked if the Fire Department had any recommendations for the storage of propane canisters. Vance recommended propane canisters be stored outside in a secure location that is well ventilated.

Schack moved, Calvert seconded a motion to introduce the ordinance. All voted "yes." Motion carried.
13. Public Hearings:

A. Temporary on-sale liquor license for Adath Jeshurun Congregation, 10500 Hillside Lane W

City Manager Geralyn Barone gave the staff report.

Calvert commented the applicant had an adequate plan in place to prevent the sale of alcohol to minors and explained she supported the proposed event.

Wiersum opened the public hearing. No one spoke. Wiersum closed the public hearing.

Wiersum reported the requested event would be held on Thursday, May 30 at the Adath Jeshurun Congregation at 10500 Hillside Lane West.

Calvert moved, Schack seconded a motion to hold the public hearing and grant the license. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

8. Off-sale liquor license for Target Corporation, 4848 Co Rd 101

Community Development Director Julie Wischnack gave the staff report.

Happe asked if staff could provide further information regarding the lawsuit that occurred in 2016. City Attorney Heine summarized the lawsuit from 2016, noting the license for Total Wine & Spirits was denied by the city. She reviewed the reasons for the denial which had to do with traffic concerns and the number of licenses in the city. However, she noted that when Total Wine & Spirits submitted a new application for a different location, the council approved a license and the lawsuit was dismissed.

Happe questioned what was the basis of the original lawsuit. City Attorney Heine explained Total Wine & Spirits believed the city’s actions were arbitrary and capricious.

Carter inquired why there was a focus on the number of stand-alone liquor stores versus the total square footage. Wischnack commented the square footage had been analyzed by staff. She explained the volume of sales information had not been reviewed by staff as this information was not easily available.

Schack asked if there had been discussion about concentration and where liquor stores were located. Wischnack reported the key in the policy was
to address location concentration and geography. She explained the council had a choice in this matter, which differed from land use requests.

Calvert questioned how the council has viewed the activity of Target or Total Wine & Spirits purchasing a small mom and pop establishment.

Bergstedt commented in the last five years the council has reviewed the Target and Total Wine & Spirits applications. He explained in the history of Minnetonka, prior to Total Wine, a small liquor store was never purchased. He reported that Big Top was looking to get out of the business. He indicated the Mayor had encouraged Total Wine to find another location and to purchase a liquor license, as there was concern about the total number of liquor licenses in the city. He stated he did not believe this had set a precedence and it was his understanding no one was forcing Big Top to sell. Barone clarified for the record, Total Wine purchased a business and not a liquor license. Wiersum corrected Council member Bergstedt’s previous statement, indicating that he had not encouraged Total Wine to purchase a liquor license or liquor store.

Wiersum commented the issue with the denial of the Total Wine & Spirits liquor license request was the fact the council believed the city had enough liquor stores and was being adequately served. He reported Total Wine & Spirits then came back to the council and suggested purchasing Big Top. City Attorney Heine clarified that described how first class cities (Minneapolis and St. Paul) were restricted in the number of liquor licenses it can issue to 1 per 5,000 in population. She reported no other class of cities had this restriction. She advised if Minnetonka were to follow the first class requirement, it would mean the city would be limited to 10 liquor licenses.

Carter requested further information regarding the proximity to schools for the cities current liquor stores. Wischnack reported a 2015 map showed the proximity of all schools to liquor establishments. She noted she would pass this map along to the council.

Wiersum noted the Mayor asked staff for a map that included liquor stores in neighboring communities. He requested this information be passed along to the council in the next staff report.

Wiersum opened the public hearing.

Dana Schlacker, District Senior Director for Target Corporation, stated he oversaw nine stores in the west metro. He discussed his plans to add a wine and spirits store to the Minnetonka Target. He reported his research shows Target customers want a convenient one stop shop as time is valuable. He indicated Target was working to meet their guests expectations by offering the sale of adult beverages. He commented on
the future of Strong Liquor in Minnetonka. He explained he had been before the council previously and discussed Target's successful history of selling adult beverages in the State of Minnesota. He requested the council support the approval of the requested off-sale liquor license.

Calvert asked why Target had selected this location for a wine and spirits shop. Jonathan Redberg, Target Corporation representative, reported State law allows Target to hold only one liquor license in a city. He explained it made more sense for Target to have a wine and spirits shop within the Super Target on 101, as it was a full service store with groceries.

Carter explained the Minnetonka High School was within walking distance of this Target location, along with the Minnetonka Middle School. She expressed concern with how a liquor store at this Target could adversely impact the community. Mr. Redberg reported Target takes the sale of alcohol very seriously and has a strong positive record. He explained all individuals trying to purchase alcohol must provide an ID. He indicated he had reached out to members of the Minnetonka School Board and the principal to address any concerns they may have. He noted the principal and school board have offered their support.

Calvert questioned how old individuals had to be to work in the wine and spirits area. Mr. Redberg stated per state statute employees had to be 18 years of age.

Happe reported he was a shareholder in Target Corporation and asked if this was a potential conflict of interest. City Attorney Heine read the portion of city code regarding conflicts of interest. She reported she would have a conversation with Happe prior to the next council meeting to see if there was a conflict of interest.

Carter moved, Schack seconded a motion to open the public hearing and continue to June 24, 2019. Schack, Carter, Bergstedt, Ellingson, Calvert and Wiersum voted "yes". Happe abstained. Motion carried.

14. Other Business:

A. Items concerning the demolition and construction of a new automobile dealership pat 15906 Wayzata Blnd.

This item was pulled from the agenda by the applicant.
B. Items concerning HIGHCROFT MEADOWS at 14410 Orchard Road

City Planner Loren Gordon gave the staff report.

Happe stated he was in an uncomfortable position given the fact staff was recommending approval of an item the Planning Commission has denied. He asked if there was a difference of opinion between staff and the Planning Commission. Gordon reported there was a difference of opinion on how the commission views the development of this site, noting the commission did believe this development matched the character of the neighborhood. Staff’s opinion was that character change would occur because of the topography and grade change on the property.

Schack questioned why an R-2 development was being considered versus a PUD. Gordon explained in 2014 public purpose measures were written into the PUD requirements and that the proposed development would not satisfy those requirements. He reported commercial projects tended to gravitate to PUD’s versus residential projects since this change was made.

Bergstedt commented the rezoning requires four votes and the preliminary plat will require five votes. He asked what would happen if the rezoning received four votes, but the preliminary plat could not get five votes. Gordon explained the proposed preliminary plat with the variances was provided to put regular lot lines in place. He indicated the preliminary plat could be approved without variances if the lot lines were reconfigured and the cul-de-sac were extended slightly. He stated it was staff’s opinion the applicant could come back with a conforming R-2 plat without variances.

Barone questioned if the council were to approve the rezoning, would the project be contingent upon the R-2 zoning. Gordon reported if the parcel was rezoned but the plat was not approved, there was no clause in place that would require the plat to occur. He stated a condition could be added to state the rezoning was only valid if the plat were approved.

Bergstedt indicated a number of residents have brought up the fact that the Planning Commission recommended denial of this request. He explained these residents are questioning why the council was even considering this request. He reported the city has very professional staff, as well as intelligent commission members, and the council values all of the recommendations that are made. He commented in the end, the council makes its own decision and was not locked into making a recommendation based on the vote of an advisory group.
Calvert inquired what the acreage was for this lot and requested further information regarding the topography. Gordon stated the lot was six acres in size. He commented further on the topography of the lot, noting there was a steep slope between Lot 7 and Lot 1.

Calvert questioned how much of the lot had buildable area. Gordon explained he would have to look this up. Further discussion ensued regarding the amount of property that was buildable.

Calvert commented on the proposed density for the new plat compared to the adjacent lot sizes. She thanked staff for providing this visual for the council.

Gordon commented the proposed ordinance and resolution have language in place that would tie one to the other. This would mean that the rezoning could only be approved if the plat were approved.

David Stradtman, Rachel Development, thanked the council for their time and consideration. He discussed how he has worked with staff to meet the concerns of the city for this project. He stated the two main concerns at this time were the character of the neighborhood and density. It was his opinion the character of the neighborhood was subjective. He commented this property was surrounded by R-1 single family homes, twin homes and the Williston Fitness Center. He explained his project with the 13 villas was 3.3 units per acre. He noted the five homes along Westmark had a density of 3.25 units per acre. He reported his development was very much in alignment with the Westmark neighborhood. He commented that several of the twinhome lots within Westmark were smaller than the lots he was proposing to construct.

Mr. Stradtman reported this neighborhood was a melting pot and had a wide variety of housing types. He noted the surrounding neighborhoods were created two or three generations ago. He discussed how housing has changed over time and noted his project could not match the existing housing given the change in infrastructure and design standards.

Mr. Stradtman commended staff for putting an objective lens on this project. He understood the council had to consider if this project was within the Comprehensive Plan for the city. He noted the property was zoned R-1 Low Density, which meant no more than four units per acre. He explained his project met those standards. He stated the next question was if the rezoning to R-2 was reasonable. He was of the opinion this was a reasonable request given the fact this property had R-2 zoned property adjacent to it. He indicated his original request was for 19 villas and staff has pushed him to reconsider his request.
Mr. Stratman reported he had villa projects being completed all throughout the metro area and some had five foot setbacks between the units. He stated he was requesting 65 foot wide lots, which were typical suburban single family lot widths. He understood the council had to consider if his request was in alignment with the Comprehensive Plan and if the request was reasonable. He explained it was his opinion the answer to both of these questions was yes.

Mr. Stradtman commented he understood the neighbors were concerned because this would be a change. He stated he was proposing to build a new housing product that had evolved when compared to the existing neighborhoods. He questioned how the neighborhood was being harmed by 13 villas and a one and one-half acre single-family lot when the site was currently being used for six acre horse farm. He noted the twinhomes in Westmark were very comparable to the detached villa homes he was proposing to build. He reported adjacent property values would not be decreasing.

Mr. Stradtman explained the proposed variances would allow him to have consistent lot lines. In addition, he was proposing to shorten the cul-de-sac in order to save significant trees. He reiterated that he was proposing to have 20 feet between the villa structures, which was a great deal of space. He discussed how hard he had been working with staff on this project and stated he believed his request was reasonable. He requested the council support his project.

Rick Denman, Charles Cudd Company, discussed the numerous meetings he had attended with the city, neighbors and planning commission. He described how housing had evolved over time and noted his proposal was a great fit for this property. He stated he was proposing to build large, single-story villas on 65 foot lots. He explained there was a demand for these types of units. He understood the neighbors were having a hard time with the proposed change but believed he was proposing the highest and best use for this property. He thanked staff for all of their assistance with this project.

Wiersum opened the meeting to the public for comments.

Jennifer Rutz, 14401 Orchard Road, stated she was before the council to express her opinions and the thoughts of the majority of her neighbors. She explained she moved to Minnetonka recently from Eden Prairie. She reported she did not care about the property being developed, but noted she was concerned with the proposed density. She commented she did not want to see a cookie-cutter development on this lot. She thanked city
staff for doing a thorough job and taking a good hard look at this project. However, she respectfully disagreed with their recommendation. She stated her neighborhood welcomed development that was appropriate. Her main concern was Cudd wanted too many homes.

Ms. Rutz indicated there were many great developers in the metro area and perhaps another developer would bring in an even better option for this land. She believed that Cudd was asking too much of the city and of the neighbors. She was of the opinion city staff had a difference of analysis when considering what the council could do with this property. She noted rezoning was a legislative function of the city council, but just because the council could do something doesn't mean it should. She encouraged the council to consider the precedent that could be set by rezoning this property to R-2. She commented on the character of the neighborhood and understood this was subjective. She indicated one side of the development had R-2 homes while the other had 44 R-1 single-family homes.

Ms. Rutz discussed the requested variances. She noted the city had very clear standards with respect to lot sizes. She reported variances were only to be approved if there was an undue hardship or practical difficulty that are not related to economic considerations. She explained the proposed use must be reasonable, caused by circumstances unique to the property and would not alter the character of the surrounding area. She indicated Cudd is stating they would not alter the neighborhood given the style of homes to the west. She noted the Westmark twinhomes have large lots with space between the units, which Cudd was not proposing. She was of the opinion Cudd's proposal did not align with the character of the neighborhood.

Ms. Rutz questioned what the practical difficulties and undue hardships were for this project. She reported the Cudd lots would be half the size of the R-1 zoning requirements. She commented further on the FAR requirements the city has in place. She stated the neighborhood would welcome development on this property that aligns with current zoning regulations that add to the character of this neighborhood. Lastly, she commented on how this development would increase traffic in the neighborhood. She recommended a stop sign be considered at Orchard Road for pedestrian safety or speed bumps in order to slow the speed of traffic. She respectfully requested the council deny the plat, variance and rezoning for Highcroft Meadows.

Beth Desmond, 14306 Orchard Road, stated she created a petition in support of a "No" vote from the council. She reported her petition was intended to create community support against the rezoning and variance
requests. She noted 201 of the signers were Minnetonka residents and 124 left comments. She explained she opposed the rezoning and variances. She reviewed a plan of what R-1 homes would look like on this property and encouraged the council to require the applicant to rethink this development. She indicated the first eight homes in the project were simply too close and dense.

Ms. Desmond indicated she recently visited three different Cudd developments and shared pictures from these developments with the council. She requested the council not support the proposed request and that the developer reconsider his plat as it was not there just yet.

Greg Raetz, 14523 Orchard Road, thanked the council for allowing him to speak. He stated he understood that villa homes were becoming more popular in the metro area. However, he indicated Minnetonka was not "the metro area" but rather was in the top 9%. He explained he was not anti-development, but rather was against the project being proposed. He understood his neighborhood could be considered transitional, but did not support this being further expanded when this property could be preserved. He encouraged the council to hold onto its existing character, to try and find better and recommended the proposed density for this project be reduced.

Don Lucia, 4209 Lindsey Lane, commented he has been a Minnetonka resident for the past six years. He explained he has been looking for villa housing and noted Cudd builds a fantastic product. He indicated he did not want to move to Woodbury or Medina but rather would like to remain in Minnetonka. He requested the council offer their support to the proposed project noting the density would not be a concern as the units would be filled with empty nesters.

Dale Thielen, 14309 Orchard Road, stated he was amazed by the fact staff did not bring up any of the opposition or discussion that was held at the planning commission meeting last week. For the record, he explained he would like to make his neighborhood better too. He indicated he would be moving out of the neighborhood sooner rather than later given his age. He encouraged the council to consider the recommendation of the planning commission noting it was based on the feedback received from the public.

Chris Osgood, 3604 West Sunrise Drive, reported he moved into his home in 1999. He explained he and his wife enjoy walking the neighborhood. He expressed concern that 28 trees would be removed for the 14th home. He stated he also feared how the lot would be impacted after being regraded given the steep slope on the property.
Brent Hislop, representative of the Bensman family, thanked the council for their time and consideration. He provided the council with a handout and stated he was of the opinion the proposed plat meets the city's housing regulations. He requested the council review the plan objectively. He commented on the city's variance process noting the proposal with the lot count can be submitted without variances. However, this would mean additional trees would be lost. He reviewed the variety of homes that were available in the surrounding neighborhood noting the average age and square footage. He reported the proposed villas were akin to the surrounding homes versus a traditional R-1 single-family neighborhood.

Mr. Hislop commented on the petition that had been signed opposing his project. He stated after reviewing the signatures and based on his calculations, 80% of the adjacent neighbor's had not signed the petition. He reiterated that the proposed plan would save 37% more trees than was required by city ordinance.

Brian Weisberg explained he was an attorney who had been asked to appear by the owner of the property, his aunt. He commented on how the neighborhood had changed over the past 40 years noting his aunt and uncle used to ride their horses to Dairy Queen. He explained that the family had chosen a high quality developer that would provide a housing product that was needed in the community. He indicated family members were not trying to damage this neighborhood but wanted a high quality housing product that would benefit the entire community.

Wiersum reported he knew Allen and Carol Bensman and they were great champions of this city.

Mark Osland, 14409 Orchard Lane, commented on the nature of the neighborhood and stated he did not support the proposed density of the Cudd development. He feared that if this development were approved it was set a dangerous precedent.

Wiersum closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

Happe stated he watched the entire planning commission meeting. He noted the city had a high quality developer for this project and noted adjustments had been made to the project bringing the density down from 19 units to 14 units. He thanked the neighbors for articulating their concerns and explained he found the petition to be highly persuasive. He indicated he placed a high value on the planning commissions decision. He stated he had a hard time going against this group. He was of the opinion the density was still too high and there were too many homes
within the development. Therefore, he would not be offering his support to the project.

Schack reported there were two lines of reasoning to consider. She commented one line would be to have R-1 single family homes on this property which would create very high end homes. Another option would be zone the property consistent with the property to the west. He indicated this would create smaller homes, smaller footprints and a more manageable price point. She stated she respected the survey results and noted 13% of the city's housing was on lots smaller than 15,000 square feet. She commented on the importance of the city having diverse housing. She believed that if the council were to approve R-2 zoning on this parcel, future developers could not assume the same approval. For this reason, she stated she could support the R-2 zoning.

Schack explained she did have concerns with the requested variances. In addition, she stated she was not comfortable with the "averages" being discussed by the developer. She anticipated that the developer and the city could come together to create a plat that was reasonable and met the city's R-2 housing regulations.

Calvert indicated she was conflicted by this request. She reported it would be very difficult for her to go against staff's recommendation as she respected their opinion. However, she also respected her former colleagues on the planning commission. She explained the council was not taking into consideration revenue generation with this request but rather was considering land use and zoning. She discussed how difficult it was to find one-story homes in Minnetonka stating the proposed villas were needed. She noted she was very familiar with this property and the neighborhood. She reported she was pleased the wooded slope was being protected. She indicated she supported the proposed development versus an R-1 single family development as this would lead to high end, high value homes. She commented she was looking for flexibility in the style of homes being built in the city. She understood this development would add traffic to an already busy street. She explained if this was a flat parcel, she would offer her support immediately. However, given the topography of the land she would not be able to support the proposed development and density.

Ellingson stated he had concerns with the high density and how there would be no room for on-street parking within the proposed development. Barone stated the proposed plat had room for on-street parking on one side of the street.
Ellingson indicated there had not been much discussion about the variance request. He noted the neighbors have addressed this concern but stated he would like to hear more from the council regarding this matter.

Carter explained she appreciated all of the comments received from the public. She reported this development would change the walkability of her neighborhood along with the traffic patterns. She understood Cudd made a beautiful villa product and noted the city needed more housing options. However, she believed the city should not just settle for good enough. Rather, she recommended the city work with the developer to make adjustments to the existing plan to come up with an even better design. She stated at this time she would not be able to support the rezoning.

Bergstedt indicated he appreciated all of the comments received from the public. He explained this parcel was going to be developed with either smaller lots for villas or with McMansions. He stated the topography of this parcel has created water runoff issues that had to be addressed, which meant large retaining walls would be installed. He was of the opinion the villa homes would have less traffic than McMansions. He reported the applicant could come back to the city with the same plan without variances, but noted more trees would be lost.

Bergstedt commented he supported the five homes around the cul-de-sac and the single-family home. He noted his only concern was with the first eight homes as it may look cookie cutter. He feared this portion of the project could look like the Groveland Homes development. He stated he understood the city could benefit from having this type of housing, but expressed concern with the first eight lots and how this would look visually. He suggested two of the lots be eliminated to improve the aesthetics and side yard setbacks. He explained he would not be able to support the request as submitted but could support the project if two lots were eliminated. He reported Minnetonka did not need anymore McMansions, but rather could benefit from having one-story villas.

Wiersum explained this has been a challenging conversation. He stated he respected the recommendation from staff, the recommendation from the planning commission and the comments made by both the neighbors and developer. He indicated he did not see a path forward for this project as proposed. He appreciated the fact that the developer had already reduced the density and stated he was pleased Charles Cudd was working with the city on this project.

Wiersum commented villa style homes were very popular and there was a market in Minnetonka. He feared if the council were to deny this project,
Charles Cudd would walk away from the city. He noted he had downsized his home to single-level living. He reported the aging baby boomers in Minnetonka were looking to downsize and this project would meet that need. He stated if the number of villa units were reduced the price of the units would increase. He indicated the proposed villas would not be affordable houses and if R-1 housing was to locate on this property the homes would be even more expensive. He summarized again for the record that this project did not have the votes at this time, but stated he believed villa style homes made the most sense for this property. He commented he understood the traffic along Orchard Road was a concern, but stated this did not have to do with the request before the council.

Wischnack recommended the council ask the applicant how he would like to proceed.

Wiersum questioned what the deadline was for this request. Barone reported the deadline was June 3.

Mr. Stradtman stated he could support the council tabling this matter. He indicated he was fairly dejected by the conversation that was held this evening. He commented he believed the project before the council was viable.

Wiersum asked how the council wanted to proceed.

Bergstedt indicated he believed tabling the project made the most sense.

Calvert suggested the density be revisited by the developer. She noted the first eight homes in the development do not have the look and feel of Minnetonka. She stated she really respected the developer and their great housing products, but recommended the request be tabled for further consideration.

Schack moved, Bergstedt seconded a motion to table action on this item with a decision to be made by June 3 unless the council were to receive an extension from the applicant. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

15. Appointments and Reappointments: None
16. Adjournment

Calvert moved, Carter seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:14 p.m. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Becky Koosman
City Clerk