Planning Commission Agenda

February 19, 2015—6:30 P.M.

City Council Chambers—Minnetonka Community Center

1. Call to Order

2. Roll Call

3. Approval of Agenda

4. Approval of Minutes: February 5, 2015

5. Report from Staff

6. Report from Planning Commission Members

7. Public Hearings: Consent Agenda

   No Items

8. Public Hearings: Non-Consent Agenda Items

   A. Ordinance rezoning portions of properties generally located at the southeast corner of the County Road 101/Excelsior Boulevard intersection from R-1 to R-1A.

      Recommendation: Recommend the city council adopt the ordinances. (4 votes)

      • Recommendation to City Council (Tentative Date: March 2, 2015)
      • Project Planner: Susan Thomas

9. Other Business

   A. Concept Plan for Cherrywood Pointe Senior Cooperative at 2004 Plymouth Road.

      Recommendation: Discuss concept plan with developer and provide feedback. No formal action required.

      • City Council (Tentative Date: March 2, 2015)
      • Project Planner: Susan Thomas

10. Adjournment
Notices

1. Please call the planning division at (952) 939-8274 to confirm meeting dates as they are tentative and subject to change.

2. Applications scheduled for the March 5, 2015 Planning Commission meeting:

   Project Description: Ridgedale Center is proposing to update the exterior signs for the mall. The signs include a new pylon sign, monument entrance signs, and directional signs to identify the mall. There would be no changes to existing tenants’ signs for the anchor tenants and restaurants. The proposal requires sign plan review.
   Project No.: 03046.15a           Staff: Jeff Thomson
   Ward/Council Member: 2—Tony Wagner Section: 02

   Project Description: Lakewest Development is proposing to redevelop the Kraemer’s Hardware site at 14730 Excelsior Blvd and the single family residential properties at 5431 and 5439 Williston Road. The concept plan proposes a 4-story residential apartment building and two twin homes.
   Project No.: 06031.15a           Staff: Jeff Thomson
   Ward/Council Member: 4—Tim Bergstedt Section: 33
WELCOME TO THE MINNETONKA PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

This outline has been prepared to help you understand the public meeting process. The review of an item usually takes the following form:

1. The chairperson of the meeting will announce the item to be reviewed and ask for the staff report on the subject.

2. Staff presents their report on the item.

3. The Commission will then ask City staff questions about the proposal.

4. The chairperson will then ask if the applicant wishes to comment.

5. The chairperson will open the public hearing to give an opportunity to anyone present to comment on the proposal.

6. This is the time for the public to make comments or ask questions about the proposal. Please step up to the podium, speak clearly, first giving your name (spelling your last name) and address and then your comments.

7. At larger public hearings, the chair will encourage speakers, including the applicant, to limit their time at the podium to about 8 minutes so everyone has time to speak at least once. Neighborhood representatives will be given more time. Once everyone has spoken, the chair may allow speakers to return for additional comments.

8. After everyone in the audience wishing to speak has given his or her comments, the chairperson will close the public hearing portion of the meeting.

9. The Commission will then discuss the proposal. No further public comments are allowed.

10. The Commission will then make its recommendation or decision.

11. Final decisions by the Planning Commission may be appealed to the City Council. Appeals must be written and filed with the Planning Department within 10 days of the Planning Commission meeting.

It is possible that a quorum of members of the City Council may be present. However, no meeting of the City Council will be convened and no action will be taken by the City Council.
1. Call to Order

Chair Odland called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Commissioners Rettew, Calvert, Kirk, Knight, Magney, O’Connell, and Odland were present.

Staff members present: City Planner Loren Gordon, Principal Planner Susan Thomas, Water Resources Engineer Liz Stout, and Natural Resource Manager Jo Colleran.

3. Approval of Agenda: The agenda was approved with Item 8A, a sign plan review for Ridgedale Center, being postponed until the March 5, 2015 planning commission meeting at the applicant’s request due to the applicant’s inability to attend the meeting.

4. Approval of Minutes: January 22, 2015

*Kirk moved, second by Magney, to approve the January 22, 2015 meeting minutes as submitted.*

*Rettew, Calvert, Kirk, Knight, Magney, O’Connell, and Odland voted yes. Motion carried.*

5. Report from Staff

Gordon briefed the commission on land use applications considered by the city council at its meeting of January 26, 2015:

- Introduced environmental ordinance updates.
- Adopted a resolution vacating a drainage easement and approving a final plat for Legacy Oaks. Construction should begin in the spring or summer.
- An amendment to the conditional use permit was approved for the Play and Learn Café.
- Adopted a resolution approving the site and building plan for One Two One Development.
A meeting to look at alternatives for the south west Ridgedale area will be held February 18, 2015 from 4 p.m. to 5 p.m. at the community center of city hall. Residents are invited to look at ideas the consultant will provide and give comments.

The annual State of the City address will be February 11, 2015 at 7:30 a.m.

The next planning commission meeting is February 19, 2015.

Gordon welcomed Deb Calvert, a new planning commissioner.

6. Report from Planning Commission Members: None

7. Public Hearings: Consent Agenda: None

8. Public Hearings

A. Sign plan review for Ridgedale Center at 12401 Wayzata Boulevard.

This item was postponed until the March 5, 2015 planning commission meeting.

B. Ordinances amending various sections of the city code.

Chair Odland introduced the proposal and called for the staff report.

Thomas, Colleran, and Stout reported. Thomas recommended approval of the ordinances.

The public hearing was opened. No testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.

Kirk asked how significant trees are handled when a property is developed. Colleran explained the three tree classifications. A woodland preservation area is a remnant ecosystem. High-priority trees are any tree that is 15 inches or greater in diameter when measured 4.5 feet above the ground except for some species including boxelder and silver maple. A significant tree is any tree that is 8 inches in diameter. During development, tree removal is allowed in certain areas. A high-priority tree must be mitigated inch-for-inch. A 30-inch oak must be replaced with 30 inches worth of trees. Significant trees must be mitigated tree for tree. A 30-inch boxelder tree would have to be replaced with 1, 2-inch tree. Ash trees are now classified as high-priority trees by the current ordinance, but emerald ash borer is currently 6 miles away from the city limits so it is inevitable that it will
spread to Minnetonka. At that point, ash trees should not have the higher protection of high-priority classification.

Kirk said that the proposed ordinance changes would allow ash trees to be removed more easily. Colleran explained that the proposed ordinance would not cause a greater requirement of mitigation for removal of an ash tree. Once emerald ash bore reaches Minnetonka, the trees would not survive untreated. It does not matter what type of tree is in a woodland preservation area or floodplain forest. Those trees need to be mitigated inch for inch no matter what species of tree would be removed.

Thomas added that when the city council created the tree protection ordinance, councilmembers agreed on providing the highest level of protection to remnant ecosystems; the next level of protection to high-priority trees that include valuable mature species of trees; and the lowest level of protection to significant trees.

Kirk asked if the ordinance modifications would change how trees are handled during the tear down and rebuild of a single-family residential lot. Thomas answered in the negative. When a single-family house is torn down and rebuilt, a property owner is allowed to remove trees within the footprint of the building and a 20-foot perimeter without mitigation. That would not be changed by the proposal.

Kirk would support a policy change for the city to be able to regulate the amount of tree removal in teardown/rebuild or expansion situations.

Colleran noted that for a property that is not zoned R-1, site improvements or an addition could be done without mitigation. The redevelopment of a single-family home is similar to redevelopment of commercial property. A commercial property would provide a landscape plan.

In answer to Kirk’s question, Thomas explained that the tree preservation ordinance applies to every property during subdivision.

Magney asked if the MS4 permit applies to all municipalities in the state. Stout explained that it applies to communities of a certain size. Minneapolis and St. Paul have Phase 1 permits which were implemented in the 1980s. In 2003, the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) implemented a Phase 2 permit that looks at urban areas.
Magney has watched erosion control and stormwater measures develop over 35 years in the construction industry. It is all good stuff. He has seen the city implement the requirements and has seen positive results for the environment. He remembered how the construction industry was upset about the MPCA requirements regarding ready-mix truck washout. The cost is minimal and it is easy to do now. He supports the positive changes.

*Kirk moved, second by Rettew, to recommend that the city council adopt the following:*

1. An ordinance amending Minnetonka City Code §300.23 concerning the wetland overlay district (page A4–A15 of the staff report).

2. An ordinance amending Minnetonka City Code §300.28 Subd.19 regulating tree protection (page A16–A27 of the staff report).

3. An ordinance amending Minnetonka City Code §300.28 Subd. 16, 17 and 18 regulating grading and erosion control (page A28–A37 of the staff report).

4. An ordinance amending Minnetonka City Code §§1205 and 300.28 regulating discharges into the municipal storm sewer system (page A38–A42 of the staff report).

*Rettew, Calvert, Kirk, Knight, Magney, O’Connell, and Odland voted yes. Motion carried.*

9. Adjournment

*Rettew moved, second by Knight, to adjourn the meeting at 7:10 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.*

By: ____________________________
Lois T. Mason
Planning Secretary
Minnetonka Planning Commission Meeting
February 19, 2015

Agenda Item 7

Public Hearing: Consent Agenda
(No Items)
Minnetonka Planning Commission Meeting
February 19, 2015

Agenda Item 8

Public Hearing: Non-Consent Agenda
Brief Description

Ordinance rezoning portions of properties generally located at the southeast corner of the County Road 101/Excelsior Boulevard intersection from R-1 to R-1A

Recommendation

Recommend the city council adopt the ordinance

Background

In 2014 the city council adopted the R-1A ordinance. Under the ordinance, requests for rezoning and subdivision cannot be considered simultaneously. Instead, the city must first review and act upon an R-1A rezoning request. The review will be informed by submission of a conceptual plat. A formal plat application will be accepted and considered only if the rezoning request is approved. (See pages A1–A12.)

Request

Lakewest Development is requesting that a portion of the properties generally located at the southeast corner of the County Road 101/Excelsior Boulevard intersection be rezoned from R-1 to R-1A. The submitted conceptual plat illustrates creation of seven new R-1A lots accessed via a new cul-de-sac. These lots would range in size from 15,000 to 27,000 square feet. The conceptual plat also illustrates five lots accessing Spring Lane. These lots – ranging in size from 22,000 to 36,000 square feet – would not require a rezoning, as they would meet minimum R-1 standards. (See page A8.)

Evaluation

Following the outline of the ordinance, the planning decision that needs to be made at this time is whether the requested rezoning from R-1 to R-1A is appropriate. Unlike other planning decisions – which must be made based on whether or not a proposal meets a list of code-defined standards – a rezoning decision must simply have a reasonable and rational basis. In evaluating a rezoning request, the ordinance suggests that R-1A zoning may be considered when:

1) The R-1A area would be appropriately integrated into the existing surrounding development; AND

2) EITHER more than a majority of existing lots do not meet R-1 standards OR the proposed R-1 area would be served by a new street.
In the opinion of staff, R-1A zoning would be appropriate in the location proposed by the applicant. Reasonable and rational arguments for rezoning the area from R-1 to R-1A include:

1) The R-1A area would be located at the intersection of two major roadways.

2) The R-1A area would not detract from the existing surrounding development, as it would be located at the edge of an existing neighborhood rather than within the middle of an existing neighborhood.

3) As presented on the conceptual plat, the R-1A area would be served by a new street (cul-de-sac), resulting in creation of a new neighborhood.

Staff Comment

While the decision to rezone a property to R-1A is discretionary, the decision to approve a plat within the R-1A district is not. If the requested rezoning is approved, the applicant or some other party could submit a formal plat application. If the formal plat is substantially consistent with the conceptual plat and meets the lot standards of the R-1A district, the city would be obligated to approve the plat.

Similarly, decisions regarding home construction within the R-1A district are not discretionary. Within traditional zoning districts such as R-1A, the city can regulate home construction only by the standards specifically outlined in the zoning ordinance. Within the R-1A district these standards include required setbacks and maximum height, floor area ratio, and impervious surface. If a formal plat is approved, the applicant or some other party could submit building permit applications. If the permit applications meet the construction standards of the R-1A district – and Minnesota State Building Code – the city would be obligated to approve the permits.

The city cannot regulate home design or pricing with a traditional zoning district. Such regulation is allowed only with the flexible, PUD zoning district.

Staff Recommendation

Recommend the city council adopt an ordinance rezoning portions of the properties at 5290 and 5300 Spring Lane, 5325 Co Rd 101, 5301 and 5311 Tracy Lynn Terrace, and two properties with unassigned addresses from R-1 to R-1A. (See page A13–A16.)

Originator: Susan Thomas, AICP, Principal Planner
Through: Loren Gordon, AICP, City Planner
SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Concept Plan Review

In April 2014, the city council reviewed a concept plan for subdivision of the site. As presented the area would have been divided into 22 lots ranging in size from just over 6,100 square feet to roughly 16,660 square feet. The council generally expressed concerns regarding: (1) the size of the proposed lots and the resulting density; and (2) the perceived lack of regard for natural resources on the site.

Neighborhood Meeting

In December 2014, the applicant held a neighborhood meeting to present the current 12-lot concept. Approximately 20 people were in attendance. The attendees generally agreed that the 12-lot conceptual subdivision was a significant improvement over the previously presented concept. They particularly noted that the size of proposed properties – whether the proposed R-1A lots or the R-1 lots – were appropriately located given the sizes of existing lots in the area. Smaller lots would be located “near” smaller lots on Tracy Lynn Terrance and larger lots across from larger lots on Spring Lane.

County Road 101 Project

County Road 101 and Excelsior Boulevard will undergo significant reconstruction in the area of the proposed rezoning. To accommodate aspects of the reconstruction – particularly a turn lane and a trail – the county will acquire roughly 2,500 square feet of the subject properties. The financial negotiation and transaction associated with this area will occur between the county and the landowner and should not impact the city’s decision regarding the requested rezoning. The county’s acquisition may impact the size and number of lots able to be subdivided in the future. However, just as with any subdivision, those details would be reviewed in conjunction with a preliminary plat application.

R-1 STANDARDS

The R-1A lot and setback standards are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>REQUIREMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area</td>
<td>15,000 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildable Area</td>
<td>2,400 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width at Setback</td>
<td>75 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width at ROW</td>
<td>75 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Depth</td>
<td>125 ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the lot sizes on the conceptual plat, the following maximum impervious surface and floor area ratio would apply. However, please note that lot size may change slightly between conceptual plat and formal plat submittal. The resulting maximums would be recalculated and applied at the time of that formal application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOT AREA</th>
<th>MAX IMPERVIOUS</th>
<th>MAX FAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 4</td>
<td>15,001 sq.ft.</td>
<td>7,500 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 5</td>
<td>15,001 sq.ft.</td>
<td>7,500 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 6</td>
<td>27,001 sq.ft.</td>
<td>13,500 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 7</td>
<td>25,256 sq.ft.</td>
<td>12,625 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 8</td>
<td>15,534 sq.ft.</td>
<td>7,765 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 9</td>
<td>15,000 sq.ft.</td>
<td>7,500 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 10</td>
<td>15,128 sq.ft.</td>
<td>7,605 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* rounded down to closest 5 sq.ft.

**Floor Area and Floor Area Ratio (FAR)**

Based on code-definition and the city’s McMansion policy, floor area is the sum of the above ground horizontal area of a home, 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. Floor area ratio is the floor area divided by lot area.
Location Map

Project: Saville Subdivision
Applicant: Lake West Development
Address: Co Rd No 101 & Excelsior (14002.15a)
SAVILLE SUBDIVISION

Minnetonka, MN

APPLICATION FOR
REZONING AND CONCEPT PLAN

January 12, 2014
INTRODUCTION
On behalf of Lake West Development Co., LLC, Landform is pleased to submit this application for rezoning and concept plan to create seven R-1A lots and four R-1 lots from seven lots at County Road No. 101 and Excelsior Boulevard. We are excited about this environmentally sensitive design and anticipate that it will be a great addition to the neighborhood.

REZONING AND CONCEPT PLAN
Lake West Development is requesting approval of rezoning seven proposed lots from R1 to R-1A and to subdivide an additional four lots in the existing R-1 zoning district (PID #s 29-117-22-33-0026, 30-117-22-44-0044, 30-117-22-44-0043, 30-117-22-44-0062, 30-117-22-44-0015, 30-117-22-44-0005, 30-117-22-44-0052). The subject properties are located in the R-1 Zoning District and are guided low density residential in the Comprehensive Plan. Lake West plans to replat the lots for future construction of single-family detached residential dwelling units. There are four homes on the existing parcels. Lake West intends to retain two of the homes which are located at the corner of Excelsior Boulevard and County Road No. 101.

Ordinance 2014-22 requires that applicant submit a concept plan with a rezoning application to the R1-A District. The concept plan responds to the conditions on site with careful consideration to slopes, tree preservation and concerns of the neighborhood. The design team has worked to ensure that the concept is consistent with all of the City’s standards zoning standards. The concept plan will help the City achieve its goals of preserving existing neighborhoods while broadening housing choices and increasing the diversity of housing options.

Ordinance 2014-22 allows applicants to rezone to R-1A when the following conditions are met:

a) The proposed R-1A development will be appropriately integrated into existing and proposed surrounding development. This does not mean the R-1A development must reflect the specific standards of the surrounding area such as lot size, density, setbacks, or design. While integration may be achieved through such standards, it may also be achieved through continuation of existing land use types, architectural transitions, landscape buffering, or other means.

The proposed development will be appropriately integrated into the existing and proposed surrounding development. The attention to lot size and preservation of natural features will result in a minimal impact on the appearance or character of the neighborhood. The exterior boundaries of the lots will remain intact and new houses will be screened by the existing trees on site.
b) Either of the following is met:

1) At least 60 percent of existing lots within 400 feet of the proposed R-1A development, and along 1000 feet on both sides of street on which the proposed development is located, have lot areas less than the R-1 standards as outlined in city code section 400; or

2) All lots within the R-1A development will be served by a new street.

All proposed lots within R-1A development will be served by a new street. Lake West is proposing to extend a new street from Tracy Lynn Terrace terminating in a cul-de-sac.

Neighborhood Support:
The applicant met with area residents on December 17, 2014 to discuss plans for the subject properties. Residents were generally supportive of the proposed lot layout and concept. Residents said that they preferred the road extension from Tracy Lynn Terrace as shown in the plans over a road extending from Spring Lane. They appreciated the context sensitive design, the preservation of buffers and screening. A copy of the exhibits presented at the meeting have been included in the submittal package for your review.

Tree preservation:
Section 300.28, Subdivision 19 of the City Code requires that a tree preservation plan and survey be submitted with preliminary plats. Because trees are an important aspect of delivering a high-quality design, the concept plan was developed with respect to the location significant and high quality trees. The building areas, road placement, and lots are designed to remove the fewest number of trees possible. As proposed, the development is well under the allowable percentage of trees to be removed.

Steep Slopes
The site was analyzed to determine if there were any steep slopes on site, as defined by code. While there were none found on site, there are slopes over 20% on site. The concept plan was developed to minimize impact on the site’s slopes with a grade over 20%. Placement of lots, building areas, and the proposed road avoids slopes and integrates new residential properties into the landscape.

SUMMARY
We respectfully request approval of a rezoning from R-1 to R-1A as shown on the proposed concept plan at Excelsior Boulevard and County Road 101. We look forward to receiving feedback on the concept plan, and presenting plans to the Planning Commission on February 19, 2015 and City Council on March 2, 2015.
CONTACT INFORMATION
This document was prepared by:
Mary Matze, Planner
Landform
105 South Fifth Street, Suite 513
Minneapolis, MN 55330

Any additional questions regarding this application can be directed to Reid Schulz at rschulz@landform.net or 612.638.0245.
NEIGHBORHOOD ANALYSIS

- View south along Spring Lane
- View north along Tracy Lane
- View toward Highway 101 from Tracy Lane
- View southeast from Highway 101

Existing Area Summary
- 45 number of residential lots within 450-feet of project site
- 0.34 to 1.54 acre range of lot sizes
- 0.59 acre average lot size
Natural Context
The site has rolling topography with many of the existing high points currently occupied by single family homes. The tree canopy includes a variety of large evergreens and deciduous specimen. The wetland in the northeast corner is heavily wooded and requires buffers.

Man-made Context
Single family residential uses generally surround the site. While a node of institutional and office/services uses anchor the intersection of County Road 101 and Excelsior Boulevard. A high voltage utility and easement bisect the eastern side, which has vegetative implications as the utility corridor is maintained without tree cover.
Proposed Development Summary
• 12 number of residential lots
• Gross density 1.95 units/acre
• Net density 2.07 units/acre
• 0.49 acre average lot size

Proposed Lot Summary
• Lot 1 = 22,060 SF
• Lot 2 = 22,056 SF
• Lot 3 = 24,175 SF
• Lot 4 = 15,001 SF
• Lot 5 = 15,001 SF
• Lot 6 = 27,001 SF
• Lot 7 = 25,256 SF
• Lot 8 = 15,534 SF
• Lot 9 = 15,000 SF
• Lot 10 = 15,128 SF
• Lot 11 = 22,008 SF
• Lot 12 = 36,408 SF
Ordinance No. 2015-

An ordinance rezoning portions of existing properties generally located in the southeast corner of the County Road 101/Excelsior Boulevard intersection

The City Of Minnetonka Ordains:

Section 1.

1.01 Portions of the properties at 5290 and 5300 Spring Lane, 5325 Co Rd 101, 5301 and 5311 Tracy Lynn Terrace, and two properties with unassigned addresses are requested to be rezoned from R-1 to R-1A.

Section 2.

2.01 The area rezoned from R-1 to R-1A is legally described on Exhibit A of this ordinance.

2.02 The described area is depicted on Exhibit B of this ordinance.

Section 3.

3.01 Rezoning of these properties is appropriate. This action is based on the following findings:

1. The R-1A area will be located at the intersection of two major roadways.

2. The R-1A area will not detract from the existing surrounding development, as it would be located at the edge of an existing neighborhood rather within the middle of an existing neighborhood.

3. As presented on a conceptual plat, the R-1A area will be served by a new street, resulting in creation of a new neighborhood.

4. The rezoning is consistent with the city’s comprehensive plan.
Section 4.

4.01 This ordinance is effective upon approval the final development plan and final plat.

Adopted by the city council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on March 2, 2015.

________________________
Terry Schneider, Mayor

ATTEST:

________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk

**Action on this ordinance:**

Date of introduction: February 9, 2015
Date of adoption: 
Motion for adoption: 
Seconded by: 
Voted in favor of: 
Voted against: 
Abstained: 
Absent: 
Ordinance adopted.

Date of publication:

I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of an ordinance adopted by the city council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota at a regular meeting held on March 2, 2015.

________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk
EXHIBIT A

Legal Description to be Inserted Prior to City Council Action
Exhibit B
Minnetonka Planning Commission Meeting
February 19, 2015

Agenda Item 9

Other Business
Brief Description
Concept Plan for Cherrywood Pointe Senior Cooperative at 2004 Plymouth Road

Action Requested
Discuss the concept plan with the applicant. No formal action is required.

Background

United Properties Residential has submitted a concept plan to redevelop the existing residential property at 2004 Plymouth Road. The 3.4-acre property is currently zoned R-1, low-density residential, but is designated for high-density residential use in the 2030 Comprehensive Guide Plan. (See page A1.)

The submitted plan contemplates construction of a four-story, senior rental building. The building would contain approximately 129 units and include a mixture of independent, assisted, and memory care units. The building would be served by a surface parking lot adjacent to Plymouth Road, as well as underground parking. (See pages A2–A8.)

Construction of the submitted plan would likely require: (1) rezoning to planned unit development; and (2) site and building plan review.

Review Process

Staff has outlined the following review process for the proposal. At this time, a formal application has not been submitted.

- **Neighborhood Meeting.** A neighborhood meeting will be held on February 18. Staff will report highlights from that meeting at the planning commission meeting the following night.

- **Planning Commission Concept Plan Review.** The planning commission Concept Plan Review is intended as a follow-up to the neighborhood meeting. The objective of this meeting is to identify major issues and challenges in order to inform the subsequent review and discussion. The meeting will include a presentation by the developer of conceptual sketches and ideas, but not detailed engineering or architectural drawings. No staff recommendations are provided, the public is invited to offer comments, and planning commissioners are afforded the opportunity to ask questions and provide feedback without any formal motions or votes.

- **City Council Concept Plan Review.** The city council Concept Plan Review is intended as a follow-up to the planning commission meeting and would follow the
same format as the planning commission Concept Plan Review. No staff recommendations are provided, the public is invited to offer comments, and council members are afforded the opportunity to ask questions and provide feedback without any formal motions or votes.

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends the planning commission provide comment and feedback to assist the applicant with future direction that may lead to the preparation of more detailed development plans.

Originator: Susan Thomas, AICP, Principal Planner
Through: Loren Gordon, AICP, City Planner
SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Next Steps

- **Formal Application.** If the developer chooses to file a formal application, notification of the application would be mailed to area property owners. Property owners are encouraged to view plans and provide feedback via the city’s website. Through recent website updates: (1) staff can provide residents with ongoing project updates, (2) residents can “follow” projects they are particularly interested in by signing up for automatic notification of project updates; (3) residents may provide project feedback on project; and (4) and staff can review resident comments.

- **Neighborhood Meeting.** Prior to the planning commission meeting and official public hearing, an additional public meeting could be held with neighbors to discuss specific engineering, architectural and other details of the project, and to solicit feedback. This extends the timing that has historically been provided in advance of the planning commission review to allow more public consideration of the project specifics.

- **Council Introduction.** The proposal would be introduced at a city council meeting. At that time, the council would be provided another opportunity to review the issues identified during the initial Concept Plan Review meeting, and to provide direction about any refinements or additional issues they wish to be researched, and for which staff recommendations should be prepared.

- **Planning Commission Review.** The planning commission would hold an official public hearing for the development review and would subsequently recommend action to the city council.

- **City Council Action.** Based on input from the planning commission, professional staff and general public, the city council would take final action.

Roles and Responsibilities

- **Applicants.** Applicants are responsible for providing clear, complete and timely information throughout the review process. They are expected to be accessible to both the city and to the public, and to respect the integrity of the public process.

- **Public.** Neighbors and the general public will be encouraged and enabled to participate in the review process to the extent they are interested. However, effective public participation involves shared responsibilities. While the city has an obligation to provide information and feedback opportunities, interested residents are expected to accept the responsibility to educate themselves about the project.
and review process, to provide constructive, timely and germane feedback, and to stay informed and involved throughout the entire process.

- **Planning Commission.** The planning commission hosts the primary forum for public input and provides clear and definitive recommendations to the city council. To serve in that role, the commission identifies and attempts to resolve development issues and concerns prior to the council’s consideration by carefully balancing the interests of applicants, neighbors, and the general public.

- **City Council.** As the ultimate decision maker, the city council must be in a position to equitably and consistently weigh all input from their staff, the general public, planning commissioners, applicants and other advisors. Accordingly, council members traditionally keep an open mind until all the facts are received. The council ensures that residents have an opportunity to effectively participate in the process.

- **City Staff.** City staff is neither an advocate for the public nor the applicant. Rather, staff provides professional advice and recommendations to all interested parties, including the city council, planning commission, applicant and residents. Staff advocates for its professional position, not a project. Staff recommendations consider neighborhood concerns, but necessarily reflect professional standards, legal requirements and broader community interests.
LOCATION MAP
CHERRYWOOD POINT
Concept Plan Review
2004 Plymouth Road

This map is for illustrative purposes only.
Narrative for Minnetonka Plymouth Road Site

United Properties is a recognized leader in the development of senior housing in the Minneapolis/St. Paul metropolitan area. Since 2002, United Properties has developed and completed seven Applewood Pointe Senior Cooperative Communities. 2015 will see the opening of two new Applewood Pointe Communities, and construction beginning on two additional Applewood Pointe Communities. In recognition of our vision, leadership and commitment, United Properties was honored by the Senior Cooperative Foundation in 2010 with the Senior Cooperative Housing Leadership Award.

While United Properties will continue to build its Applewood Pointe Cooperative brand through the recently approved redevelopment of the Minnetonka Mills/Minnetonka Boulevard site, we are also committed to developing senior housing which offers services for our residents. We opened our first community providing senior housing with services, named Cherrywood Pointe, in 2012. 2015 will see the opening of two additional Cherrywood Pointe Communities in the greater Twin Cities area, and hopefully construction beginning on two additional Cherrywood Pointe Communities. We have established a strategic alliance with Ebenezer Management Services to assist with providing the care and service needed for our Cherrywood Pointe Communities. Ebenezer is a division of Fairview Health Systems, and has been serving the senior community in the Twin Cities for nearly 100 years.

Location

We have entered into an agreement to purchase the Carlson homestead at 2004 Plymouth Road, just south of the Ridgedale area. This approximately 4 acre site is the last underdeveloped site in this vicinity. We believe introducing senior housing with services at this location provides the Minnetonka community with needed senior services, and the convenience and synergy related with the Ridgedale area’s future vision. This community will offer a continuum of care including independent living with services, assisted living, memory care, and enhanced care suites.

Site Features

The existing site has wetlands on the south and west sides of the site. Therefore, the building orientation has been positioned to capture the views over the southern and western portions of the site, with the building entrance and parking area along Plymouth Road. The plan is to maintain many of the existing trees on the north, west, and south sides of the site.

The building that is being proposed will have a one story component along the south side of the property with the main body of the building at either four or five stories. An underground parking garage below the entire building footprint is being proposed. Exterior materials are somewhat flexible as we pursue the design of the building, but we are likely to have a mixture of brick or stone, different sidings and decks incorporated into the building design. Colors will likely be earth tones with certain accents to give the building architectural appeal. We are exploring both flat roof and pitched roof design ideas at this time.

The conceptual plans submitted for review show a building with 129 units and a total of 97 on-site parking stalls. Access to the site is proposed through a reconstructed driveway shared with the office property to the north of the site, and access at the southern end of the property.
The property is guided for high density housing and is surrounded by apartment and office uses. As mentioned, the site’s proximity to the Ridgedale area provides convenience for family members with loved ones in the facility, and also provides opportunity for residents of this new community to patron the businesses around Ridgedale area.

Typical amenities provided in our Cherrywood Pointe developments are:

- Spacious, bright apartments, many with decks
- Full kitchens with all appliances in every unit
- Enriching activities including wellness and life-long learning events
- Fine dining with chef prepared meals
- On-site beauty/barber shop
- Digital satellite TV programming
- Utilities including gas, electric, water, waste and recycling
- Individual climate control in every apartment
- Outdoor decks and lovely walking paths
- Concierge at front desk with fax and copy services
- Club room with bar
- Elegant lobby for cozy chats with neighbors by the fireplace
- Library
- Fitness and work out exercise areas
- Movie theater
- Guest suite for visitors
- Clinic space for visiting wellness and health practitioners
- Bistro
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1st Floor Summary

Total SF: 40,528 sf
27 Units

Memory Care
21 - Single Units
2 - Double Units

Assisted Living Units
2 - One Bed + Den Units
2 - Two Bed Units

Site Plan - Option 5
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2nd Floor Summary
Total SF: 32,508 sf
26 Units
8 - One Bed Units
10 - One Bed + Den Units
7 - Two Bed Units
2 - Studio

3rd-4th Floor Summary
Total SF: 33,000 sf
30 Units
8 - One Bed Units
12 - One Bed + Den Units
8 - Two Bed Units
2 - Studio