Agenda
Minnetonka City Council
Regular Meeting, Monday, November 9, 2015
6:30 P.M.
Council Chambers

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Roll Call: Allendorf-Acomb-Wiersum-Bergstedt-Wagner-Ellingson-Schneider
4. Approval of Agenda
5. Approval of Minutes: None
6. Special Matters: None
7. Reports from City Manager & Council Members
8. Citizens Wishing to Discuss Matters Not on the Agenda
9. Bids and Purchases:
10. Consent Agenda - Items Requiring a Majority Vote:
   A. 2016 fee schedules for consulting engineering services
   B. Ordinance authorizing land exchange for property on Crosby Road
   C. Ordinance amending Section 710 of the city code regarding increases/changes in fees
   D. Resolution certifying the results of the November 3, 2015 Municipal General Election
   E. Announcement of closed meeting to discuss labor negotiation strategies on November 16, 2015 at 6:00 p.m. in the Lone Lake Conference Room
   F. City manager performance pay
11. Consent Agenda - Items Requiring Five Votes: None

Minnetonka City Council meetings are broadcast live on channel 16. Replays of this meeting can be seen during the following days and times: Mondays, 6:30 pm, Wednesdays, 6:30 pm, Fridays, 12:00 pm, Saturdays, 12:00 pm. The city’s website also offers video streaming of the council meeting. For more information, please call 952.939.8200 or visit eminnetonka.com
12. Introduction of Ordinances:

   A. Items concerning a hotel and daycare on the property at 6030 Clearwater Drive:

   1) Ordinance amending the existing Minnetonka Corporate Center master development plan;
   2) Conditional use permit;
   3) Site and building plan review;
   4) Sign plan amendment; and
   5) Preliminary and final plats.

   Recommendation: Introduce the ordinance and refer to the planning commission (4 votes)

13. Public Hearings:

14. Other Business:

   A. Resolution approving the final plat of RIDGEMOUNT GROVE at 12601 Ridgemount Avenue

   Recommendation: Adopt the resolution approving the final plat (4 votes)

15. Appointments and Reappointments: None

16. Adjournment
City Council Agenda Item #10A  
Meeting of November 9, 2015

**Brief Description:** 2016 fee schedules for consulting engineering services

**Recommended Action:** Approve the fee schedules

**Background**

The engineering department solicits proposals from selected consulting engineering firms on a three-year cycle and 2016 is the third year of the current cycle. These firms are chosen to augment staff expertise related to street projects, traffic studies, water resources/environmental engineering, and other areas of need. In addition, they are utilized to accommodate demands during peak periods. Fee schedules are established for the first year of the three-year agreements. Revised fee schedules are to be subsequently negotiated for the second and third years.

The engineering services pool allows the city to use consultants and their personnel that typically know and are familiar with the city, providing efficiencies to projects and savings to the city. Staff selects consultants from its pool based on the complexity of the project and the availability of each consultant, in order to utilize specific personnel and creativity needed for success. Staff also makes contact with and encourages firms, especially those newer and entering the market, to participate in applying to the pool when contracts are renewed. This serves to make the fee schedule of the market competitive. Performance and service levels are continually evaluated and as staff prepares to accept new proposals for 2017, the process will continue to consider any and all qualified submittals from interested parties to ensure it openly promotes high quality services and value for the city. If unique and special projects arise in the future, staff will continue to consider very specialized firms outside of the pool on an as-needed basis.

The fee schedules for 2016, which is the third year of the current three-year cycle, have been submitted. As council may recall, the consultants’ contracts include a stipulation requiring that the consultants’ average rates not increase by more than 4% per year after the initial contract year of 2014. Each consultant has met this requirement.

In reviewing proposed fee schedules, staff evaluates their appropriateness based on three factors: the percentage of increase for each individual rate, the estimated billing increase based on hours from the previous year, and the comparative rates between consultants for similar positions.

The city presently retains 12 firms in its consulting pool. They are listed below with their respective percentage increases, based on personnel rates that are most typically used on city projects.
The increases proposed by the consultants can generally be attributed to step salary increases or promotions for the consultant personnel that provide primary services to the city of Minnetonka. Although the increases vary from firm to firm, the comparative hourly charge out rates are generally consistent.

**Recommendation**

Approve the revised 2016 fee schedules proposed by the city’s general services consulting engineering firms, and authorize the mayor and city manager to execute the Addenda to the Agreements for Professional Services with the following firms:

- AE2S
- Albertson Engineering, Inc.
- American Engineering Testing, Inc.
- Barr Engineering Company
- Bolton & Menk, Inc.
- Hansen Thorp Pellinen Olson, Inc.
- In-Control, Inc.
- Kjolhaug Environmental Services Co.
- Short Elliott Hendrickson, Inc.
- SRF Consulting Group, Inc.
- Stantec
- WSB & Associates, Inc.

Submitted through:
- Geralyn Barone, City Manager
- Will Manchester, PE, Director of Engineering

Originated by:
- Jeremy Koenen, PE, Assistant City Engineer
City Council Agenda Item #10B
Meeting of November 9, 2015

**Brief Description:** Ordinance authorizing land exchange for property on Crosby Road

**Recommended Action:** Adopt the ordinance

**Background**

On October 26, 2015, the city council approved a land exchange agreement between the city and David and Annmarie Yasmineh. Under the land exchange agreement, the Yasminehs will convey to the city a portion of their property, which is located at 2634 Crosby Road, and the city will convey to the Yasminehs a 35-foot-wide strip of land from city property that is adjacent to the Yasmineh property. The land to be conveyed to the city is subject to a right of way easement. A sketch showing the lands to be exchanged is attached.

The conveyance of city-owned property must be approved by ordinance, and adoption of the ordinance is one of the contingencies of the land exchange agreement. The ordinance was introduced at the October 26, 2015 council meeting.

Other contingencies in the agreement include vacation of a small triangle of right of way that is not being conveyed to the city and the vacation of a watershed district easement that encumbers the 35-foot strip. The hearing for the vacation of the right of way easement will be scheduled for December 7, 2015. The watershed district staff is currently reviewing the request to vacate the watershed’s easement, and it is expected to be presented to the watershed board in November.

The city attorney has reminded the Yasminehs that all personal property must be removed from the city’s land. City staff will perform inspections on November 9, December 7 and the day of closing to ensure that requirement is satisfied.

**Recommendation**

Adopt the ordinance.

Submitted through:
- Geralyn Barone, City Manager
- Julie Wischnack, Community Development Director
- Will Manchester, City Engineer

Originated by:
- Corrine Heine, City Attorney
EXHIBIT B

"Right of Way Parcel"
6,868 sq. ft.
0.158 acres

"Vacation Area"
395 sq. ft.
0.009 acres

CITY OWNED PROPERTY
(ALSO DESCRIBED IN WARRANTY
DEED BK. 472 DEEDS, PG. 306)

"Strip Parcel"
5,250 sq. ft.
0.121 acres
Ordinance No. 2015-

An Ordinance authorizing land exchange agreement for property on Crosby Road

The City of Minnetonka Ordains:

Section 1. Pursuant to Section 12.05 of the Minnetonka City Charter, the city council authorizes the sale of the following described land, in accordance with the terms of the land exchange agreement presented to and approved by the city council on October 26, 2015:

The Southeasterly 35.00 feet of that tract of land conveyed to the City of Minnetonka per Quit Claim Deed Document No. 6696076, Hennepin County, Minnesota, which is described as follows:
All that part of Section 8, Township 117 North, Range 22 West of the 5th Principal Meridian, described as follows: Commencing at a point at low water mark on Lake Minnetonka which said point is located as follows: Commencing at the 1/4 section corner between Sections 8 and 9, Township 117, Range 22; thence South on section line 644 feet; thence West at right angles 1012.5 feet to said point of beginning of land to be described; thence North 32 degrees 27 minutes East 150 feet to a point which is 517.4 feet South and 932 feet West of said 1/4 section corner; thence North 57 degrees 33 minutes West 150 feet; thence South 32 degrees 27 minutes West 150 feet; thence Southeasterly to place of beginning.

Section 2. The mayor and city manager are authorized to execute all instruments necessary to effectuate the land exchange agreement.

Section 3. This ordinance is effective upon publication.

Adopted by the city council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on

Terry Schneider, Mayor

Attest:
The stricken language is deleted; the underlined language is inserted.
City Council Agenda Item #10C  
Meeting of November 9, 2015

**Brief Description**  
Ordinance amending Section 710 of the city code regarding increases/changes in fees

**Recommendation**  
Adopt the ordinance

**Background**

At the October 26, 2015 meeting, staff proposed changes to Section 710 of the city code regarding increases/changes in certain fees:

- Environmental Health license fees
- Engineering right-of-way fees
- Elimination of the swimming pool contractor license fee

Fees required by ordinance can be changed by amending Section 710 where these fees are listed.

**Summary of Changes**

The license fees for environmental health were raised between $5 and $10 dollars, depending on the license type (no inquiries have been received about the license fee adjustment). The engineering right-of-way fees were increased based on new technology to install fiber optic networks and the demand for faster customer speeds as well as increased amount of staff time for the application process, right-of-way width and easement questions, follow up, and inspection. Swimming pool contractor license fees were eliminated.

**Recommendation**

The council did not indicate any changes to the ordinance at the October 26, 2015 council meeting. Therefore, staff recommends approval of the ordinance (pages A1-A3).

Submitted through:
Geralyn Barone, City Manager  
Julie Wischnack, AICP, Community Development Director

Originated by:
John Weinand, Environmental Health Supervisor  
Kathy Leervig, Community Development Coordinator  
Will Manchester, PE, Director of Engineering
Ordinance No. 2015-

An ordinance amending city code section 710.005 regarding certain fees

The City of Minnetonka Ordains:

Section 1. City code section 710.005, paragraphs 5, 10, 11, 18, 31, and 32 are amended as follows, to be renumbered alphabetically and the following paragraphs added and renumbered accordingly:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>para. no.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>amount</th>
<th>code section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>body art license</td>
<td>$315.00</td>
<td>320.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>820.015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>engineering and street items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>right of way permit</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>1120.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>administrative fee</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>1120.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>excavation within street</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>1120.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>excavation within boulevard</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>1120.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>open cut trench</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>1120.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>first 100 linear feet, plus $.50/foot over 100 feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>food establishment licenses</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td>815.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class A: supper clubs, sit-down, drive-in, delivery, take-out restaurants; or similar facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class B: mobile food vendor, limited food vendor, mobile food cart, or similar facility</td>
<td>$480.00</td>
<td>815.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class C: grocery, meat market, bakery, deli, rental kitchen, limited food service, or similar facility</td>
<td>$640.00</td>
<td>815.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>additional facilities - more than one of any type or types of any operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The stricken language is deleted; the underlined language is inserted.
listed within the classes $250.00-260.00

school kitchen inspection fee $670.00-680.00

special food handling establishment - day care center
  full service $485.00-490.00
  limited service $250.00-260.00

18. lodging establishment license $195.00-205.00
  830.015

31. swimming pool installer's license $50.00
  805.050

32. swimming pool license, public 805.030
  indoor $415.00-420.00
  outdoor $415.00-420.00
  additional pool, same location $260.00-265.00

Section 2. Section 805.050 (1)(2), related to swimming pool installers is repealed.

Section 3. A violation of this ordinance is subject to the penalties and provisions of Chapter XIII of the city code.

Section 4. This ordinance is effective January 1, 2016.

Adopted by the city council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on November 9, 2015.

Terry Schneider, Mayor

Attest:

David E. Maeda, City Clerk

The stricken language is deleted; the underlined language is inserted.
Action on this ordinance:

Date of introduction: October 26, 2015
Date of adoption:
Motion for adoption:
Seconded by:
Voted in favor of:
Voted against:
Abstained:
Absent:
Ordinance adopted.

Date of publication:

CERTIFIED COPY:

I certify that the foregoing is a correct copy of an ordinance adopted by the city council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a meeting held on November 9, 2015.

________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk

The stricken language is deleted; the underlined language is inserted.
## Summary of Proposed Fee Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>License Category</th>
<th>2015 fee</th>
<th>Proposed 2016 fee</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Health Fee Changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class A license (restaurants)</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$810</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class B license (mobile food vendor)</td>
<td>$480</td>
<td>$490</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class C license (grocery stores)</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional facilities license</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$260</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School kitchen Inspection</td>
<td>$670</td>
<td>$680</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daycare center food license</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full service</td>
<td>$485</td>
<td>$490</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited service</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$260</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pool license, public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor pool</td>
<td>$415</td>
<td>$420</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor pool</td>
<td>$415</td>
<td>$420</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional pool, same location</td>
<td>$260</td>
<td>$265</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging establishment license</td>
<td>$195</td>
<td>$205</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body art</td>
<td>$315</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering Fee Changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-way fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• administrative fee</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• excavation within street</td>
<td>$40/hole</td>
<td>$50/hole</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• excavation within boulevard</td>
<td>$25/hole</td>
<td>$30/hole</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• open cut trench</td>
<td>$25/linear feet</td>
<td>$50 for first 100 linear feet, plus $.50/foot over 100 feet</td>
<td>$5 for first 100 linear feet, plus $.50/foot over 100 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brief Description: Resolution certifying the results of the November 3, 2015 Municipal General Election

Recommended Action: Adopt the resolution

Background

A Municipal General Election was held on Tuesday, November 3, 2015 for the four ward council seats. The results are included in the provided resolution.

State law requires the city council certify the results of a municipal general election between the third and tenth day following a municipal general election.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the city council adopt a resolution to certify the results of the November 3, 2015 Municipal General Election.

Submitted through:
   Geralyn Barone, City Manager
   Perry Vetter, Assistant City Manager

Originated by:
   David Maeda, City Clerk
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward/ Precinct</th>
<th>Registered Voters as of 7 a.m.</th>
<th>Election Day Registrations</th>
<th>7 a.m. + EDR</th>
<th>Accepted Absentee Ballots</th>
<th>Ballots Cast at Polling Place</th>
<th>Total Ballots Cast</th>
<th>Voter Turnout Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>18.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>1227</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1229</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>7.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td>1427</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1428</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1D</td>
<td>2029</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>18.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1E</td>
<td>1166</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>12.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1F</td>
<td>1439</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1441</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>10.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1219</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>16.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1821</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>7.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>8.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>6.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E</td>
<td>1448</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1451</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>1272</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1281</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>7.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>1179</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1183</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>6.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D</td>
<td>1238</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1245</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>20.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3E</td>
<td>1238</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1257</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>29.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td>2126</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2142</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>26.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>1102</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>24.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>1363</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1372</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>18.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>27.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D</td>
<td>1697</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1714</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>24.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1333</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>11.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4F</td>
<td>1592</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>8.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>34739</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>34883</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>4389</td>
<td>4967</td>
<td>14.24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION NO. 2015-

RESOLUTION CERTIFYING THE RESULTS OF THE
NOVEMBER 3, 2015 MUNICIPAL GENERAL ELECTION

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, as follows:

Section 1. Background.

1.01. The Minnetonka Municipal General Election was held on November 3, 2015 in accordance with applicable laws.

1.02. The results of the voting were:

Council Member Ward 1
Robert L. (Bob) Ellingson  609
Brian Kirk            518
Write ins           8

Council Member Ward 2
Colbert Boyd        255
Tony Wagner         408
Write ins           2

Council Member Ward 3
Brad Wiersum        1,076
Write ins           31

Council Member Ward 4
Tim Bergstedt       1,278
Write ins           24

Section 2. Council Action.

2.01. The Minnetonka City Council declares that the following candidates were elected to the Minnetonka City Council:

Council Member Ward 1: Robert L. “Bob” Ellingson
Council Member Ward 2: Tony Wagner
Council Member Ward 3: Brad Wiersum
Council Member Ward 4: Tim Bergstedt
Section 3. Authorization.

3.01. The City Clerk is authorized to certify the results of the November 3, 2015 Municipal General Election.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on November 9, 2015.

Terry Schneider, Mayor

ATTEST:

David E. Maeda, City Clerk

ACTION ON THIS RESOLUTION:

Motion for adoption:
Seconded by:
Voted in favor of:
Voted against:
Abstained:
Absent:
Resolution adopted.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a duly authorized meeting held on November 9, 2015.

David E. Maeda, City Clerk
Brief Description: Announcement of closed meeting to discuss labor negotiation strategies on November 16, 2015 at 6:00 p.m. in the Lone Lake Conference Room

Recommended Action: Schedule the closed meeting

Background

The city council annually reviews the wages for all employees, including all collective bargaining unit members, for the purpose of providing direction to administrative staff in labor negotiation strategies. The Minnesota Open Meeting Law, Minnesota Statutes section 13D.03, allows a meeting to be closed for the purpose of discussing labor negotiation strategies.

The required procedure for closing a meeting under section 13D.03 is slightly different than that required to close meetings for other purposes, such as attorney-client privilege or conducting a performance evaluation. For labor negotiation strategies, the council must decide, by majority vote in a public meeting, to hold a closed session for the purpose of considering strategy for labor negotiations. In addition, the time and place of the closed meeting must be announced during the public meeting.

Recommendation

Adopt the motion to schedule a closed meeting on November 16, 2015 at 6:00 p.m. in the Lone Lake Conference Room at city hall, for the purposes of considering labor negotiation strategies with respect to 2016 wages and benefits for all employees, including all collective bargaining unit members, pursuant to Minnesota Statutes section 13D.03.

Submitted through:
  Geralyn Barone, City Manager
  Perry Vetter, Assistant City Manager

Originated by:
  Corrine Heine, City Attorney
Brief Description: City manager performance pay

Recommended Action: Approve the 2015 city manager performance pay

Background

The employment contract for the city manager allows participation in the city's merit performance management program. The merit program applies to most other city employees and the city manager is eligible to receive up to 1% of her annual base pay based on city council evaluation of her performance. The city council provided feedback on the city's shared values and leadership and management competencies.

The percentage of lump sum merit pay is related to the percentage results of the performance evaluation. The city manager's 2015 performance feedback score was 93% out of 100%. Therefore, I am recommending the city manager receive performance pay in the amount of $1,424.59.

Recommendation

Approve a lump sum merit pay amount of $1,424.59.

Respectfully submitted,

Terry Schneider
Mayor
City Council Agenda Item #12A  
Meeting of November 9, 2015

**Brief Description**  
Items concerning a hotel and daycare on the property at 6030 Clearwater Drive:

1) Ordinance amending the existing Minnetonka Corporate Center master development plan;
2) Conditional use permit;
3) Site and building plan review;
4) Sign plan amendment; and
5) Preliminary and final plats;

**Recommendation**  
Introduce the ordinance and refer it to the planning commission

**Background**

In 1983, the city adopted a master development plan for the Minnetonka Corporate Center, an office and service-use planned unit development (PUD). The master development plan covered a 77-acre site – located at the northeast quadrant of the I-494/Highway 62 interchange – and called for construction of several buildings exceeding 1.2 million square feet in total area. One of the approved buildings was a 9-story, 200-unit hotel. Over the last 30 years many of the components of the master development plan have been changed. The approved hotel was conceptually relocated, resized, and ultimately removed from the plan. (See pages A1–A2.)

**Proposal**

Buhl Investors Minnetonka I, LLC Development is proposing to develop the partially vacant site at 6030 Clearwater Drive. As proposed, a 5-story, 102-unit hotel would be constructed on the west half of the site in the near term and a two-story daycare facility would be constructed on the east half of the site at some point in the future. (See pages A3–A14.) The proposal requires:

- **Master Development Plan Amendment.** By city code, a major amendment to an approved master development plan is required for any change to an approved land use or any substantial change to the approved location of a building.

- **Conditional Use Permit.** By city code, both hotels and daycare facilities are conditionally-permitted uses in a PUD.
• **Site and Building Plan Review.** By city code, site and building plan review is required for construction within a PUD.

• **Sign Plan Amendment.** Signs within the Minnetonka Corporate Center are governed by a sign covenant. The proposal includes more and larger signs than allowed under the covenant.

• **Preliminary and Final Plats.** A subdivision of the existing property would allow for future separate ownership of the hotel and daycare parcels.

The applicant is seeking approval of the master development plan, site plan review, and preliminary and final plats incorporating both the hotel and daycare uses. However, at this time, the applicant is only requesting specific approvals – conditional use permit, building plan review, and sign plan amendment – for the hotel. Specific approvals associated with the daycare use would be brought forward when a specific daycare provider is selected.

**Issue Identification**

The purpose of introducing an ordinance is to give the city council the opportunity to review a new application before referring it to the planning commission for a recommendation. Introducing an ordinance does not constitute an approval. The planning commission review of the proposal is tentatively scheduled for November 19, 2015.

Based on preliminary review of the proposal, staff has identified three issues that will be particularly analyzed as the formal review continues:

• **Amendment.** The proposed uses will be reviewed for consistency with the original and current master development plan for the area.

• **Natural Resources.** The property does not contain a woodland preservation area, but does contain many mature trees of primarily the cottonwood, linden, spruce and some oak varieties. The proposed site design would result in extensive grading and tree removal. Consistency with the city’s several natural resources ordinances will be particularly reviewed.

• **Signs.** The proposed signs will be reviewed for consistency with other amendments previously approved in the Minnetonka Corporate Center and with other hotels in the community.

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends the city council:
1. Generally discuss the proposed uses, thereby providing direction to city staff and the applicant.

2. Approve or modify the proposed notification area on page A21.

3. Introduce the rezoning ordinance and refer it to the planning commission. (See pages A22–A24.)

Submitted through:
  Geralyn Barone, City Manager
  Julie Wischnack, AICP, Community Development Director

Originated by:
  Susan Thomas, AICP, Principal Planner
Supporting Information

At the time of its original approval the Minnetonka Corporate Center was divided into 15 sites. The site had specific land uses, allowable building heights, and allowable building sizes assigned to them. The subject property is considered “Site 14.” (See page A2.) Over the last 30 years various amendments to the master development plan have impacted “Site 14” and the adjacent sites to the north and south. The following chart outlines these amendments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDP</th>
<th>SITE 13</th>
<th>SITE 14</th>
<th>SITE 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1983</strong></td>
<td>Office 4-stories 89,000 SF</td>
<td>Hotel 9 stories 200 rooms</td>
<td>Office 10 stories 230,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1989</strong></td>
<td>Office 4-stories 89,000 SF</td>
<td>Office 10 stories 230,000 SF</td>
<td>Hotel 3 stories 175 rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1993</strong></td>
<td>Office 4-stories 89,000 SF</td>
<td>Office 10 stories 230,000 SF</td>
<td>Clinic 1-2 stories 41,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1995</strong></td>
<td>Office 4-stories 89,000 SF</td>
<td>Parking lot for Site 13 &amp; Office 10 stories 230,000 SF</td>
<td>Clinic 1-2 stories 41,000 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Location Map

Project: Home2
Applicant: Buhl Investors Minnetonka I LLC
Address: 6030 Clearwater Dr
(15033.15a)
Owner Statement for Request for C.U.P. for 6030 Clearwater Drive, Minnetonka MN

Applicant: Buhl Investors Minnetonka I, LLC Development

Proposed Uses: Owner is requesting that a 102-unit five story franchised hotel property be permitted to be built on the subject property together with a 2-story daycare facility consisting of approximately 10,781 square feet.

The Property will be split into two separate Lots as shown on the site plan. There will be an Operation, Easement and Access Agreement recorded against both properties to address the shared access drive, any necessary utility and drainage easements and cross access for pedestrians and cross-parking.

The hotel use and daycare facility are complimentary uses to each other in that the primary high-peak for the hotel is in the evenings and the primary for the day care is morning drop-off and after school pick-up. These uses we believe are also complimentary to the overall development in the park providing lodging and daycare needs to the office park.

The Property is subject to the Planned Unit Development Agreement dated March 16, 1984 where the City approved by council action on July 18, 1983 a mixed use development of office and a hotel. The use of a hotel is consistent with the terms of the P.U.D. and Master Development Plan that the City approved for this development. The hotel was contemplated on a different lot location but the development contemplated a 150,000 square foot hotel. The daycare was not included in the original P.U.D. so we are requesting that it be permitted and think that it is a complimentary use to the development that has occurred in this office park and the surrounding community.
This document contains confidential or proprietary information of Cities Edge, LLC. Neither this document nor the information contained herein is to be reproduced, distributed, used or disclosed either in whole or in part except as authorized by Cities Edge, LLC.
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1. MITIGATION OF PROTECTED TREES TO BE REMOVED IS NOT REQUIRED. ALL REMOVED TREES LIE WITHIN THE "BASIC TREE REMOVAL AREA" AS DEFINED IN MINNETONKA CITY CODE SECTION 300.28, SUBDIVISION 19, REGULATING TREE PROTECTION.

2. PROVIDE CONSTRUCTION FENCING AROUND CRITICAL ROOT ZONE OF ALL TREES TO BE PROTECTED.

3. SEE L000 FOR TREE INVENTORY PLAN.

4. SEE L100 FOR PLANTING PLAN.

KEY

PROTECTED TREE - AREA OF CRITICAL ROOT ZONE

PROTECTED TREE TO BE REMOVED
REQUIRED PARKING STALLS:
- HOTEL = 105
- DAYCARE = 11

PROPOSED PARKING STALLS:
- HOTEL = 105 (5 ACCESSIBLE)
- DAYCARE = 11 (2 ACCESSIBLE)

EXISTING PARKING STALLS = 75
FROM SW PROPERTY CORNER:
looking northwest toward I-494
FROM SW PROPERTY CORNER:
looking northeast toward office park
FROM EXISTING SITE PARKING LOT:
looking southwest

GE OSMONICS
FROM EXISTING SITE PARKING LOT:
looking southwest
REQUIRED 400-FT NOTICE AREA
Ordinance No. 2015-

An ordinance amending the existing master development plan of Minnetonka Corporate Center as it pertains to the property at 6030 Clearwater Drive

The City Of Minnetonka Ordains:

Section 1.

1.01 This ordinance hereby amends the Minnetonka Corporate Center master development plan as it pertains to the property at 6030 Clearwater Drive.

1.02 The property is legally described as: Lot 2, Block 1, Minnetonka Corporate Center.

1.03 The amendment approves hotel and daycare land uses on the site.

Section 2.

2.01 This ordinance is based on the following findings:

1. The proposal is consistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Guide Plan.

2. The amendment would not negatively impact the public health, safety, and welfare.

Section 3.

3.01 Approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. The site must be developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the following plans:
   
   •
The above plans are hereby adopted as the master development plan for the 6030 Clearwater Drive property.

2. Development must further comply with all conditions as outlined in City Council Resolution No. 2015-___, adopted by the Minnetonka City Council on _______________, 2015.

Section 4. A violation of this ordinance is subject to the penalties and provisions of Chapter XIII of the city code.

Section 5. This ordinance is effective immediately.

Adopted by the city council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on ____________, 2015.

Terry Schneider, Mayor

Attest:

David E. Maeda, City Clerk

Action on this Ordinance:

Date of introduction:  November 9, 2015
Date of adoption:  
Motion for adoption:  
Seconded by:  
Voted in favor of:  
Voted against:  

A23
Abstained:
Absent:
Ordinance adopted.

Date of publication:

I certify that the foregoing is a correct copy of an ordinance adopted by the city council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota at a regular meeting held on ______________, 2015.

David E. Maeda, City Clerk
City Council Agenda Item #14A  
Meeting of November 9, 2015

Description
Resolution approving the final plat of RIDGEMOUNT GROVE at 12601 Ridgemount Avenue

Recommendation
Adopt the resolution approving the final plat

Background

On July 13, 2015, the council considered a proposal by Ashish Aggarwal to subdivide the property at 12601 Ridgemount Avenue into two single family lots. Both lots required lot width at setback variances from 110 feet to 87.5 feet. The council tabled the proposal and directed the applicant to present alternative lot configurations, modestly sized homes – a floor area of 3,200 square feet was suggested. The council also requested potential building plans. (See minutes on pages A5-A10).

On September 14, 2015, the city council again considered the request and ultimately adopted a resolution approving the preliminary plat of RIDGEMOUNT GROVE, with lot width at setback variances for both lots from 110 feet to 87.5 feet. (See minutes on pages A12–A16.)

The following was a condition of approval in the approved Resolution 2015-083:

- “Each of the homes are limited to a maximum floor area ratio of 0.14. Floor area includes the sum of the fully exposed horizontal area of a building, as measured from exterior walls and including attached garage space and enclosed porch areas, and one-half the horizontal area of any partially exposed level such as a walkout or lookout level.”

The following were conditions of approval added by the council at the meeting and included in Resolution 2015-083:

- The final plat will not be released until “building plans [are submitted] for the dwellings to be constructed on the lots; the plans for each lot must comply with applicable setback requirements and must not exceed a floor area ratio (FAR) of 0.14, based on the FAR regulations in effect as of the date of this resolution.” This amounts to an above ground of 3,200 square feet or less.

- Building permits will not be approved unless “the building plans submitted with the building permit application substantially conform to the plans” approved prior to release of the final plat.
Request

The applicant, Ashish Aggarwal, has requested approval of the RIDGEMOUNT GROVE final plat. (See page A26.) As required the applicant has submitted building plans for the two future homes. However, the plans do not meet the FAR requirement noted in the resolution. (See building plans on pages A27-A38.) The following chart is a summary of the submitted plans:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>West lot</th>
<th>East lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Above Ground SF</strong></td>
<td>3,220 sf</td>
<td>3,260 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Below/Part Below Ground SF</strong></td>
<td>1,330 sf</td>
<td>1,295 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SF</strong></td>
<td>4,550 sf</td>
<td>4,555 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total SF for FAR Calculation</strong>*</td>
<td>3,885 sf</td>
<td>3,910 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAR</strong></td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes all above ground space and ½ of partially exposed space as calculated by the McMansion Policy and approved Resolution No. 2015-083.

Summary Staff Comment

The applicant has stated several times that the intent is to construct “smaller” homes on the properties. At the direction of the council, the applicant agreed to propose homes with floor area ratios of 0.14 or less. However, the plans reflect homes with more than 3,200 square feet above ground area and FARs exceeding 0.14.

City staff has been having an on-going conversation with the applicant’s representatives regarding the FAR calculation for several weeks. Though the council approved resolution clearly states the manner in which FAR is calculated – and this calculation is consistent with the manner in which FAR has been calculated in all previous applications of the McMansion policy – the applicant’s representatives continue to dispute the calculation. Staff has indicated to the representatives that the requirement outlined in the approved resolution can be easily met through construction of full basements (no look-out windows) and removal of 20 square feet and 60 square feet above ground space on the west and east lots respectively.

Staff Comment

The remaining conditions required for final plat approval have been met and the final plat is consistent with the approved preliminary plat. However, several preliminary plat conditions must be completed prior to the release of the final plat. This includes the submission of revised building plans for the dwellings to be constructed on the lots with maximum floor area ratios of 0.14.
Staff Recommendation

Adopt the resolution on pages A39–A41, which grants final plat approval of RIDGEMOUNT GROVE. The intention of staff would be not to release the final plat until the building plans are revised to meet the condition in the resolution.

Submitted through:
  Geralyn Barone, City Manager
  Julie Wischnack, AICP, Community Development Director
  Susan Thomas, AICP, Principal Planner

Originated by:
  Ashley Cauley, Senior Planner
Location Map

Project: Aggarwal, Ashish
Address: 12601 Ridgemount Ave W
(15013.15a)

This map is for illustrative purposes only.
Minutes from July 13, 2015
City Council meeting
D. **Preliminary plat, with lot width at setback variances, at 12601 Ridgemount Avenue**

Thomas gave the staff report.

Wagner asked if the information in the council packet was showing lot width setback or lot width at right of way. Thomas said they were lot widths at right of way.
Ashish Aggarwal, 16135 55th Avenue North, Plymouth, said he lived in Minnetonka for 11 years. When his family decided to move to a different house, they could not find a modest sized home in Minnetonka. He said he was present because of his past experience and also because he believed in doing the right thing. The two small homes would greatly enhance the value to the neighborhood. The full criteria of subdivision were being met. The only variance required was width at setback. The question before the council was if the deficiency in width was big enough and so crucial to pass up two affordable homes that fit the scale and character of the neighborhood. He said the project was supported by pretty much all of the neighborhood and was consistent with the city’s vision for 2030. He presented a letter of support from 15 of the 18 neighbors. He said that after the subdivision both lots would be half acre. The project would revitalize the neighborhood while fitting in with the scale and character of the neighborhood. There was no other lot in the neighborhood as large and as wide. Twenty percent of the adjoining properties do not meet the setback requirements. A large McMansion on the lot would decrease the value of the adjoining lots. He said the lots were in the same spirit as the R1-A zoning the council recently approved. The lot splits support the city’s land use and comprehensive guide plan for 2030. The advantages of the project far outweigh the one shortcoming.

Samantha Grose, JP & Co., 10800 Normandale Boulevard, Bloomington, said she was a degreed architect that does all the design work for her company. She said if a large home were built on the lot it would continue the trend of large home redevelopments that devalues the neighboring homes. Builders would look at them as land value only. The vision for the property was to create two homes with character that fit nicely on the lot and remain in scale with the neighborhood. Preventing McMansions and keeping affordable housing was a common theme with all the neighbors that were met with. She said she had a discussion with Schneider earlier in the day who suggested bringing forward some other options for laying out the subdivision.

Max Norton, 3649 73rd Court East, Inver Grove Heights, said he had been a professional designer for over 50 years. He had designed and built over 60 homes and countless remodels across the metro area and Greater Minnesota including six in Minnetonka. He said he felt the staff and planning commission had made some possible oversights in the analysis. The three burdens of proof for a variance that staff determined were not met, need to be reevaluated. The difference between the zoning standard width and the proposed width was less than 20 percent. Compared to the other substandard lot widths in the neighborhood there was less than 10 percent difference. He said these were metrics but in truth the average
passerby would not be able to tell the difference between an 87½ foot lot and a 110 foot lot. Looking at the map the obvious unique circumstance was the present lot was nearly twice as wide as the other lots in the immediate area. The two proposed lots and homes would be more consistent with the neighborhood than one large home that would not require any variances. This was an opportunity to expand and provide affordable housing in the area. He said he could not concur with the staff finding about character of the neighborhood that if something was slightly different from its surroundings, it was unacceptable. Controlled diversity of character helps maintain desirable property value, not erode them. He pointed to Summit Avenue in St. Paul as an example.

Schneider noted that he had discussed with the applicant that if this proposal was not acceptable to the council, there may be an alternative to do a reconfiguration with more of a lot behind a lot. That alternative might be more attractive than this proposal.

Wagner noted that if approved it would set a precedent lot at setback. He said this was an area of the city that had unique homes at different age stages.

Grose showed two different alternative options. Aggarwal said when he initially met with staff he brought up a couple of different options that put the houses one behind the other. Staff feedback indicated the council did not like lot behind lot so this was not an option. He said building the two homes in a neighborhood that was in need of revitalization was absolutely the right thing to do. Schneider said it was not always a good idea to assume what the council might accept. The council had to look at the situation, and every application and lot was different. There was a general tone and preference but it could never be said the council would never do this or always do this. He said in this case he looked at the drawing first before reading the staff recommendation. Without having all the details it did look like a natural lot behind lot because of the hill on the backside. Aggarwal said the back of the lot was heavily wooded. If the house was located there, trees would have to be removed. If the houses were put side by side, there would be no tree impact. Schneider said he had concern over the type of variance being requested. If approved it would set a precedent for other areas.

Allendorf asked how many votes were required to overturn the planning commission’s denial. Heine said the planning commission was not the final decision maker. On some issues the planning commission makes a decision that unless it is appealed, is final. That was not the case in this situation. She said in this case the planning commission made a recommendation to the council. The council could make any decision it
wanted and was not bound to follow the recommendation. Because a variance was required, the ordinance required five votes for approval.

Allendorf said as he went up the neighborhood from the east it really was a changing neighborhood with Ridgemount on the south side. As he looked at the homes on the east he could easily delineate approximately where the lot line was based on where the house was. After a couple of blocks however the trees became denser and the houses were placed differently, not just front to back, and he couldn’t tell where the lot line was or even where the house was from Ridgemount. He didn’t think it was the lot size that made the difference but it was the size of house on the lot. The petition that was passed around showed two houses that were approximately 3,200 square feet each. He asked if this was controllable through side yard setbacks or through a floor area ratio. Thomas said the house size could be controlled through setbacks if the council wanted to have side yard setbacks and front yard setbacks that were greater than standard through a floor area ratio. If applied under the McMansion policy the floor area ratio would provide for 7,800 square feet. The council could choose to do a lower floor area ratio. Because a variance was involved the council had broad discretion. Allendorf said when he looked at the information in the council packet he thought the two homes would fit into the neighborhood and he couldn’t tell what the setback was. He was not adverse to two homes on the lots as they were split but controlling the size of the houses to be consistent with the look of the neighborhood.

Barone said in the past the city had tried to control house size when an application was reviewed but when it came time for the person to actually build the house, they ended up coming back and asking for a larger size. Wischnack said the two most recent examples were Braeburn Woods and Locust Hills. This led to using floor area ratio more for the calculation. In this case the floor area ratio was not terribly helpful for the house size issue. She noted some of the drawings shown by the applicant had two car garages while the renderings in the council packet had three car garages. Allendorf said if there was a way to keep the houses on the lots around 3,200 square feet he thought it would be within the character of the neighborhood and he would not be averse to approving that.

Wagner said he drove the road quite a bit and when he met with the applicant he, like Allendorf, could envision reasonably sized homes fitting in well. He would never favor creating a precedent for lot behind lots. Given all the work that had been done looking at mid-priced housing and housing variety, this neighborhood screamed out for that. He would be willing to look at that for this area. He worried a little bit about precedent.
for a couple of the lots but looking at the map there were very few lots it could be done. He would be open to the suggestion made by Allendorf.

Acomb said looking at the map there appeared to be several lot behind lots. She asked if this didn’t already set the stage for doing a lot behind lot that would not establish a precedent. Doing a lot behind lot was not her preference. She preferred side by side lots. She said it seemed there was room for coming up with something that would work.

Ellingson said he was not a big fan of doing lot behind lot because in the past there were examples ending up not working well including the Hennepin County medical clinic. He said he had sympathy for the applicant’s proposal because it was more straightforward but he realized the difficulty of limiting the size of the house.

Schneider commended the applicant for the idea of doing relatively modestly sized homes. He saw a benefit of having a modest priced home with appropriate size. The council usually looks pretty closely at house size and lot setbacks in the general area. If the Plymouth Road property was included it probably made more sense. It would be hard to say the council was following what it did in the past. Combine this with the recommendations from staff and the planning commission for denial, it gave him pause. However he thought this lot deserved two homes. It would be more out of character to have one big home on the lot. The question was if there was an alternative configuration. He said he was somewhat on the fence but was leaning toward being worried about setting a precedent.

Wagner said he didn’t want the council to try to design something at the meeting and would prefer tabling the item directing staff to present an alternative with a floor area ratio limit that would accommodate Allendorf’s comments. He would not support lot behind lot in any way. The council still might not approve the proposal but it would provide an alternative to look at.

Wagner moved. Allendorf seconded a motion to table item.

Allendorf asked if there was a way to somehow memorialize in what staff brought back to the council what was being discussed in terms of size. Wagner asked if the lot split could be conditioned to building plans that were aligned to Allendorf’s comments. If the applicant returned asking for a 5,000 square foot house the lot split approval would be nullified. Heine said a condition could be put on the variance and Wagner’s suggested condition was reasonable. Wischnack noted there was a timing issue on the application so the applicant would have to come back with a solution.
by the August 17 meeting or would have to waive their right for review within 180 days. Wagner noted he would be absent from the August 17 meeting.

Aggarwal said they would be open to waiving the review deadline. He said he would be out of the country for the August 17 meeting. He said the smaller homes were absolutely the right thing to do and the homes would not be built for somebody specific but would go on the market once built. This provided more flexibility as opposed to building something for a specific buyer. Wischnack clarified that Aggarwal was agreeing to extend the review period for another 60 days. Aggarwal indicated that was correct.

Bergstedt said on one hand there was a staff and planning commission recommendation for denial based on long standing variance standards. On the other hand the council was all in agreement about looking for smaller, more affordable housing and avoiding McMansions. Like others he was not excited about discussing lots behind lots without staff looking at it first. He said it would be beneficial to have staff look at alternatives and also to have all seven council members present especially since this proposal was in Wiersum's ward and he was excused from tonight's meeting.

Schneider said his suggestion for a lot behind lot alternative was made to keep moving toward a resolution rather than just having a denial. While this property probably wasn't ideal for a lot behind a lot, what he was looking for was a little bit of separation from the frontages. He said the current plan had a shared driveway with a turnaround. This was a lot of asphalt that he wasn't sure was wise. Moving one of the homes back 10 to 15 feet would provide relief from the frontage and would blur the lot line issue.

All voted “yes.” Motion carried.
Minutes from the September 14, 2015
City Council meeting
B. Preliminary plat of RIDGEMOUNT GROVE, with lot width at setback variances, at 12601 Ridgemount Avenue

Thomas gave the staff report.
Samantha Grose, JP & Co., said the proposal was for two modest sized homes, with each lot being over a half acre maintaining the large lot character of the neighborhood. The proposed homes were consistent with the city’s 2030 Comprehensive Plan and the 2030 Land Use Plan. Four out of the five requirements for a subdivision would be met. A width at setback variance was being requested. If a large home were built on the site it would continue the trend of redevelopment that devalues the neighboring homes. At the July meeting the council asked the applicant to look at four adjustments to the plan: to max FAR at 3,200 square feet; committing to a building pad; eliminating the turnaround shared driveway; and juxtaposing the front setbacks. The revised plan includes all these adjustments. She said the recommendations from the last meeting improved the project. Staff requested nine adjustments to the proposal. All the requirements have been added.

Ashish Aggarwal, 16135 55th Avenue North, Plymouth, noted the city received an email from a resident about a house on a property about a mile from this site. The house going on the acre lot is around 6,000 square feet. He pointed out this was an example of what is happening on big lots in the city.

Wagner said at the last meeting he asked staff about the idea of instead of basing the approval on the FAR, conditioning the actual splitting of the lot to building plans meeting the city’s specifications. He asked if staff discussed the idea. Thomas said because a variance was being requested, the condition could be added as part of the council’s approval. Wagner said there was discussion at the last meeting about projects where the council approved the idea of smaller homes and then the applicant coming back indicating they could not sell the building plan so a bigger house was needed.

Thomas indicated that the 3,200 square feet includes everything above ground. It was presumed there would be a full basement.

Schneider asked hypothetically if it would work if the council approved the split conditioned on an approved submission of a formal plan, and then staff determined if the intent was met. Thomas said the condition would be associated not with the plat, but with the building permit. The plat could be filed and staff would review the building permit. Wischnack said in the past the split and subdivision were still allowed to happen. Wagner said he did not want that done in this situation. Schneider said the struggle was trying to do the right thing for the right reason, getting a modest sized home that would actually improve the lot maintaining more of the character of the neighborhood, while trying to tie down the specifics so the council got what it was expecting. If the council was going to provide more flexibility...
with how it granted variances after determining there was a public benefit, trying a different approach where the plat could be approved but not released until the floor plans were submitted. City Attorney Corrine Heine said the issue that could come up was one lot being sold to a buyer who wants to build so that there were only building plans for one lot. Schneider clarified that there would be a building plan for each lot that would be sold with each lot.

Allendorf said it was his understanding that the developer was going to pre-build both homes and not wait for buyers. This would mean the developer would submit building plans for both homes at the same time. Aggarwal indicated that was correct. The construction of the homes would be staggered. He said he was comfortable with the council putting a permit restriction that set a limit on the square footage. This would provide some flexibility of the buyer wanted to have three bedrooms or bathrooms on the top floor versus four.

Schneider said the council was not looking to prescribe the number of bedrooms or bathrooms, but it was important that the final plat could not be released until a final plan was approved. Aggarwal said both plans could be submitted at the same time committing to the square footage. Grose said both homes would be custom built. She asked what would happen if the first lot was sold and somebody wanted to purchase the second lot but wanted a different look and feel to the house. Schneider said the council was not determining exterior design or the number of bedrooms, but instead was specifying the basic concept. If the second buyer wanted to make changes from the first home, the staff would review to determine if the second home was consistent with the concept.

Wischnack said she wanted to be clear about the process. The city would get a final plat drawing and would not release it until both building drawings were submitted. The plat would then be released. If the building permits did not match what was originally submitted, meaning the proposed home was larger or was a walk out instead of a full basement, it would be grounds for denying the permit.

Wagner said the intent was once there was the building permit that the applicant wanted to request, then the final plat would be issued. Wischnack said the issue would be there would have to be two permits at one time before the final plat could be issued. Schneider said the permit could not be issued until there was a formal legal lot. Instead, once the applicant requested the final plat, there would be two plans that would be recorded. The homes could be built at any time. How it would impact the look of the neighborhood was something to be considered.
Wiersum said what was being discussed felt a bit Pandora’s box-ish. He said the side yard setback variance was not insignificant. It was 20.45 percent below standard. He preferred two small houses as opposed to one big house but didn’t want to be held hostage to that notion. A house could be built on the conforming lot that would not be out of character with the neighborhood. If he felt 100 percent confident that the council was getting what it was seeking he would be convinced to vote for approval. He said the staff may have to work legally to nail down what was being sought. He was inclined to support the staff recommendation for denial unless he was convinced that the smaller homes being sought would actually get built.

Schneider clarified that the side yard setback being required was the full 30 foot setback. This meant the home had to be 20 feet narrower. He viewed this as a test case to see if this type of technique and legal approach to tie down the end result, worked.

Wagner noted the neighborhood was in absolute transition. There were homes built in the 1940’s and lots behind lots. He said two homes on the property would look just as normal as it does today because the area was so wooded. He thought the neighborhood could use some vibrancy.

Schneider said sometimes one had to be careful about what it wished for because if it decided not to try to be creative and a McMansion was built it might be more impactful than expected. Wiersum agreed but he said he wanted to feel certain the council got what it was asking for.

Acomb said she shared Wiersum’s concern but with the location of the property near two schools, it was the perfect place for two young families to live. She liked the idea of two smaller homes but wanted the assurance that was what would be built. She was willing to take the chance given some of the restrictions that were discussed.

Schneider said another option would be to continue the item to allow staff to work out the details. Heine said she already had drafted some proposed language that she shared with the rest of the staff.

Allendorf said he didn’t think the council was taking a chance because he was confident staff could work things out.

Ellingson said he agreed with Schneider’s comments about the side lot setback requirements that would limit how big the house could get.

Heine provided the language she had drafted.
Aggarwal said he would not be back before the council asking for another variance. He asked if it mattered to the council if the homes had a full basement or a lookout. Schneider said it did matter. The way the 3,200 square foot was calculated was on all exposed levels. Wischnack said that would be included in the resolution.

Allendorf moved, Wiersum seconded a motion to adopt Res. 2015-083 approving the preliminary plat including the condition that:

- Plat won’t be released until the building plans are submitted that meet the specified criteria – Square foot above ground of 3200 or less; FAR of 0.14
- Building permits won’t be approved unless the plans submitted with the building permit application substantially conform to the plans approved prior to release of the final plat

All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

Schneider said if the provision worked there may be other opportunities to do the right thing without making things so complicated.
Doc No T05293482
Certified, filed and/or recorded on
Sep 25, 2015 9:40 AM
Office of the Registrar of Titles
Hennepin County, Minnesota
Martin McCormick, Registrar of Titles
Mark Chapin, County Auditor and Treasurer
Deputy 9
Pkg ID 1297355E

Document Recording Fee $46.00

Document Total $46.00

PID(s)
02-117-22-22-0013

Existing Certs
1394444

This cover sheet is now a permanent part of the recorded document.
Resolution No. 2015-083

Resolution approving the preliminary plat of RIDGEMOUNT GROVE, with lot width at setback variances, at 12601 Ridgemount Avenue West

Be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, as follows:

Section 1. Background.

1.01 Ashish Aggarwal has requested preliminary plat approval of RIDGEMOUNT GROVE, a two-lot subdivision with lot width at setback variances.

1.02 The property is located at 12601 Ridgemount Avenue. It is legally described as follows:

(Per Torrens Certificate No. 1394444)
The East 175 feet of the West 340 feet of Lots 1 and 2, Block 4, Sunset Hill, Hennepin County, Minnesota

1.03 On June 25, 2015, the planning commission held a hearing on the proposed plat. The applicant was provided the opportunity to present information to the commission. The commission considered all of the comments received and the staff report, which are incorporated by reference into this resolution. The commission recommended that the city council deny the preliminary plat with width at setback variances.

1.04 On July 13, 2015, the city council considered the preliminary plat. The council tabled the proposal and directed the applicant to present alternative lot configurations and modestly sized homes.

1.05 In August 2015, the applicant submitted a plan with modestly sized homes.
Section 2. General Standards.

2.01 City Code §400.025 outlines general design requirements for residential subdivisions. These standards are incorporated by reference into this resolution. One design standard requires that lots be at least 110 feet wide at the required front yard setback. The applicant is proposing lot widths at setback of 87.5 feet.

2.02 By City Code §400.055, a variance from the subdivision requirements may be granted but not mandated, when the applicant meets a burden of proving that: (1) the proposed variance is a reasonable use of the property, considering things such as functional and aesthetic justifications for the variance and improvement to the appearance and stability of the property and neighborhood; (2) the circumstances justifying the variance are unique to the property, are not caused by the landowner, are not solely for the landowner’s convenience, and are not solely because of economic considerations; and (3) the variance would not adversely affect or alter the essential character of the neighborhood.

Section 3. Findings.

3.01 But for lot widths at setback, the preliminary plat would meet the design standards as outlined in City Code §400.025.

3.02 The proposed preliminary plat would meet the variance standards as outlined in City Code §400.055:

1. Reasonableness and Unique Circumstance: The existing lot is larger than the other lots in the immediate area. Of the lots surveyed within 400 feet, four lots have lot width at setback of less than 110 feet. This, coupled with the lot’s depth, presents a circumstance not common to all similarly zoned properties in the area.

2. Neighborhood character: Based on the plan submitted, and as conditioned by this resolution, the homes built on the two newly created lots would be more similar in size to existing homes in the area than would one large home built on the one existing lot.


4.01 The preliminary plat of RIDGMOUNT GROVE is hereby approved, subject to the following conditions:
1. Final plat approval is required. A final plat will not be placed on a city council agenda until a complete final plat application is received.

a) The following must be submitted for a final plat application to be considered complete:

1) A final plat drawing that clearly illustrates the following:

1. Minimum 10-foot wide drainage and utility easements adjacent to the public right-of-way and minimum 7-foot wide drainage and utility easements along all other lot lines.

2. Utility easements over existing or proposed public utilities, as determined by the city engineer.

3. Drainage and utility easements over wetlands, floodplains, and stormwater management facilities, as determined by the city engineer.

2) Title evidence that is current within thirty days before the release of the final plat for the city attorney's review and approval.

2. Prior to final plat approval:

a) This resolution must be recorded with Hennepin County.

b) The documents outlined in section 4.01(1)(a)(2) above must be approved by the city attorney.

3. Prior to release of the final plat for recording:

a) Submit the following:

1) Two sets of mylars for city signatures.

2) An electronic CAD file of the plat in microstation or DXF.

3) Park dedication fee of $5000.
4) Building plans for the dwellings to be constructed on the lots; the plans for each lot must comply with applicable setback requirements and must not exceed a floor area ratio (FAR) of 0.14, based on the FAR regulations in effect as of the date of this resolution.

4. Subject to staff approval, RIDGEMOUNT GROVE, must be developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the following plans, except as modified by the conditions below:

- Preliminary plat dated August 25, 2015
- Grading plan and tree preservation plan dated August 27, 2015
- Utility plan dated August 27, 2015

5. Prior to issuance of a building permit for both of the lots within the development:

a) Submit the following items for staff review and approval:

1) Final grading and tree preservation plan for the lot. The plan must:


   b. Comply with the city's tree preservation ordinance. Final house, driveway, utilities and stormwater management must be located to maximum tree preservation on both lots. No more than two of the six existing high priority trees can be removed.

   c. Show sewer and water services to minimize impact to any significant or high priority trees. No additional trees may be removed for installation of utility services.

2) Final utility plan must meet the following:

   a. Remove the existing one-inch service back to the main and turn off the existing one-inch corporation stop. New ½-inch corporation must be tapped.
b. Confirm the location of the water main. Tie-cards suggest that the main may be closer to the lot than indicated on the proposed plan.

c. Confirm service construction requirements with plumbing inspector.

d. Confirm the proposed water service line to Lot 2.

3) A tree mitigation plan. This plan must meet minimum mitigation requirements as outlined in ordinance. However, at the sole discretion of staff, mitigation may be decreased.

4) A stormwater management plan that meets the requirements of the city's water resources management plan.

5) A letter for the surveyor stating that boundary and lot stakes have been installed as required by ordinance.

6) A construction management plan. This plan must be in a city approved format and outline minimum site management practices and penalties for non-compliance. If the builder is the same entity doing grading work on the site, the construction management plan submitted at the time of grading permit may fulfill this requirement.

7) Cash escrow in an amount to be determined by city staff. This escrow must be accompanied by a document prepared by the city attorney and signed by the builder and property owner. Through this document the builder and property owner will acknowledge:

- The property will be brought into compliance within 48 hours of notification of a violation of the construction management plan, other conditions of approval, or city code standards; and
• If compliance is not achieved, the city will use any or all of the escrow dollars to correct any erosion and/or grading problems.

b) Install a temporary rock driveway, erosion control, tree and wetland protection fencing and any other measures identified on the SWPPP for staff inspection. These items must be maintained throughout the course of construction.

c) Submit all required hook-up fees.

d) The building plans submitted with the building permit must substantially conform to the plans submitted as required by paragraph 3.a)4) above.

8. All lots and structures within the development are subject to the all R-1 zoning standards. In addition:

a) Each of the homes are limited to a maximum floor area ratio of 0.14. Floor area includes the sum of the fully exposed horizontal area of a building, as measured from exterior walls and including attached garage space and enclosed porch areas, and one-half the horizontal area of any partially exposed level such as a walkout or lookout level.

b) All lots within the development must meet all minimum access requirements as outlined in Minnesota State Fire Code Section 503. These access requirements include road dimension, surface, and grade standards. If access requirements are not met, houses must be protected with a 13D automatic fire sprinkler system or an approved alternative system.

9. Permits may be required from other outside agencies including, Hennepin County, Basset Creek Watershed District, and the MPCA. It is the applicant’s or property owner’s responsibility to obtain any necessary permits.

10. During construction, the streets must be kept free of debris and sediment.

11. Unless the city council approves a time extension, the final plat must be approved by September 16, 2016.
Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on September 14, 2015.

Terry Schneider, Mayor

Attest:

David E. Maeda, City Clerk

Action on this resolution:

Motion for adoption: Allendorf
Seconded by: Wiersum
Voted in favor of: Wiersum, Bergstedt, Wagner, Ellingson, Allendorf, Acomb, Schneider
Voted against:
Abstained:
Absent:
Resolution adopted.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a duly authorized meeting held on September 14, 2015.

David E. Maeda, City Clerk
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Important Notice:
Any reproduction, distribution or modification of the plan is strictly prohibited without written permission of JP&CO. Any violator shall entertain JP&CO. its damages, costs and attorney fees to enforce this provision.

FRONT (NORTH) ELEVATION

FAR CALCULATION

BASEMENT @ 90SF
MAIN FLOOR @ 1300SF
SECOND FLOOR @ 1200SF
GARAGE @ 605 SF
TOTAL SQ. FOOTAGE @ 3195 SF

SIDING, SOFFITS, AND FASCIA

General Exterior Finishing Materials as follows:
- Exterior wall surfacing shall be LP SmartSide, pre-finished, siding with 6" reveal
- Caulk all seams between lap siding and trim areas
- Trim boards shall be 1x4 inch material prefinished in color White (PPG)
- Soffit material shall be LP Smartside prefinished in color White (PPG)
- Corner Trim boards in 4" and 6" widths to be used and to be prefinished color White (PPG), Smartside brand
- Front columns (6x6 posts) to be Cedar and wrapped with 12" columns on the front and 8" columns on the rear
- Window trim 2 ¼" to come on front windows only

FRONT PORCH:
- x 2X10 Joist to be used if final grade allows for enough clearance
- LP skirt board to wrap around perimeter of porch decking
- Decking to be Trex or Composite material

FLASHING NEEDED ALONG FRONT SEAM A27

10.5 12 12

4

EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS

COTTAGE RESIDENCE (EAST)
12601 RIDGEMONT AVE. WEST
MINNETONKA, MN 55305
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OPTIMA HOMES

JPeter Paulson, CEO
Contractor Lic. #BC340362
Samantha Grose, Designer
Assoc. AIA, Allied ASID

www.optima-homes.com
30600 Lannondale Blvd, Bloomington, MN 55437 | PH: 612.567.8895 | samantha@jpandcompany.net
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SCALE: 1" = 1'-0"
PLAN N (0006-0415)
ARCH D (0006-0408)

Ridgemount Grove
12601 Ridgemount Ave
15013.15a
Important Notice:
Any reproduction, distribution or modification of the plan is strictly prohibited without written permission of JP&CO. Any violator shall
entitle JP&CO. its damages, costs and attorney fees to enforce this provision.

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:
1) 2X6 EXTERIOR WALLS TO BE PLACED ON EXTERIOR EDGE OF ICF WALLS. 3 1/2" OF BEARING ON CONCRETE
2) 2X6 EXTERIOR WALL - CONSTRUCTION TO BE 2X4 STUDS 12"oc. JOGGED FROM THE INTERIOR AND EXTERIOR. INTERIOR NAILING/BACKING 24"oc.

KEY TO SYMBOLS
ICF WALLS TO BE BRACED AND BACKFILL TO BE DONE PRIOR TO FRAMING PANEL DELIVERY.

Foundation
SECOND FLOOR NOTES:
1) TRUSS HANGERS TO BE FIELD APPLIED & NAILED TO SIP
2) PERIMETER OF OSB SUB FLOOR (41") TO BE SHIPPED LOOSE
3) RANDON & PLUMBING VENT TO JOG IN FL TRUSS AND RUN IN INTERIOR WALL
4) ROOF TRUSSES TO HAVE 12" ENGERY HEAL
5) BATH VENT TO HAVE 6" RIGID DUCT
GRADE 2X6 RAFTER TOE NAILED INTO LEDGER AT EXTERIOR WALL RAFTER SET @ 2'oc W/CEMENT BOARD PAINTED FOR FINISHED SURFACE BEAM TO BE (2) 2X10 WRAPED W/CEMENT BOARD AND PAINTED CEMENT BOARD USED FOR SOFFIT MATERIAL & ROOF CEILING 5/4 DECKING TO BE INSTALLED BY HOMEOWNER 2X12 CEDAR SKIRT TO WRAP DEC K (2) 2X10 BM ACROSS FRONT W/ 2X10 JOIST HUNG OFF LEDGER BOARD AGAINST HOUSE 4X4 TREATED POST W/DECORATIVE COLUMN WRAP ANCHOR BOLT IS RE'Q TO FASTEN POST TO FTG AIR BARRIER NEEDED AGAINST HOUSE 8' CEILNGS (UNFINISHED BASEMENT) 9' CEILNGS (UNFINISHED BASEMENT) 8' CEILNGS (UNFINISHED BASEMENT) ENG. FLOOR TRUSSES ENG. FLOOR TRUSSES ENG. TRUSSES

CROSS SECTIONS

Cross Section 8

Important Notice:
Any reproduction, distribution or modification of the plan is strictly prohibited without written permission of JP&CO. Any violator shall entitle JP&CO. its damages, costs and attorney fees to enforce this provision.

www.optima-homes.com
10800 Normandale Blvd., Bloomington, MN 55437  PH: 612.567.8895  samantha@jpandcompany.net
Important Notice:
Any reproduction, distribution or modification of the plan is strictly prohibited without written permission of JP&CO. Any violator shall entitle JP&CO. its damages, costs and attorney fees to enforce this provision.
CONSTRUCTION NOTES:
1) 2X6 EXTERIOR WALLS TO BE PLACED ON EXTERIOR EDGE OF ICF WALLS. 3 1/2" OF BEARING ON CONCRETE
2) 2X6 EXTERIOR WALL - CONSTRUCTION TO BE 2X4 STUDS 12"oc. JOGGED FROM THE INTERIOR AND EXTERIOR. INTERIOR NAILING/BACKING 24"oc.

KEY TO SYMBOLS
INSULATED CONCRETE FORMS (ICF)
2X6 EXTERIOR WALL
2X4 INTERIOR WALL
BEARING WALL W/STRIP FTGS
INTERIOR WALL
2X6 INT. PLUMBING WALL
42" HALF WALL
ROOF PERIMETER
INTERIOR BEAMS
BEARING POINTS

Important Notice:
Any reproduction, distribution or modification of
the plan is strictly prohibited
without written permission of
JP&CO. Any violator shall
entitle JP&CO., its damages,
costs and attorney fees to
enforce this provision.

JPeter Paulson, CEO
Contractor Lic. #BC340362
Samantha Grose, Designer
Assoc. AIA, Allied ASID

PRAIRIE RESIDENCE (WEST)
12601 RIDGEMONT AVE. WEST
MINNETONKA, MN 55305

Scale 1/4" = 1'-0"
Plan # 005-008-2015

A35
CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1) 2X6 EXTERIOR WALLS TO BE PLACED ON EXTERIOR EDGE OF ICF WALLS. 3 1/2" OF BEARING ON CONCRETE

2) 2X6 EXTERIOR WALL - CONSTRUCTION TO BE 2X4 STUDS 12"oc. JOGGED FROM THE INTERIOR AND EXTERIOR. INTERIOR NAILING/BACKING 24"oc.

KEY TO SYMBOLS

- INSULATED CONCRETE FORMS (ICF)
- 2X6 EXTERIOR WALL
- 2X4 ENTERIOR WALL
- BEARING WALL W/STRIP FTGs
- INTERIOR WALL
- 2X6 INT. PLUMBING WALL
- 42" HALF WALL
- ROOF PERIMETER
- INTERIOR BEAMS
- BEARING POINTS

Additional framing:

EXTERIOR WALLS TO BE 2X4 TOP & BOTTOM PLATE IF 2X6 VERTICAL STUDS ALTERNATING FRONT TO BACK. CONFIGURATION TO PROVIDE CONTINUOUS THERMAL SEAL FOR BUILDING ENVELOPE

Advanced framing:

EXTERIOR WALLS TO BE 2X6 WIDE TOP & BOTTOM PLATE W/ 2X4 VERT. STUDS ATERNATING FRONT TO BACK. CONFIGURATION TO PROVIDE CONTINUOUS FOAM SEAL FOR BUILDING ENVELOPE

Braced wall schedule:

A minimum of 3/8" WOOD STRUCTURAL PANEL SHEATHING WITH ALL EDGES FASTENED TO FRAMING PROPERLY ATTACHED WITH 8GA NAILS AT 6"oc AND 12"oc. STAPLE EQUIVALENT FASTENERS ARE ACCEPTABLE.

A minimum of 1/2" GYPSUM BOARD SHEATHING WITH ALL EDGES FASTENED TO FRAMING PROPERLY ATTACHED WITH 8GA NAILS AT 6"oc AND 12"oc. STAPLE EQUIVALENT FASTENERS ARE ACCEPTABLE.

SIMILAR TO WALL TYPE A WITH CONTINUOUSLY SHEATHED RETURNS

Important Notice:

Any reproduction, distribution or modification of the plan is strictly prohibited without written permission of JP&CO. Any violator shall entitle JP&CO. its damages, costs and attorney fees to enforce this provision.
**SECOND FLOOR NOTES:**
1. TRUSS HANGERS TO BE FIELD APPLIED & NAILED TO SIP
2. PERIMETER OF OSB SUB FLOOR (48") TO BE SHIPPED LOOSE
3. RACON & PLUMBING VENT TO JOG IN FL TRUSS AND RUN IN INTERIOR WALL
4. ROOF TRUSS TO HAVE 12" ENGERY HEAL
5. BATH VENT TO HAVE 6" RIGID DUCT

**KEY TO SYMBOLS:**
- 8" BLOCK (42")
- NEW 4.5" EXTERIOR WALL
- NEW INTERIOR WALL
- EXS INTERIOR WALL
- ROOF PERIMETER
- BEARING POINT

**CONSTRUCTION NOTES:**
1. 2X6 EXTERIOR WALLS TO BE PLACED ON EXTERIOR EDGE OF ICF WALLS. 3 1/2" OF BEARING ON CONCRETE
2. 2X6 EXTERIOR WALL - CONSTRUCTION TO BE 2X4 STUDS 12"oc. JOGGED FROM THE INTERIOR AND EXTERIOR. INTERIOR NAILING/BACKING 24"oc.
Resolution No. 2015-

Resolution approving the final plat of R RIDGEmOUNT GROVE

Be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, as follows:

Section 1. Background.

1.01 Ashish Aggarwal is requesting final plat approval of the RIDGEMOUNT GROVE final plat, a two-lot residential subdivision with lot width at setback variances (Project #15013.15a).

1.02 The property is located at 12601 Ridgemount Avenue. It is legally described as follows:

The East 175 feet of the West 340 feet of Lots 1 and 2, Block 4, Sunset Hill, Hennepin County, Minnesota. (Torrens Cert. No.: 1394444)

1.03 On September 14, 2015, the city council approved the RIDGEMOUNT GROVE preliminary plat.

Section 2. Findings.

2.01 The final plat meets the requirements and standards outlined in the subdivision ordinance, City Code §400.

2.02 The final plat is consistent with the previously approved preliminary plat.

Section 3. City Council Action.

3.01 The city council grants final plat approval of RIDGEMOUNT GROVE. Approval is subject to the following conditions:
1. Compliance with conditions outlined in preliminary plat Resolution No. 2015-083.

2. Prior to release of the final plat for recording:
   a. Submit the following:
      1) Two sets of mylars for city signatures;
      2) An electronic CAD file of the plat in microstation or DXF.
      3) Park dedication fee of $5,000.
      4) Building plans for the dwelling to be constructed on the lots; the plans must comply with applicable setback requirements and must not exceed a floor area ratio (FAR) of 0.14, based on the FAR regulations in effect as of the date of this resolution.

3. Unless the city council approves a time extension, the final plat must be recorded by November 9, 2016.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on November 9, 2015.

Terry Schneider, Mayor

Attest:

David E. Maeda, City Clerk

Action on this resolution:

Motion for adoption:
Seconded by:
Voted in favor of:
Voted against:
Abstained:
Absent:
Resolution adopted.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a duly authorized meeting held on November 9, 2015.

________________________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk