Planning Commission Agenda

March 5, 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 19, 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. Sign plan review for Ridgedale Center at 12401 Wayzata Boulevard.

      Recommendation: Adopt the resolution approving the sign plan. (5 votes)

      • Final Decision Subject to Appeal
      • Project Planner: Jeff Thomson

9. Other Business

   A. Concept plan review for Kraemer’s Hardware redevelopment at 14730 Excelsior Boulevard, 5431, and 5439 Williston Road.

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

      • City Council (Tentative Date: March 23, 2015)
      • Project Planner: Jeff Thomson
10. Elections

- Election of Commission Chair
- Election of Commission Vice Chair

11. Planning Commission Bylaws and Policies

12. Adjournment of Regular Meeting and Recess before Planning Commissioner Training

Training for Planning Commissioners (to be held in Shady Oak Conference Room)
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 19, 2015 Planning Commission meeting:

   Project Description: Buell Consulting Inc. on behalf of Verizon Wireless, is proposing to construct a 100-foot telecommunications tower south of the existing building and parking lot at 15001 Minnetonka Industrial Road. The proposal requires a conditional use permit.
   Project No.: 10038.15a       Staff: Ashley Cauley
   Ward/Council Member: 3—Brad Wiersum   Section: 16

   Project Description: The applicant is proposing to remove the existing home from the property and construct a new two-story single family home at 3520 Meadow Lane. The proposed home requires an expansion permit and front yard setback variances.
   Project No.: 15001.15a       Staff: Ashley Cauley
   Ward/Council Member: 3—Brad Wiersum   Section: 17
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 Kirk, Knight, Magney, O’Connell, Calvert and Odland were present. Rettew was absent.

Staff members present: Community Development Director Julie Wischnack, City Planner Loren Gordon, and Principal Planner Susan Thomas.

3. **Approval of Agenda:** The agenda was approved as submitted.

4. **Approval of Minutes:** February 5, 2015

   *Kirk moved, second by Knight, to approve the February 5, 2015 meeting minutes as submitted.*

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

5. **Report from Staff**

Gordon briefed the commission on land use applications considered by the city council at its meeting of February 9, 2015:

- Introduced the ordinance regarding the Saville properties.
- Adopted a resolution approving the revised plan for Villas at Groveland.
- Upheld the planning commission’s denial of a variance application for a property on Linner Road.

There was a meeting open to the public on February 17, 2015 to review proposals for improvements to the Ridgedale area. The next meeting will be March 10, 2015.
The next planning commission meeting will be March 5, 2015. The year-end report will be presented and there will be commissioner training after the meeting.

6. Report from Planning Commission Members

Kirk announced that he has been appointed to the Southwest Light Rail Community Advisory Committee which will review light rail station area plans over the next couple of years. He will meet with the committee monthly and report to the commission what he learns.

7. Public Hearings: Consent Agenda: None

8. Public Hearings

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.

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

Thomas reported. She recommended approval of the application based on the findings and subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.

O’Connell asked why a concept plan would be part of the presentation. Thomas explained that the ordinance requires a potential applicant to provide a concept plan to give the city an idea of the number of potential lots.

Kirk felt it made sense to look at the application’s zoning requirements and later look at the plat. It allows residents to review the proposal twice and that may be a good thing. He favored an expiration of the approval of the rezoning in case the current applicant would not do the project. He asked for the maximum density that could happen on the site if it would be zoned R-1A. Thomas indicated that the proposal seems to represent the maximum development allowed under R-1A zoning given the site constraints. There would possibly be an opportunity to connect the street from Tracy Lynn Terrace to Spring Lane and create one or two more lots, but that would create issues with the site’s natural resources. Staff’s recommendation includes a condition that would make the rezoning only effective upon approval of a plat.

Kirk asked if it would be possible for the concept to expire in a certain amount of time. Thomas said that staff had considered including an automatic expiration of
the rezoning in early drafts of the proposed ordinance. The city attorney was concerned because zoning is tied to property. The city has the right to rezone a property back to its original zoning at any time. Based on the city attorney’s suggestion, a sunset clause was not incorporated. Rezoning would be evaluated in light of the proposed concept plan, but no action would be taken on a concept plan itself.

Magney asked for data on the properties on Tracy Lynn Terrace. Thomas provided a slide with the information. Existing lot sizes range from 18,000 square feet to 30,500 square feet.

Magney asked how a utility easement cutting through Lots 5 and 10 would be handled. Thomas answered that a developer may relocate a sewer line, but it would be done at the developer’s expense.

Reid Schulz, of Landform Professional Services, on behalf of the applicant, Lake West Development, stated that:

- He thanked staff for their work to help get to this point.
- Last spring, the city council felt a concept plan with 22 lots was too dense. The current proposal would have fewer lots.
- Last December, the applicant held a neighborhood meeting. The comments and concerns received were taken into consideration.
- A neighborhood analysis and tree survey were completed.
- The wetlands and accesses were considered. The access point location was considered off of Spring Lane as well as Tracy Lynn Terrace. The neighbors prefer the access to be located on Tracy Lynn Terrace.
- He was available for questions.

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

Kirk visited the site. He had no problem with the development. The struggle he has is with changing the zoning on the piece of property. He takes it seriously and wants to understand the implications for the neighborhood. Staff has done a good job of providing the reasons why an R-1A zoning classification would work for the site. Tree preservation and stormwater management would be looked at further down the line. Staff did a good job with the analysis. He supports the rezoning.
O’Connell moved, second by Magney, to recommend that the city council adopt an ordinance rezoning portions of the properties at 5290 and 5300 Spring Lane, 5325 County Road 101, 5301 and 5311 Tracy Lynn Terrace, and two properties with unassigned addresses from R-1 to R-1A (see pages A13-A16 of the staff report).

Kirk, Knight, Magney, O’Connell, Odland, and Odland voted yes. Rettew was absent. Motion carried.

This item is tentatively scheduled to be reviewed by the city council March 2, 2015.

9. Public Hearings

B. Concept plan for Cherrywood Pointe Senior Cooperative at 2004 Plymouth Road.

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

Thomas reported. She requested commissioners discuss the concept plan and provide the developer with feedback.

Brian Carey, of United Properties, appreciated the opportunity to receive feedback. He stated that:

- Minnetonka recently approved United Properties’ Applewood project.
- United Properties has been in business since 1916. He represents the residential division.
- From 1990 to 2010, there has been slow growth in senior housing. United Properties has since built 7 Applewood Pointe communities which serve about 1,000 residents and a Cherrywood Pointe community. There are 2 Applewood and 2 Cherrywood Pointe communities currently under construction.
- Senior housing will not age the community. Senior housing provides housing for people who serve as volunteers and have served as leaders in the community for many years.
- The houses seniors leave are sold to young families and improve the school environment.
- He showed photos of an Applewood Pointe community in Roseville.
- The comprehensive guide plan guides the site for high-density residential.
• The site is not included in the Ridgedale vision area, but the proposal would support keeping the area vibrant.

Jill Makobie-Keizer, of United Properties, stated that:

• The average-aged resident is in his or her eighties.
• Family members and employees will help to support the surrounding area by taking their aging parents and themselves shopping.
• The proposal would be a fine addition for the area.

Mr. Carey continued:

• The site is surrounded by apartments on the south, a library on the northeast, a medical office building and retail, and single-family residences 1,250 feet from the site.
• There would be parking setbacks 10 feet and building setbacks 40 feet on the front. There would be a 50-foot wetland setback which exceeds what would be required. The building would fit within the setbacks.
• The site plan provided the intention of how the site’s traffic pattern would work. It would reduce and simplify the traffic in the area. It would allow the addition of a right-hand turn lane for exiting. It would improve the neighboring driveway and parking lot to do that. The exit would be right-in and right-out only. The building would be about 40,000 square feet on the first floor. There would be a courtyard in the middle to provide a safe walking area for residents in memory care.
• There would be 73 parking stalls.
• The first floor would have a dining area, movie theater, salon, offices, and memory care areas.
• He provided renderings of 11 senior communities to show the flexibility of what could be done on the site. There was opposition expressed for the 5-story model, so he provided a 4-story model that shows a classic looking building. The consensus seemed to prefer the classic, residential style over the modern look.
• He was happy to answer questions.

Kirk asked if there would be a point where there would be too much senior housing. Mr. Carey answered in the negative. It is not on the radar at all right now. All through 2040, there is a tremendous growth curve with many more
seniors than there are today. For the next 25 years, the demand for senior housing will be in excess of twice what it is now and it will not drop then either.

Kirk asked if more parking could be added in the basement if the building would change from senior living to apartments. Mr. Carey answered that that could be considered in the future. Nothing has been built in the Ridgedale area in many years to provide assisted living. The demand for this type of use will exist for a long, long time. It would extend at least passed the useful life of the building.

Kirk felt that the Applewood Pointe in New Brighton photo demonstrates what he would like in the area since it has a more residential look. Mr. Carey stated that the design work has not been done yet for the proposed four-story building. It would be attractive and be favored by the city council and commissioners. He will suggest the preferred style to the architect.

Kirk noted that the site may be environmentally sensitive. He asked for the wetland setback. Thomas answered 35 feet. The proposed 50 feet would exceed the required wetland setback.

Kirk asked how the proposal would fit into the Ridgedale redevelopment plan. Pedestrian connections would be a consideration. Mr. Carey stated that he is excited about the opportunities to work with Ridgedale. There would be some Cherrypointe residents walking to Target and there would be many adult children picking up residents to take them to the nearby Target and Byerly’s. He embraces the fact that buses serve the Ridgedale area. His employees could utilize the bus service.

Kirk supports senior housing. Diversity in housing in Minnetonka will occur when seniors vacate their houses to move into Cherrypointe and their houses are purchased by young couples. That is where the affordable housing would occur. This is a great opportunity for that. The site would support a building of the proposed size. The housing type would be appropriate. He supports the development. It looks good.

Calvert confirmed the location of the accesses. Mr. Carey explained that the primary access to the site would be the north access. Drivers exiting or entering the garage and heading south could use the south access.

Calvert clarified with Mr. Carey that the garage would be the lower level. Residents would have a nice view of the wetland.
Calvert knows that senior housing is needed. She asked how flexible the proposal would be to repurpose. Mr. Carey said that it would be very flexible. All of the units on floors two through four would have full kitchens, bathrooms, and closets. They would be very nice apartments. The parking area could be expanded. That would be a very long way away. There is no indication that the senior population would decrease after 25 years.

O'Connell asked if the applicant has data from completed senior housing projects that show that seniors who own houses near the senior housing project move out of their houses. Mr. Carey said that 60 to 70 percent of Applewood Pointe residents come from the community. There are two main draws for seniors for this kind of a building: to be near their children and to be near other seniors.

O'Connell suggested providing elevations comparing the proposed building with the existing office building to the north at the next meeting. Mr. Carey said that was a good idea.

Wischnack added that the city required St. Therese to market only to Minnetonka residents for a certain period of time. Thirty percent of the initial seniors to move into St. Therese were Minnetonka residents who moved out of single-family houses. Wischnack has information regarding where Minnetonka residents are moving from and moving to through 2012 that she will forward to commissioners.

The public hearing was opened.

Annette Bertelsen, 13513 Larkin Drive, stated that she thought it was great that United Properties wants to bring high quality senior housing to the community. She looks forward to working with them throughout the development process. The site is unique. It is blessed with a slope, wetland, and woodland. The woodland is critical to protecting the wetland. She requested that the developer be required to follow Minnetonka’s R-5 high-density residential design standards and that the proposed density be scrutinized. High-density housing starts at 12 units per acre. The site has 3 acres of upland, so 36 units would qualify as high density. Regency Woods next door is 15 units per acre. The proposed plan would include 129 units and be 46 units per acre. Something more intimate in the beautiful setting would be a great opportunity. She requested that the city have natural resources staff create site-specific setbacks.

No additional testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.
In response to O’Connell’s question, Thomas answered that a traffic study may be done to look at the number of trips that would be generated by 129 senior units.

Magney asked if site-specific setbacks could be implemented for a PUD. Thomas explained that the applicant may not apply to have the zoning changed to a PUD. Senior housing is allowed in every zoning classification. A traditional zoning district has specific setbacks outlined in the ordinance. The city does have very strong natural resource ordinances including the tree ordinance. When an application is received, natural resources staff visit the site and verify the accuracy of the tree survey and wetland delineation.

Wischnack added that a PUD might help save more of the natural resources than an R-5 district would. Once an application is received, then saving as many trees as possible would be a goal.

Magney felt that the proposal is the right use for the site. He could not see single-family houses sandwiches between apartments, commercial uses, and a medical office building. The elevations with the broken up façade and different materials looks very nice.

Kirk liked that the comprehensive guide plan supports the use. It would be nice to compare a plan as a PUD with a plan that follows R-5 zoning ordinance requirements. The development is a good one.

Chair Odland looks forward to seeing specific drawings that include the height of the proposed building.

10. Adjournment

Magney moved, second by Kirk, to adjourn the meeting at 7:55 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

By: ____________________________

Lois T. Mason
Planning Secretary
Minnetonka Planning Commission Meeting
March 5, 2015

Agenda Item 7

Public Hearing: Consent Agenda
(No Items)
Minnetonka Planning Commission Meeting
March 5, 2015

Agenda Item 8

Public Hearing: Non-Consent Agenda
MINNETONKA PLANNING COMMISSION
March 5, 2015

Brief Description  Sign plan review for Ridgedale Center at 12401 Wayzata Boulevard

Recommendation  Adopt the resolution approving the sign plan

Introduction
The property owner, General Growth Properties, is proposing to update the exterior signs for Ridgedale Center. The signs include a new pylon sign, monument entrance signs, and directional signs which provide wayfinding for the mall’s anchor tenants. There would be no changes to existing wall signs for the anchor tenants and restaurants. (See narrative and plans on pages A1-A46.)

Existing Sign Plan
Ridgedale Center is governed by a sign plan that was approved by the planning commission in June 1986. (See pages A47-A51.) The sign plan regulates all exterior signs at Ridgedale, including the mall, anchor department stores, as well as the freestanding buildings occupied by Firestone Tire and Sears Auto. The sign plan allows for several different types of exterior signs, including:

- **Ridgedale Center signs:** The mall is allowed several exterior signs to identify the center, which include the existing pylon sign and the tower structures at each of the entrances.

- **Anchor department store signs:** Each of the four department stores are allowed wall signs on each of their exterior elevations.

- **Restaurants:** Restaurants that are located adjacent to a mall entrance and have an exterior entrance are allowed a wall sign.

- **Freestanding tenants:** The existing freestanding buildings which are occupied by Firestone Tire and Sears Auto, are allowed wall signs on the exterior of the building.

- **Interior tenants:** The existing sign plan prohibits all other tenants, including tenants inside the mall, from having exterior signs.

The existing sign plan has been amended since its adoption in 1986. In 2013, the city council approved an amendment for the expanded Macy’s store to have a taller height for
their wall signs. Also in 2013, the planning commission approved an amendment for the Bar Louie wall signs.

Ridgedale Center

The mall is currently undergoing a three phase redevelopment which was approved by the city council in March of 2013. The redevelopment includes an expansion to the Macy's department store, a two-story expansion of the mall, and construction of a new 140,000 Nordstrom department store. The redevelopment also includes renovation to the exterior elevations and entrances of the mall. All of these improvements are currently under construction. The master development plan also has a future phase 3, which would include three new freestanding restaurants on the northwest side of the mall.

Proposed Signs

As part of the current improvements, the applicant is also proposing to update all of the exterior signs for Ridgedale Center itself. However, there would be no changes to any of the tenant signage for the department stores, restaurants, or freestanding tenants. In addition, interior mall tenants would still not be able to have exterior signage. The following summarizes the new exterior signs:

- **Pylon sign:** The plans include updating the existing pylon that is located on the north side of the mall property. The sign would not be replaced. Instead, the existing cladding would be removed and a new exterior cladding would be added on the exterior of the structure. The new cladding would consist of a dark aluminum panel which would match the materials used in the new exterior mall elevations. The sign cabinet would also be re-clad in the same material, except for the new brand logo. The top of the sign would be squared-off from the current sign design, but the new sign would have the exact same height (85 feet) and copy and graphic area (480 sq. ft.) as the existing sign. (See pages A20-A22.)

- **Entrance tower signs:** There are four tower structures that are located at each of the existing mall entrances. The tower structures identify the mall entrances and currently have signage on the top which identifies the mall. The exterior materials of the towers will be updated as part of the previously approved mall façade improvements. The proposed sign plan includes updating the signage on top of the towers by replace the existing Ridgedale text with the new Ridgedale logo. (See pages A42-A45.)

- **Monument entrance signs:** The applicant is proposing to add four monument signs at some of the vehicle site entrances. The monuments would identify the mall, and may provide directional signs on the base if needed. (See pages A24-A28.) The site does not currently have any monument, so these would be additional signs beyond what currently exists.
• **Directional signs**: The applicant is proposing to add multiple directional signs along the public streets and interior ring road to provide wayfinding for vehicular traffic. The signs would direct vehicles to the department stores and major tenants. The signs would be 8 feet in height with 20 square feet of copy and graphic area. (See pages A30-A34.)

**Staff Analysis**

Staff finds that the applicant’s proposal is reasonable:

• The revised sign plan is consistent with the existing sign plan for Ridgedale Center. The existing sign plan focuses on providing identification for the mall and anchor department stores. Individual tenants within the mall are not allowed exterior signage. Only restaurants and freestanding tenants are allowed exterior wall signs that are smaller and proportional to their tenant space. This would continue to be the standard under the revised sign plan. The new signs would provide site identification for the mall, as well as directional messages. There would be no changes to the regulations for individual tenants.

• The proposed sign plan improves site identification and wayfinding. The site has frontage on three major roadways, seven vehicle access points, and an interior private roadway network. There is limited wayfinding signage today, and the new monument and directional signs provide better wayfinding for vehicles travelling to the mall.

• The proposed sign plan would reflect the reinvestment in the mall that was approved with the 2013 master development plan. The signs would continue the design theme from the mall expansion and façade improvements, and would update the exterior appearance of the mall.

**Proposed Sign Plan**

City staff is recommending that the planning commission rescind the existing sign plan, and approve the revised sign plan. The existing sign plan includes numerous standards and provisions that are privately enforced by the mall, and do not impact the city’s administration or enforcement of the sign ordinance. For example, the sign plan includes requirements for tenants’ interior signs. The revised sign plan would regulate the standard items outlined in the city’s sign ordinance such as height, size, and location. In addition, the revised plan would clarify that the city’s sign ordinance regulations apply, except for the specific regulations outlined in the resolution. The previous sign plan amendments for Macy’s and Bar Louie would not be affected by the proposed change.
Staff Recommendation

Adopt the resolution on pages A57-A60, which rescinds the existing sign plan and approves a revised sign plan for Ridgedale Center at 12401 Wayzata Boulevard.

Originator: Jeff Thomson, Planner
Through: Loren Gordon, AICP, City Planner
Supporting Information

Project No. 03046.15a

Property Ridgedale Center, 12401 Wayzata Blvd.

Applicant General Growth Properties

Surrounding Land Uses

Northerly: I-394
Easterly: Crane Lake, zoned PID/Planned I-394 District and guided for open space
Southerly: Mix of institutional, office, residential and hospitality uses, zoned PID and guided for mixed use
Westerly: Mix of bank, retail, restaurant and commercial uses, zoned PID and guided for mixed use

Planning

Guide Plan designation: Mixed Use
Zoning: PID/Planned I-394 District

Sign Plan Review Standards

Factors which will be used in determining if an individual sign plan will be considered include the following:

1) The development includes a high rise (greater than 3 story) structure;

   Finding: Ridgedale Center does not include any high rise structures.

2) The development includes multiple structures and/or substantial site area;

   Finding: Ridgedale Center is 84 acres in total size, making it one of the largest developments in the community. The site also has seven vehicle access points from public streets and four separate parking lots.

3) The development includes mixed uses;

   Finding: Ridgedale Center includes a mix of commercial uses, including retail, restaurant, automotive, and anchor department stores.
4) A sign plan is uniquely adapted to address the visibility needs of a development while remaining consistent with the intent of this section to direct high quality signage; and

**Finding:** The site has unique visibility needs compared to other commercial properties. Ridgedale abuts three major streets, Wayzata Boulevard, Ridgedale Drive, and Plymouth Road, and has visual frontage from I-394. The site also has seven separate vehicle access points from these public streets. In addition, the site is a regional destination which anchors the larger Ridgedale area regional center.

5) The sign plan includes permanent sign covenants which can be enforced by the city.

**Finding:** The sign plan includes specific conditions of approval which would be administered and enforced with all sign permit applications. This would include the current signs and all future signs.

**Motion Options**

The planning commission has three options:

1) Concur with staff’s recommendation. In this case a motion should be made to approve the proposal based on the findings outlined in the staff-drafted resolution.

2) Disagree with staff’s recommendation. In this case a motion should be made recommending denial of the proposal. The motion should include findings for denial.

3) Table the request. In this case, a motion should be made to table the item. The motion should include a statement as to why the request is being tabled with direction to staff, the applicant or both.

**Approving Body**

The planning commission makes a recommendation to the city council, which has final authority to approve or deny the request. (City Code §300.06 Subd. 4)

**Appeals**

Any person aggrieved by the planning commission’s decision regarding the requested variances may appeal such decision to the city council. A written appeal must be submitted to the planning staff within ten days of the date of the decision.
### Neighborhood Comments
The city sent notices to 100 area property owners and received no comments.

### Deadline for Decision:
May 13, 2015
Location Map

Project: Ridgedale Sign Improvements
Applicant: General Growth Properties
Address: 12401 Wayzata Blvd
(03046.15a)
As part of the ongoing redevelopment and expansion of Ridgedale Center, General Growth Properties proposes modernizing the sign plan document to incorporate existing signage upgrades along with additional directional, tenant, and project identification signage opportunities currently not contemplated by the existing Sign Plan.

The sign plan amendment proposal is an important component to the long-term vision of sustained viability for Ridgedale Center as a major regional attraction. The proposed signage enhancements will significantly improve the external presentation of the center, while offering improved way-finding and destination identification for the customer. The package meets both the current and future anticipated needs for the Center.

The proposed signage is unified and complimentary with the new exterior and interior renovation design, resulting in what will be an integrated customer experience from curb to center court.
CONTACT INFORMATION

Redmond Schwartz Mark Design
Martin Schwartz
martin@rsmdesign.com

Kate Gilman
kate@rsmdesign.com

RSM Design
160 Ave. Cabrillo
San Clemente, CA 92672
P: 949.492.9479

www.rsmdesign.com

DLR Group
Wade Morgan
wmorgan@DLRGROUP.com

DLR GROUP
520 Nicollet Mall, Suite 200
Minneapolis, MN 55402
P: 9612.977.3530

GGP
Brian De Vinck
brian.devinck@generalgrowth.com

GGP
110 N. Wacker Drive, Chicago, IL 60606
P: 312.960.5038
Indemnity: These plans are for design purposes only and are not intended to be used for construction. Anyone who uses these designs for construction does so at their own risk. Owner, and Owner's agents, servants and employees who use these designs ("Indemnitees") agree to indemnify and hold Redmond Schwartz Mark Design, its officers, directors, agents, servants and employees ("Indemnitors") harmless from any and all claims, liability, cost, losses, damages, recovery and expenses (including attorney's fees, court costs and expert witness fees) incurred by Indemnitee arising from any claims involving these designs or any other work done by Indemnitee.

The following package represents the signage and graphics scope as understood by RSM Design throughout the design process and at the time of issuance. RSM Design cannot be held responsible for alterations, changes, value engineering, and other modifications made to the signage scope and fabrication methods without the inclusion of and consent of RSM Design prior to fabrication and installation.

With the acceptance of this package by the Client and Architect of Record, all of the designs represented in this package have been reviewed (and approved unless RSM Design is notified otherwise) by the architects of record and the client (General Growth Properties) for original design intent, placement, appropriateness, and functionality.

All location plans and location elevations represented in this package may not be representative of the existing built conditions. The sign fabricator is responsible for verifying all existing conditions (dimensions, backing, accessibility, other conditions) prior to fabrication and installation.

Conflicts/contradictions with drawings or conditions

The contractor should recognize and bring to RSM Design any conflicts or contradictions either in regards to our drawings or as they relate to other disciplines or contractors. All conflicts should be described in writing and the contractor is to provide alternative solutions to resolve the conflict. All conflicts are to be resolved and any changes approved by RSM Design and Developer prior to sign fabrication.

Roles and Responsibilities:

RSM Design's role on this project is for the design and aesthetic look of each sign in coordination with the design team.

The sign fabricator is responsible for all structural, mechanical, fabrication, coordination, and installation of all signs and is responsible for meeting all local and national codes, ordinances, and laws associated with these designs.

Roles and Responsibilities:

RSM Design's role on this project is for the design and aesthetic look of each sign in coordination with the design team.

The sign fabricator is responsible for all structural, mechanical, fabrication, coordination, and installation of all signs and is responsible for meeting all local and national codes, ordinances, and laws associated with these designs.

General Notes:

1. It is the fabricator/installers responsibility to:
   a. remove, note and legally dispose of all existing signs.
   b. remove Legal, Warning, Code Required or ADA signs only when replacement sign is to be installed, temporary sign(s) to be provided as needed for safety measures.
   c. patch and repair any damage to surfaces at or adjacent to sign, either existing damage or damage caused by removal of existing sign.
   d. coordinate painting of garage interior and all sign installations with general contractor.
   e. confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication. RSM to be notified of any changes or comments.

4. Sign Fabricator's shop drawings to include layout of all seams and messaging on signs.

5. Renderings are illustrative and conceptual in nature, measured, dimensioned drawings and messages in this document govern.

6. All exterior signs to have appropriate weep holes with internal light baffles.

7. Where sign will be anchored to concrete provide steel plate with epoxy set anchors. Locate anchors at grout where brick occurs and tie into existing concrete. Locate and avoid existing re-bar. Shop drawings for anchor must include a current ICC report.
GENERAL RSM DESIGN SIGNAGE SPECIFICATIONS

These general specifications addressing signage and graphic elements within the attached package are intended for the signage fabricator, and are a supplement and subversive to the general project specifications provided by the Owner, developer, or architect of record. The sign fabricator is responsible for obtaining and complying with the referenced general project specifications in addition to these signage specifications.

This document has been assembled by RSM Design with the expectation that the sign fabricator will meet the following quality and performance requirements. The acceptance of these drawings by the sign fabricator constitutes agreement to comply with the following conditions. The Owner will hold the sign fabricator to these requirements as part of their contract obligations.

I. INDEMNITY

These signage drawings are for design purposes only and are not intended to be used for construction. Anyone who uses these designs for construction does so at their own risk. Owner, and Owner’s agents, servants and employees who use these designs (“Indemnitors”) agree to indemnify and hold RSM Design, its officers, directors, agents, servants and employees (“Indemnities”) harmless from any and all claims, liability, cost, losses, damages, recovery and expenses (including attorney’s fees, court costs and expert witness fees) incurred by Indemnity arising from any claims involving these designs or any other work done by Indemnitee.

The following package represents the signage and graphics scope as understood by RSM Design throughout the design process and at the time of issuance. RSM Design cannot be held responsible for alterations, changes, value engineering, and other modifications made to the signage scope and fabrication methods without the inclusion of and consent of RSM Design prior to fabrication and installation.

With the acceptance of this package by the Owner, developer, and/or architect of record, all of the designs represented in this package have been reviewed (and approved unless RSM Design is notified otherwise) by the architects of record and the client for original design intent, placement, appropriateness, and functionality.

All location plans and location elevations represented in this package may not be representative of the existing built conditions. The sign fabricator is responsible for verifying all existing conditions (dimensions, backing, accessibility, electrical accessibility, other conditions) prior to fabrication and installation.

Conflicts / Contradictions with Drawings or Existing Conditions

The contractor should recognize and bring to RSM Design any conflicts or contradictions either in regards to these drawings or existing conditions or as they relate to other disciplines or contractors. All conflicts should be described in writing and the sign fabricator is to provide alternative solutions to resolve the conflict. All conflicts are to be resolved and any changes approved by RSM Design and client prior to sign fabrication.

Roles and Responsibilities

RSM Design role on this project is for the design intent and aesthetic look of each sign and in coordination with the overall project design team. The sign fabricator is responsible for all structural, mechanical, fabrication, details of the signs (venting, waterproofing, safety, etc.), engineering of the signs coordination, and installation of all signs. The sign fabricator is responsible for meeting all local and national codes, ordinances, and laws associated with these designs and their construction documentation.

Sign fabricator to inform owner, developer, general contractor, and RSM Design that the sign package has been submitted to the local governing municipality or city for review and plan check, and any variances have been approved for the signs.

General Notes

1. It is the sign fabricator’s and installers responsibility to:
   a. Coordinate all sign installations with general contractor.
   b. Remove existing signs as determined by client and dispose of them legally.
   c. Patch and repair any damage to wall surfaces and surrounding finished floor, at or adjacent to sign, includes existing damage and any damage caused by removal of existing sign.
   d. Remove Legal, Warning, Code Required or ADA signs only when replacement sign is to be installed; and temporary sign(s) to be provided as needed for safety measures.
   e. Advise RSM Design of any existing signs not accounted for in RSM Design’s sign package.
2. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM Design of any changes or conflicts within the design package.
3. Sign fabricator to confirm all final sign messaging and locations with client or general contractor prior to fabrication. RSM Design to be notified of any changes or comments.
4. Sign fabricator’s shop drawings to include layout of all seams, attachments, and messaging on all signs.
5. Renderings in RSM Design’s package are illustrative and conceptual in nature; measured, dimensioned drawings, and messages in this document govern.
6. All exterior signs to have appropriate water proofing and weep holes to discharge any water inside, but weep holes must contain internal light baffles to shield any light leakage.
7. Sign fabricator to detail and provide all necessary mechanical or non-mechanical ventilation for signs (exterior and interior) to keep signs from overheating or condensation building up. If vents or ventilation devices alter the design intent, RSM Design is to be notified prior to fabrication.
8. Where signs will be anchored to concrete, sign fabricator to provide steel plate with epox set anchors (locate and avoid existing re-bar). Where signs will be located on brick, locate anchors at grout where brick occurs and tie into existing concrete.
9. Sign fabricator’s shop drawings (which will be used for construction) must include and clearly document all of the following:
   - Internal structure
   - Construction details and joints
   - All visible attachments and material seams
   - Venting
   - Lighting details
   - Water proofing and water drainage
   - Electrical locations
   - Access panels
   - Foundation details
   - Engineered structural members
   - Material thicknesses
   - Color samples sprayed on actual (final) materials
10. Sign fabricator’s drawings to be based off of their original documentation and drawings, and are not to be “copies” of or re-formatting of RSM Design’s original design drawings.

II. PERFORMANCE INFORMATION NON-DISCLOSURE AGREEMENT

All ideas, designs, arrangements, and plans indicated or presented by these drawings are owned by and are the property of the Redmond Schwartz Mark Design, Inc. (RSM Design) and the project Owner, and were created, evolved, and developed for use on and in connection with the specified project ONLY. These designs and details cannot be used on any other project. None of such ideas, designs, arrangements or plans shall be used by or disclosed to any persons, firm, or corporation for any purpose whatsoever without the written permission of Redmond Schwartz Mark Design Inc. and the Owner. Any and all inquiries in this regard by outside parties should be referred to RSM Design. It is required that all original artwork furnished by RSM Design be returned upon completion of this project.

For the purpose of this package and these specifications, the term “Contractor” shall mean sign fabricator or sign contractor and the term “sign” shall refer to any fabrication, object, or article of graphics or furniture described in these drawings and/or specifications. The acceptance of these drawings by contracted general contractors, vendors, bidders, sign fabricators, or sub-contractors and their agents constitutes agreement to all of the following conditions outlined in these specifications.
III. DESIGN INTENT AND SHOP DRAWINGS

A. Details on drawings indicate a design approach for sign structures but do not necessarily include all fabrication details required for the complete structural integrity of the signs. It shall be the responsibility of the Contractor to perform the complete structural design of the signs and to incorporate all the reasonable safety factors necessary to protect the Owner, the Contractor, and RSM Design against public liability.

Sign fabricator also to be responsible for the detailing and inclusion of all necessary water proofing, proper ventilation devices, and internal lighting specifications in their shop drawings.

B. Fabrication and installation design: Unless otherwise directed by Owner, design to withstand severe public abuse, souvenir theft or vandalism, but not less than equivalent of resisting simple hand implements and tools (screwdrivers, knives, coins, keys, and similar items), and adult physical force for approximately 10 minutes. All fabricated signs shall also be built to withstand normal maintenance operations used by employees/staff.

C. Electrical Design: Contractor shall specify all internal and external electrical and internal lighting components to be used to illuminate sign elements. Major, large scale elements may require the involvement of a licensed lighting designer at the sole cost of the Owner. Final coordination of fixture type, lamping, quantity and locations to take place between Contractor, general contractor, and Owner, as well as selected lighting designer for suitability in attaining desired appearance and/or effect.

a) Actual installation of lighting fixtures not contained within the sign elements(s) to be performed by a licensed electrical contractor or equivalent for the location of the project.

b) Sign connection to existing electrical power on site, if more than (6) feet from sign element(s), must be performed by a licensed electrical contractor. Sign fabricator to coordinate necessary electrical requirements and locations with the general contractor.

c) When requested by the Owner and RSM Design, lighting mock-up(s) shall be provided using the specified fixtures or lamps, either in-shop review, or on-site evaluation, to determine the effectiveness of the desired lighting scheme and to the approval of the Owner.

d) If required, sign fabricator to submit calculations signed by a registered professional lighting engineer in the area or country of the project to Owner for review.

e) Sign fabricator to submit certification of conformance to UL (or similar) in quantities, dimensions, message, or vandalism, but not less than equivalent of resisting simple hand implements and tools (screwdrivers, knives, coins, keys, and similar items), and adult physical force for approximately 10 minutes. All fabricated signs shall also be built to withstand normal maintenance operations used by employees/staff.

D. Resulting working drawings, shop drawings, and contract documents including permit documents are the sole responsibility of the Contractor in every respect. Contractor is responsible for obtaining all permits in the area, local municipality, or country of the project's location.

E. RSM Design will review the submitted shop drawings only for conformance with general design intent, and will in no way be responsible or liable for any results of construction from approved working drawings, material selection, shop drawings, contract documents or any other agreements other than agreement with the Owner authorizing these documents. Sign fabricator to submit shop drawings for review and approval obtained by RSM Design and Owner prior to any fabrication begins. Should fabrication that has begun and might need to be changed prior to obtaining approval of shop drawings, sign fabricator to assure all costs associated with the changes.

F. Sign fabricator to make corrections to and resubmit any shop drawings not approved.

G. Sign fabricator to submit drawings for review and approval obtained by RSM Design and Owner prior to any fabrication begins. Should fabrication that has begun and might need to be changed prior to obtaining approval of shop drawings, sign fabricator to assure all costs associated with the changes.

H. UL (or similar) Compliance.

Complete Underwriters (for the United States) or approved recognized testing agency (for other countries), compliance, as required, is the responsibility of the Contractor. Contractor shall provide lighting fixtures and electrical components that meet all UL (or similar) testing lab requirements for safety, operation, construction and are UL-labeled and listed.

I. Lamp Emission.

All lighting fixtures/sources shall emit a color balanced, consistent and uniform light with no browning, flickering, halogen, or other uneven effect.

K. Electrical Hardware.

All transformers and electrical hardware shall be concealed, non-audible and non-visibility to pedestrian and vehicular traffic. Provide disconnect switch as required by local or international governing agencies. Confirm with Owner and general contractor the necessity or desirability of light sensor switches, day-night circuit connections, local restrictions on night time area lighting or other conditions that could affect the use and operation of any sign illumination.
there shall be no visible labels, manufacturer's or otherwise, code permitting, on the completed signs. If labels are required, a sample label and intended location along with an explanation of the requirements must be submitted for review by RSM Design and the Owner, prior to application and/or installation. No visible sign fabricator company labels or stickers are permitted.

M. Stock.
All material, hardware, electrical components, finishes, etc. used to fabricate sign components shall be “NEW” (not previously used or operated in any other application) and from the most recent original manufacturer's production run/supply and appropriately matched to the service conditions required of the site.

N. Testing.
Contractor is required to provide Owner with a copy of all testing inspection reports as may be required by local or international codes. An independent testing lab may be hired by the Owner to do inspection and material testing. Contractor is not to proceed with fabrication until all unsatisfactory conditions have been corrected by the Contractor in a manner acceptable to the Owner.

V. SUBMITTAL
A. Shop Drawings.
The Contractor shall submit a digital PDF file of detailed shop drawings; as well as two (2) sets of detailed shop drawings for each sign type, to the following: (1) set of 11” x 17” prints to general contractor and (1) set of 11” x 17” prints to RSM Design for review prior to the start of any fabrication. These drawings are to show and indicate all materials, finishes, construction details, lighting specifications and installation details of artwork and signage structure. This includes types and locations of all mechanical fasteners, indicated welds, attachments, joint details, internal frames, lighting details and specifications, reinforcements, support backing, ventilation (natural or mechanical), water proofing, engineering details and calculations, electrical locations, foundation details, access panels, material thicknesses, color samples (on actual materials), and connection to support structure or mounting surface, whether shown or discussed in RSM Design's drawings or not. Shop drawings and data shall be reviewed by RSM Design with such promptness as to cause no delay in the work. The Contractor shall make all corrections required by RSM Design and resubmit for final review. Shop drawings for all signs must be approved by RSM Design and the General Contractor or Owner before the start of fabrication.

B. Conflicts/Contradictions w/ Drawings or Conditions.
The contractor shall recognize and bring to RSM any conflicts or contradictions either in regards to the drawings or as the drawings relate to other disciplines or contractors. All conflicts should be described in writing and the Contractor is to provide alternative solutions to resolve the conflicts. All resolved conflicts, any changes approved by RSM Design and Owner prior to sign fabrication.

C. Product Data.
The Contractor shall submit manufacturer's technical data and installation instructions for each type of sign and/or fixture required as will be provide in the completed, installed sign unit. Identification of all materials used, by manufacturer's descriptive literature, control number, name, code number, batch and formula when available shall be provided by the Contractor. All standard pre-manufactured items and/or specifications are the responsibility of the Contractor. Any materials indicated or specified in RSM Design’s drawings must be approved of by the Contractor for availability, warranty, appropriateness, compatibility with other materials, etc. If Contractor has any concerns about any materials about or specified by RSM Design in their design intent drawings, Contractor to inform RSM Design in writing prior to fabrication or take on full responsibility for use of specified material.

D. Specific Samples and Mock-ups
The Contractor shall submit two (2) samples and/or prototypes as specified within the drawings, minimum size 8.5” x 11” or as requested by RSM Design, of color and finish on the specified materials and/or accessories required for signs. Samples must be submitted to RSM Design in a time frame allowable for review of color, texture and aesthetic compatibility to any existing adjacent materials prior to fabrication. It is strongly encouraged that all color and material samples be submitted to RSM Design when shop drawings are submitted for review. Compliance with all other requirements is the exclusive responsibility of the Contractor. When specified, finish full-size samples of sign materials. Contractor to resubmit all samples and mock-ups as requested until all RSM Design, general contractor, and Owner specifications are met and approved. All project mock-ups need to be approved prior to fabrication of all final signs.

E. Structure.
Installation, engineered internal structure, engineered mounting assemblies and engineered foundations are by Contractor and are to adhere to design intent of RSM Design, if specified. Contractor to coordinate and provide architect of record and general contractor with drawings indicating placement and structural requirements for architectural backing. Contractor shall submit two (2) sets of prints and one digital set of comprehensive engineering drawings to RSM Design incorporating an adequate foundation and/or mounting structure for all sign components to meet all load and wind requirements and given site conditions. The Contractor shall, at his or her expense, submit to general contractor for distribution and review, calculations, sealed by certified engineers registered in the state or country of final installation, for all structural members including foundations.

F. Custom Fabricated Items.
The Contractor is to submit shop drawings of all custom fabricated items and specifications on all standard pre-manufactured items.

G. Electrical Requirements.
The Contractor shall provide, within 30 days of the award of contract, the specific electrical requirements to the Owner and/or general contractor.

H. Light Service.
The Contractor shall provide the general contractor or Owner with complete lighting or LED replacement information, brand, type, wattage, color, etc. for all lighted components. This information shall be in a digital format and shall indicate at least one local area (site) supplier.

J. Special Conditions.
The Contractor shall provide RSM Design and the Owner with specifications and recommendations to provide a magnetic force field around all signs that will protect the signs from all damage. Please email RSM Design upon receipt of an acknowledgment of this “Special Condition” so that RSM Design can remove it from the final bid / award package. Thank you.

K. Maintenance.
The Contractor shall provide the Owner with complete finish/component care instructions as specified by the manufacturer for on-going sign cleaning and maintenance. Three (3) sets are to be submitted. Contractor to provide Owner with one (1) gallon or one (1) liter (unopened and clearly marked) of each paint color/finish used on the project.

L. Copy / Text / Messaging Layouts.
The Contractor shall provide the Owner full size black and white copy layouts required for all signs and all copy prior to fabrication. Layouts must be submitted to the Owner and/or RSM Design in a time frame allowable for review, multiple adjustments and approval without delay to the project. Final copy of all signs, including size and fonts used to be reviewed and approved by Owner prior to final fabrication. RSM Design is not responsible for correct adherence to code, copy information or location of signs. City, County, State, or Country sign requirements supersede information shown in the RSM Design sign designs.

VI. FINISHES
A. Colors and Surface Textures.
All colors shall match exactly the color and finish specifications provided by RSM Design. Exercise care to assure that finished surfaces are unblemished in the completed work. For exposed signage, materials with applied colors or other characteristics related to appearance, Contractor shall provide color matches indicated, or if not indicated, as selected and reviewed by RSM Design.

B. Surface Preparation.
All surfaces shall be thoroughly cleaned and free from dust, dirt, rust, scale, mill scale, oil, grease or residue from cleaning. All structural metals shall be cleaned by sandblasting. Except as indicated or directed otherwise, finish all surfaces smooth. All coatings shall be applied in strict accordance with the manufacturer’s recommendations. All paint products shall conform to local codes. All finished pieces shall present a uniform opaque color appearance unless specifically indicated otherwise by RSM Design.

GENERAL NOTES:
1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM Design of any changes or conflicts to project.
2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM Design of any changes or conflicts to project.
3. Contractor must submit manufacturer’s technical data and installation instructions on all standard pre-manufactured items.
4. Contractor must submit at least one (1) gallon or liter of each paint color/finish used on the project.
5. Contractor to provide Owner full size black and white copy layouts required for all signs.
6. Contractor to provide Owner with one (1) gallon or liter (unopened and clearly marked) of each paint color/finish used on the project.
7. Contractor to submit manufacturer’s technical data and installation instructions on all standard pre-manufactured items.
C. Painted Finish.

1. Surfaces
   Using Matthews paint products (or similar quality), finish with 1 coat 74-734 & 74-735 Metal Pretreat @ .25 mils DFT, 1 coat Matthews Acrylic Polyurethane 1 mil DFT (min.). Observe designer’s specification regarding specularity (matte to gloss). If Matthews paints are not available, Contractor to use similar and submit to RSM Design for approval prior to fabrication.

2. Aluminum
   Using Matthews paint products finish (or similar quality), with 1 coat 74-734 / 74-735 Metal Pretreat @ .25 mils DFT or 1 coat 74 793 Spray Bond @ .15 to .25 mils DFT and 1 coat Matthews Acrylic Polyurethane 1 ml DFT (min). Matthews paints are not available, Contractor to use similar and submit to RSM Design for approval prior to fabrication.

3. Bright Metals
   Match finish (polished, satin, brushed, etc.) detailed on drawing. if specified, coat with a non-yellowing polyurethane clear coat.

4. Plastic Surfaces
   All plastic to be paint finished according to paint manufacturer’s specifications.

D. Application.

All applications of color coatings are to be equal and of consistent cover with no “streaking”, “spotting”, “gradation” or other variations within and from each similar application.

E. Ultra-Violet/Fading Protection.

Contractor shall utilize materials, coatings and processes to minimize as much as possible any noticeable fading of pigmented coatings.

F. Neon Returns.

All exposed neon returns and double backs are to be behind that neon unless otherwise specified.

VII. MATERIALS

A. Acrylic / Color Translucent Sheet.

Where sheet material is indicated as “color,” provide color translucent sheet of density required to produce uniform brightness without halo-like effect. Material provided shall be appropriately matched to the intended permanent field conditions. Note: Where translucent material is called out as ‘cast’, ‘formed’ or ‘molded’ resin, acrylic or polycarbonate (i.e. ‘Lexan’, ‘Tufco’, etc), the Contractor shall research and specify the optimum material and fabrication method for the desired finish and/or effect.

Contractor shall provide samples of such materials as indicated on RSM drawings.

B. Acrylic/Transparent Sheet.

Where sheet material is indicated as “clear” provide colorless sheet in gloss finish, with light transmittance of 92% where tested in accordance with the requirements of ASTM D-1103 (or similar local or country standards).

C. Aluminum Sheet.

Provide aluminum sheet of alloy and temper recommended by the aluminum producer or finisher for the type of use and finish indicated and with no less than the strength and durability properties specified in ASTM B-109 for 5005-H115 (or similar local or country standards). 

D. Aluminum Extrusion.

Provide aluminum extrusion of alloy and temper recommended by the aluminum producer or finisher for the type of use and finish indicated and with no less than the strength and durability properties specified is ASTM B- 221 for 6063-T5 (or similar local or country standards).

E. Structural Steel.

Contractor to coordinate with Architect of Record all internal structural steel support as required, to meet the requirements of the permanent installation. Contractor to provide architect of record and general contractor with drawings indicating placement and structural requirements for architectural backing.

F. Fasteners.

Unless otherwise indicated, provide concealed fasteners fabricated from metals that are non-corrosive to either the signage materials or the mounting surface. Where screw-heads are necessarily visible, they shall be indicated on all shop drawings, be a flush mounted “ellen-head” attachment, and be “painted out” to match the adjacent surface.

G. Electrical/Lamps.

Provide new electrical components and respective lamps, so as to be easily repaired or replaced from local available stock (24 hr. max. turn-around).

H. Vinyl Machine-Cut Copy.

Vinyl machine-cut copy shall be of 3M Scotchcal brand film or other quality product with provable identical performance specifications and warranty conditions. Any vinyl other then 3M must be submitted to RSM Design for review and approval prior to fabrication.

J. Paint.

Paint shall be manufacturer’s highest grade for best ultraviolet light resistance, weatherability and overall longevity of finish and color. Paint shall have a written warranty against premature fading and be approved by RSM Design prior to construction. Prior to close-out, Contractor shall turn over to Owner (3) copies of complete paint schedule indicating colors used on each sign type.

J. Engineering and Wind Loads.

Signs should be detailed and engineered by selected sign Contractor to withstand severe wind loads in potential hurricane or wind storm conditions; engineering should comply with local sign and building code requirements and calculations and drawing should be submitted with shop drawings for review.

VIII. FABRICATION

Intent of Specifications: It is intended that all finished work be of highest quality to pass eye-level examination and scrutiny by RSM Design and the Owner. Contractor to be responsible for all signage engineering; as such Contractor is to assume responsibility for coordinating with the various team members (including general contractor, lead architect of record, landscape architect, and RSM Design) all final locations of sign types, as well as necessary footings and foundations and blocking as may be necessary within walls.

Contractor is responsible for coordinating with general contractor all electrical power requirements and connections to all applicable sign locations.

A. Copy Application.

All sign copy shall be crisp, sharp, clean, and free from “ticks,” discontinuous curves, line waver, and similar type of imperfections.

1. Sign copy to comply with the requirements indicated for size, proportion, style, spacing, content, position, material, finish and color of letters, numbers, symbols and other graphic devices.

2. All letter forms shall be aligned so as to maintain a baseline parallel to the sign format, with margins and layout as indicated on design drawings and approved shop drawings.

3. Silk-screening copy: Finish sheen of copy to match sheen of copy panel background (gloss, semi-gloss, or sheens between). Edges of letters shall be straight and corners sharp. Surfaces of letters shall be uniform in color, finish and free from pinholes and other imperfections.

4. Routed copy: Cutting and routing shall be done in such manner that edges and corners of finished letter forms shall be sharp and true. Letter forms with nicked, cut, ragged, rounded (positive or negative) corners, and similar disfigurements will not be acceptable. Letter forms shall be aligned so as to maintain a base parallel line to the sign format, with margins and layout as indicated on RSM Design’s design drawings and approved shop drawings. Vertical strokes shall be plumb. Mechanically fasten center of letters to acrylic plastic as required.

B. Illumination.

Illuminate units in the manner indicated using the manufacturer’s standard lighting components including fluorescent, incandescent, LED, or neon, fixtures, transformers, insulators and other components. Make provision for servicing and for concealed connection to the building system.

Coordinate the electrical components of signs with those of the power supply provided.
C. Signage / Cabinet.

1. Details shown on the drawing shall be followed for exterior appearance only. Structural design shall utilize unitized, self-supportive framing. Fabricate cabinet, exposed faces and graphic devices to size and style indicated and produce surfaces free from oil canning, warping, distortion or any irregularities or inconsistencies. Include internal bracing for stability and attachment of mounting accessories as required.

2. Contractor may change interior construction shown on these details to conform with their shop practices and industry standards. However, these changes must be submitted as part of the shop drawings and be reviewed by RSM Design prior to fabrication.

3. Construct all work to eliminate burns, cutting edges and sharp corners.

4. Qualifications: Welding must be performed by operators who are currently qualified by tests as prescribed in AWS D1.1, D1.2, or D1.3 (or similar), as applicable, and/or certified by a recognized building or code authority. Submit qualifying data and certification to Developer for approval. Welding must conform to the acceptable requirement of AWS D1.1, D1.2, and D1.3 and MPS 11-0099 (or similar in country of project).

5. Parts indicated to be turned must be accurately machined worked from solid stock to dimensions indicated or on approved shop drawings. Finished surfaces to be polished smooth unless otherwise indicated or directed by Developer, free of any visible pits, voids, or similar defects.

6. Make all signs tight fitting, between parts and sections, and with adjacent surfaces. Unless indicated otherwise, non-welded joints between various portions of signs must be weatherproof for exterior signs and have tight, hairline-type appearance, without gaps (varying or otherwise). Provide sufficient fastenings to preclude looseness, racking, or similar movement.

7. Conform with manufacturer’s recommended fabricating procedures regarding fastening, restraining, expansion and contraction of dissimilar materials.

8. Isolate dissimilar materials. Exercise particular care to isolate non-ferrous metals from ferrous metals, including fasteners.

9. Metal thickness: Provide metal thicknesses most appropriate for the fabrication conditions. These must all be called out in the shop drawings. RSM Design to be advised of any changes to shop drawings. RSM Design to be advised of any changes to the drawings and be reviewed by RSM Design prior to fabrication.

10. All non-painted exposed metal to be stainless steel unless otherwise specified.

11. Fasteners on sign-face surface shall not be exposed, except where specifically noted.

12. Sign-face surfaces shall not be penetrated during fabrication or installation of signs, except where specifically noted.

13. Sign-face surface shall not be deformed, distorted, or discolored by attachment of concealed fasteners.

14. All fasteners shall be resistant to oxidation or other corrosive action completely through their cross sections.

15. Work shall be secured with fasteners of the same metal, color and finish as the components they secure where they are exposed to view.

E. Neon / Lamps.

All exposed neon if used shall be installed in such a manner as to minimize double backs, exposed wires, etc. All exposed neon shall appear as a continuous line (4’0” min. seamless runs) of light with no irregularities from section to section. Contractor shall coordinate with RSM Design to select exact color of neon and/or lamps prior to fabrication. Contractor is responsible for referencing and following local code constraints.

F. Mock-Ups

1. Mock-Ups of specific sign(s) may be requested by RSM Design as part of the final Design Intent Documents. The cost of Mock-Ups will be a part of fabricator’s bid.

2. Mock-Ups will be specified in drawings as two or three dimensional, as well as being operational or not.

3. Mock-Ups will be specified in drawings for in-shop or on-site review, and coordinated with Owner and all interested parties.

4. Mock-Ups will be reviewed and signed off by Owner, RSM Design, and interested parties prior to fabrication and installation.

5. Contractor to resubmit all samples and mock-ups as requested until all RSM Design, general contractor, and Owner specifications are met and approved.

G. Aluminum Sheet.

Not less than 0.125” (or equivalent metric measurement) thick unless noted otherwise. Contractor to fabricate the HELIARC or MIG welded, filled and ground smooth, unless the seam occurs along a color break. Then a clean butt joint with concealed backing channel and plug weld is acceptable upon receipt of RSM Design approved sample to match surrounding material finish. All bends, curves and folds to be geometrically correct and produced by a consistent mechanical method unless approved otherwise by RSM Design.

H. Joining and Brake Forming.

All sheet metal shall have brake formed edges with radii not greater than sheet thickness unless otherwise specified. Adjacent stock shall have edges with similar radii.

J. Welding.

All exposed welds are to be ground smooth, unless the seam occurs along a color break. Then a clean ground smooth, unless the seam occurs along a color break. Then a clean seam ground smooth, unless the seam occurs along a color break. Then a clean seam ground smooth, unless the seam occurs along a color break. Then a clean seam

K. Specifications:

IX. LARGE FORMAT COMPUTER OUTPUT

High-resolution large format computer output to comply with the following:

1. Minimum resolution 200 dpi.

2. Process: 3M SCOTCHPRINT (or approved equal).

3. Substrate: Opaque or Translucent Scotchcal film (or approved equal).


5. Input: Electronic art as specified to be provided by RSM Design.

6. Warranty: 5 year minimum

X. INSTALLATION

A. Contractor shall be responsible for determining the erection and dismantling of all barricade or protective coverings necessary to safeguard the public and property during the performance and duration of his or her work.

B. Contractor shall attach signs to substrates in accordance with the structural engineer’s and the manufacturer’s instructions unless otherwise shown. Install level, plumb and at proper height. Repair or replace damaged units as directed by and to the approval of Owner or RSM Design.

C. Installation of all signage items shall be by the Contractor. Installation includes provision of any required footing, to be reviewed by RSM Design, all anchor bolts, fastenings, attachment metals, and other miscellaneous metal items embedded in concrete or building wall material as required, and security of sign units in place with no visible fasteners.
D. The Contractor shall provide required electrical equipment and connection to shell building. The point of connection is to be provided by the general contractor. All electrical connections shall be made by a licensed electrician employed by the Contractor for this purpose. All connections shall be made in accordance with the requirements of the National Electrical Code, NEC (or similar code in country of project) in addition to all applicable local codes. Electrical contractor shall provide and install all wiring, conduit, junction boxes and electrical devices necessary to provide electrical power to rough-in connections unless otherwise noted. Contractor shall provide concealed neon transformers and all electrical connections beyond rough-in connections by electrical contractor, according to NEC approved methods.

E. Contractor shall be responsible for matching sign service available on site to the requirements of the sign, including transformers.

F. All necessary signage components as well as the entire signage assembly are to be UL listed, or by approved nationally recognized testing lab in country of project.

G. Contractor is responsible for compliance with all applicable environmental regulations.

H. Contractor is responsible for compliance with all OSHA regulations (or similar regulations in country of project).

J. Contractor must coordinate installation with general contractor so that overall project schedule is not impacted.

K. Contractor is responsible for determining site wind load requirements and insuring that all signs comply.

XI. CLEANING / PROTECTION AND WARRANTIES

A. All items to be installed by the Contractor shall be left in a clean condition. Upon completion of the installation of each sign, clean all soiled sign surfaces and “touch up” as directed by Owner or RSM Design in accordance with the manufacturer’s instructions. All debris and packing material shall be removed and disposed of in a legal manner. All protective masking of the plastic surfaces shall be removed by the Contractor upon completion of installation. All excavation and site work shall be returned to its original grade configuration after contract items are installed.

B. Finish Surfaces.

Sign units shall be warranted in writing by the Contractor for a period of no less than one year from the date of Owner acceptance. All finishes are to be warranted for 3 years from the date of Owner acceptance. There shall be:

1. No delamination of any parts of the sign or of lettering from the sign face.
2. No cupping, warping or dishing in excess of the requirements stipulated in the specifications.
3. No bubbling, crazing, chalking, rusting or other disintegration of the sign face, messages or edge finish of the panels.
4. No corrosion developing beneath the paint surface of the support systems, except as the result of obvious vandalism.
5. No corrosion of the fasteners.
6. No movement of signs from their foundations. The signs must remain true and plumb on their foundations, except when the sign has sustained obvious post-installation external damage.
7. No fading of the colors when matched against a sample of the original color and material.
8. No variation of any other performance specified by RSM Design on the drawings or in the specifications.

C. Structure/Components

1. Contractor shall provide Owner with three (3) copies of the written warranty prior to installation, guaranteeing to correct, to Owner’s satisfaction, at Contractor’s sole expense, any defects in fabrication, faulty materials, workmanship, design, and installation of sign work for a period of one year after completed installation of sign work.
2. Fading, cracking, warping, peeling, delaminating, rusting, corroding, and structural failure, including distortion by whatever cause, shall be construed as failure because of faulty materials and workmanship.
3. Failures during warranty period shall be repaired or replaced to satisfaction of Owner.

D. External Lamps.

All lamps shall be warranted against failure for 90 days, all LED and neon three (3) years and all ballast one (1) year. Lamps and LEDS are to be replaced within 48 hours of notice by Owner, in the event of failure within specified time. These items are to be replaced by Contractor at Contractor’s sole expense.

E. Contractor shall have total and complete responsibility for the security of all equipment, materials, and sign components until reviewed and accepted by the Owner.

XII. PERMITS

A. Securing and paying for all permits required by local governmental agencies is the responsibility of the Contractor. Inspections and tests necessary for the construction and placement of all work required by the applicable governing agencies is by the Contractor.

B. Contractor shall secure and pay for all insurance required by law including but not limited to Liability, Worker’s Compensation, Comprehensive Construction Liability, Personal Injury, Comprehensive Auto and Property on-and off-sites. Contractor shall check insurance requirements for terminology and coordinate insurance requirements with project general specifications. Insurance requirements should be checked for terminology and coordinated with general specifications.

C. Contractor shall not reveal or disseminate any information to any personal(s), private or public, other than RSM Design, Owner, or contractor’s personnel as necessary to execute the contract without first contacting the Owner for permission.

XIII. CODE REQUIREMENTS

All signs must comply with ADA guidelines (in the United States) and/or County/City/Fire Marshall Code Requirements:

A. Contractor to provide copy proofed Grade Two Braille to ADA specifications for permanent room signs for projects within the United States. Type and symbols to be raised a minimum of 1/32”

B. Signs must be mounted 60” [or metric equivalent] from finish floor to center of sign on latch side of the door where applicable.

C. Characters and background on ADA signage shall be eggshell, matte or other non-glare finish for projects within the United States.

D. Contractor to provide copy of approved city or county fire marshal drawing sets of all applicable signages.

E. Contractor responsible for all signs complying with all applicable codes for specified region.

XIV. BID NOTES

Original fabrication quotes shall be sent directly to the Owner with copies of all pricing information to be sent simultaneously to RSM Design and general contractor. Pricing shall be submitted in accordance with the bid documents. Bidding contractors are required to clearly indicate in writing within their bid the method of construction anticipated, the materials to be used, and any exclusions or exceptions to the bid documents.

XV. COORDINATION

All foundations, electrical plans, specialty lighting, LED, digital sign components to be coordinated by Contractor. All wiring, fixtures, anchoring, foundations to be by Contractor.

XVI. ACCEPTANCE OF SPECIFICATIONS

Contractor has read and understands the above specifications and agrees to the terms outlined above. I hereby acknowledge that I/we have read, understand, and accept responsibility for compliance with the provisions set forth within these specifications and will comply with all specifications.

Fabricator Signature: ________________________________

Date: ________________________________
MATERIALS

- **M1** Glass
- **M2** Tile panels
- **M3** Sign White Acrylic #7328
- **M4** Not used
- **M5** Precast Concrete. Coordinate color with RSM Architect
- **M6** Sculpted Sign Foam Painted to match M2 Pattern scaled 400% of M2 for mockup.

VINYL

- **M7** Aluminum
- **M8** Frosted Acrylic

PAINTS

- **P1** MP Black
- **P2** MP Dark Grey
- **P3** MP White
- **P4** MP Red
- **P5** MP Off-Black
- **P6** MP Metallic Black Dark
- **P7** MP Metallic Black Light
- **P8** Light Grey

The Fabricator shall submit two samples and/or prototypes of each material, paint and vinyl call out listed on this sheet, minimum size 8” x 8” or as requested by RSM of each. Samples must be submitted to RSM in a time frame allowable for review of material, color and aesthetic compatibility to any existing adjacent materials. RSM will review the samples and send one set back to the fabricator and keep one set as control samples throughout the fabrication process. If a color or material is not approved, the Fabricator must re-submit a new sample until it is approved by the team.

**The Tile Gallery**

Tile: V23 Wave Tile
Size: 60x60 squares
Color: Bianco Trani

Pattern to run horizontal unless otherwise noted.

All paints to have Satin Finish unless otherwise specified. All painted surfaces are to be on aluminum.
**GENERAL NOTES:**
1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.
2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.

**PROJECT ARROWS**
- Left
- Right
- Straight
- Keep Right
- Keep Left

**PROJECT SYMBOLS**
- Men’s Restroom
- Women’s Restroom
- Restrooms
- Family Restrooms
- Handicap

**LOGO / FONT / SYMBOLS / ARROW SCHEDULE**

**LOGO**
- Primary Logo Orientation
- Logo Type Only
- Logo Mark Only

**FONTS**
- Gotham - Book
- Gotham - Medium

**SYMBOLS**
- Men’s Restroom
- Women’s Restroom
- Restrooms
- Family Restrooms
- Handicap

**ARROWS**
- Left
- Right
- Straight
- Keep Right
- Keep Left

**PATTERN STUDIES**
- Option 1
- Option 2

**LOGOS**
- Logos shown are the final project logos for use; please note, see all final drawings for color and materials specification.

**PROJECT**
- 160 Cabrillo
- San Clemente
- CA 92672
- 949.492.9479 T
- 949.492.2230 F
- rsmdesign.com
**GENERAL NOTES:**
1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.
2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.

**MOCK-UP LEGEND**
1. Full 3D Working Mock-Up; On site review
2. Partial 3D Working Mock-Up; On site review
3. Full Size Color 2D Movable Mock-Up; On site review
4. Full Size Black & White prints of copy, provided for review
5. No Mock-Up Required

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign Designation</th>
<th>Proposed Sign Type</th>
<th>Estimated Quantities</th>
<th>Electrical Required</th>
<th>Lighting</th>
<th>Mock-Up</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e1</td>
<td>Project Pylon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes Internal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e2</td>
<td>Project Monument</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes Internal</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e2a</td>
<td>Project Monument w/ Tenant Names</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes Internal/External</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e3</td>
<td>Vehicular Directional</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes Internal</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e4</td>
<td>Entry Tower</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes Internal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e5</td>
<td>Street Signs</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>No None</td>
<td>Quantities and Locations per Civiv's signing and striping plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e6</td>
<td>Regulatory Signage</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>No None</td>
<td>Quantities and Locations per Civiv's signing and striping plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e7</td>
<td>Suspicious Activity Sign</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>No None</td>
<td>4 Quantities and Locations to be provided by others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s1</td>
<td>Entry Identity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes Internal</td>
<td>1, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s2</td>
<td>Door Graphics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s3</td>
<td>Overhead Directional</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes Internal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s4</td>
<td>Freestanding Directional</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes Internal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s5</td>
<td>Project Directory</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes Internal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s6</td>
<td>Integrated Directory</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes Internal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s7</td>
<td>Amenity Identity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s8</td>
<td>ADA Door Plaque</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s9</td>
<td>Elevator Glass Graphics</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>No None</td>
<td>3 On 3 sides of elevator.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s10</td>
<td>Specialty Graphics</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Yes External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s11</td>
<td>Emergency Storm Shelter</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>No None</td>
<td>Quantities and Locations to be provided by others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s12</td>
<td>Multi Tenant Blade</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No Ambient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* PLEASE NOTE: ALL QUANTITIES NEED TO BE VERIFIED WITH SITE PLAN BY FABRICATOR PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION

**ELECTRICAL NOTES:**
At this point in the design process, the specific electrical requirements for each sign cannot be determined. However, as a general working and planning electrical requirement, we recommend no lower than a 120 Volt/20 amp circuit and the signs may have no less than a 7.0 amp total load. Please note that all exact electrical requirements for each sign will need to be provided by the selected sign fabricator.
GENERAL NOTES:
1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.
2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.
GENERAL NOTES:
1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.
2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.

Note: All locations to be coordinated with landscape architect and approved by client representative.
GENERAL NOTES:

1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.

2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.

Note: All locations to be coordinated with landscape architect and approved by client representative.

SIGN PROGRAMMING - EXTERIOR ENLARGED
GENERAL NOTES:
1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.
2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.
GENERAL NOTES:
1. Fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM if any changes or conflicts to package.
2. Fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM if any changes or conflicts.

Notes:
- Existing sign cladding to be removed, sign to be re-clad as shown.
- Fabricator to coordinate with client/GC to determine design & constraints of existing foundation and notify RSM if proposed design exceeds limitations.

Painted aluminum panels over existing structure support.

Painted aluminum channel letters with sign white acrylic faces, returns painted metallic gray.

Painted aluminum letter flush with face of frame. Letter and frame inside to return 6".

Internally illuminate Lexan panels with applied digitally printed vinyl pattern. Seams to be coordinated with architect. Pattern to match.

Painted aluminum base as required to clad bottom of support structure as needed.

Existing Ridgedale sign.

Existing concrete base.

Mockup Area.

Painted aluminum panels over existing structure support.

Notes:
- Fabricator to coordinate with client/GC to determine design & constraints of existing foundation and notify RSM if proposed design exceeds limitations.
- Existing sign cladding to be removed, sign to be re-clad as shown.

Painted aluminum letter flush with face of frame. Letter and frame inside to return 6".

Internally illuminate Lexan panels with applied digitally printed vinyl pattern. Seams to be coordinated with architect. Pattern to match.

Painted aluminum channel letters with sign white acrylic faces, returns painted metallic gray.

Painted aluminum base as required to clad bottom of support structure as needed.

Existing Ridgedale sign.

Existing concrete base.
1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.

2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.

Flat return of letter to slant up 8% to back panel for runoff. Typical
1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.

2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.
GENERAL NOTES:
1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.
2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.
NOTES:

1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.

2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.

3. 3.5" deep, reverse channel halo-lit letters mounted 1 1/2" off back wall

4. Light cove at base of wall to uplight wall.

5. Base and planter finish material to be coordinated with RSM and architect.

Notes:

- At severe grade locations second tier planter box may be added. To be coordinated with RSM & architect.

- Planter box may switch sides of sign based on individual location conditions. To be coordinated with RSM & architect.

- At severe grade locations second tier planter box may be added, To be coordinated with RSM & architect.

- Planter box may switch sides of sign based on individual location conditions. To be coordinated with RSM & architect.

- Feature material over aluminum cabinet

- Feature material all sides

- Base and planter finish material to be coordinated with RSM and architect.

- Foundation to be coordinated with GC.
GENERAL NOTES:
1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.
2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.

DRAWING FOR DESIGN INTENT ONLY.
NOT INTENDED FOR CONSTRUCTION.

©2014 Redmond Schwartz Mark Design Inc.
All drawings and written material appearing herein constitute original and unpublished work of Redmond Schwartz Mark Design Inc. and may not be used or disclosed without prior written consent of Redmond Schwartz Mark Design Inc.
GENERAL NOTES:
1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.
2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.
GENERAL NOTES:
1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.
2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.

Base and planter finish material to be coordinated with RSM and architect.

Feature material over aluminum cabinet.

Foundation to be coordinated with GC.

3.5" deep, reverse channel halo-lit letters mounted 1 1/2" off back wall.

Light cove at base of wall to uplight wall.

1" thick fabricated, painted aluminum letters. Printed 1/4" of wall.

Feature material all sides.
GENERAL NOTES:
1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.
2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.

Feature material to be mitered at all corners.

Mounts for “RIDGEDALE” letters

Halo-illuminated dimensional letters mounted to cabinet frame

Light cove with LED illumination to wash up onto feature material. To be spec’d as water tight fixture.

Precast Cap. Top of wall to slope min. 2% away from wall to facilitate runoff.

Base and planter finish material to be coordinated with RSM and architect. Granye by Triarch, custom color TBD. Typical.

Painted fabricated aluminum letters.

Weep holes as required on all sign components.

Aluminum sign structure

Precast Cap.

Feature material to be mitered at all corners.

Note: Sign fabricator to engineer below grade drainage at planters.

Rigid insulation, place filter fabric between insulation and soil, typical.

Precast Cap.

Concrete footing

Concrete Wall

1" dia PVC pipe weep

Drainage aggregate backfill

Concrete footing

Scale: 1" = 1'-0"
GENERAL NOTES:
1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.
2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.
GENERAL NOTES:
1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.
2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.

Notes:
- Signs on slope to maintain 1' min. exposed base on high side. Low side of base to extend below grade.
- Messages shown are for reference only, to be determined and approved by client representative prior to fabrication.
- Signs are one sided at most locations. Sign box wraps back equal distance on two sided signs.
- Message box to sit on street side of sign or right side if parallel to street.

Feature material on all sides of aluminum cabinet.

Replaceable tenant panels with internally illuminated push-through sign-white acrylic graphics, flush to sign face. Panels to wrap sign.

Precast base, material & finish to be coordinated with RSM & architect.

Logo on panel wrapped side.

Sign to sit flush to finished surface and follow grade. To be field verified.

Foundation to be coordinated with GC.

Logo background recessed 1/4" into base.

White acrylic allows LEDs in perimeter of sign box to glow onto feature material cladding.

Signs oriented perpendicular to street, to have panel side to street.

Internally illuminated aluminum box to wrap structure. Led lighting inside perimeter of box to glow through acrylic back and illuminates feature material.

Notes:
- Signs on slope to maintain 1' min. exposed base on high side. Low side of base to extend below grade.
- Messages shown are for reference only, to be determined and approved by client representative prior to fabrication.
- Signs are one sided at most locations. Sign box wraps back equal distance on two sided signs.
- Message box to sit on street side of sign or right side if parallel to street.

Signs oriented perpendicular to street, to have panel side to street.

Replacing tenant panels with internally illuminated push-through sign-white acrylic graphics, flush to sign face. Panels to wrap sign.

Precast base, material & finish to be coordinated with RSM & architect.

Logo on panel wrapped side.

Sign to sit flush to finished surface and follow grade. To be field verified.

Foundation to be coordinated with GC.
GENERAL NOTES:
1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.
2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.

DRAWING FOR DESIGN INTENT ONLY.
NOT INTENDED FOR CONSTRUCTION.

©2014 Redmond Schwartz Mark Design Inc. All drawings and written material appearing herein constitute original and unpublished work of Redmond Schwartz Mark Design Inc. and may not be used or disclosed without prior written consent of Redmond Schwartz Mark Design Inc.
DRAWING FOR DESIGN INTENT ONLY.
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GENERAL NOTES:
1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.
2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.
3. Vehicular Directional Messaging

All messages to be approved by client representative prior to fabrication.

See location plan for sign orientation.
GENERAL NOTES:
1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.
2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.

All messages to be approved by client representative prior to fabrication.

See location plan for sign orientation.

12.08.14
PROGRESS
INTERIOR & EXTERIOR
DESIGN INTENT
Typical logo/message locations for towers. Tower/message orientation for each tower to be noted on final message and location plans. To be approved by client representative.

Reverse-channel halo-lit letters painted P1
Pinned off back wall.

See details following page.
GENERAL NOTES:
1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.
2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.
GENERAL NOTES:
1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.
2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.

Note:
- Locations and messages for signs per Civil (Signing and Striping Plan).
- Street names to be provided by client representative.
- Signs to comply with all applicable codes and regulations.
Note:
- Locations and messages for signs per Civil (Signing and Striping Plan).
- Street names to be provided by client representative.
- Signs to comply with all applicable codes and regulations.
Notes:
- Messages shown are for reference only
- Final message to be provided and approved by client representative prior to fabrication.

1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.
2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.

A REMINDER FROM YOUR LOCAL POLICE DEPARTMENT

HIDE YOUR THINGS
LOCK YOUR CAR
TAKE YOUR KEYS

Acrylic panel, face painted
1/8" deep reveal painted
All edges and corners eased
1/8" thick applied alum. letters painted

1. Signage Activity Sign - Front View
2. Signage Activity Sign - Side View

Acrylic panel, face painted
1/8" deep reveal painted
All edges and corners eased
1/8" thick applied alum. letters painted

1. Signage Activity Sign - Front View
2. Signage Activity Sign - Side View
ALL DRAWINGS AND WRITTEN MATERIAL APPEARING HEREIN CONSTITUTE ORIGINAL AND UNPUBLISHED WORK OF REDMOND SCHWARTZ MARK DESIGN INC. AND MAY NOT BE USED OR DISCLOSED WITHOUT PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT OF REDMOND SCHWARTZ MARK DESIGN INC. ©2014 REDMOND SCHWARTZ MARK DESIGN INC.

GENERAL NOTES:
1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.
2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.

DRAWING FOR DESIGN INTENT ONLY. NOT INTENDED FOR CONSTRUCTION.

©2014 REDMOND SCHWARTZ MARK DESIGN INC.

1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.
2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.

©2014 REDMOND SCHWARTZ MARK DESIGN INC.

IF YOU SEE SOMETHING, SAY SOMETHING!
REPORT SUSPICIOUS ACTIVITY TO THE POLICE

CALL 287-EYES (287-3937)

1/8” thk. applied aluminized letters painted
Recessed area painted

Background

1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.
2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.

©2014 REDMOND SCHWARTZ MARK DESIGN INC.

1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.
2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.

©2014 REDMOND SCHWARTZ MARK DESIGN INC.
GENERAL NOTES:
1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.
2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.
No logo
Side D

No logo
Side C

Logo side B

Logo side A

East Tower - Top View
Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"

15'-4"

1 East Tower - Side View A
Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"

2 East Tower - Side View B
Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"

3 East Tower - Side View C
Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"

4 East Tower - Side View D
Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"
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GENERAL NOTES:
1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.
2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.
3. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.

DRAWING FOR DESIGN INTENT ONLY.
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RSMDesign.com

160 Edelston
San Clemente
CA 92672
949.482.9479 T
949.492.2230 F
rsmdesign.com

PROGRESS
EXTERIOR
DESIGN
INTENT

01.12.15

A43

Ridgedale Sign Plan
12401 Wayzata Blvd.
1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.

2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.
GENERAL NOTES:
1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.
2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.
GENERAL NOTES:
1. Sign fabricator to verify all locations and conditions prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or conflicts to package.
2. Sign fabricator to confirm all final messaging with client prior to fabrication and notify RSM of any changes or comments.
A. GENERAL:

1. It is the intent of Developer, Dayton's, Donaldsons, Penney's and Sears that signs at Ridgedale be developed in an imaginative and varied manner and that all signs conform with the intent of this Exhibit as well as comply with the criteria set forth below.

2. Although previous and current signing practices of Tenants and/or Parties will be considered, they will not govern signs to be installed at Ridgedale.

3. Each Tenant and/or Party shall be required to identify their respective premises by illuminated signs; such signs may be illuminated by the so called "back-lit" method with lamps contained wholly within the depth of the letter.

4. There shall be no free-standing or pylon signs other than those erected and maintained by Developer or as provided for in this Exhibit.

5. There shall be no moving or flashing signs.

6. There shall be no signs placed upon the roof or on the penthouse walls of any building or structure within the Entire Premises, except as permitted by Developer.

7. There shall be no signs painted on the exterior surfaces of any building or structure within the Entire Premises.

8. There shall be no temporary signs or sale signs or banners affixed to the exterior surfaces of any building or structure within the Entire Premises not in any parking area nor on any light standards.

9. There shall be no signs placed at right angles to any front, whether interior or exterior, of any building or structure within the Entire Premises.

10. There shall be no signs, whether temporary or permanent, hung or affixed around, on or behind glass doors or display windows, whether interior or exterior.

11. There shall be no exterior signs permitted for any Tenant and/or Party whose Gross Floor Area is less than 100,000 square feet.

12. There shall be no signs affixed to any storefront, whether interior or exterior, identifying leased departments contained within the premises of any Tenant or Occupant.

13. The following types of signs or sign components shall be PROHIBITED:
   a. Signs employing moving or flashing lights.
   b. Signs employing exposed raceways, ballast boxes or transformers.
   c. Signs employing painted non-illuminated letters.
   d. Signs employing painted non-illuminated letters.
c. Signs employing ionomer-vacuum formed type plastic letters.

f. Signs of box or cabinet type except at customer/package pickup stations and on gas islands, which shall be permitted.

g. Signs employing uncapped or uncapped plastic letters or letters with no returns and exposed fastenings.

14. The use of corporate crests or insignia will be permitted provided such corporate crests, shields or insignia shall not exceed the average height for sign letters.

15. Developer's written approval of drawings and specifications for all signs desired by any Tenant and/or Party within the Entire Premises is required. Tenant and/or Party shall submit three copies of its sign plans for Developer's approval prior to fabrication of sign. Such drawings shall show location of sign on storefront giving color, materials, attachment devices and construction details.

B. DEPARTMENT STORE SIGN CRITERIA:

1. The signs which, on both levels of the Dayton's, Donaldsons, Penney's and Sears buildings front on the Air-Conditioned Mall, shall be:

   a. Not more than four feet (4') in height.

   b. Mounted flush with the wall of the building to which affixed (unless "back-lit").

   c. Of a length which does not exceed 75% of the lineal footage of the mall storefront to which affixed.

   d. Of a design which is uniform with other signs of Tenant and/or Occupant similarly placed.

   e. Display only the name of the department store for Sears, Dayton and Penney, and for Allied the name "Donaldson's", as applicable.

2. The signs affixed to the exterior surfaces of Dayton's, Donaldsons, Penney's, and Sears Main Buildings shall be:

   a. Limited to one sign per exterior face.

   b. Mounted flush with the wall of the building to which affixed (unless "back-lit").

   c. Display only the name of the department store for Sears, Dayton and Penney, and for Allied the name "Donaldson's", as applicable, the first letter of which (or in the case of Penney, the letters "JCP") to be not more than eight feet (8') in height and the other letters to be not more than four feet (4') in height; the maximum height for all letters, in the case of a sign employing all upper case letters, shall be not more than eight feet (8').

   d. Of a length which does not exceed 25% of the lineal footage of the surface to which affixed.

   e. Of a design which is uniform with other signs of Tenant and/or Party similarly placed.
f. It is understood that catalog and parcel pick-up locations, in the normal course of events, have sign requirements to which the criteria listed in this Section 2 do not apply; signs identifying these areas are subject to developer's approval as provided for in this Exhibit and are to be 1) interior or "back-lit", 2) not placed at right angles to any front and 3) architecturally harmonious.

3. The signs affixed to the exterior surfaces of Dayton, Donaldsons, Penney and Sears' T.B.A. or Auto Center as the case may be shall be:

a. Limited to one sign per exterior surface.

b. Mounted flush with the wall of the building to which affixed (unless "back-lit").

c. Display only the name of the department store for Sears, Dayton and Penney and for Allied the name "Donaldson's" as applicable and two additional words describing the business conducted therein (such as "Auto Center").

d. Not more than five feet (5') in height.

e. Of a length which does not exceed 75% of the lineal footage of the surface to which affixed.

f. Of a design which is uniform with other signs of Tenant and/or Party similarly placed.

g. Such signs shall not project above the general roof-top line of the building to which affixed.

h. Gas price signs shall be limited to one per T.B.A. and shall be illuminated; the gas price sign may be of the pylon type located in close proximity to the gas pump area and shall be 1) interior lit, 2) a maximum of fifty (50) square feet per panel and 3) no higher than fifteen feet (15') overall.

i. The use of so called product identification signs is expressly prohibited.

4. The plans and specifications for any other signs desired by Dayton's, Donaldson's, Sears or Penney's shall be submitted to Developer and reviewed in accordance with Article 24 of this Operating Agreement and the provisions of this Exhibit "I".

C. INDIVIDUAL TENANT SIGN CRITERIA:

1. All Signs and identifying marks shall be within the limitations of the leased premises between the floor line and the store front header. All such signs shall be subject to the requirements and limitations as outlined herein:

a. Signs shall not project beyond the line of the leased premises bordering "Common Area" more than two inches (2'') if less than eight feet (8') above finished floor line or more than six inches (6'') if above eight feet (8').

b. The wording of signs shall be limited to the store name only.

c. Multiple or repetitive signage will not be permitted; one store sign per storefront will be permitted. Developer shall be the final judge in determination of the number of storefronts.
d. Sign letters or components shall not have exposed neon or other lamps. All light source shall be concealed by translucent material. Sign letters or components may be back-illuminated with lamps contained wholly within the depth of the letter. Maximum brightness in any event shall not exceed 100 foot-lamberts.

e. The average height of sign letters or components on stores shall not exceed eighteen inches (18”).

f. The extreme outer limits of sign letters or components shall fall within a rectangle each of the two short sides of which shall not fall closer than 24 inches to the side lease lines of the leased premises; the top side of which shall not fall closer than 12 inches to the soffit of the mall facade element. No part of the sign letters shall hang free of the background when such background is provided.
DEPARTMENT STORE SIGNAGE

Attached Exhibit "I" which relates to department stores at Ridgedale Center will remain in full force and effect except as amended from time to time (i.e. allowing a restaurant less than 100,000 square feet to erect an exterior sign like Magic Pan, Applebees).

RESTAURANT SIGNAGE

With respect to referenced amendments, the following applies:

1. Only restaurants will be considered to be allowed an exterior sign. At no time will a store other than a restaurant use be granted approval to erect an exterior sign.

2. The maximum height of said exterior restaurant sign will be 30 inches.

3. The maximum length of signs will be judged on aesthetic qualities and will not be subject to restrictions as to height vs. width of individual letters.

4. The only areas where exterior signs will be considered is at each of the four entryways to the center. There will be a maximum of two (2) restaurant uses at each entryway. If a restaurant has a separate restaurant entryway, they will be allowed to construct a second sign appropriate to the smaller entryway.

5. If a restaurant is to have an exterior awning with logo or lettering, the logo or lettering shall not exceed 50% of the coverage of said awning.

RIDGEDALE CENTER SIGNAGE

1. Ridgedale Center reserves the right to construct entryway signage to identify "Ridgedale Center". This could possibly occur during renovation of entrances or at any time that the owners of Ridgedale Center may elect to construct such signs.

2. This type of signage would be subject to the same restrictions as in attached Exhibit "I".

NOTE: These sign criteria guidelines are intended to allow the City of Minnetonka a reference point for future exterior sign requests. Ridgedale Center reserves the right to discuss and request variations from these proposed guidelines on a case by case basis.
New Mall Design

- Landlord Provided Storefront (up to 18')
- Wood Patterned Composite Panel
- Glass Curtain Wall
- Art Wall
- Granite
- Illuminated Glass (signage shown is generic and serves as a placeholder until the signage package is complete)
- Mesabi Black Granite
- Landlord Provided Storefront (up to 18')
- Basalt Tile

VIEW OF BUILDING EXPANSION-SOUTH
New Mall Design

VIEW OF BUILDING EXPANSION - NORTH
New Mall Design

VIEW OF RENOVATED ENTRY - WEST
New Mall Design

VIEW OF RENOVATED ENTRY - SOUTH

WOOD PATTERNED COMPOSITE PANEL
EXISTING TENANT
GLASS CURTAIN WALL
ART WALL
WHITE METAL ACCENT PANEL
EXAMPLE TENANT STOREFRONT
New Mall Design

Materials

Wood Patterned Composite Panel

Gray Composite Panel

White Metal Accent Panel

Basalt Stone Tile

(Mixed Samples Shown to Represent Color Variation of Material)

Mesabi Black Granite
Resolution No. 2015-

Resolution rescinding the existing sign plan and approving a revised sign plan for Ridgedale Center at 12401 Wayzata Boulevard

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

Section 1. Background.

1.01 General Growth Properties has requested approval of a sign plan for Ridgedale Center at 12401 Wayzata Boulevard.

1.02 On June 19, 1986, the planning commission approved the existing sign plan for Ridgedale Center.

1.03 On February 5, 2015, the Planning Commission held a hearing on the proposal. The applicant was provided the opportunity to present information to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission considered all of the comments received and the staff report, which are incorporated by reference into this resolution.

Section 2. General Standards.

2.01 City Code §300.30, Subd. 9(h) states that factors which will be used in determining if an individual sign plan will be considered include the following:

1. The development includes a high rise (greater than 3 story) structure;

2. The development includes multiple structures and/or substantial site area;

3. The development includes mixed uses;

4. A sign plan is uniquely adapted to address the visibility needs of a
development while remaining consistent with the intent of this section to direct high quality signage; and

5. The sign plan includes permanent sign covenants which can be enforced by the city.

Section 3. Findings.

3.01 The proposal would meet site and building plan standards outlined in the City Code §300.27, Subd. 5.

1. Ridgedale Center is one of the largest developments in the community. The site is 84 acres in total size, which is one of the largest commercial sites in the city. The site also has seven vehicle access points from public streets and four separate parking lots.

2. Ridgedale Center includes a mix of commercial uses, including retail, restaurant, automotive, and anchor department stores.

3. The site has unique visibility needs compared to other commercial properties. Ridgedale abuts three major streets, Wayzata Boulevard, Ridgedale Drive, and Plymouth Road, and has visual frontage from I-394. The site also has seven separate vehicle access points from these public streets. In addition, the site is a regional destination which anchors the larger Ridegale area regional center.

4. The sign plan includes specific conditions of approval which would be administered and enforced with all sign permit applications. This would include the current signs and all future signs.

Section 4. Planning Commission Action.

4.01 The existing sign plan for Ridgedale Center is hereby rescinded.

4.02 The revised sign plan for Ridgedale Center is hereby approved, subject to the following conditions:

1. The site must be developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the sign plans dated December 8, 2014, except as modified by the conditions below.

2. Exterior signs for the mall must meet all of the requirements of the city’s sign ordinance, expect for the following:
a) The mall is allowed exterior signs according to the following standards:

1) The signs must not exceed the following number, height, and size:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quantity (max.)</th>
<th>Height (max.)</th>
<th>Copy and graphic area (max.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pylon sign</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85 ft.</td>
<td>480 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monument signs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8 ft.</td>
<td>40 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>directional signs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8 ft.</td>
<td>20 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entrance towers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>225 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) There may be no additional freestanding or pylon signs than identified above. All freestanding signs must include the name of the shopping center only, and must not include individual tenant identification. Directional signs must include only directional messages.

b) Anchor department stores that exceed 100,000 square feet in size are allowed exterior signs according to the following standards:

1) Maximum of one wall sign per exterior elevation.

2) The total height of the sign must not exceed 8 feet.

3) The total length of the sign must not exceed 25% of the lineal footage of the surface to which it is affixed.

c) Restaurants that have frontage on the mall exterior are allowed exterior signs according to the following standards:

1) Maximum of one wall sign per exterior elevation.

2) The total height of the sign must not exceed 30 inches.

d) Freestanding buildings are allowed exterior signs according to the following standards:

1) Maximum of one wall sign per exterior elevation.
2) The total height of the sign must not exceed 5 feet.

3) The total length of the sign must not exceed 75% of the lineal footage of the surface to which it is affixed.

e) All other tenants are not allowed exterior signs, including temporary business signs.

3. Sign permits are required.

Adopted by the Planning Commission of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on March 5, 2015.

__________________________________________
Chairperson

Attest:

__________________________________________
Kathy Leervig, Deputy 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 Planning Commission of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a duly authorized meeting held on March 5, 2015.

__________________________________________
Kathy Leervig, Deputy City Clerk
Minnetonka Planning Commission Meeting
March 5, 2015

Agenda Item 9

Other Business
Brief Description: Concept plan review for Kraemer’s Hardware redevelopment at 14730 Excelsior Boulevard, 5431, and 5439 Williston Road.

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

Proposal

Lakewest Development Co. LLC has submitted concept plans for redevelopment of the previous Kraemer’s Hardware site, and the two single-family residential properties to the north. The concept plans include a market-rate apartment building on the south side towards Excelsior Boulevard, and four to eight townhomes on the north side of the site. The apartment building would be four stories in height with 78 units. The proposal would require an amendment to the comprehensive plan, rezoning, and site and building plan review. (See pages A1-A17.)

Site Information

The site is located on the northeast corner of Excelsior Boulevard and Williston Road, and is located within the Glen Lake village center. The site is currently improved with a vacant commercial building which was previously occupied by Kraemer’s Hardware. The development site also includes two single-family residential properties to the north. The Kraemer’s site is currently zoned B-2/Limited Business and guided for commercial use in the comprehensive plan. The northerly properties are zoned and guided for low density residential uses. (See pages A18-A22.)

Background Information

- Previous Concept Plan Review: In 2014, Lakewest Development submitted a concept plan for redevelopment of the site, which was reviewed by the planning commission and city council. The concept plans consisted of a four-story, mixed use building with residential apartments and ground floor commercial retail. The previous concept plans did not include the northerly single-family residential property. (See pages A23-A38.) The planning commission and city council had the following general comments:
  - Something needs to be done with the property, but the proposed building would be too large for the site.
  - Development of just this corner would result in an abrupt transition; a master plan should be put together for the existing properties on the north side of Excelsior Boulevard.
Given the past development in Glen Lake and the location of the site, it would be beneficial to have a larger community engagement process to look at the northwestern part of Glen Lake, and how the redevelopment of the Kraemer’s site could integrate into other potential development on surrounding properties.

- **North Western Glen Lake Study:** As a result of the planning commission and city council discussion of the concept plans, the city undertook a small village center study of the northwestern area of Glen Lake. The process involved four community workshops to engage area residents and build consensus on how to shape a future redevelopment. The summary report and final recommendations are provided on pages A39-A85.

**Review Process**

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

- **Neighborhood Meeting.** The applicant held a neighborhood meeting on February 2, 2015. Generally, the project was well received by those in attendance. Discussion items and questions included:
  
  - What will happen during construction to address potential drainage and erosion control north of twinhomes?
  - How to address stormwater? Underground tank? Rainwater garden?
  - What type of residential - rentals? condos? families?
  - How does height compare to previous?
  - Driveway access on Excelsior Blvd is busy already.
  - How much closer is proposed building to street than the existing?
  - Amenities for patios and balconies?
  - Sidewalks along streets? Extend to the twinhomes.
  - Lighting?
  - No commercial space in the building?
  - What is the phasing?
  - Like some cross sections of buildings along Excelsior.
  - Project is better than the previous concept.
  - Public space could be more natural.

- **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. It would useful if commissioners would provide their reaction and general comments on the contemplated land use, building size, architecture and general site design.

Originator: Jeff Thomson, Planner  
Through: Loren Gordon, AICP, City Planner
ADDITIONAL 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 would 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

Project: Kraemers Hardware redevelopment

Address: 14730 Excelsior Blvd. and 5439 Williston Rd.

(06031.14a)
Members of the Planning Commission & Council
C/O Mr. Loren Gordon
Planner
City of Minnetonka
14600 Minnetonka Blvd.
Minnetonka, MN 55345

Re: Sketch Plan Narrative Kraemer's Williston Road Redevelopment

Dear Staff, Council and Commission Members,

Lake West Development, LLC is pleased to submit a sketch plan set prepared by Collage Architects for comment and your questions at the next available Planning Commission and City Council meetings. With City comments being favorable, we would be able to move forward into the active and binding submittal process to gain City approvals, final funding and construction permits to make the drawings a real development. 78 apartments and 4 to 8 detached townhome units are represented on the submittal in a unique layout that responds to the site and the neighborhood. We have looked at many physical site issues and verbal issues over the last year. Several are commented on with this narrative. Some will have more detail at the final submittal for project approvals.

Upon a looks good at sketch plan review, the necessary guide plan amendments, rezoning and site plan approvals would be started.

ISSUES FROM NORTHWEST GLEN LAKE STUDY(s)
The sketch plan evolved by listening to the Glen Lake Study LISC Visioning process and study of the summer and fall 2014. Direct responses to items of significant group conversations for predominantly residential uses that diversify the community and build more of a multi-generational neighborhood are:

1. Build on Neighborhood walkability by minimizing curb cuts onto Williston Rd. and orienting to the Village on Excelsior Boulevard; The plan allows pedestrians to be the focus on Williston, while the auto is still featured on Excelsior Boulevard.
2. Be residential. Panelists at session 3 highlighted the need to limit commercial space to where practical and not to seek to add more as mixed uses. The proposal is only multi-generational residential. The residents will be able to support the existing businesses. By setting up this building with variable floor plan sizes, the current market can be reached at a variety of projected rents. The architectural plans can also be arranged to be in a position to combine units in the future for different floor plans should the building management recommend such a plan.
3. Don't be too dense and minimize a plan targeted exclusively to seniors. The plan is market rate with apartment sizes that accommodate a variety of age groups; The height is limited to functional limitations due to building practices for the market, and to best blend into the ground as the site moves “up” Williston from Excelsior Blvd.
4. Be complimentary to other uses; The Building façade includes colors and other materials begun by other buildings in the area in order to complement the color pattern and build on the theme; The
design picks up roof lines that enhance and repeat some of the building features already a permanent part of the area.

5. Explore combined sites; The plan transitions the land uses from a small cluster of townhomes to the north as either rental or owner occupied to the apartment building. The dance studio structure was examined in a sketch plan alternative, but ownership was not interested in a plan that blended the two properties with a single structure. The ability to incorporate the adjacent dance studio beyond joint access did not meet with success. Graphics were shared with staff. A repaired retaining wall and improved parking may be the best interim improvement. The joint access alignment may be the best site element to maintain for future redevelopment opportunities for the properties east of this corner site.

6. Include Elements that enhance the area as a unique and special place. The corner at Williston and Excelsior is set aside for place making, to engage pedestrians on a friendly basis in a green gathering space, at least in the summer. Should transit continue through this corridor, a stop can be added here. Urban design elements begun in the 4-block area can be replicated here to the extent visibility is maintained and the design responds to apartment and neighborhood users.

7. Limit surface parking by incorporating underground or structured parking. The building limits the surface lot to only Excelsior Boulevard and deliberately placed parking interior to the structure. A unique part of the design is how the parking on two floors is not connected in order to limit access onto Williston.

The plans in front of the Commission and Council for comment include the following land plan solutions. A presentation by the design architects, Collage will accompany this narrative.

**LAND USES & TRAFFIC – Reject mixed used in favor of Residential Only for less traffic**

The plan is 100% Residential although the incidental uses of rental office, community room, decks, storage, work out space are part of the apartment building space plan. Sketch schematics on Sheet 1 show the present land uses and the residential pattern that was recognized along Williston. The green open space spine of today is preserved in the proposal.

The parking access points were studied to minimize their impacts to Williston and recognize the current trends of a 1:1 ratio of underground stall per dwelling unit, plus adequate guest stalls. We removed the current commercial access location to Williston Rd. intentionally from the lot on Excelsior Blvd. to minimize traffic concerns. Only 23 stalls from the building access Williston Road as well as the 4 detached TH units north of the apartments;

A traffic memo as needed for final approvals can confirm that the net new trips of this proposal are less than what the prior retail uses created.

**NATURAL RESOURCES- reject density on northerly parcels to preserve pines and slopes**

The largest grouping of trees and natural pines is preserved at the SE corner of the wider residential parcels to the NE of the apartment corner. Proposed as a passive picnic and pet walking area, views and benefits of being in this wooded area are preserved. By being incorporated into the apartments grounds maintenance obligations, long-term management is gained. The south edge of this tree stand and its retaining walls will be explored for any weak spots and their probable rebuilding with this development.
Many more plantings are added at the streetscape and foundation level, along Williston and Excelsior Blvd and to create a corner entrance to the area at Williston and Excelsior Blvd. They are conceptually shown. A great feature for the building is the large 50’ x 80’ courtyard that faces Williston. It creates the second of four green spaces to the master plan.

**ARCHITECTURE: reject too big a structure and blend into topography**

The architectural elevations are sensitive to the height conversations of previous meetings and step up the hill, with two floors buried into the hill. The façade steps back using the courtyard for the impression of 4 primary structures at the Williston setbacks.

The density is at +/- 35 units an acre for the main structure. See sheet 3 for additional calculations to be confirmed by staff regarding various measurement metrics.

Balconies, different façade materials and use of retaining wall extensions create a series of private courtyard spaces of the Williston Streetscape.

A building elevation option is included on sheet 6 to see the difference a gable end makes to the portion of the structure where Williston is beginning the transition from commercial land use depths to residential.

**SITE ORGANIZATION & TREES**

Storm drainage needs to meet today’s criteria. Concept plans place rate control and water quality in 4 locations on the plan. Drainage patterns are preserved to the extent possible throughout the plan and the use of the well draining soils in storm ponding rate control structures is being explored in the next design phase. Holding ponds are:

1. Under the new parking lot along Excelsior Boulevard, using some of the space created by the former basement of the existing hardware store;
2. An infiltration Basin is envisioned in the NW at existing low spots where the natural ground grades preserve trees and current rate control in a non engineered design currently;
3. Flat roof design creates rate control storage prior to entering other site storage tanks, some for irrigation use on landscape areas;
4. Courtyard at the second floor level as Williston climbs houses the largest containment zone that could function for irrigation and other green technology features.

Respectfully,

Curt Frethem
Owner
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FUTURE REDEVELOPMENT TO BLEND ACCESS AND GRADE

- STORM WATER POND INFILTRATION OR RETENTION AT GRADE
- SITTING AREA FOR VIEWS
- EXISTING TREES SAVED FOR PASSIVE PICNIC, DOG WALK SPACE FOR APTS.

EXISTING BLDG REPLACED BY OTHERS

10' JOINT ACCESS EASEMENT (FUTURE REDEVELOPMENT)

WALLS REPLACED

EXISTING BLDG
REPLACED
BY OTHERS
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DESCRIPTION

For Title Commitment No. M-25499, issued by Custom Home Builders Title, Inc., as agent for Old Reliable National Title Insurance Company.

Beginning at a point in the West line of the Northeast Quarter of Northeast Quarter, Section 11, Township 121, Range 92 East of the First Principal Meridian, St. Louis County, Minnesota; thence East along said West line 130 feet; thence North along said West line 130 feet; thence West along said West line 130 feet; thence South along said West line 130 feet; thence South along the West line of said Northeast Quarter 130 feet; thence North along the West line of said Northeast Quarter 130 feet; thence West along the West line of said Northeast Quarter 130 feet to a point in the West line of said Northeast Quarter; thence South along the West line of said Northeast Quarter 130 feet; thence West along the West line of said Northeast Quarter 130 feet to the point of beginning.

Abstracted by:

Kraemer's Redevelopment
14730 Excelsior Blvd.

PROPERTY SUMMARY

1. Subject property's address is 14730 Excelsior Blvd., its property identification number is 33-1/2-23-0049.

2. The gross area of the subject property is 6,463 Square Feet.

BENCHMARKS

1. The vertical datum is based on NAVD88. The original benchmark marks are SCHAEFER and Wells, both referenced from the MSU7 (Sedgwick) Database.

BENCHMARK A

SCHAEFER, located near the intersection of Trunk Highway 7 and Baker Road. Elev. +0.0028.

BENCHMARK B

Wells, located near the intersection of Trunk Highway 7 and Felt 16s Road. Elev. +0.0003.

SURVEY NOTES

1. Bearing system is based on the west line of Tract G having an assumed bearing of North 00 degrees 00 minutes 00 seconds East.

2. The surveyor makes no guarantees that the underground utilities shown comprise all such utilities to the area, either in service or abandoned. Utility information shown herein, if any, is a compilation of this map information and those visible utilities that were located during the survey work. The surveyor further does not warrant that the underground utilities shown herein, if any, are in the exact location as indicated, although he does certify that they are located as accurately as possible from information available. The surveyor has not physically located the underground utilities. Pursuant to MS 316.6 contact Governor State One Call at 651-454-0001 prior to any excavation.

3. Field work was completed on 7/26/2013.

4. The buildings and exterior dimensions of the outside wall at ground level are shown on the survey. It may not be the foundation wall.
Section C  Village Areas

The concept of a village signifies a tightly organized, multi-purpose center of activities. Aesthetics and physical lay-out of the village area contribute to the overall function and identity of the area. The impression gained from streetscape, signage, roadway network configuration, building design and layout notifies visitors that they are entering an area that has a coherent image and identity, and is convenient to access.

The following attributes define and distinguish each of the community and neighborhood village areas in the city:

* The geographic area is centered around or near a major intersection or community resource, and may cover a broader area.
* The area is organized, accessible and well connected to other areas of the city.
* Villages will incorporate both internal pedestrian connections, such as sidewalks and trails, and also accessibility to various transportation alternatives.
* The existing and planned uses within villages are organized to form a cohesive pattern.
* The villages include retail and service uses, and may accommodate a mix of medium and high density residential uses.

Areas designated as villages are expected to evolve over time as redevelopment and other changes occur. Redevelopment projects, public investments and other changes within the area should contribute to more intentional organization, land use character, intensity of uses, and functionality.

The city’s villages, identified in the Minnetonka 2030 Vision in Chapter III, are organized into three types of function, as defined by uses, intensity and residential density. The three types—community, neighborhood, and special purpose villages—are described below. Specific land use direction criteria are provided for those villages considered most likely to attract additional development and redevelopment in the coming years.

Community Village Centers

Community villages are the largest of the three village centers. Market demand for continued commercial activity in these areas is expected to remain strong in the future. These areas should support additional high density residential redevelopment in appropriate locations. The community village centers include Glen Lake Station, the Highway 7 and County Road 101 area, and the Minnetonka Boulevard and County Road 101 area.

1. Glen Lake Station

The Glen Lake Station area has undergone numerous redevelopments since it was established as an early commercial center in the city. Redevelopment efforts have been aided by public investments and the development of a variety of land uses to encourage the evolution of the
area as an attractive, interesting and pedestrian-friendly community center. These efforts have been guided by several previous plans, including the Glen Lake Study (completed in the late 1970s) and the 2003 Glen Lake Neighborhood Concept Plan (not adopted by the city).

In concert with these plans, commercial development and redevelopment has occurred on the north and south sides of Excelsior Boulevard, east of Eden Prairie Road. A variety of commercial uses now anchor the area including a grocery store, drug store, bank, restaurants and numerous small shops and other services.

Additional commercial redevelopment is underway within the Glen Haven shopping center. Additionally, several senior multi-family housing complexes have been built on the north side of Excelsior Boulevard and new multi-family developments have been completed or are undergoing construction south of Excelsior Boulevard, north of the lake.

The Glen Lake Station Park at the corner of Excelsior and Beacon Hill provides a focus for the commercial area and nearby ballfield facilities provide recreational opportunities for residents in the south Minnetonka area. Additionally, existing and planned trails and sidewalks that provide access to greater Minnetonka, Eden Prairie and other surrounding cities, connect the area.

The one aesthetic drawback to the area is the Xcel substation that serves the southwest metropolitan area. The city has worked to lessen the impacts of the substation by providing landscaping and screening of the facility.

The following land use strategies will guide future development and redevelopment in the Glen Lake Station area in accordance with the 2030 land use plan for the area shown on Figure IV-2:
Chapter IV. 2030 Land Use Plan

A. Continuation of the approved development pattern and land uses.
B. Provision of internal and eternal connections to neighborhoods and facilities.
C. Limitation of height of new development/redevelopment to the overstory tree canopy (3 - 5 stories).
D. Incorporation of sidewalk and trail improvements along major pedestrian corridors.
E. Provision of additional and/or improvement to existing transit facilities and programs.

2. Highway 7 and County Road 101 Area

A. Existing Conditions

The Highway 7 and County Road 101 (“7/101”) area is the largest community village area in the city. It is bordered and well buffered on three sides by the floodplain of Purgatory Creek and associated wetlands. Three of the quadrants of the intersection contain shopping centers with “big box” retail uses. The 7/101 Plan, adopted in the late 1970s, guided previous development activities within the area.

The shopping centers on the north side of TH 7 were constructed on portions of “reclaimed” floodplain and wetland areas of Purgatory Creek. The old 7-Hi Shopping Center (now Super Target), located west of CR 101, was constructed in the 1960s prior to the adoption of the city’s wetland and floodplain ordinances. The Super Target shopping center has undergone two substantial upgrades since it was originally developed. Free-standing banks and other businesses also occupy properties within this quadrant.

The Cub/Westwind Shopping center, on the east side of CR 101, was constructed on land made available for development by roadway and stormwater improvements to correct conditions created by agricultural drainage. Corridor improvements currently are underway for CR 101, north of TH 7, to improve traffic safety and improve trail connections, bury power lines and add streetscaping.

The southwest quadrant of the 7/101 area contains a diverse collection of small office, retail and multifamily uses, in a triangle formed by Excelsior Boulevard on the south side. Other retail stores, a restaurant, and a large office occupy the southeast quadrant.

Medium-density housing developments are also located adjacent to the 7/101 area, but are well-buffered by wetland and floodplain areas. The area’s proximity to Minnetonka High School and its connections to the city's trail and walkway system along Purgatory Creek and CR 101 contribute to the area’s vitality and access from community neighborhoods.

B. Planning Issues

Although a number of services are offered in this area, the four quadrants of the intersection are not well-connected, making it difficult for residents from the surrounding areas to access the services by foot or bicycle or for shoppers to perform multiple shopping trips with just one automobile stop. However, an existing trail underpass, east of the TH 7/CR 101 intersection, provides some connectivity for the eastern portion of the intersection.

Some of the businesses in the area currently are not performing at full capacity. In addition, the area generally does not take full advantage of the surrounding natural amenities—particularly Purgatory Creek and its associated wetlands and wooded areas. Given the potential for more cohesive activity at this intersection, it is likely that some redevelopment will occur in the future.
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B. Concept plan review to redevelop the Kraemer’s Hardware site at 14730 Excelsior Boulevard and the single family residential property at 5439 Williston Road.

Gordon reported.

O’Connell asked what could be located on the site without rezoning. Gordon explained that B-2 zoning would allow a floor area ratio (FAR) of .8. Uses could be a retail store, restaurant, gas station, commercial offices, and professional offices. A building could be up to 3 stories tall.

In response to Chair Lehman’s question, Gordon stated that the Beacon Hill high-density use existed first. Chair Lehman stated that changing the land use for the property north of the Kraemer’s property from residential had been requested before.

Curt Fretham, of Lakewest Development, applicant, was thankful for the opportunity to speak. He provided a description of the uses surrounding the proposed site. He stated that:

- The current R-1 zoning abuts commercial zoning and would make it difficult to create half-acre, single-family lots.
- Excelsior Boulevard and Williston Road have been graded but nothing has been tied in. Some grading would have to take place, but in a respectful and least-intrusive manner.
- The total site is approximately 2.8 acres. He is proposing a 4.5-story, mixed-use building with surface and underground parking. There would be 98 residential apartment units and 9,400 square feet of retail space.
- Neighbors were concerned with grading, traffic, parking, green space, height, size, unit count, over saturation of apartments, and providing a park area. All of the concerns are legitimate.
- The building would be integrated into the existing topography. Surface parking would be in the rear of the retail use. From Williston Road traveling south, the building would not appear to be 4.5 stories. Traveling from the west to the east on Excelsior Boulevard, it would look like a 4.5-story building. There would be a courtyard to break up the visual. The site is the gateway into the Glen Lake area.
- The building would be pulled forward to the street. He was interested in feedback on that. It would allow some landscaping to break things up.
• Due to neighbors' concerns, four twin homes would be built on the north portion. That would provide a transition to single-family houses on the north. He would appreciate feedback on that concept.
• Including a playground or park is being considered.
• The buildings would have a flat roof to help decrease the scaling and mass.
• The benefit of the proposal is that it would bring new life to the corner and bring active people to the area who would appreciate the walkability of what Glen Lake has to offer. It would provide for diversity of housing which is a city goal. It would help retailers in the area.
• He would appreciate thoughts on whether the proposal would be worthy of a comprehensive guide plan change. It would change a commercial district to high-density residential and a small portion of a low-density residential district to high-density residential zoning.

Chair Lehman asked if the courtyard would be flat or sloped. Mr. Fretham answered that it would be a private, recreational area for the residents on top of the parking garage. It would be flat. The topography would help hide part of the building. Chair Lehman would like to see what that profile would look like. Mr. Fretham answered that profiles and elevations would be done further along in the process. Mr. Fretham explained that the parking ramp on the south side would be exposed to Williston Road. The parking ramp would disappear under the hill when traveling north on Williston Road. The courtyard would be flat and sits on top of the parking ramp. Mr. Fretham noted that the parking ramp would look like a building.

Chair Lehman asked about the transition to the uses east of the site. Mr. Fretham said that is a challenge right now. There would have to be retaining walls or an agreement with the neighbors regarding grading. That part has not been worked out. Chair Lehman noted that large retaining walls have not been well received in the past.

Chair Lehman questioned if a plan that did not move the building forward had been considered. Mr. Fretham answered positively. He was open to shifting the building. He was interested in others’ opinions. The building would appear larger the closer it would be to the street. Moving the building closer to the street would save trees. Chair Lehman and Mr. Fretham noted that other buildings in the area are pulled back.

Kirk stated that there would be three stories of apartments above ground. He asked if retaining walls would allow the first story of apartments to disappear under the north slope of the next lot. Mr. Fretham said there would not be a retaining wall, but the grade would hide the first floor of apartments on the north side. Kirk asked if the bottom floor of apartments would have windows. Mr.
Fretham said that there would be 2.5 stories above grade on the north end. Kirk confirmed with Mr. Fretham that there would be two stories of parking below grade.

Kirk said that elevations would be helpful. Kirk asked if there are retail tenants lined up. Mr. Fretham answered in the negative. He would like to have a restaurant, but, because of the parking requirements, only a restaurant on a small scale may be possible.

Kirk noted that the former Kraemers’ site becomes an overflow parking area often. Kirk and Mr. Fretham discussed parking issues in the area. Odland noted that it is a general safety concern.

Kirk was not sure if pulling the building forward would be wanted. A master plan for the entire area that would include the gun shop, post office, and dance studio would be beneficial. The proposal seems abrupt for the site to have an urban landscape with a tall building pulled to the front. He would like to see the site developed. Putting a fresh coat of paint on the existing building would not be enough. However, he saw this proposal as a lot of building.

Odland stated that the intersection of Williston Road and Excelsior Boulevard becomes one lane traveling west. The area is very congested. The area has The Gold Nugget, empty retail space, senior buildings, and The Glen which put a lot of mass in that neighborhood.

Kirk was worried there would be no buffer on the north, but feels better with the possibility of twin homes. He would want to see a greater buffer on the north side if it would not be known how the lot immediately to the north would be developed. It might make sense to pull that property into development now as part of a planned unit development to provide a buffer for something higher density or if the other two parcels would need to provide a buffer. Between Williston Road and Beacon Hill, it looks like the whole corridor could be developed differently to be more consistent instead of going from single-family to high-density residential. Looking at this one corner, it appeared to be too much.

Odland concurred.

O’Connell could not tell whether the proposal would be too big for the corner without elevations.

Odland asked how many apartments are located above The Gold Nugget. Gordon answered that The Exchange Building has 54 market-rate rental units and 20,000 square feet of commercial space with underground parking and access from Stewart Lane. That site is 3.5 acres. The proposed site is 2.8 acres.

Mr. Fretham stated that his site is bigger than the other site.
Odland stated that The Exchange Building is setback from Excelsior Boulevard and there is ample parking in the front. This site is surrounded by other businesses and a post office that is very congested and difficult to get through. Mr. Fretham agreed. He was fine with locating parking in the front. Odland asked what could be done to reduce the size and mass. She asked for other options for the space. Mr. Fretham stated that is a good, but tough question. He could take a look at reducing the number of units.

O’Connell clarified with Mr. Fretham that the first plan did not include the lot north of the site, but Mr. Fretham now has control of that lot.

The public hearing was opened.

John Goodrich, 14924 Excelsior Boulevard, stated that:

- Commissioners’ questions were excellent.
- The houses are nice with large yards that would abruptly border a large building.
- The proposal would have almost double the number of units as The Exchange Building and be located right next to the street. That needs strong consideration. It would be too abrupt of a change.
- The Kraemer’s property and the two adjacent properties are eye sores. Hopefully something can happen there.
- To put 98 apartments next to a dance studio and a gun shop does not seem to be the best option. It would be disjointed and disconnected. It would not fit.

Richard Urban, 5625 Eden Prairie Road, stated that:

- He complemented the developer for accurately characterizing the results of the first neighborhood meeting. The concerns are with the density and traffic.
- The corner is oddly shaped. Ninety-eight units would cause several hundred trips on Excelsior which already handles as much traffic as it can.
- He was not quite as concerned with the abruptness because the corner is the concentration of commercial uses. Without addressing the gun shop and dance studio, the redevelopment falls apart because of the difference between new and existing buildings. He is more worried about that abruptness. The area could end up with a very large building next to small, cinder-block style buildings with minimal parking. Without doing the entire area, redevelopment cannot work.
- He liked the concept of building it back into the hill. There is too much close-to-the-street parking in that neighborhood. That is part
of the problem with the commercial area. All of the parking is concentrated on the street side. It reduces the attractiveness. Covered parking in the back would be better.

- The density would be too much.

John Shepherd, 14501 Atrium Way, stated that:

- He urged commissioners to take into consideration the ambiance of the proposal. It is an interesting proposal. He gives credit to the developer. It would add new vitality to the Glen Lake area.
- His condominium is on the ground floor and looks on Tree Street. St. Therese is a 5-story building not in keeping with the spirit of Glen Lake. It effectively removed all of his natural lighting. It has negatively impacted the value of his apartment.
- He agreed with the other speakers.
- The ambiance and the size of the building should be taken into consideration.

Ann Flanagan, 15024 Cherry Lane, stated that:

- The proposal has positive things, but she is concerned about the size. Ninety-eight rentals on two acres of land is an awful lot.
- She liked the access on Excelsior Boulevard. There may need to be a stoplight between Williston Road and County Road 4.
- The idea of twin homes on the north piece would be a good transition.
- This is a nice residential area that should remain a nice residential area.
- She agreed with comments regarding the building being oversized.
- A flat roof would be better.
- She would prefer more green space on Excelsior Boulevard.
- Parking in the rear would be better because parking is a nightmare near the post office.

Charles Ostlund, 5408 Williston Road, stated that:

- He was speaking also on behalf of residents of 5402, 5406, and 5410 Williston Road.
- He had an expectation that residential zoning would remain. He thinks it is wrong to change zoning. Zoning should stay the same forever. It reduces the monetary and personal value of a property to change it.
- He thinks it is wrong for the city to expect a builder to do affordable housing in Minnetonka. He favored the developer proposing what would work economically.
• He asked if there would be a possibility for the developer to get the gun store and dance studio. A more uniform design for the whole area would be better. Right now, the proposal would ruin the neighborhood.

Bob Trojan, 5653 Glen Avenue, stated that:

• He thanked commissioners and staff for their work.
• He appreciated the effort to redevelop the area, but with double the density than what exists above The Gold Nugget it seems a bit much. It would be too tall.
• He agreed with Kirk’s thoughts regarding the gun shop and dance studio. The proposed building would look obtuse. It would change the character dramatically.

The public hearing was closed.

Chair Lehman encouraged the developer to provide more visuals. There are concerns with the mass. He preferred pushing the building back from the street. He opposed replacing the space between the building and street with parking. Adding twinhomes on the north side is a good idea and enhances the proposal. He is interested in how the proposal would flow with what is east of the site. He conceptually liked the idea of retail, residential, and parking mix. Finding the right balance is yet to be worked out.

Odland asked if there are limits for size and mass for the site. Gordon explained that the comprehensive guide plan outlines a range of redevelopment opportunities for the site including a building with height of 3 to 5 stories. Odland noted that the site is an entry to the Glen Lake village center. The area has steep topography and an abrupt change of use from commercial to single-family housing. Gordon stated that there is not a lot of guidance on how to transition, so that is a good discussion for commissioners.

Odland noted that the area near Ridgedale Center has more apartment buildings. She was not sure the proposed site would be appropriate.

Kirk confirmed with Wischnack that TIF funding has not been requested at this time.

Kirk would not be afraid to rezone a site if it benefited the area. This is a great example when an R-1 district abuts commercial uses. Creating a transition area makes sense. He did not want to see the building pulled back far enough to have parking in the front. Pulling it back would reduce the appearance of the mass. He could not imagine 98 units. He thinks it would be way too big for the site.
Odland noted the number of school buses that travel on Williston Road and the number of children who cross Williston Road. The traffic burden would be a concern.

Kirk is not worried about Williston Road. It would be Excelsior Boulevard handling the trips created by 98 units which each averages 7 a day. He had trouble getting out of the site when Kraemer’s was located there because of traffic.

Odland stated that there are already stoplights at both intersections and the county may not allow a stoplight in the middle of a block. It may make traffic worse.
B. Concept plan review for Kraemer’s Hardware redevelopment at 14730 Excelsior Boulevard and 5439 Williston Road

Gordon and Wischnack gave the staff report. Wischnack suggested using a process similar to the one that was used for the Minnetonka Mills area.

Wagner noted the process used for the Minnetonka Mills area was beneficial. It was good engagement in a less threatening manner. He suggested combining the village center process with the process Wischnack was suggesting for this area.

Acomb said she participated in the Minnetonka Mills area process as the representative for the park board. She said a lot of her neighbors who also participated felt it was a great opportunity to get better insight with a much better back and forth engaging process. She thought a similar process would be beneficial for the Glen Lake area.

Schneider said he attended the Minnetonka Mills area meetings. There was a good facilitator who kept the group on task and there was a good civil engagement. Another component that was helpful was it was not the community debating with the developer but it was an independent development panel indicating that for a development to occur in a quality way there had to be certain levels of density and certain economic expectations. Different scenarios were run to provide comfort level to the residents. The challenge for the Glen Lake area would be figuring out how to include or exclude the gun shop and dance studio. What happens with that property should be compatible with what happens on this corner. He said the corner was large enough to develop on its own without waiting for the other property but the property north of this property needed to be developed concurrently. This would eliminate the concern that another wing to a development would be added later.

Wagner said the exercise should not just look at this site but also look at the broader area and how the properties would interact.

Allendorf said there were competing interests on the corner. An overall planning session that looks at the gun shop and ballet studio properties as well as this property and the two residential properties would run into some constraints unless rules are setup ahead of time. If a planning session would lead to the perfect getting in the way of the good by saying 30 years from now the gun shop would be part of this property therefore not having anything done for 30 years would be a disservice. He didn’t think the residential properties on Williston Road could be connected with
a commercial piece of property on the corner. If some ground rules could be established recognizing the residential properties, recognizing the hardware store property was in play because it was vacant, and recognizing the existing businesses, he would support the process.

Bergstedt noted the property was in his ward and just looking at the plan in front of the council, he would have some of the same comments as the previous item regarding density. The Exchange building has 54 units and adding 100 more units perplexed him. Even though there was agreement something needed to be done on the corner, to try to meld the proposal into something without looking at the adjacent properties troubled him even more. Right now the traffic issues, the egress, ingress, parking made the area dangerous. To put a large development in without looking at the bigger picture seemed to be way premature and doing things backward. He agreed using the Mills process seemed to be a good answer. He acknowledged there were strong feelings about past development in Glen Lake and using the Mills process would add transparency and hopefully facilitate some good discussion. There also hopefully would be more buy in and understanding when a project does move ahead.

Ellingson said he agreed using the Mills process was a wonderful suggestion. He attended one of the Mills’ meetings and thought it was a terrific process for informing the neighbors. The history of the development in Glen Lake was there were two neighborhood meetings after the formal application had been submitted. At the beginning of the second meeting he asked the developer if anything would change in the proposal based on the neighborhood comments and the developer indicated he was not going to change anything because the proposal was his vision for the area. This was unfortunate because the process did not include the neighbors until after the formal application was submitted and then the developer did not listen to neighbors’ comments. What then got build was different from what had been proposed because of the economy.

Wagner said there still was a risk that a developer would not listen to the feedback and still submit an application forward. He said with the Mills process people at least understood the context of how a developer and land owner make decisions.

Schneider said with the Mills process the end proposal was something the neighborhood could live with even though it never got built. Everyone agreed the proposal could work well in a very complex setting.

Wischnack said by using the process she didn’t want it to be viewed as a way to delay a project. It was important that the developer understand that the process would be used to get an end result that could be approved.
Wagner said he was pretty certain no one on the council would support the density in the concept plan.

Don Jensen from Lake West Development said the single family home adjacent to the property was built in 1958. The facility holding the dance studio and gun shop was built in 1965. The post office was built in 1966. The homes to the north would add an acre to a PUD. The entire area was around 2.8 acres. This would mean there would be 37 units per acre not the number that was in the staff report. If the concept plan moved forward there would be patio space further to the north with Williston Road to the left. There would be a catch grade to Williston as the elevation rose. There would be an additional walkway in order to locate a sidewalk at the right elevation. If it was decided a combination of retail and residential was appropriate the feedback being looked for were thoughts about the configuration. The goal was to accomplish something on this site and move adjacent in time. Another issue that needed to be resolved was transitioning from the high hill the remaining homes to the north were the highest in the sub-neighborhood and had a lot of trees that were at the end of their life cycle. Part of a solution to minimize retaining walls could be a PUD agreement that some of the trees could be removed so the next 150 years of growth could happen. This would allow the removal a substantial amount of retaining walls. He said the light rail authority moving forward would affect the market research in terms of what was the best tenant mix for this structure.

Schneider noted if it was decided to go ahead using a process similar to that used for the Minnetonka Mills area, information from the developer involved would not be relied on. Rather a professional development panel that was independent of Minnetonka would be brought in to discuss ideas of what may or may not work. He said for the Minnetonka Mills process the potential developer was behind the scenes observing and not really participating. In this case the developer could choose to participate or not to participate. Acomb said the community would feel as if the process was being directed a certain way if the developer had a large input. Wischnack said the type of participation the developer might be involved with was coming to the meetings and observing.

Curt Fretham from Lake West Development said he heard there was not any support for the project in the concept plan. He asked for direction if there was some support for elements of the plan which would require a guide plan change. Without that he felt he would be spinning his wheels as he went through the process. He was OK going through the process if the council felt there was something that could be worked with.

Allendorf said for past projects Fretham had brought to the council he had asked for direction for different options. Allendorf said that was why staff
was suggesting this other process. He said this project from a traffic standpoint, from a density standpoint, from a planning the entire corner standpoint was not going to get council support. The process being suggested would give Fretham explicit direction from the council and from the neighborhood. He didn’t see anything in the concept plan he could support.

Schneider said the number of units and the magnitude or mass of the building was causing the concern. Having a market rate rental project in the corner as an anchor to the Glen Lake area with a certain appropriate number of units was the right thing to do. He wasn’t sure about mixed use but he was open to a guide plan change for the right use. He thought the property to the north would be better developed as townhouses or twin homes. He said he thought there needed to be some redevelopment and additional density on the corner but the question was to what level and magnitude made sense. The process would engage some independent thought processes to what really made sense economically as well as spatially.

Allendorf said he did not like anything about this project. Schneider asked if he liked the housing. Allendorf said not integrated the way it was with retail. He said he thought there was residential available on Williston Road with the two lots that were appropriate for some level of residential. Schneider asked if Allendorf agreed that housing on the corner might work. Allendorf said he didn’t think it would work together with the one house.

Wagner said the best advice he could give to Fretham was the concept plan was so over the top that the council was adverse to providing feedback. The best course of action if he wanted to develop the corner was to help the staff and neighborhood figure out what could work on the property and what could integrate years down the line with the next two pieces of property. This was an integral part of Glen Lake and he wanted it figured out how everything would fit together.

Bergstedt said he agreed with Wagner. He said he was shocked with the density in the concept plan. The neighbors in the area had concerns. If everyone was excited about following the process where there could be a better idea for the broader area, and how things may redevelop with neighborhood buy in, there would be education on both sides. For the council to give too much direction would circumvent that process.

Wischnack said the process would include two months for the workshops and another month for the report.
Allendorf asked for information about the notice area. Gordon showed the area that encompassed around half a mile in radius from the site and included around 340 properties.

Acomb asked if people who wanted to participate outside the notification area would be allowed to participate. Wischnack said anyone in the city could participate.

Lindi Doherty, 14924 Glen Oak Street, thanked the developer because something was needed on the property. She thanked the council for getting the community involvement. She thought there needed to be a step by step plan. She was concerned there was a timeframe put around the process both in terms of getting something done as well as for the developer. The risk was the developer walking away all together.

Ann Flanagan, 15024 Cherry Lane, was grateful that the council was listening to the neighborhood. She agreed something needed to be done with the corner but the concept plan proposed something that was way too large. Adding 98 apartments and retail really would be intrusive.

Becky Henry, 5425 Spring Lane, thanked the council for the consideration of the project. She was concerned about high density. She was concerned with traffic issues not only for this area but the greater area. Trying to get west on the arteries with the additional PUDs would make Highway 7 a parking lot and would lose the city’s wooded and open space appeal.

Schneider suggested using the process as part of the 2014 village center process whether or not Fretham chose to continue.
Summary
The City of Minnetonka enlisted the Twin Cities LISC’s Corridor Development Initiative (CDI) to facilitate a series of community workshops from June to August 2014 to identify development guidelines for the northwestern site in the Glen Lake neighborhood. The development guidelines will be presented to the Minnetonka City Council and EDA for their consideration.

The Corridor Development Initiative works to provide an opportunity for community members to help guide future development rather than simply react to a specific development proposal. The Corridor Development Initiative is an interactive process that brings diverse interests together to share perspectives and find common ground. The process creates the opportunity for people to discover and strengthen a voice of compromise, and to witness a way for diverse interests to achieve a shared vision.
The Study Area: Glen Lake’s north western site
The Glen Lake district is one of eleven village centers located throughout the City of Minnetonka. Originally a train station, the Glen Lake neighborhood has a small town feel and sense of community, amidst a glorious natural setting, including Glen Lake. The Glen Lake commercial area, located along Minnetonka Boulevard at Eden Prairie and Williston roads, is a mixed use area that includes walkable neighborhood-scale retail, and a range of housing (single family, multi-family, and a variety of senior living options).

The north western site is the last section to be redeveloped along the Glen Lake commercial area, and contains 10 individual parcels. A recent proposal for redevelopment on a portion of the site triggered the interest by the City to gather community input to inform their review and assessment of alternatives. The City determined that the Corridor Development Initiative would be a valued resource for informing what future development options might be considered. By utilizing the CDI series of community workshops to articulate community values for the area, and incorporate financial realities to potential development scenarios, the City of Minnetonka would be better equipped to respond to or guide subsequent development proposals. The CDI process provided an opportunity for community members to help set the stage for potential redevelopment, rather than react to a developer’s proposal.
Overview of the Corridor Development Initiative Process:
The Corridor Development Initiative consisted of four community workshops. Approximately 93 community members attended the workshops, aimed at gathering input on community values and concerns, and assessing likely development scenarios that could meet those values. The process involved a technical team of facilitators, designers, developers, and city staff to inform and support participants as they explored ideas. Resulting from the process was an increased understanding by participants about the site’s challenges and opportunities, and identified ways that redevelopment could enhance the area for future and current residents. The purpose of the CDI process is to identify a range of development options that meet community goals and market viability, rather than landing on one specific development direction or product.

Community Outreach
A variety of methods were used to notify the community about the Minnetonka Glen Lake Corridor Development Initiative workshops. Information about the public workshops was distributed through:

• A direct mailing of “Save the Date” postcards announcing the series of workshops to the neighborhood (notification area)
• 200 flyers distributed to the local businesses, to be posted for their customers.
• Email notification to the City’s list serve.
• The City of Minnetonka web site

Child care and translation services were available upon request to limit obstacles for participation. All participants that signed in for any of the workshops were notified in advance about upcoming sessions by email.

The series of CDI community workshops were held in the Chapel of The Glenn at 5300 Woodhill Road. They included:
Workshop I: Gathering Information  
Monday, June 30, 2014

Presentations were provided by City staff, and Todd Rhoades of Cermak Rhoades Architects about the Glen Lake neighborhood, and participants were asked to respond to four questions:

1.) What makes the western Glen Lake area interesting or unique?  
Themes: Small town feel / sense of community, small businesses, safe, natural setting, unique location.

2.) What could be accomplished through development that would improve or enhance the area?  
Themes: Additional services / businesses, housing, attract customers to the area, stronger connections, visual appeal.

3.) What concerns for the area do you have as future development occurs?  
Themes: Traffic / parking, size / scale, housing, environmental concerns, types of commercial uses.

4.) Are there specific needs (housing, retail, office, etc.) for which this site would be a good fit?  
Themes: Housing, retail, community space.

Workshop II: Development Opportunities – Block Exercise  
Monday, July 14, 2014

Participants worked at three tables, two that included the larger study area and two that included the subset of properties that are currently being considered for redevelopment (active sites), to explore different development scenarios. The scenarios were presented to the large group, and everyone discussed what they learned through the exercise. A few of the scenarios were within range of being financially viable.
Workshop III: Developer Discussion  
Monday, July 28, 2014  
A panel of developers that represented a variety of development products (mixed use, senior housing, and commercial development) responded to questions from participants and provided information on the challenges and opportunities of redevelopment for the study area, and for the larger Glen Lake commercial area. The community desire for a grocery store or pharmacy for the area will require creative solutions (such as a smaller format grocery store or cooperative), given that the Glen Lake commercial area is not likely to attract “big box” or national retailers. When asked what their recommendations were for the site, all the panelists agreed that residential had the greatest potential for the site, with a small amount of retail and/or office space (mixed-use).

Workshop IV: Framing Recommendations  
Monday, August 11, 2014  
Draft development guidelines were reviewed and edited by participants to reach consensus for the final recommendations (Attachment A). The final recommendations will be presented to the City Council and EDA at their September 15, 2014 meeting.

At the final workshop participants offered some reflections or take-aways from the Glen Lake CDI workshops:
• The process provided a concrete idea of what NW Glen Lake site could be and what it won’t be. It won’t be a big-box destination, which is reassuring. And it will likely be residential with some retail.
• There is a need for higher density to make commercial uses viable.
• The community perspective is important in shaping the core values, but what happens depends on the developer and the nature of the proposed project.
• We need more kids in the Hopkins school district (attract young families).
• Is this a vision for the Kraemer store? Or for the larger area?

The study area is broad (from the BP Station to the Kraemer site). The CDI recommendations will help the City react to redevelopment proposals for any of the parcels.
• Recognition of the need to strengthen the walkability and bikeability of the area - could use more sidewalks and bike-only designated areas.
• Look for ways to strengthen the Glen Lake neighborhood as a special / memorable place.

Community Participation  
Workshop participants were largely residents from the immediate and surrounding area. A few local businesses owners also attended, as well as city officials. 40% of attendees participated in 2 or more of the workshops, and 7 out of 93 participants attended all four. An average of 36 participants attended per workshop.

Evaluation of the CDI Process  
An evaluation form was distributed at each of the four meetings in the project series. The evaluation for the first three sessions sought to assess the degree to which the goals for the evening had been met and asked for specific suggestions for the next meeting. The evaluative question at the fourth meeting was the level of support for the final recommendations.
Demographics of Participants
A couple of demographic questions were asked regarding the length of time living or working in the area and the age group of participants. The large majority of responses came from long-term residents and adults/seniors.

Satisfaction
A question was also asked regarding the level of satisfaction with the meeting and the overall project. The number of people attending and completing evaluations varied for each of the meetings—ranging from a low of 13 at the 3rd meeting to a high of 26 at the first meeting. The vast majority (over 97%) of respondents were very or somewhat satisfied with each of the meetings and the project overall. Out of a total of 68 evaluation forms received throughout the project “somewhat dissatisfied” was indicated on only 2 of them.

Individual Meeting Comments
Below are things that respondents reported worked best during each of the four meetings.

Meeting 1:
• Group session discussions
• Well organized
• Working together
• Good to hear so many ideas/concerns expressed by neighbors
• Briefing
• Overall very effective
• (5) Small group discussions, Small groups it was nice to have the collaborative effort Table talk, Break-out block writing sessions and hearing others responses
• Having questions prepared
• Well ran
• Good introduction
• (2) Multi input from many, Getting input from the community
• Enough seating for everyone
• Like the brainstorming between residents

Meeting 2:
• Good group facilitator
• Got in a good group
• Splitting into group
• Everything
• Good leadership
• The physical demo

Above: Photos taken during the Block Exercise, February 2014.
Meeting 3:
- The Panel
- Questions and answers
- Very informational
- Panel setting
- The questions facilitated by Barbara
- Good balance and qualified panel
- The moderator was fantastic one of the best moderators I have witnessed
- Good mix of panelist. I appreciate Barbara queuing up audience questions, so no one gets forgotten.

Meeting 4:
- The ability to collectively alter the draft on screen
- Facilitator had control
- Those present were able to participate in formulation of recommendations for presentation to city
- The process to get one document produced
- The ideas and concerns that came
- Good conversation airing of concerns
- Neighbor communication
- I am glad my neighbors have some goals and I do like the “Mayberry” feel of neighborhood
- All of it
- Discussion

Achievement of Goals
The ratings assessing the degree that the goals for each meeting were accomplished were also consistently positive. Each of the first three sessions had specific learning and opportunity goals. Participants were asked to rank the level of achievement for each of them. Below is a combined ranking of meeting goals over the first three meetings. Ninety-two percent indicated that the goals had been at least somewhat met during each meeting.

Support for the Final Recommendations
Fourteen of the 15 respondents indicated they could support the final recommendations from the final session. One person indicated that s/he could “somewhat” support them, but would want more specific information or didn’t get everything they had wanted.

Overall Project Recommendation
Participants were also asked to indicate if they would recommend the project to other cities. All 15 of the respondents indicated that they would do so.
**Conclusion**

The north western portion of the Glen Lake neighborhood is poised for redevelopment. Nestled into a sloped topography, the site is in a prime location for a mix of residential, commercial, and office uses. The site offers the opportunity to enhance the walkability of the area, while incorporating additional neighborhood services to support the vitality of the neighborhood.

The study area includes 10 individual parcels, which presents a challenge for a coordinated redevelopment approach for the area. The City should consider establishing a phased long-term plan for the area to maintain a cohesive vision that would complement and enhance the surrounding neighborhood. To achieve the full potential of the site, the City will need to work proactively with developers (e.g. identify strategies for shared parking, coordinated and complementary uses, attract and retain needed retail and services, safe and effective traffic flow, etc.). However, residents don’t want the City to wait for the perfect development if a good, viable development consistent with these principles becomes an opportunity.

The components of the north western study area should be complementary with the greater Glen Lake neighborhood. For example, the desire for a local grocery store continues. Perhaps a non-traditional solution could be identified for the larger Glen Lake neighborhood, such as a food cooperative (e.g. Lakewinds) and smaller grocery store / pharmacy option. A previous market study conducted by the City revealed that a grocery store would in fact be viable in the area. Given the market constraints of the area, there are opportunities for creative solutions with smaller retail concepts, and agreement not to sacrifice great for good.

The Corridor Development Initiative submits the attached recommendations to the Minnetonka City Council for your consideration regarding the north western Glen Lake site.

**Attachments:**

A. North Western Glen Lake Development Guidelines  
B. Fact Sheet  
C. Map of the North Western Glen Lake Study Area  
D. North Western Glen Lake Development Wish List (Workshop I)  
E. Block Exercise Summary Sheets (Workshop II)  
F. Developer Panel Discussion Meeting Notes (Workshop III)  
G. Evaluation summaries for each CDI workshop  
H. Attendance list for the North Western Glen Lake CDI workshops  
I. Overview of the Corridor Development Initiative  
J. Announcement / publicity flyer for the North Western Glen Lake CDI workshops
A. North Western Glen Lake Development Guidelines

GLEN LAKE
Located in a well-preserved pocket of the City of Minnetonka is historic Glen Lake. The Glen Lake area/neighborhood has a small town feel and sense of community, amidst a glorious natural setting. The neighborhood and commercial area located on Excelsior Boulevard at Eden Prairie and Williston roads is known as Glen Lake, named for the large lake located just southeast of that intersection.

In 1907, on the southwest corner of the intersection, Chris Kraemer set up a general store that sold food, sewing materials, hardware, animal feed and clothing. Electric streetcars and freight trains began traveling between Minneapolis and Lake Minnetonka on train tracks originally installed in 1881. The tracks ran through Glen Lake on the south side of Excelsior Boulevard and under a bridge for Eden Prairie Road, where a station was located. The line was discontinued in 1932 when buses became the primary mode of mass transportation. Traces of the line can still be seen just west of Glen Lake, especially at the entrance to Purgatory Park where a bridge traversed Purgatory Creek.

In 1958, Kraemer's store moved to the west end of a new shopping center, and by the 1980s, the business, now primarily a hardware store, occupied a new building across Excelsior Boulevard. Today, the Glen Lake neighborhood is a mixed commercial and residential area, with a hilly landscape, rich tree canopy, and clean local lake. From the unique businesses along Excelsior Boulevard, to the recent residential investments, Glen Lake is a walkable and inviting destination with excellent visual appeal of the natural and surrounding environment.
ASSETS
The broader city of Minnetonka offers:

- A proud reputation of preserving its natural resources – residents can enjoy 42 community parks, more than 40 miles of trails and more than 1,000 acres of public open space, as well as natural scenery that includes mature trees, wetlands, and prairies.
- Eleven village centers located throughout the city offer a variety of focus points for retail and services.
- A wealth of community resources, including three public school districts and three private schools, two libraries, many churches, a variety of transportation options, utility companies and other community agencies.

Glen Lake neighborhood offers:

- Natural amenities such as Glen Lake and Kinsel Park, nestled in a topography of rolling hills, marshlands, wetlands, and wooded areas that attract wildlife.
- A diversity of small businesses, restaurants, and housing options, including a spectrum of senior housing.
- A walk-able community that is small and safe, enhanced by local parks with athletic fields and a skateboard park.
- Schools and daycare services.
- A strong sense of unique history and place, such as Glen Lake Station.
DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES: NORTH WESTERN GLEN LAKE SITE

The north western portion of the Glen Lake neighborhood is poised for redevelopment. Nestled into a sloped topography, the site is in a prime location for a mix of residential, commercial, and office uses. The site offers the opportunity to enhance the walkability of the area, while incorporating additional neighborhood services to support the vitality of the neighborhood.

The study area includes 10 individual parcels, which presents a challenge for a coordinated redevelopment approach for the area. The City should consider establishing a phased long-term plan for the area to maintain a cohesive vision that would complement and enhance the surrounding neighborhood. To achieve the full potential of the site, the City will need to work proactively with developers (e.g. identify strategies for shared parking, coordinated and complementary uses, attract and retain needed retail and services, safe and effective traffic flow, etc.). However, residents don’t want the City to wait for the perfect development if a good, viable development consistent with these principles becomes an opportunity.

The components of the north western study area should be complementary with the greater Glen Lake neighborhood. For example, the desire for a local grocery store continues. Perhaps a non-traditional solution could be identified for the larger Glen Lake neighborhood, such as a food cooperative (e.g. Lakewinds) and smaller grocery store / pharmacy option. A previous market study conducted by the City revealed that a grocery store would in fact be viable in the area. Given the market constraints of the area, there are opportunities for creative solutions with smaller retail concepts, and agreement not to sacrifice good for great.

Below: Photos illustrating the current land uses on the north western Glen Lake site.
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REDEVELOPMENT OF THE SITE INCLUDE:

Goal 1: Maintain the small town / community appeal of the Glen Lake neighborhood
A. New development should encourage the continued mix of neighborhood scale retail and services.
B. Any residential, commercial, or mixed use development or redevelopment design will seek
to reflect and enhance the unique character of the Glen Lake area as a self-contained village.
C. Create engaging pedestrian and bike-friendly streetscapes that connect the
commercial area along Excelsior Boulevard with or to the surrounding area.
D. Enhance the walk-ability and bike-ability of the area, with attention to stronger
connections to other existing trails, commercial areas, parks, and Glen Lake.
E. Design and site orientation must be respectful of residential and commercial uses.
F. Consider impact on existing neighborhood character and
single-family homes in the immediate vicinity.
G. Use existing setbacks and height restrictions to blend elevation
of development into existing topography.
H. Retain a post office in the area.
I. Provide for a diverse range of housing options, promoting a mix of
household size and incomes (young and multi-generational appeal).
J. Manage traffic flow and parking needs of the site so that
pedestrians (rather than cars) are the dominant focus.
K. Consider design elements and aesthetics that enhance transit and bike uses.
L. Include elements that enhance the area as a unique and special place.
M. Maintain setbacks to buildings to ensure a sense of openness for pedestrians.

Goal 2: Capitalize on the natural setting and environment
N. Create a stronger connection to the lake through pedestrian and bike trails, and way finding (signage).
O. Utilize landscaping and streetscape amenities to improve pedestrian and bike safety.
P. Limit surface parking with new development by considering alternatives such as underground or struc-
tured parking.
Q. Ensure an effective transition between the development and the neighboring residential uses that pre-
serves the natural areas as much as possible.
Above: A variety of existing land-uses can be found in the north western Glen Lake area.

**Goal 3: Produce high quality development that enhances the livability of the area**

*Support was expressed for:*
- Residential development, with the option of small scale commercial / mixed use.
- Residential uses that diversify the community, and would appeal to younger families, producing a multi-generational neighborhood.
- Commercial uses that complement and enhance surrounding businesses.
- The importance of a local grocery store or pharmacy to provide necessary conveniences for the community.
- Maintaining a post office in the area.
- Innovative commercial spaces that bring restaurants, retail, and places for people to gather.
- Medical offices or related services for the seniors and others.

**FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:**

Julie Wischnack, AICP
City of Minnetonka
Community Development Director
952-939-8282
Jwischnack@minnetonka.com
City Guidance and Property Information

- The Western Glen Lake study area is located in the Glen Lake Station Village Center. The city has long viewed this village center as a vital commercial, residential and activity center to the surrounding neighborhoods.

- In the 2008 Comprehensive Plan, the city approved commercial and single family residential guidance for the study area.
  - 8 of the 10 parcels are guided for commercial use (shown in red).
  - The northerly two parcels along Willis-ton Road are guided for single family residential (shown in yellow).

- The study area is comprised of 10 parcels held by 6 owners. The total size of the study area is 5.37 acres.

- The commercial parcels have a long history of support to the Glen Lake area. Kraemer’s Hardware is the longest standing business in Minnetonka operating in a few locations in Glen Lake since 1904.

Redevelopment Proposals

- Compared to the eastern portion of Glen Lake, the study area has experienced virtually no redevelopment in many decades.

- Within the past few years, a few proposals to redevelop the single family residential parcels as memory care residential have been reviewed by the city. The city denied these proposals.

- In early 2014, a development team (Lake West) suggested that the city entertain a mixed use residential and commercial development for the former Kraemer’s Hardware location. Initial feedback was the project was too intensive for the site and additional study of the site/area was needed.
Attachment C. Map of the North Western Glen Lake Study Area
Attachment D. North Western Glen Lake Development Wish List (Workshop I)

Minnetonka Western Glen Lake
CDI Workshop I
Small Group Discussion Notes
June 30, 2014

1. What makes the western Glen Lake area interesting or unique?
   “Small town” feel / sense of community
   • Small town “home” feeling (2)
   • Nature, private, nice lot sizes
   • Appropriate size – not too tall or too large
   • The people
   • Everyone knows each other – see neighbors

Small businesses
• Unique small businesses – no chain retailers
• Diverse businesses and community
• The diversity (business and services) – grocery store, hardware store, different styles of housing
• Small business operators
• Small business
• Guns & dancing & post office
• Recent renovation of the strip mall
• Essential services – walking, easy access to those (grocery, bank, post office)
• Post office
• BP does repair
• Deox Gas at Mobil
• Currently a parking lot and garden market
• I want Butler Square with a rooftop restaurant

Safe
• Glen Lake is still regarded as a “community” – which is small and safe
• Safe area
• Accessible walkways
• Walkable
• Convenience – pedestrian access, proximity – walking
• No highway traffic – a walkable community already exists
• 2 lanes to one lane on Excelsior Blvd

Natural setting
• View off Wing Lake, unusual topography – rolling hills, trees, etc. keeps wildlife present within our community
• Landscape
• Hilly road
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• Build on key assets such as Kinsel Point, Glen Lake, the history of the area.
• Glen Lake park
• Gardens

Unique location / Other
• Landlocked with limited space available
• Absolute west end
• Near residential
• Need to transition well
• On hill, water in basement of old building
• The Councils good or poor decisions for the use of the area

2. What could be accomplished through development that would improve/enhance the area?
   Additional services / businesses
   • Perhaps some medical services
   • A pharmacy
   • Bring back the grocery store
   • Bakery
   • Better parking for post office
   • Drug store
   • Small businesses (dentist, auto parts, tax accountant, lawyers – office building)
   • Additional stores and services

Housing
• Inviting new families and new home buyers to the area keeping it vibrant
• Housing. Bring in younger families

Attract customers to area
• Make Glen Lake a destination
• Identity
• Something that keeps “players” to stay in community (e.g. Dairy Queen, fountain)
• To bring more people to the area – families to move here, people to spend their money here
• Provide opportunities to see friends

Stronger connections
• Extend walkways
• An actual bus terminal
• Bike path / lanes with connection to other bike paths
• Possible connection with SW LRT rail?
• Create pedestrian access from west of Glen Lake into business area

Visual Appeal
• Eliminate eye-sores
• An increase in green spaces and “artfulness” of area
• Balance (size)
• Beautification
• Green space

3. What concerns for the area do you have as future development occurs?
   Traffic / parking
   • Increased traffic
   • Adequate parking and ingress / egress
   • Parking to accommodate seniors, parents / young children where appropriate
   • Traffic on Williston Road
   • Traffic light / traffic control to allow better access to and from Woodhill & Excelsior Blvd
   • Added traffic
   • Parking for future development
   • Parking needs
   • Traffic
   • Additional traffic leaking to traffic signals creates back-up

Size / scale
• Safety concerns with too large, too big – too many renter changes
• Development too large to sustain (e.g. parking, etc.)
• Avoid “large scale” projects
• Excessive height
• Encroach tall buildings on street
• Height of building
• Scale of building

Housing
• No more senior housing
• Lots of senior housing – no further need
• No more senior housing, no low-income housing
• Not all low cost housing

Environmental concerns
• Loss of trees
• Green trees
• Not pedestrian friendly
Commercial uses
- Two gas stations are excessive; neither is full range of services
- Not all big chain operators
- Keep businesses full
- Current retaining walls, drainage – new problems

Other
- Development does NOT happen
- Need to look at whole site as one entity
- Time frame
- Style

4. Are there specific needs (housing, retail, office, etc.) for which this site would be a good fit?

Housing
- Low-density townhomes
- Housing size and use
- Adds homes
- Homeowners

Retail
- Local bakery
- Local butcher / meat store
- Smaller restaurant
- Make the Kramer’s “new” site more visible and viable
- A pharmacy
- CVS drug store
- Drug store
- Rx drug
- Keep post office
- Drug store
- Physical therapy
- Grocery store
- Post office remain
- Grocery / drug / convenience store
- Trader Joes or specialty grocery store
- No Trader Joes! Traffic!

Community space
- Exchange library
- Satellite site for Williston Community Center
- Landscaping should be included regardless of use.

Other
- Frustrations from last Wartman A/Bk development
• Young and multigenerational appeal
• Connection (visually pleasing) from east to west Glen Lake
• Bike lane
• Mixed-use
• Mixed-use building
• More parking with ramp behind building

5. What additional information would you like to have in order to assess the opportunities for housing and commercial development in the western Glen Lake area?

Background information
• What happened / status of Kinsel Point development?
• Why have previous developments failed?
• Continue to be notified by City of Minnetonka about development and substantial changes
• Bigger picture – Minnetonka & Metropolitan Council guide plan
• New bus schedule study
• Light rail connection
• School District capacity
• Walk behind the buildings
• See retaining walls
• Make the 2010 comp plan part of the discussion
• Issues surrounding rental vs. homeownership

Market data
• Survey business owners about their input and needs
• Old Market study (grocery store)
• Density needed to support small businesses

Financial incentives / tools
• What financial incentives are available from City to assist development?
• Will TIF be used?
• What type of city financial support?

Regulatory / fiscal impact
• Tax effect
• What variances will be required?
• Building within the slope restrictions?
### Attachment E. Block Exercise Summary Sheets (Workshop II)

#### Western Glen Lake: Table 1  Extended Site

**Scenario #1**

**Details:**
- Affordable Rental Units: 10
- Market Rate Rental Units: 60
- Home Ownership Units: 100
- Total Units: 180
- Average Building Height: 2.5 Stories
- Levels, Below Grade Parking: none
- Total Commercial S.F.: 25,000 sf

**Key Ideas (notes from discussion plus further thoughts):**
- Lots of open space, detached buildings

**Results:**
- Total Development Cost: $26-30 million
- $3-6 million gap
- Plenty of green space

**Conclusion:**
- Huge financial gap (more than 20%), probably not feasible

#### Scenario #2: Excelsior on Excelsior

**Details:**
- Affordable Rental Units: 12
- Market Rate Rental Units: 112
- Home Ownership Units: 0
- Total Units: 124
- Average Building Height: 4
- Levels, Below Grade Parking: 1
- Total Commercial S.F.: 20,000 sf

**Key Ideas (notes from discussion plus further thoughts):**
- Maximize it out. Recruit existing businesses to new retail.
- Trees and green space along Excelsior.

**Results:**
- Total Development Cost: $42 million
- $8 million gap
- Plenty of green space

**Conclusion:**
- 20% gap, worth looking at more closely but getting a little far away.

---

**Corridor Development Initiative**

**Western Glen Lake | Minnetonka**

**JULY 14, 2014**
**SCENARIO #3: OFFICE & OWNERSHIP**

**DETAILS:**
- Affordable Rental Units: 7
- Market Rate Rental Units: 47
- Home Ownership Units: 24
- Total Units: 78
- Average Building Height: 4 Stories
- Levels, Below Grade Parking: 1
- Total Commercial S.F.: 20,000 sf

**Key Ideas (notes from discussion plus further thoughts):**
Gas station stays. Four story office building, owner occupied townhomes, some open space. Restaurants.

**RESULTS:**
- Total Development Cost: $32 million
- $5 million gap
- Plenty of green space

**CONCLUSION:**
- 15% financial gap, not bad
SCENARIO #1: GLEN HILLS

**DETAILS:**
- Affordable Rental Units: 12
- Market Rate Rental Units: 48
- Home Ownership Units: 0
- Total Units: 60
- Average Building Height: 3.5 Stories
- Levels, Below Grade Parking: 1 (surface parking)
- Total Commercial S.F.: 35,000

**Key Ideas (notes from discussion plus further thoughts):**
- Drug store on corner and a new post office plus new office space.
- Housing built into the hill with access of Excelsior.
- Surface parking for businesses.

**RESULTS:**
- Total Development Cost: $28 million
- $5.5 million gap
- Plenty of green space

**CONCLUSION:**
- Too large of a gap to be feasible. 1/2 of the financial gap was due to the commercial.

SCENARIO #2: GLEN STATION

**DETAILS:**
- Affordable Rental Units: 16
- Market Rate Rental Units: 8
- Home Ownership Units: 24
- Total Units: 48
- Average Building Height: 2.5 stories
- Levels, Below Grade Parking: 1
- Total Commercial S.F. 30,000

**Key Ideas (notes from discussion plus further thoughts):**
- Drug store & restaurant on corner. First floor retail with housing along Excelsior. Owned condos on back portion of the site.

**RESULTS:**
- Total Development Cost: $26 million
- $5 million gap
- Plenty of green space

**CONCLUSION:**
- Too large of a gap to be feasible.
### Western Glen Lake: Table 2  Extended Site

**Scenario #3: Community Corner**

**Details:**
- Affordable Rental Units: 12
- Market Rate Rental Units: 48
- Home Ownership Units: 12
- Total Units: 72
- Average Building Height: 3.5
- Levels, Below Grade Parking: 1
- Total Commercial S.F: 10,000 sf

**Key Ideas (notes from discussion plus further thoughts):**
- Small town feeling along Excelsior, 1-2 story buildings.
- Housing concentrated on back of site.

**Results:**
- Total Development Cost: $30 million
- $4.5 million gap
- Plenty of green space

**Conclusion:**
- 15% financial gap, worth looking into further.
SCENARIO #1: KRAMER'S POINT

DETAILS:
Affordable Rental Units: 7
Market Rate Rental Units: 13
Home Ownership Units: 24
Total Units: 44
Average Building Height: 3 Stories
Levels, Below Grade Parking: 1
Total Commercial S.F.: 5,000

Key Ideas (notes from discussion plus further thoughts):
Where is the best location for access into the property from Williston Road? Transition of density, higher towards Excelsior. Presence of green space.

RESULTS:
Total Development Cost: $19 million
$2.2 million gap ($500K gap from commercial)
Plenty of green space

CONCLUSION:
Less than 20% financial gap; may be worth playing with a little more.
WESTERN GLEN LAKE: TABLE 3

SCENARIO #2: 1904--VERSION 1
DETAILS:
Affordable Rental Units: 0
Market Rate Rental Units: 0
Home Ownership Units: 64
Total Units: 64
Average Building Height: 3 stories
Levels, Below Grade Parking: 1
Total Commercial S.F.: 10,000

RESULTS:
Total Development Cost: $26 million
No gap
Plenty of green space

CONCLUSION:
The estimated home price was $400,000

SCENARIO #2: 1904--VERSION 2
DETAILS:
Affordable Rental Units: 0
Market Rate Rental Units: 32
Home Ownership Units: 32
Total Units: 64
Average Building Height: 3 stories
Levels, Below Grade Parking: 1
Total Commercial S.F.: 10,000

RESULTS:
Total Development Cost: $24 million
$2 million gap
Plenty of green space

CONCLUSION:
Could be financially feasible

KEY IDEAS FROM ALL THREE OPTIONS:
- Respect the adjacent neighborhood
- Transition of residential
- Green on Excelsior and Williston
- Neighborhood scale commercial
- A mix of apartment sizes

SCENARIO #2: 1904--VERSION 3
DETAILS:
Affordable Rental Units: 0
Market Rate Rental Units: 48
Home Ownership Units: 16
Total Units: 64
Average Building Height: 2.5 stories
Levels, Below Grade Parking: 1
Total Commercial S.F.: none listed

RESULTS:
Total Development Cost: $24 million
$3.5 million gap
Plenty of green space

CONCLUSION:
Worth looking into more
Attachment F. Developer Panel Meeting Notes (Workshop III)

Minnetonka: Western Glen Lake Corridor Development Initiative

Workshop 3: Developer Panel

July 28, 2014
The Glenn, Chapel, 5300 Woodhill Rd, Minnetonka

Meeting Notes

Developer Panel Discussion
Facilitated by Barbara Raye, Center for Policy Planning and Performance

Panel Members:
- Bill Beard, The Beard Group
- John Mehrkens, Senior Housing Group / Presbyterian Homes
- Pat Mascia, Briggs and Morgan
- Keith Ulstad, United Properties
- Tom Ryan, Oppidan Investment Fund

Opening Questions:
1. What is your development expertise?
2. How would you redevelop the western Glen Lake area?

Bill Beard, The Beard Group
- Bill’s development background includes mixed use projects with residential, commercial, and office components. Recent projects are located in Hopkins’ Mainstreet, and Osseo.
- **Recommendations for the site:** Residential with possible small amount of retail.
  - It’s a terrific site. There is a “there” here — a synergism and community feel that can be built on.
  - Learn from a recent mixed-use project I did in Hopkins:
    - Residential / rental units – 100% full
    - Commercial space – 100% vacant
  - Limit the commercial space.
  - The scenarios that were proposed in the block exercise weren’t nearly as dense as other projects in the area.
  - Greater density can drive stronger amenities, and make the area more walkable. Many uses are already here.
  - You are on the right track with how you are looking at the opportunity of the site.

John Mehrkens, Senior Housing Group / Presbyterian Homes
- John specializes in senior housing of all types, and oversees project development and consulting services for Presbyterian Homes.
- **Recommendation for the site**: Housing has good potential for the area. Neighborhood-based senior community (limited size) might work – not a larger compound.
  - Already a significant amount of senior housing in the area. There is a value in multiple components that compliment each other.
  - Over time more seniors will be going to need housing products.
  - Making Glen Lake a destination that doesn’t attract more traffic present conflicting goals.
  - The area won’t attract national retail tenants. More likely to be smaller (Mom & Pop) / local retail options.
  - All-age housing products may also be saturated.

**Pat Mascia, Briggs and Morgan**
- Pat’s primary areas of expertise are in commercial real estate development and leasing, commercial real estate acquisitions, zoning and land use law, structured and project finance, and commercial and corporate finance. Recent projects include the West End in St. Louis Park, the Wilder Center in St. Paul (LEED Gold Certified), and almost 1.5 million square feet of industrial and office space.

- **Recommendation for the site**: Primarily housing, but also cries for some sort of mixed-use.
  - Limited possibility of some smaller office space.
  - The cost of redevelopment is high, and will push the need for density up.
  - Need to address the tension of parking and traffic.
  - Good area for neighborhood retail and local shops, but it will be hard for them to pay the higher rents of a new building.
  - As a residential site it looks fantastic.
  - For a mixed-use project, each element needs to stand on its own. The housing needs to be viable with or without the retail / commercial space. And the success of the retail / commercial space should not depend on the housing.

**Keith Ulstad, United Properties**
- Keith’s expertise is in retail investment and development. While focusing primarily on grocery-anchored neighborhood shopping centers, he also has a strong market knowledge, and relationships with many tenants in the retail sector. He has been responsible for the development or redevelopment of more than 25 shopping centers.

- **Recommendation for the site**: Probably predominately a housing site. If retail / commercial mix it has to be done carefully, with primarily convenience services (of which there are already a fair amount in the area).
  - 10 – 15,000 square feet of commercial space, maybe 20,000, could be viable. Which presumes 1,200 – 1,500 sf shops. (The meeting room space is about the same size.)
  - It’s important to think about what the site is, and what it is not. There is a very hard boundary from a retailer’s perspective. The area will not be attractive to national retailers.
  - I don’t see it as an office site. Typically office begets office. Maybe small medical offices would work.
  - The site will most likely be led by housing, with well thought out commercial included. (Not primarily commercial, with housing included.)

**Tom Ryan, Oppidan Investment Fund**
- Tom works with commercial clients to find sites, and supports them through city processes and lease negotiations or land purchases.
• **Recommendation for the site:** Mixed-use.
  - The site is unique.
  - Good location for a pharmacy.

**What is the “right mix” of housing for the area?**

**JM** No matter how many housing units are added on the site, it won’t be enough to tip the market to bring retailers here (presuming 30 – 130 new units built). It’s not a dramatic enough increase to the market. There is a diversity (or continuum) of the senior housing market, from independent to skilled nursing. The most well received type is Independent Living – which is also the most challenging to do as free standing element. People are moving into this type of housing at later stages of life (more frail). An interim step is a townhome / condominium / cooperative. The trend will continue with new home services, allowing people to stay in their homes longer. Cooperatives are a good ownership model, predominately independent, few parking needs, lower density might lend well to the site.

**What’s the right size of commercial space?**

**PM** Depends on the type of use. Larger restaurants, such as CRAVE, need 10,000 square feet. Smaller restaurants, like a sushi place, might use only 2,000 square feet. The size of the space needed depends on the neighborhood / customer base. Outdoor seating helps to expand the seating area. A yogurt shop is typically 1,200 square feet. For a 10,000 square foot area, you would probably need 10 tenants / stores.

**KU** The challenge is in designing the retail space. A shallow commercial space is 60 feet deep. 30,000 square feet requires a lot of customers to fill it up. Mixed use needs to be carefully done, and designed so that all uses can succeed.

**PM** The depth of the retail presents a challenge for what you build above (configuring vertically). Also, be thinking about how open space is integrated in the site. The more you add commercial space, the more parking you will need.

**TR** We used to think that people would live, shop, all in one place (vertical uses). That didn’t turn out to be true. All elements need to support themselves independently from each other.

**KU** The big challenge of mixed use is that the developer needs to build to what is hot. Waves that go through the economy don’t support doing different things at the same time. I have a project working now that was originally going to be condo / office. We ended up shifting through six different uses, and are finally landing on three. Mixed use projects are a matter of market timing – you need to wait for the stars to align.
How can we make the area more walkable?

People will walk around Glen Lake, but they won’t walk to Glen Lake. There’s no grid, and the area converges around the site. The lack of a street system will hurt walkability. To make it more walkable, put structured/surface parking near Glen Lake. Get to the site, make it convenient so that people will become pedestrians.

How can we attract people to the area?

JM Creating a destination is a lofty goal. Something that would get people to drive in from other places might be a series of specialty shops. More people usually means more parking. Housing will be underground parking, and will require fewer spots than commercial uses. Structured parking will be financially challenging: $27,000 per stall vs. $3,500 – $4,000 per stall for surface parking.

BB Rule of thumb – the purpose of place-making is to make an area special or cool for those who live in the area, greater good for the community. Making it a great spot, means it will be a great place to live. Concentrate on making one space special, which makes the neighborhood special. When you have a lot of retail, it requires a higher parking requirement, which may detract from the place-making elements.

JM There are many tension points to be managed.

What does a developer look at to select a site? What would draw you to a particular site?

TR The price of the site and its access for retail. Access is less important for housing. The Gold Nugget is a draw for the area.

Explain more about “the box / boundary” that limits the retail market of the area?

KU The area is bounded by Hwy 494, 7, Crosstown, and 101. Major roads are a psychological barrier for people. This is a neighborhood retail setting – and a cool one (e.g. Gold Nugget, Kramer Hardware). A grocery store needs a market area of 42,000 households to be viable.

What happens to the existing businesses on the site? Will they need to move? Or could they stay?

PM The hard part is the transition for existing businesses, and the need for temporary relocation during construction. The other challenge is higher rents in the new space (necessitated by the cost of the new construction). Often the local retailers are not able to stay, even if they can deal with temporary relocation.
What’s the likelihood that the entire site gets developed together, given the multiple property owners?

PM  Depends on how the City wants to stage it. What will the plan be long term? It may be that no one can purchase all the sites, but a plan could be in place that is staged over time. The fact that a developer would need to aggregate multiple sites makes a larger project much more challenging to do.

JM  An economic package will appeal to an investor. The big challenge is in trying to assemble multiple sites, and keeping everyone on the same page (usually there is at least one hold out). A phased approach allows for transition, but adds to the cost.

BB  No developer will want to come in to do the whole site all at once. There are no tools to accomplish (site acquisition) easily. A land use plan could help.

Wouldn’t office space as a component of a mixed use project offer more foot traffic which would create a destination?

Attempts at grocery stores keep failing. Would a smaller Mom / Pop drug store or grocery store be viable?

BB  Developers don’t create a market, we respond to it. No matter how much a community want it, it won’t happen unless the market is there. Office space is very compatible with mixed use residential.

TR  Not sure if this is an office market. Not easy to access. A grocery store could potentially work as a smaller foot print. The previous grocery store that recently closed did so because of other problems.

Glen Lake is bordered by two schools / daycare, which are great for bringing people into the area for goods and services. Wouldn’t that factor in to strengthen the market for a grocery store?

Can we work with a corporate partner to acquire and hold sites for a long-term vision and strategy? Example: Des Moines IA

KU  The school and daycare are great for bringing people in, but not enough traffic to impact retail. There’s not enough daytime population to attract restaurants.

The simple answer to the second question is no – Land ownership is a cost on a balance sheet. Businesses are putting more work into longer term growth plans. United Health Group purchased a site at Shady Oakes, driven by what they need for their business rather than what the community needs.

PM  As Cargill put together their new campus they considered how to recruit and keep talent. They assessed where their employees lived, and looked for a location that would...
be easily accessible. Be-the-Match (a bone marrow business) wanted to be near light rail.

Office growth is hard to count on today. There hasn’t been much employment growth, and there are a lot of vacant office buildings to fill before building new.

JM The DesMoines example was about social accountability, and the need for the city to remain competitive. In a larger region its harder to do.

The likelihood of finding a small grocer is difficult. The margins for grocery stores are very small (no room for error). A different kind of grocer may work. Pharmacies have a strong system to assess viable sites. The likelihood is more remote.

BB Smaller format grocery stores are happening (e.g. Aldi’s, Trader Joes, Kowalski). The sector needs clarity to figure out if the smaller stores are a viable option. It’s really about the viability of the location (not as much about the rents).

**What’s hot in development right now?**

JM Senior housing – just look at the demographics. Actually, the baby boom won’t access senior housing for another ten years. Today’s seniors are active and independent longer. Pockets of housing types will have certain success due to pent up demand.

PM Industrial. Apartments continue to hang on. Rumors that the condo market is starting to come back. Office is not (it’s stable but not hot).

KU Fast, casual dining / fresh fast food (e.g. Chipotle). Smaller grocery stores (28 – 30,000 square feet) are being tested. Industry standard is 50 – 60,000 square feet. Lakewoods Co-op is an example of a smaller grocery store. Fresh Time farmers market (30,000 sf) has an emphasis on fresh produce.

TR Discount stores (e.g. Goodwill). Note the recent acquisition of Family Dollar by Dollar Tree to compete with Walmart.

BB The Osseo residential project we are doing has 71 units, designed for a mix of age levels (Millenials, Baby Boomers, Gen X). They want the same things on the exterior, but different interior spaces. Baby boomers want larger units with storage. Millenials need less space – smaller units.

**What makes a site attractive to a developer?**

PM A lot of what is discussed in the block exercise scenarios are viable – it depends on the right mix. Attracting national retailers is not a viable option. Multi-story office building is not a viable option. What makes a great site? The surrounding context, what’s
missing that might be added? Figure out the pieces of the puzzle. A developer takes on a lot of risk, and when it doesn’t work out, they absorb the losses. Ultimately, having the right location at the right price is what works.

Is there an unmet demand?

KU It feels like a great residential site, with retail as an amenity. It’s a well connected part of town.

Are we already filled out with neighborhood retail?

KU The post office is a great draw – important amenity. Keeping it will make the development better.

BB You can do residential without retail. In our Osseo project on Main Street the community wanted retail. We showed them the cost of putting retail in the project, and they decided not to. There is a “there” in Glen Lake. The cost to do retail will require subsidy in the 15% to 20% range.

JM There are economics to making a project work. You need to look at the value of the site, not the price of the site. This site can be developed as a housing only site (or housing as the dominant component). Other retailers would probably like more retail in the area.

What about Target Express? Or Walmart, who is looking at a smaller option?

KU Possibility, but too soon to tell. Target has one Target Express at 16,000 square feet (a pilot project), but the jury is still out as to whether it will be successful. Walmart is talking about doing a smaller store, but they haven’t figured out how to bring the scale down. It’s a ways off, but I’m not saying it won’t come.

Your risk is our risk. Members of the community are exhausted by previous development. A high-rise condo project is still sitting idle. How would that inform this site? And what would you advise the City Officials if you were a resident?

TR The idle project wouldn’t have a huge impact on future development – not enough housing units (rooftops) to affect the market.

PM Absolutely, the community shares in the risk. No developer comes in wanting a project to fail. The developer is putting the money in. There are so many moving parts, the assumptions can’t be controlled. The best the community can do is to be knowledgeable about what the developer is about (background), do a market study, and this process is a great step to be informed. Educate yourself and you will have more success than failure.
BB  In our Osseo project, 80% of the residents came from the local community. People don’t want to leave their community, but also don’t want the responsibility of home upkeep.

It’s good that we are getting an understanding of what density will be needed. The previous proposal for the site wasn’t necessarily bad, but concerns about traffic pushed the developer off. What is it going to take give a proposal the green light?

(Closing Comments)

BB  Redevelopment is scary because people don’t know how it will end up. When proposals are submitted, they don’t know how to react. Minnetonka is a great place, and that won’t change. Think about how to add another piece to make it more special. One redevelopment project won’t change who you are as a community.

JM  I commend you for the work you are doing, and I understand why you are tired. This process is a good way to educate each other about how to make a project successful. The good news is that it’s a viable site, and will attract people who are willing to go through the brain damage to make it work.

PM  West End was grueling. It took three years to plan, had a lot of conflict, was a painful process, AND we ended up with a better project. You need to build trust on both sides.

KU  It’s good to have constructive criticism. A clear vision is better for everyone. I’m impressed by the process and the strong turn-out on such a nice summer night.

TR  This is a special community. I encourage you to keep working together.
Attachment G. Evaluation summaries for each CDI Workshop

Corridor Development Initiative
Western Glen Lake

Evaluation – June 30, 2014
Tonight’s session was the first in a series that will engage residents in planning for the Western Glen Lake area. We would like to know how well the session met its goals. Please complete this form and leave it on the registration table. Your feedback will be used to make improvements throughout the project.

1. What worked well or were good parts of the session for you?
   - Group session discussions
   - Well organized
   - Working together
   - Good to hear so many ideas/ concerns expressed by neighbors
   - Briefing
   - Overall very effective
   - (5) Small group discussions, Small groups it was nice to have the collaborative effort
     Table talk, Break-out block writing sessions and hearing others responses
   - Having questions prepared
   - Well ran
   - Good introduction
   - (2) Multi input from many, Getting input from the community
   - Enough seating for everyone
   - Like the brainstorming between residents

2. What could have been improved?
   - Acoustics
   - History of the area, the culture that is current
   - Better sound
   - Larger projection of slides.
   - A better description (up front) on why we are starting this discussion/purpose of this planning project
   - Light snacks and beverages
   - Can’t read the slides. Blue print doesn’t show. Too small print.
   - First slide (Loren) hard to read small letters, light color
   - The facilitator should get familiar with the site. She seemed unaware that the hardware store is still in Glen Lake or that there is still a post office on the site
   - Define West Glen Lake
   - Greater context of the community, Metro Council, Minnetonka, DOT roads, what the state has in mind for us long term.
   - More detail on current status of properties/projects
   - Nothing
   - Meet the people at table before start
   - Intro was important but a little long

3. Please rate the following items by putting an “x” or “✓” in the appropriate column.
Corridor Development Initiative
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you have a good understanding of the characteristics of the area and things that could be considered when evaluating development options?</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you get good information about the history of the area and other projects that have occurred here?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have a good list of the benefits and opportunities that the right development could bring to the area?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe the city could have provided examples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have a greater understanding of the concerns your neighbors have regarding future development on the site?</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you have the opportunity to speak and to be heard?</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Would you recommend the next session to your neighbors/colleagues?

| 27 - Yes | 1 - No | 1 - No Opinion |

Comments: Publicize more.

5. What additional information would you like to have included in the next meeting?

- Success story examples and examples of what the city is trying to do
- Hard to work a splinter without a big picture overview. Should do community level at least before the small area of interest
- Construction choices
- Future traffic considerations, city planning's idea on what are the future needs for the area
- What the city thinks is sustainable in the area. And if there are plans or ideas that have been put forth
- What are the advantages and disadvantages of this development?
- I heard a lot of conflicting comments. It will be very interesting to see how it resolves
- You did just about everything you could within the time frame
- Old market study
- What current business owners think would be helpful
Corridor Development Initiative
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- Like to see what progresses with next meetings

6. How long have you lived or worked in the area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) = 1-3 Years</th>
<th>(1) = 4-9 Years</th>
<th>(2) = 10-19 Yrs</th>
<th>(25) = 20+ Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. What age bracket do you represent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0 = Teen</th>
<th>1 = Young Adult</th>
<th>14 = Adult</th>
<th>12 = Senior/Retired</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. What cultural/ethnic heritage do you represent?

- 14 Caucasian
- 4 Germans
- 3 Scandinavians
- 1 Basque
- Life long Minnesotan
- Middle income, master's degree

Comment:
Too many of us and not enough ethnic diversity
Scandinavian and German - but in MN since 1855

9. How did learn about tonight’s session?

- Friend on Glen Oak received mailing x
- Flier at Glen Lake Café
- Post card/car in mail (11)
- Neighbors are involved
- Word of mouth/friend (3)
- E-Minnetonka.com.mailing
- Postings (2)
- Mailing (4)

10. What had you hoped to get from tonight’s session?

- Community views
- Information on what may be developed
- Information (2)
- Trying to figure out the purpose of this discussion. What is driving this?
- Ideas and problems
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- Meeting what just what I expected
- Concerns/desires of the community
- Receive additional information, learn more about the project.
- See what others in the community thought
- Understanding on what our neighbors want in this area
- Energy for change
- Information about the possibilities for proposed sites
- Share ideas-good
- My voice heard
- If view things as “no” (no development) This encouraged me - there might be things I do want
- A better understanding

11. How satisfied are you overall with tonight’s session?

| 15 = Very Satisfied | 10 = Somewhat Satisfied | 1 = Somewhat Dissatisfied | 0 = Very Dissatisfied |

Optional: Any other comments you would like to share?

- I’m concerned about this discussion. It is not my intention to be driving the small businesses out of Glen Lake by participating. I understand the need for planning but this is not my endorsement to bring out the bulldozers and flatten the NW corner.
- Please not another 50th & France! Traffic lights are not a viable (good) decision for the area. Parking is key, connection (access) to the rest of the world is key, hwy 7 & 62 signage for “Glen Lake”
- Good idea for community meeting/discussion
- Keep up the good work
- Good to get input
- I don’t feel a real sense of urgency with the planning process. Participation (full) is a large time commitment when the “outcome” is just “planning”. What is the council’s commitment to action?
- Very informative
- Good introduction
- Hope citizens are heard this time, unlike the bundled ABC of Wartman’s project that was accepted over community’s objections.
Corridor Development Initiative  
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_Evaluation – July 14, 2014_

Please tell us how effective tonight’s Block Exercise was in meeting its goals.

1. What worked well?
   - Good group facilitator
   - Got in a good group
   - Splitting into group
   - Everything
   - Good leadership
   - The physical demo
   - Lego block idea and financial feedback almost immediately
   - Most people had a better idea of the challenge. Very few at this table understood the affect of typography
   - Working in groups to construct plans
   - Having table leaders that were brought in different approach was fun
   - Groups discussion laying out block on table

2. What could have been improved?
   - More significant data draft ownership
   - Some not open to others opinions felt their ideas were always better
   - Less air conditioning warmer temperature
   - Make the groups smaller. The facilitator was a little to forceful with his ideas rather than asking leading questions for us to solve problems
   - Better instructions re: not moving from your table and doing 3 versions at one table
   - We didn't have time to discuss how our plan s fit our goals. We were too focused on costs
   - More mapping to remind of the greater context of the proposed development

3. Please rate the following items by putting an "x" or "√" in the appropriate column

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community members had an opportunity to build sample development options.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants gained knowledge about market influences and financial feasibility of their ideas.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Participants had an opportunity to hear ideas from other community members about multiple options for the future.
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>11</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Design considerations, traffic flow, parking, and other development concepts helped in preparing for a successful development.
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. How long have you lived or worked in the area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>1-3</th>
<th>4-9</th>
<th>10-19</th>
<th>20+</th>
<th>Not Apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(46)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What age bracket do you represent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Bracket</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teen</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Adult</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior/Retired</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What had you hoped to get from tonight’s session?

- More information about the development
- A better understanding of how to use the property
- A better understanding of economies of development
- How far the development would be. How many buildings affected
- Involvement – learning
- No gas station, No gun shop, restaurant okay
- Well addressed
- Just what we got
- A feel for what’s being thought of
- More information on grocery etc.

7. Would you recommend the next session to your neighbors/coworkers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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8. What additional information would you like to have included in the next meeting?

- Current or proposed plans for the site
- More community involvement is good
- What is the likelihood that the grocery store and dance studio would be part of the development
- I would like a CAD representation of heights slope actual altitude of site. Sketch up would help
- Traffic limits on Williston

9. How satisfied are you overall with tonight’s session?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments. (Optional)

- Wonder how much all of this is costing the city (tax payers?)
- Need a more realistic look at development projects
- I would like to get peoples names and location residence around development. Small map needed more reference of neighborhood. Expand map outside red line.
- Great job
- Thanks
- It was fun
Corridor Development Initiative  
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*Evaluation – July 28, 2014*

1. What worked well?  
   - The Panel  
   - Questions and answers  
   - Very informational  
   - Panel setting  
   - The questions facilitated by Barbara  
   - Good balance and qualified panel  
   - The moderator was fantastic one of the best moderators I have witnessed  
   - Good mix of panelist. I appreciate Barbara queuing up audience questions, so no one gets forgotten.

2. What could be improved?  
   - How do you get more neighbors involved; such a small percent attends  
   - The panel lacked ability to explain what will work, too much negativity, too much discussion what does not work. Want information on what should be developed. Heard housing, but little information on the type of housing. Bill was completely out of touch with audience and their needs. Panel was too focused on their message, not the needs of community.  
   - Doesn’t seem very “open” to any ideas. Need one developer having a record or experience thinking outside the box to be creative or take a low risk for real success.  
   - Acoustics  
   - The panel questions by the moderator were not informative for the most part  
   - Very timely  
   - More time for questions

3. Please rate the following items by putting an “x” or “✓” in the appropriate column

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You gained information about options developers think are possible at the site.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You better understand the considerations that developers use when selecting a site.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You gained ideas about how the community can build a relationship with developers regarding its vision.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You had an opportunity to ask questions and discuss with the panel and others the goals and concerns you have for re-development.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4. What additional information would you like to have before our final meeting?
   • Would the developer be open to reflection on our comments, what do they think?
   • Outside source market study
   • Exact plans
   • Why is it already “one” parcel (2 lots, plus Kramer’s) rather than still looking at the option of “two” parcels

Additional Comments:
• *I came late to the meeting so I missed much of the developers insights*
• *Good, realistic - world opinions*
• *Excellent comment on knowing your developer*

5. How long have you lived or worked in the area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3 Years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-9 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ years</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What age bracket do you represent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Bracket</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Adult</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr/Retired</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How satisfied are you overall with tonight’s session?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Session 4 – August 11, 2014

1. What was most helpful about tonight’s session?
   • The ability to collectively alter the draft on screen
   • Facilitator had control
   • Those present were able to participate in formulation of recommendations for presentation to city
   • The process to get one document produced
   • The ideas and concerns that came
   • Good conversation airing of concerns
   • Neighbor communication
   • I am glad my neighbors have some goals and I do like the “Mayberry” feel of neighborhood
   • All of it
   • Discussion

2. Can you support the recommendations the group developed and approved?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• More yes than no because of the diversity of opinion, I didn’t get everything I wanted.
• Need more specifics

3. What did you gain from the project overall? (i.e. relationships, insight, information etc.)
   • Some new ideas about Glen Lake that I can support. Some of my ideas have changed based on new view points
   • Relationships, insight, information (3)
   • Information (2)
   • Insight
   • Increased sense of community-peaceably
   • Interest and feedback grew with each meeting
   • Developer perspective
   • An understanding of what the community and the developers want and what they can do.

4. What could have been improved to make the project more effective?
   • The last session needed more than 2 hours to obtain consensus. Very hard to build a final document from a diversity of people in only 2 hours.
   • Well done to bring locals into awareness
   • Online feedback/suggestions
   • Bit off too much (to get done?) for this time frame
• Be more practical and realistic
• In session 4 some of the changes suggested were to nit picky, overall the sessions were interesting
• “?” (2)

5. Would you recommend this series/project to other cities or communities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. How many sessions did you attend?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 session</th>
<th>2 sessions</th>
<th>3 sessions</th>
<th>4 sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Attended only one session – but read all the city project files

7. How long have you lived or worked in the area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>0-3</th>
<th>4-9</th>
<th>10-19</th>
<th>20+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. What age bracket do you represent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teen</th>
<th>Young Adult</th>
<th>Adult</th>
<th>Sr/Retired</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Overall how satisfied are you with the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Do you have any additional comments you would like to make to LISC, the City staff or elected officials?

• More input by city staff
• No
• Excellent process
• Great job
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Overview

The **Corridor Development Initiative (CDI)**, coordinated by the **Twin Cities Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC)**, is a proactive planning process to assist the planning and development of mixed-use projects, including mixed income, higher density housing along major corridors, with access to transportation options, retail amenities, parks, and job opportunities. CDI fosters an exciting partnership among neighborhoods, city government, and a technical team of development consultants, design experts, and facilitators to connect market opportunities with neighborhood and city goals and raises the level of dialogue around redevelopment issues. In 2007 the Corridor Development Initiative received the American Planning Association’s **National Planning Excellence Award for a Grassroots Initiative**.

“The Initiative shows the importance of getting residents meaningfully engaged in shaping the future of their neighborhoods,” said APA Awards Jury Chair Carol Rhea, AICP. “Any community looking for a new way to resolve controversial neighborhood redevelopment and infill issues should consider using this as a model,” she said.

The heart of the program involves an interactive block exercise facilitated by a neutral team of design and development experts from the Initiative’s technical team. Through this hands-on educational workshop residents, neighborhood leaders, and other participants develop their own housing or mixed-use development proposals and test them to see whether they are financially viable. As a result, participants learn about cost factors and other considerations developers must address when putting together a proposal.

“The Corridor Development Initiative pulls citizens out of the reactionary role that they play in community development decisions, and into a proactive role where they play an active part in directing development for their community,” said Gretchen Nicholls, Program Officer at Twin Cities LISC and Corridor Development Initiative Coordinator. “It models a new way to engage cities and communities by raising the level of dialogue around redevelopment issues, and setting the stage for future development. People come to realize how density and affordable housing become tools for creating a viable development project,” she said.

Through the Initiative’s consensus approach, said Minneapolis Mayor R.T. Rybak, citizen energy is harnessed “to build communities far stronger than anything government can do alone.” The Corridor Development Initiative is used in both urban and suburban cities throughout the Twin Cities metropolitan area, and is being replicated in other cities nationally.

For more information contact:

Gretchen Nicholls  
Twin Cities LISC / Corridor Development Initiative  
651-265-2280  
gnicholls@lisc.org

Videos and testimonials are available at: [www.corridordevelopment.org](http://www.corridordevelopment.org)
Mark your calendars!
We encourage participants to attend all four events
All events are free and open to the public and will be held at:
The Glenn, Chapel
5300 Woodhill Road, Minnetonka

Workshop I: Gather Information
Monday, June 30, 2014, 6:00 - 8:00 pm
What is important and unique about western Glen Lake?
What are the concerns about future development, and what
can be achieved through development?

Workshop II: Development Opportunities -- The
Block Exercise Monday, July 14, 2014, 6:00 - 8:00 pm
Join your neighbors in an interactive workshop to create
feasible development scenarios for western Glen Lake.
Design and development experts will be on hand to share
ideas and insights.

Workshop III: Developer Discussion
Monday, July 28, 2014, 6:00 - 8:00 pm
Explore the opportunities and challenges of development
with a panel of developers and market consultants to build a
strategic road map for the future of western Glen Lake.

Workshop IV: Framing Recommendations
Monday, August 11, 2014, 6:00 – 8:00 pm
Contribute to the creation of development recommendations
for western Glen Lake which will be submitted to the
Minnetonka city Council and Planning Commission.
Planning Commission Staff Report  
Meeting of March 5, 2015

Brief Description  
Election of chair and vice-chair

Recommendation  
Elect a chair and vice-chair.

Introduction

Article IV of the Planning Commission’s Bylaws requires that the Commission hold an election for its chair and vice chair at the first meeting in March each year. The chair position was vacated by Paul Lehman when his term expired in January. The current vice chair is Heather Odland who has served as chair for February meetings. Staff recommends that the commission hold its election of officers at this time. According to the Bylaws, officers of the commission serve for a one–year period.

Staff Recommendation

Elect a chair and vice-chair.

Originator: Loren Gordon, AICP, City Planner
MINNETONKA PLANNING COMMISSION
March 5, 2015

Brief Description
Review of the Planning Commission’s Bylaws and Policies

Recommendation
Readopt the bylaws and policies

Introduction

The Planning Commission’s Bylaws require that the Commission review its bylaws and policies each year. The current bylaws and policies are attached.

Comments

Staff has no changes to recommend; however, commissioners should review the bylaws and policies. Staff requests that commissioners review the bylaws and policies and advise staff before the meeting of any suggested changes.

Staff Recommendation

Readopt the attached bylaws and policies, with any suggested changes.

Originator: Loren Gordon, AICP, City Planner
ARTICLE I - GENERAL

The Minnetonka Planning Commission is established under City Code section 300.04 and Minnesota State Statutes Annotated section 462.354, subdivision 1(2).

ARTICLE II - PURPOSE

The commission is appointed by the City Council to assist and advise the City Council in the administration of the City Zoning Ordinance, Guide Plan and Subdivision Ordinance: to conduct public hearings upon matters as required by the provisions of City Code, section 300, and on any other matters referred by the City Council.

ARTICLE III - MEETINGS

Section I. Regular Meetings

The regular meetings of the commission will be held at the offices of the City of Minnetonka, located at 14600 Minnetonka Boulevard. The meeting schedule will be as designated on the official city calendar. All meetings will be open to the public, except as otherwise provided by law.

The planning commission meeting will convene at 6:30 P.M. and conclude no later than 11:00 P.M. unless a majority of the members present vote to continue the meeting beyond 11:00 P.M. for a single item. Items not covered by 11:00 P.M. will be automatically continued to the next planning commission meeting and given priority placement on the agenda.

Before opening a public hearing, the chair will ask for a presentation from the applicant. The chair will then open the public hearing. At larger public hearings, the chair will request a presentation from any neighborhood representatives. Following that, the chair will ask for comments from any other members of the public. The chair will encourage the applicant and neighborhood representatives to limit their presentations to about fifteen minutes each. The chair will encourage other public speakers to limit their time to about eight minutes, so everyone has time to speak at least once. However, time limits will be at the discretion of the chair. Once everyone has spoken, the chair may allow speakers to return for additional comments. The public hearing will remain open until the chair determines that all information and statements have been heard. The chair may then close the public hearing and limit discussion to members of the commission.

The voting order shall be alphabetical according to the last name of each commissioner. The voting order shall rotate alphabetically at each planning commission meeting. The presiding officer shall always vote last.
Section II. Special Meetings

A special meeting may be held when deemed necessary by four members of the commission or by the request of the city council.

Section III. Quorums

At any duly called meeting of the commission, a majority of the active members shall constitute a quorum.

Section IV. Agendas

An agenda for each meeting shall be prepared by the Planning Department for the City in cooperation with the chair. The agenda shall be delivered to all members of the commission along with supporting data on the Friday before the next regular meeting.

The commission may continue consideration of any scheduled item when supportive material for that item has not been delivered to the members five (5) full business days before the meeting at which it is considered.

The city planner shall add items to the consent agenda that he or she considers to be routine. The planning commission shall hold one public hearing and then approve all such items with one motion. Before voting on the consent agenda, the chair will open the hearing, announce each item and ask if anyone wishes to have a separate discussion or vote on that item. If so, the commission will then remove that item from the consent agenda and hold a separate hearing on it after voting on the consent agenda items. There will be no staff presentation or discussion by the public or commission on the items remaining on the consent agenda. However, the chair may allow informational questions without removing an item from the consent agenda. Items approved under the consent agenda are approved subject to the staff recommendations.

Section V. Voting

Any vote that requires a two-thirds majority shall be based on the current planning commission membership, excluding any vacant positions. Members present must vote on all agenda items, unless disqualified because of a conflict of interest under the City's Code of Ethics or State law.

ARTICLE IV - OFFICERS

Officers of the commission shall consist of the chair and a vice chair. The officers shall be elected for a one-year period at the first meeting in March of every year. If there is no quorum at the first regular meeting in March, the election shall be held at the next regular meeting having a quorum.

A. Chair: The chair shall preside over all meetings of the commission. If the chair and vice chair are absent, the commission members present shall designate one of themselves to serve as chair.
B. Vice Chair: The vice chair shall perform all the duties of the chair in the absence of the chair.

C. Secretary: The Secretary is a non-elected member of the Planning Department staff. The secretary shall keep an accurate account of meetings and proceedings of meetings, send written notices and agendas of all meetings to members, keep a policy file of all commission records and documents, and notify the city council in writing of all commission conclusions and recommendations.

ARTICLE V - CODE OF ETHICS

The planning commission members shall abide by the Code of Ethics established in Section 115 of the Minnetonka Code as amended from time to time. Additionally, no planning commissioner shall act as a representative for someone else for any planning or zoning item that comes before the Minnetonka Commission or Council. A planning commissioner may represent a planning or zoning item for their own property or property in which they have a real interest.

ARTICLE VI - PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE

The proceedings of the commission shall be governed by and conducted according to the latest rules of Roberts Rules of Order, as revised.

ARTICLE VII - AMENDMENTS

The commission shall review its bylaws and policies at the first meeting in March of each year. These bylaws may be amended or altered by a majority vote of the members of the commission at any regular or special meeting, having a quorum, provided the amendment was mailed or delivered to the commission members at least five days before the meeting.

Revised February 2008;
Readopted with changes March 3, 2011
General Policies regarding specific types of variance requests:

The following policies are not intended to be hard and fast rules, since each variance request is unique unto itself. The policies have evolved from past decisions of the City along with administrative interpretation of the zoning ordinance. The primary purpose of the following sections is to establish a framework whereby reasonable use of single-family residential property is outlined and fair treatment can be applied to all properties.

A. Garages

1. A two-car garage on single-family residential property and a one-car garage on a double dwelling property is generally considered to be a reasonable use. Larger garages may be approved if consistent with neighborhood characteristics and the findings for a variance.

2. Maximum standard two-car garage dimensions are 24’ x 24’. Maximum standard one-car garage dimensions are 13’ x 24’.

3. Garages that require variances should minimize setback intrusion to the greatest extent possible.

4. Conversion of garage area to living space does not justify a variance for new garage space.

5. Neighborhood characteristics may dictate the size and setbacks of a garage considered to be a reasonable use.

6. Variances are considered in light of mature tree location and preservation opportunities.

B. House Additions

1. Reasonable use of property is considered in light of general City-wide development standards.

2. Variances to allow setback intrusion are considered in light of reasonable use as long as variances are limited to the greatest extent practicable.

3. Variances are considered in light of providing room additions of functional size with adequate internal circulation.

4. The configuration and position of the existing house is considered when reviewing variance requests.

5. The proposed addition should be designed to conform to development
constraints of the property.

6. Variances are considered in light of mature tree location and preservation opportunities.

C. Accessory Attached Structures

1. Decks, screen porches, and bay windows are by definition accessory uses or uses incidental to the principal use.

2. The need for accessory structures primarily results from personal circumstances rather than hardship inherent in the property.

3. Variances are considered in light of the size and configuration of the structure so that variances are limited to the greatest extent possible.

4. Variances are considered in light of impacts to adjoining properties.

5. Neighborhood characteristics may be considered for review of accessory attached structures.

6. Deck variances will be reviewed in light of ordinance provisions that permit encroachment into required setbacks.

D. Accessory Detached Structures Other Than Garages

1. Sheds, barns, utility buildings, and recreational facilities are by definition accessory uses or uses incidental to a principal use.

2. The need for accessory structures primarily results from personal circumstances rather than hardship inherent to the property.

3. In light of the above policy to allow two-car garages, accessory structures are, in most cases, above and beyond the reasonable use of the property.

4. Mitigating circumstances may exist whereby accessory structure variances may be considered. These circumstances primarily relate to unique conditions resulting from extraordinarily burdensome regulations applied to a property.

5. Where mitigating circumstance exists, neighborhood characteristics can be considered.

E. Undersized Lots

1. Undersized lots of record not meeting the minimum dimensional requirements, may be considered for variances to apply a buildable status.

2. Buildable status will be applied only if a reasonable development opportunity will result.
3. The size of the lot should be consistent with the average neighborhood lot area.

4. Efforts to obtain additional property should be exhausted.

5. The house should be designed to fit the dimensional constraints of the lot and conform to all setback requirements.

6. If the property is and has been assessed and taxed as a buildable lot, strong consideration will be given to dimensional and setback variances.

7. If an undersized lot was in common ownership with an adjacent lot after adoption of the zoning ordinance, then no hardship exists.

8. If an undersized lot was purchased after adoption of the zoning ordinance, then the hardship is self-created.
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