Planning Commission Agenda
September 20, 2018—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: September 6, 2018

5. Report from Staff

6. Report from Planning Commission Members

7. Public Hearings: Consent Agenda

8. Public Hearings: Non-Consent Agenda Items
   
   A. Items concerning Villas of Glen Lake, a five-lot residential development at 5517/5525 Eden Prairie Rd.

      Recommendation: Recommend the city county approve the request (4 votes)

      • Recommendation to City Council (Tentative Date: October 8, 2018)
      • Project Planner: Susan Thomas

9. Adjournment
Notices

1. Please call the planning division at (952) 939-8290 to confirm meeting dates as they are tentative and subject to change.

2. Applications and items scheduled for the October 18, 2018 planning commission meeting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Front yard setback variance for a deck.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Address</td>
<td>3200 Ford Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project No.</td>
<td>18033.18a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned Staff</td>
<td>Drew Ingvalson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Councilmember</td>
<td>Rebecca Schack</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Site and building plan review of a new restaurant.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Address</td>
<td>11390 Wayzata Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project No.</td>
<td>15022.18a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned Staff</td>
<td>Ashley Cauley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Councilmember</td>
<td>Rebecca Schack</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Preliminary and final plats for a two lot subdivision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Address</td>
<td>14916 Highwood Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project No.</td>
<td>18030.18a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned Staff</td>
<td>Susan Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Councilmember</td>
<td>Mike Happe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.
Unapproved
Minnetonka Planning Commission
Minutes
Sept. 6, 2018

1. Call to Order

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

2. Roll Call

Commissioners Henry, Powers, Sewell, Hanson, and Kirk were present. Knight was absent.

Staff members present: City Planner Loren Gordon, Senior Planner Ashley Cauley, Planner Drew Ingvalson, and Natural Resource Manager Jo Colleran.

3. Approval of Agenda

_Powers moved, second by Henry, to approve the agenda as submitted with additional comments provided in the change memo dated Sept. 6, 2018._

_Henry, Powers, Sewell, Hanson, and Kirk voted yes. Knight was absent. Motion carried._

4. Approval of Minutes: Aug. 16, 2018

_Powers moved, second by Henry, to approve the Aug. 16, 2018 meeting minutes as submitted._

_Henry, Powers, Sewell, Hanson, and Kirk voted yes. Knight was absent. Motion carried._

5. Report from Staff

Gordon briefed the commission on land use applications considered by the city council at its meeting Aug. 27, 2018:

- Adopted a resolution approving items for the adult daycare facility on K-tel Drive.
- Adopted a resolution approving items for a parking ramp on Whitewater Drive.
- Adopted a resolution approving items for Ridgedale Active Apartments and giving them credit for exceeding park dedication requirements.
- Adopted a resolution approving financing for Dominium.
- Reviewed a concept plan for Marsh Run, redevelopment at 11650 and 11706 Wayzata Blvd.
• Reviewed a concept plan for redevelopment of the Reneke property at 14317 Excelsior Blvd.
• Reviewed a concept plan for the Minnetonka Police and Fire facility project at 14500 and 14550 Minnetonka Blvd.

There was a joint city council, commissions, and comprehensive guide plan steering committee meeting held in a small-group format to receive feedback from commissioners and councilmembers. Outreach into the community will be done in October to receive feedback from residents on the 2040 comprehensive guide plan.

The next planning commission meeting is scheduled to be held September 20, 2018.

6. Report from Planning Commission Members

Chair Kirk stated that he and Henry attended the study session. It was very informative. Henry agreed.

7. Public Hearings: Consent Agenda

No item was removed from the consent agenda for discussion or separate action.

_Sewall moved, second by Hanson, to approve the items listed on the consent agenda as recommended in the respective staff report as follows:_

A. Resolution approving an aggregate side yard setback variance for a garage and living space addition at 4660 Caribou Drive.

Adopt the resolution approving an aggregate side yard setback variance for a garage and living space addition at 4660 Caribou Drive.

_Henry, Powers, Sewell, Hanson, and Kirk voted yes. Knight was absent. Motion carried and the item on the consent agenda were approved as submitted._

Chair Kirk stated that an appeal of the planning commission’s decision must be made in writing to the planning division within 10 days.

8. Public Hearings

A. Resolution denying a variance and approving an expansion permit to construct a garage addition at 5039 Clear Spring Drive.

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

Ingvalson reported. He recommended denying the variance application and approving an expansion permit based on the findings and subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.
In response to Powers’ question, Ingvalson explained that staff found alternative options that would eliminate the need for a variance. There are houses in the area that do not meet the front yard setback, but none of them are as close as what the proposal would have if approved.

Chair Kirk noted that the garage space underneath the eve would be extended. Ingvalson explained that the setback is measured from the foundation.

Jason Lake, 5039 Clear Spring Drive, applicant, provided photos of neighbors’ houses that extended their garage forward. He thought the proposal would be more aesthetically attractive. He wants to match the look of the neighboring houses.

In response to Powers’ question, Mr. Lake stated that adhering to the setback would require more fill on the back side, a tree may be impacted, and the engineering would have to be redone. The dormer above the garage would just be aesthetic.

The public hearing was opened.

No additional testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.

Chair Kirk struggled because he thought it would look odd if the dormer would extend further out from the foundation of the garage.

Powers also struggled with the proposal. Visually, a house starts at the front of an overhang. He did not have a problem with the overhang encroaching into the front yard setback for any visual reason. The proposal would make more sense visually and be more consistent with the neighborhood. He noted that the neighbors like the proposal more than one that would meet setback requirements. He supports the applicant’s proposal.

Hanson agreed. He supports the application.

Henry felt it would be reasonable to make an exception in this case. The proposal would fit in with the neighborhood. Aesthetic value is a valid reason. If the overhang would be extended, he would have a bigger problem.

Sewall also struggled. Aesthetics and consistency are factors and he appreciated that the applicant spoke to neighbors who provided positive feedback. There is an issue with consistency of setbacks. He agreed with the rest of the commissioners that the eve would not encroach any further. He concurred with commissioners and disagreed with staff’s recommendation.

Chair Kirk noted that commissioners need to provide reasons justifying why this site is unique and warrants a variance. The two-and-a-half feet would not be noticeable since the proposal would fit architecturally and aesthetically with the neighborhood. In this case, staff has pointed out a relatively easy way for the applicant to complete the project,
except for the architectural element in the front, and meet ordinance requirements. The issue is approving a variance that has a solution.

Sewall looks at each project on its own unique basis and its reasonableness.

Powers appreciated Chair Kirk’s thoughts. The neighborhood seems to agree with the applicant. Commissioners agreed that the proposal would be more aesthetically appealing. He was not worried about a precedent. This is a unique setting. The homeowner is being sensitive to the neighbors.

Chair Kirk preferred to vote to deny the variance application, but will vote to approve the application since the motion to approve the application would most likely have passed if a few more commissioners were in attendance. He understood that commissioners felt that because of the natural rooflines of the house, it would make more sense to keep the rooflines in alignment and keep the same architectural conditions that exist on neighboring houses by allowing the addition to encroach two-and-a-half feet into the existing setback. The findings of fact include that the proposal would be aesthetically consistent with the character of the neighborhood.

*Hanson moved, second by Sewall, to adopt a resolution approving a variance application to allow a front yard setback of 23.9 feet to construct a garage addition to the single-family house at 5039 Clear Spring Drive.*

*Henry, Powers, Sewell, Hanson, and Kirk voted yes. Knight was absent. Motion carried.*

**B. Resolution approving a conditional use permit with variances for a restaurant at 14725 Excelsior Blvd.**

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

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

Henry asked why the results were different for the ITE parking study and the city’s parking study. Cauley explained that the ITE study is based on parking studies throughout the United States and the city’s number is generated by a study of the parking on the actual site. Cauley stated that the applicant has been discussing parking options with surrounding property owners in case additional parking would be needed.

Chair Kirk asked if the Glen Lake Animal Hospital was included. Cauley answered that the Glen Lake Animal Hospital has a parking agreement in place with the shopping center.

Diego Montero, applicant, stated that he was excited to use the space that has been empty for four years and bring Argentinian food to Minnetonka.
Chair Kirk stated that he counted 42 chairs. Mr. Montero stated that the maximum seating would be 50 patrons. The property owner has been talking with neighboring property owners regarding additional parking options.

The public hearing was opened.

Anne Hossfeld, 14616 Glendale Street, stated that she had no objections. She had questions about parking. The parking lot has been completely full in the evenings since Unmapped opened. She questioned where the patrons would park. That was a concern. She noticed that vehicles were parking on the side of Eden Prairie Road before it was signed “no parking.” She questioned where those vehicles would now park. She questioned if it would be o.k. for patrons of a restaurant to park on neighboring residential streets.

No additional testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.

Hanson was happy to see the application prompting an interest in finding additional parking. The parking lot is usually full in the evenings and that is without The Copper Cow. People park across the street which creates a safety issue. The east side of the lot is usually full and the west side of the lot is usually two-thirds full. Vehicles are usually parallel parked along the retaining wall on the north side.

Henry has found the east side of the parking lot full during peak times. The west side generally is not full. Cauley agreed. The stalls in front of the tenant a patron wants to visit may be full, but there may still be available parking further away.

Henry asked if a condition of approval requiring parking agreements was considered. Cauley responded that there is a condition of approval that states that if a parking issue would arise that parking agreements would be required to be implemented.

In response to Chair Kirk’s question, Cauley explained that Unmapped’s variance allowed the number of parking stalls to be reduced from 178 to 132. Restriping occurred which resulted in the parking lot now having 133 stalls. The 209 stalls listed in the staff report represents the total number of stalls required for all of the uses including the proposed use on the site.

Chair Kirk felt that it would be in the best interests of the businesses and owner of the property to maintain a cross parking agreement in order to allow the businesses to function.

Powers noted that there is a serious parking problem developing in the area, but no neighbors responded to the public hearing notice. Cauley explained that The Copper Cow was required to secure a parking agreement prior to obtaining the certificate of occupancy.
Sewall thought there would be an opportunity for additional parking agreements to be made. He thought the parking situation would be worse in five years. He saw it more as a problem for the property owner to address.

Sewall confirmed with Cauley that none of the businesses on the site have a condition of approval requiring the business to have a cross parking agreement. If a parking problem would occur, the property owner could obtain additional parking agreements and if the city received parking complaints, then a parking study could be done and require the insufficient number of parking stalls be obtained elsewhere with a parking agreement.

Powers likes that the city has methods to deal with a parking issue.

*Powers moved, second by Henry, to recommend that the city council adopt the resolution approving a conditional use permit with variances for a restaurant with on-sale liquor at 14725 Excelsior Blvd.*

*Henry, Powers, Sewell, Hanson, and Kirk voted yes. Knight was absent. Motion carried.*

C. Concept plan for redevelopment of the property at 1809 Plymouth Road.

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

Gordon reported. Staff recommends the planning commission provide comments and feedback on the identified key issues and any others the planning commission deems appropriate.

Drew Johnson, of Oppidan, representing the applicant, stated that:

- He looked forward to hearing the feedback.
- Wells Fargo currently occupies the first floor with the rest of the building vacant. Wells Fargo would continue operation throughout redevelopment. A branch would be built on the site and the existing building would be reused and reinvigorated.
- The process would not impede the 2030 plan.
- The applicant would purchase the property if the proposal would move forward.
- The proposal would include trail connections to adjacent uses, better landscaping, and achieve office goals.
- The ring road is controlled by an OEA made up of TCF, Wells Fargo, and U.S. Bank. All three parties would have to agree.
- The proposal would not complicate future redevelopment of the area.
- The drive-through design would consist of one window with one vacuum tube and an ATM bypass.
- Setbacks would conform to ordinance requirements.
- The amount of parking would increase on the site.
• The existing drive through would be converted to parking.
• He was available for questions.

Powers asked if the exterior or roof would be changed. Mr. Johnson answered affirmatively. The exterior of the building would be refreshed and landscaping would be added.

Chair Kirk understood the need for banks to downsize. He appreciated the intent to reface and remodel the building.

Gordon provided results from a study by Marquette Advisors that found that the Twin Cities vacancy rate for office buildings is 14.2 percent. Minnetonka’s vacancy rate for office buildings is 13 percent. Buildings in the I-394 corridor have 15.5 percent vacancy.

Chair Kirk invited those present to comment.

Annette Bertelsen, 13513 Larkin Drive, stated that:

• She attended the neighborhood meeting. The developer was generous with his time. She contacted a couple dozen of her neighbors to get their comments.
• The proposal seems like a good use.
• Some businesses were lost with the Highland Bank redevelop. It would be nice to have a dental office or insurance agent, for example.
• No one she talked to objected to an office use.
• Walkability and safety is always a priority. She assumed that the sidewalks would be connected.
• Staff has done a great job in requesting that new and remodeled buildings have consistent elements.
• The landscaping of the TCF area is pretty sparse and has lots of concrete. The concrete benches are streaked, have chunks missing, and they are less than one year old.
• The proposed new building would be boring and underwhelming. She would like the building to look more beautiful.
• She wants appropriate transitions from the single-family houses to the Ridgedale Village area. What happens here impacts her neighborhood.
• The proposed landscaping could be more exciting.

No one else chose to speak.

Chair Kirk thought the proposed building would look small compared to the neighboring building. Walkability to the site would be very important. It is important to recognize sidewalks and how to handle snow removal. The dedicated cueing for the drive lane takes room from the parking lot that could be used to provide walkability. He would rather see space for several really mature trees rather than a thin boulevard of 200
bushes to soften the look. The building is uninspiring and could use some dressing up. He wants to understand the potential of the building.

Sewall thought the land use would be appropriate for the next five years. He thought the best scenario would be for the whole block to be bought up and redeveloped in one, large, cohesive development. That would provide an opportunity for better design and flow. In terms of immediate land use, the use would be appropriate. He agreed with Chair Kirk’s comments regarding walkability and landscaping. He supports making the site and entire area more visually appealing.

Powers was more concerned with getting tenants in the office building than the idea for the proposed one-story Wells Fargo building. This is not 300 years ago when the area was all trees. He does not want the building to be ugly or boring, but it has to remain affordable. He wants the site to speak visually that it is Minnetonka and the Ridgedale area.

Henry would like the area to have higher density.

This item is scheduled to be reviewed by the city council on September 17, 2018.

9. **Adjournment**

*Sewall moved, second by Powers, to adjourn the meeting at 9 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.*

By: 

____________________________
Lois T. Mason
Planning Secretary
Minnetonka Planning Commission Meeting
Sept. 20, 2018
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Public Hearing: Consent Agenda
No Items
Minnetonka Planning Commission Meeting
Sept. 20, 2018

Agenda Item 8

Public Hearing: Non-Consent Agenda
MINNETONKA PLANNING COMMISSION
September 20, 2018

Brief Description
Items concerning VILLAS OF GLEN LAKE at 5517 and 5525 Eden Prairie Road:

1) Rezoning from B-1 and R-1 to R-3;

2) Preliminary and Final Plats, with variances; and

3) Variances for detached dwellings and setbacks.

Recommendation
Adopt the ordinance and resolution approving the proposal

Background
In 2017, Quest Development, Inc. presented a concept plan for redevelopment of two, single-family residential properties at 5517 and 5525 Eden Prairie Road. The plan contemplated development of five villa homes, sometimes referred to as detached townhomes. At 3.3 units per acre, the plan would be consistent with the sites’ low-density designation in the 2030 Comprehensive Guide Plan. Low density is defined as up to four units per acre. The city council generally indicated that the housing type was desirable, though the number of units and site design details would need to be evaluated in greater detail.

Formal Application
Quest Development has now submitted formal applications for redevelopment of the two sites. Though the location of the access drive has shifted, the submitted plans are generally consistent with the concept plans. The proposal requires:

• **Rezoning.** To facilitate the proposed development, the properties would be rezoned to R-3, low-density residential.

• **Preliminary and Final Plats, with variances.** Under the subdivision ordinance, all lots must have frontage on the public right-of-way from which they will take their access. As proposed, three would be developed without frontage on a public street.

• **Variance for Detached Dwellings and Front Yard Setbacks.** Within the R-3 zoning district, attached (townhome) dwelling units are allowed. The proposal is for detached homes.

Proposal Summary
The following is intended to summarize the proposal. Additional information associated with the proposal can be found in the “Supporting Information” section of this report.
• **Existing Site Conditions.**

The roughly 1.5-acre site is located on the east side of Eden Prairie Road, just south of Stewart Lane. The site contains several noticeable natural features, including a steep slope – or bluff, as defined by the shoreland ordinance – and 20 high-priority trees. Until recently, the site also contained two single-family residential homes.

• **Proposed Lots.**

As proposed, the combined site would be divided into five lots served by a private driveway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Lot Area</th>
<th>Lot Width</th>
<th>Lot Depth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>10,000 sq.ft.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>10,300 sq.ft.*</td>
<td>80 ft</td>
<td>120 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>10,855 sq.ft.*</td>
<td>90 ft</td>
<td>115 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 3</td>
<td>14,155 sq.ft.</td>
<td>65 ft</td>
<td>210 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 4</td>
<td>12,770 sq.ft.</td>
<td>50 ft</td>
<td>250 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 5</td>
<td>15,500 sq.ft.</td>
<td>55 ft</td>
<td>285 ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* requires slight shift of property line, per staff-drafted plan.

All numbers rounded down to nearest 5 square feet or 5 ft

• **Proposed Homes.**

The current proposal is for subdivision of the property only. If approved, a separate builder would be commissioned for construction of the homes. The specific design of the homes would be administratively reviewed through the building permit application process.

The applicant’s intent, as outlined during the concept plan and the more recent city council introduction, is that the homes would offer single-level living. Conceptual floorplans and renderings suggest roughly 2,000 square foot footprints and 1½ story front facades. The more specific site plans illustrate the following setbacks from property lines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Front *</th>
<th>Side*</th>
<th>Rear*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REQUIRED</td>
<td>50 ft</td>
<td>15 ft</td>
<td>40 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>35 ft v</td>
<td>10 ft v</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>35 ft v</td>
<td>30 ft</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>20 ft</td>
<td>120 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 4</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>165 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>10 ft v</td>
<td>195 ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* from exterior lot lines

v variance required
Primary Questions and Analysis

A land use proposal is comprised of many details. In evaluating a proposal, staff first reviews these details and then aggregates them into a few primary questions or issues. The following outlines both the primary questions and staff findings associated with the proposal.

- **Is the proposed land use and density appropriate?**

  Yes. Within the 2030 Comprehensive Guide Plan the site is designated for low-density residential development. Low-density is defined as four or less units per acre. The proposal would result in a development density of 3.3 unit per acre. As such, the proposed land use and density is specifically appropriate. From staff’s perspective, the proposal is also generally appropriate in light of the 2016 Glen Lake Neighborhood Study. That study envisioned residential development on the site that differs from code-standard, R-1, 22,000 square foot lots. (The Glen Lake Neighborhood Study can be found here: [https://eminnetonka.com/current-projects/planning-projects/1140-glen-lake-study.](https://eminnetonka.com/current-projects/planning-projects/1140-glen-lake-study.)

- **Are the requested variances reasonable?**

  Yes. The proposal requires several variances. In staff’s opinion, these variance are reasonable.

  ✓ Lots Without Frontage. There are several residential developments in the surrounding area that contain properties without frontage on a public right-of-way, including both townhome developments and single-family lots. Given this, the proposed lots would not out of character.

  ✓ Detached Homes. The arrangement of an attached townhome development on the site would likely be different that the proposed site arrangement. However, in staff’s opinion, the difference in site design would result in very little – if any – difference in overall site impact. Given this, whether the residential product is attached or detached matters little from a site perspective.

  ✓ Front Yard Setback. As proposal includes 35-foot setbacks from the Eden Prairie Road Property line. The actual separation between the homes and the paved surface of the roadway would be roughly 60 feet. Further, the 35-foot setback would be allowed if the property were zoned R-2 or R-1A. The proposal also includes 10 foot side yard setbacks from the development’s south property line. These setbacks could be increased to 15 feet with a northward shift of property lines and homes. However, such shift would likely impact several trees along the development’s north property line. Area property owners, commissioners, and councilmembers had requested that efforts be made to reduce impacts to this area.

- **Are the proposed site impacts reasonable?**

  Yes. To accommodate the proposed development grading would occur on the westerly half of the site. Generally, one to five feet of excavation would be necessary. The plans submitted suggest that this grading activity would result removal of, or significantly impact to seven of the site’s high priority trees. This 35 percent removal/impact would meet the standards of the tree protection ordinance. However, this level of removal/impact is
predicated on very “tight” construction limits. Staff is concerned that that removal/impact would likely increase to eight, or 40 percent, during actual construction. To ensure the ordinance is met, staff is suggesting a slight change to the grading plan in the area of spruce and pines adjacent to Eden Prairie Road. No grading or tree removal would occur with the code-defined bluff or bluff impact zone.

The current plans represent a significant improvement to the plans originally submitted, in that the plans protect the spruce and pines along the west side of the site and several deciduous trees along the north property line. Area property owners, commissioners, and councilmembers had requested that efforts be made to reduce impacts to these areas.

Summary Comments

The VILLAS OF GLEN LAKE would result in a visual change to the immediate area. However, in staff’s opinion, it would not negatively impact the character of the area. The development site is uniquely located within the Glen Lake Village Center. With access to a county road, the site abuts a small office building, a medium-density townhome development, and a conditionally-permitted, licensed residential care facility. The VILLAS OF GLEN LAKE would not disrupt any clear development pattern or aesthetic character. Further, the proposal would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, the Glen Lake Neighborhood Study, and the already eclectic mix of land uses and residences in the area.

Staff Recommendation

Recommend the city council adopt the following, pertaining to the properties at 5517 and 5525 Eden Prairie Road.

1) An ordinance rezoning the properties to R-3, low-density residential; and

2) A resolution approving the preliminary and final plats, with variances, of VILLAS OF GLEN LAKE

Originator: Susan Thomas, AICP, Assistant City Planner
Through: Loren Gordon, AICP, City Planner
Supporting Information

Surrounding Land Uses

North: office building, zoned B-1
South: licensed residential care facility, zoned R-1
East: retail/warehouse property, zoned commercial
West: Eden Prairie Road and single-family homes beyond

Planning

Guide Plan designation: low-density residential
Existing Zoning: B-1 and R-1

Steep Slopes and Bluffs

The highest point of the subject property is situated in the northwest corner of the site. The property slopes downward in all directions from this point. The easterly third of the site (roughly) slopes downward toward Glen Lake and is defined as a steep slope/bluff.

By city code, a steep slope is one in a slope that: (1) has an average grade of 20 percent or more; (2) that covers an area at least 100 feet in width; and (3) that rises at least 25 feet above the toe — or bottom — of the slope to the top of the slope. The code goes on to define how the toe and top of slope are determine, which may or may not correspond to the visual bottom and top of the slope. Depending on the grade percentage, certain development and construction actives may be allowed within steep slopes areas located outside of the shoreland overlay district.

With the shoreland overlay district, steep slopes are called “bluffs.” This different wording is required by the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. Very limited actives are allowed within bluffs and a bluff impact zone, which is essentially a 20-foot setback from top of the bluff. The proposal would not encroach within the bluff or bluff impact zone.

Grading

To accommodate the proposed development grading would occur on the westerly half of the site. Generally, the knoll on the site would be lowered, with excavation of one to five feet of soil.

Tree Impact

The property contains a total of 76 regulated trees. Based on the submitted plans:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Removed*</th>
<th>% Removed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** By city code, a tree is considered removed if 30 percent or more of the critical root zone of is compacted, cut, filled or paved.

** with slight grading modification, which is a condition of approval.

The level of tree removal/impact would be permitted under the tree protection ordinance.
**Tree Mitigation**

Based on the anticipated tree removal, seven, six-foot evergreen trees and two, two-inch deciduous trees must be planted as mitigation for tree removal. The applicant’s submittal includes a landscape plan that would exceed this mitigation requirement.

**Stormwater**

As proposed, stormwater runoff would be directed to several catch basins and directed via pipe to an underground facility. This facility would outlet to an infiltration basin, which would ultimately outlet to the public storm sewer system.

Engineering staff has reviewed the plans associated with the proposal and believes, with some technical modifications, it can meet city stormwater rules. As a condition of approval, final plans must meet both the city’s Water Resources Management Plan standards and Nine Mile Creek Watershed District rules.

**Utilities**

Public water and sewer facilities are available in Eden Prairie Road. As proposed, new sewer and water mains would be extended into the site and private services would then be connected to these mains.

**Homeowners Association**

As a condition of approval, a homeowners association would need to be established to ensure maintenance of the private driveway, private utilities, stormwater facilities, and landscaping.

**Traffic**

It has not been the city’s practice to commission traffic studies for single-family residential developments. The city’s traffic consultants have frequently suggested that single-family homes generate, on average, 10 vehicle trips per day. This is number is supported by Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) data that suggests 9.57 vehicles trips per day. Using these numbers, the proposal would generate roughly 50 daily trips. This would certainly be more trips than the two homes previously located on the site. However, given that Eden Prairie Road carries approximately 7,300 vehicles per day, staff does not anticipate that these trips would impact the roadway operations.

The proposal was forwarded to Hennepin County for review. The county requested dedication of additional right-of-way and easement, which has been shown on the current plans, and restriping of Eden Prairie Road to provide for a center turn lane, which has been included as a condition of approval.

**Pedestrian Improvements**

At the request of city staff, the proposed plans include construction of a sidewalk between the site and the north property line. However, the sidewalk would not meet Hennepin County standards and would likely impact a stand of pine and spruce trees that must be saved for the tree ordinance standards to be met. As such, staff is no longer suggesting that the sidewalk be constructed at this time. However, staff would support such construction as part of a larger county roadway project in the future.
Pyramid of Discretion

Motion Options

The planning commission has three options:

1. Concur with the staff recommendation. In this case a motion should be made recommending the city council adopt the ordinance resolution approving the request.

2. Disagree with staff’s recommendation. In this case, a motion should be made recommending the city council deny the request. This motion must include a statement as to why denial is recommended.

3. Table the requests. 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.

Voting Requirement

The planning commission will make a recommendation to the city council. The city council’s final approval requires an affirmative vote of five members, due to the variances.

Neighborhood Comments

The city sent notices to 223 property owners and has received no written comments to date.

Deadline for Action

OCTOBER 22, 2018
Location Map

Project: Villas of Glen Lake
Address: 5517 & 5525 Eden Prairie Rd
CONCEPT PLAN
• Reviewed a concept plan for Dominium apartments that would be located in Opus. The use and density was found to be appropriate. Integrating parks and trails in Opus was discussed.

There was a comprehensive guide plan meeting December 11, 2017 and the next one will be in January 2018. Please check the city’s website, eminnetonka.com, to confirm the date.

The next planning commission meeting will be January 4, 2017.

6. Report from Planning Commission Members

Schack reported on how the comprehensive guide plan meeting focused on economic development. She encouraged everyone to watch the presentation and discussion on line. Powers agreed that it is good to get involved and learn how a city operates.

Calvert attended the mountain bike meeting that had over 200 interested parties in attendance. There is a lot of education needed to learn about mountain-bike trails.

7. Public Hearings: Consent Agenda

No item was removed from the consent agenda for discussion or separate action.

*Calvert moved, second by Powers, to approve the item listed on the consent agenda as recommended in the staff report as follows:*

A. Time extension for a parking lot setback variance from 20 feet to 5 feet at 11311 K-Tel Drive.

Approve a 12-month time extension.

*Knight, O’Connell, Powers, Schack, Sewall, Calvert, and Kirk voted yes. Motion carried and the item on the consent agenda was approved as submitted.*

Chair Kirk stated that this motion may be appealed to the city council if requested in writing within 10 days to planning staff.

8. Public Hearings: None

9. Other Business

A. Concept plan review for The Villas of Glen Lake at 5517 and 5525 Eden Prairie Road.

Chair Kirk introduced the proposal and called for the staff report.
Thomas reported. Staff recommends that the planning commission provide comments and feedback on the identified key issues and other issues the planning commission deems appropriate. The discussion is intended to assist the applicant with future direction that may lead to the preparation of more detailed development plans.

Blaine Waters, Quest Development, applicant, stated that:

- He lives in the Glen Lake community.
- There is a desire for this type of housing priced below the $800,000s.
- The intent is for the area to be walkable and this type of housing would fit with that vision.
- He welcomed comments and questions.

Powers asked for the price point. Mr. Waters was hoping for $550,000 to $650,000. It would be difficult to have the price any lower due to land and building costs. There would be 1,450 square feet on the main level and another 1,000 square feet in the basement. Mr. Waters was still researching if a second-story option would be offered. He predicted that most of the houses would be rambler style.

Chair Kirk confirmed with Mr. Waters that the houses would have walk-out basements.

In response to Powers’ question, Mr. Waters said that the backyards would be minimal and geared toward empty nesters. There would be small areas to congregate and entertain. The steep-slope, wooded area would not be able to be developed.

Chair Kirk invited those present to provide comments.

Greg Olson, owner of the office building at 5509 Eden Prairie Road, stated that:

- He would like a buffer between his lot and the proposed site. He would like a fence and landscaping.
- A five-foot setback seems too small.
- He invited commissioners to walk the property. He marked the property line. The corner of his office building is 17 feet from the property line.
- He is worried about water flooding his basement and parking lot on the east side.
- He thought five houses would be considered high-density residential. He was concerned with the amount of hard cover surface.
- He was worried about losing trees located on the property line.
- Neighbors have walked through his property for years with dogs and people have dumped garbage in his dumpster. Neighbors have dumped grass clippings on his property. He has had people sleep in their vehicles in the parking lot or leave their vehicles in the lot overnight.
- He takes pride in the parking lot. The plan upset him.
- He was worried about people walking through his parking lot.
• When Highway 169 was closed, traffic was backed up along Eden Prairie Road.
• He was concerned that the proposal’s snow would be dumped in his parking lot.
• The vehicle lights would shine in his windows.

Thomas appreciated the drainage, buffering, and setback questions which would be looked at if a formal application would be submitted. The concept plan may fit zoning for a PUD or R-3, low or medium density residential district.

Sewall stated that there should be an increase in buffering that corresponds with a decrease in the size of setbacks. As much natural buffering as possible would be the best option. He did not think empty nesters would walk around a parking lot too much.

Calvert suggested maintaining the mature trees between the properties to maintain the buffer and natural feel.

Chair Kirk stated that new townhomes at an affordable price are needed in the city. However, the proposal would sacrifice too much in terms of the volume of space that would be covered by hard surface. The root zones of the neighbors’ trees should be protected. That would require a little more than the five-foot setback. He struggled with the density. He was not as concerned with the hydrology, but the trees on the north and south would have to be protected. There could be a problem if the street would be widened or a sidewalk or trail added.

Calvert agreed that new, single-level housing stock is in desperate need. The natural buffer and preserving the root zones of the mature trees located between the site and neighbor are important. The houses would be located close to Eden Prairie Road which could become problematic if the street would be expanded or a sidewalk or trail added.

Schack concurred. The tree ordinance provides specific requirements that could be met by preserving the trees on the steep slope, but clear-cutting trees adjacent to the neighbor is not appealing. She encouraged incorporating the wooded areas into the plan.

Powers said that if the villas already existed and a commercial building would be proposed where it is now, then the commercial building would not be allowed to have such a small setback to the property line.

O’Connell asked if the city would have the ability to build a sidewalk north of the site. The trees located between the properties are important. He asked for the amount of buildable area and setbacks for an office building on the property zoned for an office building. He supports this type of housing. The proposal would provide a transition from an office building to single-family residential housing.

Calvert asked if there would be sustainable aspects to the proposal. Mr. Waters explained that the building code now requires many sustainable practices. The proposal
would meet or exceed code requirements. It would be cost prohibitive to utilize geothermal or solar power for five villas.

Chair Kirk thought that the Groveland Pond villas are too large for the setbacks. The volume of the houses in The Sanctuary creates a more aesthetically pleasing development.

Calvert liked that the proposal would provide a transition from commercial to single-family housing.

Knight did not have a problem with the setbacks between the proposed houses, but he did not like the north side yard setback. That would be too tight. He asked how the private drive would be regulated. Thomas answered that the city must approve a private street, it was not a given. A private street must be able to support the weight and turning radius of the largest fire truck. There is a minimum private drive/street width requirement of 20 feet and 14-foot vertical requirement.

Calvert noted the issues of guest parking and snow removal.

Knight noted the large setback on the south side. He suggested moving the houses further south.

The city council is tentatively scheduled to review the concept plan on January 8, 2018.

10. **Adjournment**

   *Calvert moved, second by Powers, to adjourn the meeting at 7:27 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.*

   By:  
   
   ____________________________  
   Lois T. Mason  
   Planning Secretary
Acomb moved, Wagmer seconded a motion to continue the public hearing to Feb. 26, 2018. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

14. Other Business:

A. Resolution declaring vacancy in the council seat for Ward 3

Barone gave the staff report.

Wagner moved, Calvert seconded a motion to adopt resolution 2018-003 declaring vacancy in the council seat for Ward 3. All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

Wagner what the process would be once the council called for a special election. City Clerk David Maeda indicated staff was working on a calendar that would identify key dates for the election including when candidate filing and absentee voting would occur. This would be provided to the council at its Jan. 22 meeting.

B. Concept plan review for The Villas of Glen Lake at 5517 and 5525 Eden Prairie Road

City Planner Loren Gordon gave the staff report.

Acomb asked what the different requirements were for a private drive and a public street. Gordon said the two primary differences were who owns it and who maintains it. For access reasons, the city generally likes to have the streets built to pretty similar standards. The city code standard is for a 24 foot wide road and that standard was what was proposed for the private street. He said staff generally prefers a public street over a private street because long term there was more benefit to the residents who would otherwise incur more costs over time.

Ellingson asked what restrictions existed for building in the bluff area. Gordon presented a graphic that showed the restrictions. A twenty foot buffer represented what the setback would be from the top. Ellingson asked if the council could grant a variance. Gordon indicated a variance could be granted to minimize the impacts.

The developer, Blaine Waters, 5068 Holiday Circle, said the five units were consistent with the city’s overall vision for the area. The plan was also in line with the city’s housing goals and bringing in a variety of housing stock. The hope was to bring in five units that would provide mostly main level living to the Glen Lake area.

Wagner asked Waters to explain why he chose the layout he did. Waters said there were multiple iterations of what a layout might look like with the type of unit in mind. One of the bigger reasons he ended up with this concept was based on the bluff line. A topographic survey and tree inventory were done. He said it wasn’t entirely clear through the process where the actual bluff line was. He
came to find there was a defined equation on determining the bluff line. This plan took that into account. Wagner said, similar to this plan, there was a development on Williston Road that he shudders every time he drives by because the home’s back porch faces a major county road. This make it feel less residential. This combined with the setback gave him pause about the concept plan. He said the proposed use was a needed use in the city. He liked that the plan protects a sensitive natural area. He had concerns with the setbacks because five feet felt too close. He wasn’t sure he could support the current layout.

Acomb said she shared some of Wagner’s concerns in large part with the setback to the north. She thought the layout could be done differently. The homes were close together because the whole width of the property could not be used. She said she would like to see a sidewalk along County Road 4. This would help address some of the concerns that were raised at the planning commission meeting. She appreciated the woodland preservation area. She hoped the builder would be mindful of some of the existing trees in the building area.

Calvert noted she was on the planning commission when the concept plan was presented. She shared all the concerns that were raised. She was appreciative of the mindfulness of the woodland preservation area. She also would like to see the sidewalk. She said in some ways the plan was a nice transition from the very large lot single family homes to the more commercial area. However the proximity to Eden Prairie Road when the rest of the homes were set so far back felt strange. She shared the concern about having the back of the house up against County Road 4. She also heard the business owner’s concern about not having adequate buffer between the development and his business.

Ellingson said he was concerned about the tree loss and the grading that would happen. He noted another property on Williston Road north of the daycare where the houses were removed and all the trees are gone. Because of the topography of the area, he was apprehensive that everything would be leveled from Eden Prairie Road back to the bluff line.

Wiersum said the need for this type of housing made the plan attractive. He was concerned about the five foot setback. He said this was the classic Minnetonka development proposal because the city had challenging sites with the topography and trees. He liked the woodland preservation and bluff preservation area but he thought there was a lot trying to be squeezed on to the rest of the property. If there were fewer units the developer would have more space to work with but he understood the reality of the cost of land in the city and the challenge of making it all work. He said this was a good location for this type of housing.

Greg Olson, the owner of the neighboring dental office, distributed information about the trees in the area. He noted generally developers calculate setback using the foundation not the soffits. In this case using measurement from the soffits, it would mean the homes would be two to three feet from his property line and not five feet. He said there was also a water issue with the whole terrain going down to his property. He was worried about the amount of hard surface.
He said there needed to be some type of barrier between the properties to prevent the residents from walking through as well as dumping garbage on to his property. Because there was no sidewalk on the east side of Eden Prairie Road it was dangerous for pedestrians. Currently the pedestrians walk through his property to avoid walking on the road. He was concerned about the increase in traffic from the development, snow removal and the amount of trees that would be removed.

C. Concept plan review for Ridgedale Executive Apartments at 12501 Ridgedale Drive

Robert Weinstine, an attorney with the Winthrop & Weinstine law firm, said he represented the property owner. Since the council last saw the concept plan, the property owner seriously considered all the feedback he received from the council. Neighborhood issues were reflected upon. Earlier in the day there was a neighborhood meeting that was attended by five or six people and also city staff. He said the plan was generally well received. As a result of listening to the neighbors, the building height was reduced from six stories to five stories. This was a significant financial contribution from the property owner given all the amenities that were being included to make it a first class development. For comparison, he noted the building at 1700 Plymouth Road was six stories. The building southeast of the YMCA was four stories and was much closer to residential homes and the topography was much higher. In addition to reducing the size of the building, the building was moved further back on the property. As a result the closest home would be 423 feet away. The area was wooded and the plan would not affect the trees in any way. The design of the building has been softened. The proposed path was removed. He said the development would be very attractive to empty nesters and young professionals.

Gordon and Community Development Director Julie Wischnack gave the staff report.

Wagner noted the reduced height was about seven feet while most apartment buildings a story was eight to 12 feet high. He asked if part of the reason for this was the amount of parking, which was 250 parking spots for 93 units. He asked if this was discussed at the neighborhood meeting. Gordon said the information Wagner was referencing was a staff interpretation and not from the architect. He said the concept plan indicated floor to ceiling heights around 10 feet. There would also be around two to three feet between floors. As far as the parking, he noted the office building was part of the site. The plan was for two to three spots per unit, visitor parking spots, plus spots for the office building. Staff would do more analysis on the parking if an application was submitted.

Jesse Hamer, from Momentum Design Group, the architect for the project, said the revised height of the building would be about 65 feet, about a nine foot reduction. The current plan met the city’s full parking requirement. There were two spaces per units and 57 spaces for the office building. He said in addition to moving the building back, there was an effort to increase the connection to the pedestrian walk area. There also was a plaza area added in front of the building.
FORMAL APPLICATION
April 26, 2018

Susan Thomas
Asst. City Planner
14600 Minnetonka Blvd
Minnetonka, MN 55345

RE: Preliminary Submittal for VILLAS OF GLEN LAKE development

Dear Ms. Thomas:

On behalf of the Applicant/Developer, Mr. Jim Waters, Quest Development, Inc., Loucks is submitting the attached Preliminary Plat documents for VILLAS OF GLEN LAKE, a new single family residential subdivision. We offer the following comments regarding this submittal:

**Preliminary Plat:**
The existing site includes two single family residential dwellings. The proposed Preliminary Plat includes a total of 5 new single family lots. The plat includes a common driveway, combining the two existing driveways into one access from Eden Prairie Road (CR 4). An ingress/egress easement will be obtained for all lots for access rights.

The site contains a ‘Bluff’ along the east end of the site. A 20’ buffer is shown from the bluff edge which will be preserved with no disturbance to the existing ground.

**Rezoning:**
The current zoning is B-1 & R-1. The applicant is requesting rezoning to R-2, Low Density Residential District. All of the lots meet the required setbacks. The only exception is the lot area. The minimum lot area in R-2 is 12,500 SF. The proposed lots 1 & 2 are 10,651 and 10,795 SF, respectively. The average lot area = 12,964 SF. The impetus for the smaller lots is the requirement to not disturb the bluff including the 20’ bluff setback area. Therefore, the rear lots are extra-large to protect the bluff area.

The proposed rezoning is consistent with the land use plan and is compatible with the zoning of adjacent properties.

**Stormwater Management:**
The VILLAS OF GLEN LAKE development has been designed to efficiently and sensitively handle stormwater management concerns. Both NURP standards and infiltration basins are used to address the runoff from the site. The overall effect meets pre-development runoff rates for both rate and volumes while protecting adjoining parcels from negative drainage concerns. The requirements of the Nine Mile Creek Watershed District are also included in the design.
Wetlands:
There are no delineated wetlands on the site

Tree Preservation:
The tree preservation plan includes an inventory of the existing trees within the property boundary. Existing trees outside of the property lines are shown on the plan for context, but are not included on the inventory list or calculations. The allowable tree removal area per the City’s code is shown on the tree preservation plan (20’ outside of the building footprint and 10’ outside of the interior drives). There are 74 existing trees on site and 30 of them are planned to be removed. All but one of the removed trees are within the allowable removal limits, the proposed landscape plan should clearly cover the mitigation requirement. All of the tree preservation calculations are shown on sheet L1-0.

Landscaping:
The landscaping plan shows the primary ground cover and trees needed to achieve the city’s minimum landscape value amount. The cost opinion of the proposed landscaping is on the landscape plan, we have included an amount for foundation plantings, but have not shown them on the landscape plan. Tree species were chosen both for their compatibility with the surrounding trees and aesthetic qualities.

Phasing:
The development is expected to be built in one phase.

We look forward to your comments on the proposed plans. Please let us know if there is other information you need from us or Quest Development.

Sincerely
Loucks

Paul Kangas, LA
Project Manager

CC: Jim Waters, Quest Development
GENERAL NOTES:

1. BACKGROUND PLANS ARE BASED UPON A TRUE SURVEY BY LOUCKS AND MAKES USE OF DRAWINGS PROVIDED BY THE CITY. LOUCKS DOES NOT GUARANTEE THE ACCURACY OF INFORMATION PROVIDED BY OTHERS.

2. LAWS TO NOTIFY GOPHER STATE ONE CALL AT LEAST 48 HOURS IN PLACE ON OR NEAR THIS SITE. BEFORE DIGGING, YOU ARE REQUIRED BY LAW TO NOTIFY THE ENGINEER IF THERE ARE OTHER SERVICES FOUND.

3. LAW TO NOTIFY THE ENGINEER IF THERE ARE OTHER SERVICES FOUND.

4. LAW TO NOTIFY THE ENGINEER IF THERE ARE OTHER SERVICES FOUND.

WARNING:

TO THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL ERRORS OR OMISSIONS MADE IN THIS DRAWING. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE ENGINEER IF THERE ARE OTHER SERVICES FOUND.
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THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL ERRORS OR OMISSIONS MADE IN THIS DRAWING. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE ENGINEER IF THERE ARE OTHER SERVICES FOUND.
DEMOLITION NOTES

1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Based on a field survey by Loucks and Environmental Engineering, Inc., this drawing does not guarantee the accuracy of the representation of the site.

2. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL REMEMBER AND REFER TO THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS DURING THE CONSTRUCTION PHASE OF THE PROJECT. THE CONTRACTOR WILL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY DAMAGES TO UNDERGROUND SERVICES OCCURRING DURING THE CONSTRUCTION PHASE OF THIS PROJECT.

3. THE CONTRACTOR WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PROVIDING AND MAINTAINING TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES AS REQUIRED IN THIS PLAN. BEFORE DIGNING, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL CONTACT GOPHER STATE ONE CALL AT 651-454-0002 AT LEAST 48 HOURS IN ADVANCE FOR THE LOCATIONS OF ALL UNDERGROUND WIRES, CABLES, CONDUITS, UTILITIES. THEY SHALL COOPERATE WITH ALL UTILITY COMPANIES IN MAINTAINING THEIR CONSTRUCTION AT NO COST TO THE OWNER.

4. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL REPAIR OR REPLACE THE ABOVE WHEN DAMAGED DURING CONSTRUCTION AT NO COST TO THE OWNER.

5. PRIOR TO COMMENCING CONSTRUCTION, EROSION AND SEDIMENTATION CONTROL DEVICES SUCH AS BARRICADES, WARNING SIGNS, DIRECTIONAL SIGNS, FLAGMEN AND LIGHTS TO CONTROL THE MOVEMENT OF TRAFFIC WHERE NECESSARY. THE CONTRACTOR WILL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY DAMAGES TO THE SITE.

6. THE REMOVAL OF EXISTING SERVICES WITHIN THE CONSTRUCTION LIMITS SHALL BE PERMITTED ONLY AFTER THE CONTRACTOR HAS OBTAINED THE PROPER PERMITS. PERMIT IS REQUIRED PRIOR TO REMOVALS OR INSTALLATION.

7. THE REMOVAL OF EXISTING SERVICES WITHIN THE CONSTRUCTION LIMITS SHALL BE PERMITTED ONLY AFTER THE CONTRACTOR HAS OBTAINED THE PROPER PERMITS. PERMIT IS REQUIRED PRIOR TO REMOVALS OR INSTALLATION.

8. ALL CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY INCLUDING EXCAVATIONS, EXPOSING & PAVING MUST TAKE PLACE ON-WITHIN THE PROJECT SITE. TEMPORARY STREET SIGNS, LIGHTING & ADDRESSES SHALL BE PROVIDED DURING CONSTRUCTION.

9. REMOVE EXISTING FENCES.

10. REMOVE EXISTING BUILDINGS.

11. REMOVE EXISTING LIGHT POLES.

12. REMOVE EXISTING CONCRETE.

13. REMOVE EXISTING PAVING.

14. SEE TREE PRESERVATION PLAN FOR REMOVAL.

15. SEE TREE INVENTORY PLAN FOR TREE REMOVAL.

LEGEND

- REMOVE EXISTING FENCE
- REMOVE EXISTING CONCRETE
- REMOVE EXISTING LIGHT POLES
- REMOVE EXISTING PAVING
- REMOVE EXISTING BASKETBALL HOOP
- REMOVE EXISTING CONCRETE PAD
- REMOVE EXISTING BUILDINGS
- REMOVE EXISTING LIGHT POLES
- REMOVE EXISTING FENCES

WARNING

THE CONTRACTOR WILL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR CALLING FOR LOCATIONS OF ALL EXISTING UTILITIES. THEY SHALL COORDINATE WITH ALL UTILITY COMPANIES IN MAINTAINING THEIR SERVICE AND/or REPLACEMENT OF UTILITIES.

THE CONTRACTOR WILL CONTACT GOPHER STATE ONE CALL AT 651-454-0002 AT LEAST 48 HOURS IN ADVANCE FOR THE LOCATIONS OF ALL EXISTING UTILITIES. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE COORDINATION OF ALL UTILITIES WITH THE OWNER & ADDITIONAL UTILITIES ON THE SITE. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL REPAIR OR REPLACE THE ABOVE WHEN DAMAGED DURING CONSTRUCTION AT NO COST TO THE OWNER.

THE CONTRACTOR SHALL REPAIR OR REPLACE THE ABOVE WHEN DAMAGED DURING CONSTRUCTION AT NO COST TO THE OWNER.
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SITE DATA

- STREET: Eden Prairie Road
- PROPERTY: VILLAS OF GLEN LAKE
- CITY: Minnetonka
- COUNTY: Hennepin
- STATE: Minnesota
- ZIP CODE: 55343

SITE NOTES

1. The contractor shall be responsible for locating any underground existing structures or utilities that may be present on the site.
2. The contractor shall coordinate with all utility companies in advance of any excavation or underground work.
3. No utility lines shall be disturbed until a confirmed, written notification has been received from Gopher State One Call.
4. Any sign or fixture removed within the right-of-way or as part of the site work shall be replaced by the contractor in accordance with the City Fire Chief.
5. No parking fire lane signs must be installed as indicated by the City Fire Chief.
6. Verify exact locations and number of required signs with the City Fire Chief.
7. There shall be no obstructions within the fire lane.

CONTRACTOR REQUIREMENTS

1. The contractor shall coordinate with all utility companies in advance of any excavation or underground work.
2. No utility lines shall be disturbed until a confirmed, written notification has been received from Gopher State One Call.
3. Any sign or fixture removed within the right-of-way or as part of the site work shall be replaced by the contractor in accordance with the City Fire Chief.
4. No parking fire lane signs must be installed as indicated by the City Fire Chief.
5. Verify exact locations and number of required signs with the City Fire Chief.
PAINTS.

INSTALL SNOW FENCE AROUND EACH TREE TO BE PROTECTED PRIOR TO GRADING. FENCE SHALL BE PLACED AT THE DRIP EDGE OR CRITICAL ROOT ZONES OF THE TREES. FENCING SHALL BE NO CLOSER THAN 6' TO THE TRUNK OF ANY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY AND SIGNAGE SHALL BE INSTALLED AT ALL TREE PROTECTION AREAS THAT INSTRUCTS TO TREES TO BE PROTECTED SHALL BE BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE OWNER AND LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL HAVE "TREE PAINT" ON SITE AT ALL TIMES. IF AN OAK IS WOUNDED DURING CONSTRUCTION, TREE TO BE PROTECTED. THE PERIMETERS FOR TREES BEING PROTECTED SHALL BE DESIGNATED AT ALL TIMES DURING WORKERS TO STAY OUT. CONTRACTOR SHALL AVOID ALL AREAS WITHIN TREE PROTECTION FENCE. SOIL SHOULD BE BETWEEN TREE PROTECTION AND EXISTING TREE TO REMAIN. NETTING BETWEEN WOOD STAKES POLYETHYLENE LAMINAR SAFETY STRING 4' HIGH, ORANGE PROPERTY BOUNDARY LEGEND

SIGNIFICANT TREE TO BE REMOVED - ALLOWABLE
SIGNIFICANT TREE TO BE REMOVED - MITIGATE
HIGH PRIORITY TREE TO BE REMOVED
HIGH PRIORITY TREE TO BE PROTECTED

SIGNIFICANT TREE CALCULATIONS

HIGH PRIORITY TREE CALCULATIONS

TREE INVENTORY

TREE PRESERVATION PLAN

L1-0
MINIMUM LANDSCAPE VALUE COST OPINION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMON TREES</th>
<th>SCIENTIFIC NAME</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ 4</td>
<td>Viburnum opulus 'Nanum'</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Spirea betulifolia 'Tor'</td>
<td>5' 9'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>Juniperus horizontalis 'Prince of Wales'</td>
<td>2' 3'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Pinus nigra</td>
<td>60' 110'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Picea glauca densata</td>
<td>60' 110'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Syringa reticulata 'Ivory Silk'</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Malus 'Prairie Rose'</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Gleditsia triacanthos inermis 'Suncole'</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Celtis occidentalis</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>Redmond Linden</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Common Hackberry</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Red Sunset Maple</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORNAMENTAL TREES - 15 TOTAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMON TREES</th>
<th>SCIENTIFIC NAME</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Dwarf Bush Honeysuckle</td>
<td>2' 3'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Autumn Magic Chokeberry</td>
<td>2' 3'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Little Princess Spirea</td>
<td>2' 3'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Taunton Yew</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Scandia Juniper</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OVERSTORY TREES - 13 TOTAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMON TREES</th>
<th>SCIENTIFIC NAME</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Austrian Pine</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Ivory Silk Lilac</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Spring Snow Crabapple</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Prairie Rose Crabapple</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLANT LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>SCIENTIFIC NAME</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ 6</td>
<td>Viburnum opulus 'Nanum'</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Spirea betulifolia 'Tor'</td>
<td>5' 9'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>Juniperus horizontalis 'Prince of Wales'</td>
<td>2' 3'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Pinus nigra</td>
<td>60' 110'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Picea glauca densata</td>
<td>60' 110'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Syringa reticulata 'Ivory Silk'</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Malus 'Prairie Rose'</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Gleditsia triacanthos inermis 'Suncole'</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Celtis occidentalis</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>Redmond Linden</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Common Hackberry</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Red Sunset Maple</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORNAMENTAL TREES - 15 TOTAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMON TREES</th>
<th>SCIENTIFIC NAME</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Dwarf Bush Honeysuckle</td>
<td>2' 3'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Autumn Magic Chokeberry</td>
<td>2' 3'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Little Princess Spirea</td>
<td>2' 3'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Taunton Yew</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Scandia Juniper</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OVERSTORY TREES - 13 TOTAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMON TREES</th>
<th>SCIENTIFIC NAME</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Austrian Pine</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Ivory Silk Lilac</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Spring Snow Crabapple</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Prairie Rose Crabapple</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOUNDBATION PLANT LIST SUGGESTIONS

In order to encourage species diversity and to meet minimum requirements to select their own landscaping, the following list is a subset of the types of plant materials that may be selected by the homeowner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>SCIENTIFIC NAME</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ 6</td>
<td>Viburnum opulus 'Nanum'</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Spirea betulifolia 'Tor'</td>
<td>5' 9'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>Juniperus horizontalis 'Prince of Wales'</td>
<td>2' 3'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Pinus nigra</td>
<td>60' 110'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Picea glauca densata</td>
<td>60' 110'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Syringa reticulata 'Ivory Silk'</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Malus 'Prairie Rose'</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Gleditsia triacanthos inermis 'Suncole'</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Celtis occidentalis</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>Redmond Linden</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Common Hackberry</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>Red Sunset Maple</td>
<td>20' 30'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DFP EXAMPLE

UNIT A3

UNIT A4

FRONT ELEVATION
VILLAS OF GLEN LAKE

KNOW ALL PERSONS BY THESE PRESENTS: That Qwest Development, a Minnesota corporation, for owner of the following described property situated in the County of Hennepin, State of Minnesota, to wit:

That part of Lot 7, Glen Lake Park, lying Southwesterly of a line drawn parallel to and 115 feet North of the Southwesterly line of the following described property. The part of Lot 7, Northwesterly of a straight line running from a point on the Easterly line of said lot distant 364 feet from the most Northerly corner thereof to a point on the line of said lot distant 125 feet from the Southeast corner of same.

Together with that part of Lot Seven (7), Glen Lake Park, described as follows: Commencing at the Southeast corner of said lot; thence Southeasterly along said line of said lot distant 125 feet Southwesterly from said Southeast corner thereof; thence Southwesterly along said Southwesterly line 64.75 feet Southwesterly from said Southeast corner thereof; thence Southeasterly along said Northerly line 364 feet from the Southeast corner thereof.

Has caused the same to be surveyed and platted as VILLAS OF GLEN LAKE, and does hereby dedicate to the public for public use the public way, and does also dedicate the drainage and utility easements as created by this plat.

I hereby certify that the within plat of VILLAS OF GLEN LAKE was recorded in this office this _______ day of _________________________, 20______. If applicable, the written comments and recommendations of the Commissioner of Transportation and the County Highway Engineer have been reviewed by the City or the prescribed 30-day period has elapsed without receipt of such comments and recommendations, as provided by Minnesota Statutes, Section 505.03, Subdivision 2.

City Council, Minneapolis, Minnesota
By: _________________________________, Mayor
By: _________________________________, Clerk

RESIDENT AND REAL ESTATE DEPARTMENT, Hennepin County, Minnesota
I hereby certify that taxes payable in 20______ and prior years have been paid for land described on this plat, dated this _______ day of _________________________, 20______. If applicable, the written comments and recommendations of the Commissioner of Transportation and the County Highway Engineer have been reviewed by the City or the prescribed 30-day period has elapsed without receipt of such comments and recommendations, as provided by Minnesota Statutes, Section 505.03, Subdivision 2.

Qwest Development, a Minnesota corporation
By: _________________________________, Manager

COUNTY RECORDER, Hennepin County, Minnesota
I hereby certify that the within plat of VILLAS OF GLEN LAKE was recorded in this office this _______ day of _________________________, 20______. If applicable, the written comments and recommendations of the Commissioner of Transportation and the County Highway Engineer have been reviewed by the City or the prescribed 30-day period has elapsed without receipt of such comments and recommendations, as provided by Minnesota Statutes, Section 505.03, Subdivision 2.

Mark V. Chapin, County Auditor
By: _________________________________, Deputy

Mark L. Stanislowski, Licensed Land Surveyor,
Minnetonka, Minnesota

STATE OF MINNESOTA
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN
The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this _______ day of _________________________, 20______ by Mark L. Stanislowski, a Licensed Land Surveyor.

Notary Public:
County, Minnesota
My Commission Expires:
Notary Printed Name:

SURVEYORS CERTIFICATION

Mark L. Stanislowski, Licensed Land Surveyor,
Minneota, Minnesota

STATE OF MINNESOTA
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN
The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this _______ day of _________________________, 20______ by Mark L. Stanislowski, a Licensed Land Surveyor.

Notary Public:
County, Minnesota
My Commission Expires:
Notary Printed Name:
THE BEARINGS FOR THIS SURVEY ARE BASED ON THE WESTERLY LINE OF LOT 7, GLEN LAKE PARK, ASSUMED TO HAVE A BEARING OF NORTH 08 DEGREES 30 MINUTES 45 SECONDS WEST.

DENOTES 1/2 INCH X 14 INCH IRON MONUMENT SET, MARKED "LS 48988"

DENOTES 1/2 INCH OPEN IRON MONUMENT FOUND UNLESS OTHERWISE SHOWN

DENOTES RECORD DOCUMENT

VILLAS OF GLEN LAKE
EXCERPTS FROM GLEN LAKE NEIGHBORHOOD STUDY
FIGURE 4.3 DEVELOPMENT SITES MAP
NOTE: Concepts do not represent actual development proposals and are for discussion purposes only. They do not imply that development is or will be supported by property owners.

This trail segment will require property owner cooperation.
This trail segment will require property owner cooperation.

NOTE: Concepts do not represent actual development proposals and are for discussion purposes only. They do not imply that development is or will be supported by property owners.
Resolution No. 2018-

Resolution approving the preliminary and final plats, with variances, of
VILLAS OF GLEN LAKE at 5517 and 5525 Eden Prairie Road

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

Section 1. Background.

1.01 Villas of Glen Lake, LLC. has requested approval of the VILLAS OF GLEN LAKE preliminary and final plats. The proposal includes the following variances:

- Variance to for three lots without frontage on a public right-of-way;
- Variance for detached homes;
- Front yard setback variance from 50 feet to 35 feet; and
- Side yard setback variance from 15 feet to 10 feet.

1.02 The subject site is located at 5517 and 5525 Eden Prairie Road. It is legally described of Exhibit A of this resolution.

1.03 On September 20, 2018, the planning commission held a hearing on the proposal. The applicant was provided the opportunity to present information to the commission. The commission considered all of the comments received and the staff report, which are incorporated by reference into this resolution. The commission recommended that the city council grant approval of the proposal.

Section 2. General Standards.

2.01 City Code §400.030 outlines general design requirements for residential subdivisions. These standards are incorporated by reference into this resolution.

2.02 City Code §400.055 outlines the variance standard for lots without frontage on a public right-of-way. These standards are incorporated by reference into this resolution.
City Code §300.07 outlines that variances may be granted from the requirements of the zoning ordinance when: (1) the variance is in harmony with the general purposes and intent of this ordinance; (2) when the variance is consistent with the comprehensive plan; and (3) when the applicant establishes that there are practical difficulties in complying with the ordinance. Practical difficulties means: (1) The proposed use is reasonable; (2) the need for a variance is caused by circumstances unique to the property, not created by the property owner, and not solely based on economic considerations; and (3) the proposed use would not alter the essential character of the surrounding area.

Section 3. Findings.

3.01 The proposed plats would generally meet the design requirements as outlined in City Code §400.025.

3.02 The requested variances lots without frontage on a public right-of-way would meet the variance standard outlined in City Code §400.055:

1. A right-of-way extension would adversely impact natural resources, including mature trees and a code-defined bluff.

2. While five lots would share access off of a private drive, two of these lots would technically have frontage on a public right-of-way.

3. As a condition of this resolution, a common access easement is required outlining the responsibilities of future property owners.

4. There are several residential developments in the surrounding area that contain properties without frontage on a public right-of-way, including both townhome developments and single-family lots. Given this, the proposed lots would not alter the essential character of the neighborhood.

3.03 The requested variance for detached structures and the requested setback variances would meet the variance standard outlined in City Code §300.07 Subd. 1(a):

1. PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE:

   a) Detached structures.

   The intent of R-3 ordinance is to allow for locations within the community where attached townhomes can be constructed. The proposed detached structures are not contrary to this purpose. The arrangement of an attached townhome development on the subject site would likely be different than the proposed site arrangement. However, the difference in site design would result in very little – if any – difference in overall site impact. Given this, whether the residential product is attached or detached matters little from a site perspective.
b) Setbacks.

1) The intent of the front yard setback requirement is to provide appropriate separation between the traveled portion of a roadway structures for both safety and aesthetic reasons. The proposed 35-foot setback would meet this intent. The homes would be located roughly 60 feet from the traveled portion of Eden Prairie Road. Further, the proposed 35-foot setback would be allowed where the lots zoned R-2 or R-1A.

2) The intent of side yard setback requirements is to appropriately locate structures within the width of individual properties. The proposed 10-foot side yard setback from the south property line would meet this intent. The homes would be no closer to the side yard than single-family homes would be allowed within the R-1 district.

3. Practical Difficulties: There are practical difficulties in complying with the ordinance:

a) Reasonableness:

1) Detached Structures. General planning principals suggest that zoning ordinances outline the highest intensity land uses allowed in individual zoning districts and that less intense land uses would be reasonable. Detached homes would be considered a less intense land use than attached homes.

3) Setbacks. The proposed homes would be located roughly 60 feet from the traveled portion of Eden Prairie Road. Further, the proposed 35 foot setback would be allowed where the lots zoned R-2 or R-1A. Similarly, the homes would be no closer to the side property lines than single-family homes would be allowed within the R-1 district. Further, these side yard setbacks could be increased to 15 feet with a northward shift of property lines and homes. However, such shift would likely impact several trees along the development’s north property line. Area property owners, commissioners, and councilmembers had requested that efforts be made to reduce impacts to this area.
b) Unique Circumstance and Character of Locality. The development site is uniquely located within the Glen Lake Village Center. With access to a county road, the site abuts a small office building, a medium-density townhome development, and a conditionally-permitted, licensed residential care facility. The proposal would not disrupt any clear development pattern or aesthetic character.


4.01 The above-described proposal is hereby approved, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to release of the final plat for recording, submit the following:

   a) Documents for the city attorney’s review and approval. These documents must be prepared by an attorney knowledgeable in the area of real estate.

      1) Title evidence that current within thirty days before release of the final plat.

      2) A common access easement between the public right-of-way and individual lots.

      3) Private utility easements for services crossing private property lines.

      4) A private fire hydrant maintenance agreement.

      5) A stormwater maintenance agreement.

      6) Documents establishing a homeowners’ association. The association must be responsible for maintaining any common areas, common drives, private utilities, private fire hydrants, and required stormwater facilities approved by the City.

      7) A legal document outlining that the driveway, utilities, and hydrant on site will be privately constructed and maintained. The document must be recorded against the individual properties after the filing of the plat.

      8) A Contract for Residential Development

b) A revised final plat drawing that clearly illustrates the following:

   1) Dedication of 7-feet of right-of-way adjacent to existing Eden Prairie Road right-of-way.
2) Minimum 10-foot wide drainage and utility easements adjacent to the public right-of-way(s) and minimum 7-foot wide drainage and utility easements along all other lot lines.

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

4) Drainage and utility easements stormwater management facilities, as determined by the city engineer.

c) Two sets of mylars for city signatures.

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

e) Park dedication fee of $15,000.

2. Subject to staff approval, VILLAS OF GLEN LAKE must be developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the following plans, except as modified by the conditions below:

- Site Plan, dated August 23, 2018
- Grading and Drainage Plan, dated August 23, 2018
- Utility Plan, dated August 23, 2018
- Preliminary Plat, dated August 23, 2018
- Tree Preservation Plan, dated August 23, 2018
- Landscape Plan, dated August 23, 2018

3. A grading permit is required. Unless authorized by appropriate staff, no site work may begin until a complete grading permit application has been submitted, reviewed by staff, and approved.

a) The following must be submitted for the grading permit to be considered complete.

1) Evidence of filing the final plat at Hennepin County and copies of all recorded easements and documents as required in section 4.01(1)(a) of this resolution.

2) An electronic PDF copy of all required plans and specifications.

3) Final site, grading, stormwater management, utility, landscape, and tree mitigation plans, and a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) for staff approval.

   a. Final grading plan must:
- Not include sidewalk adjacent to Eden Prairie Road.
- Include crown, inverted crown, or cross slope on the private drive to direct run off to the stormwater facilities and not out to Eden Prairie Road.
- Adjust grading to ensure tree 1304 and/or tree 1305 is preserved.

b. Final stormwater management plan. The plan must demonstrate conformance with the following criteria:

- Rate. Limit peak runoff flow rates to that of existing conditions from the 2-, 10-, and 100-year events at all points where stormwater leaves the site.
- Volume. Provide for onsite retention of 1-inch of runoff from the entire site’s impervious surface.
- Quality. Provide for all runoff to be treated to at least 60 percent total phosphorus annual removal efficiency and 90 percent total suspended solid annual removal efficiency.

c. Final utility plan must:

- Confirm existing sewer and water main locations.
- Clearly label which utilities are public and which are private. Note, the water main from wet tap to hydrant and all service lines would be private. Similarly, sanitary sewer main extended eastward into the site and all services lines would be private.

d. Final landscaping and tree mitigation plans must:

- Meet minimum landscaping and mitigation requirements as outlined in ordinance. However, at the sole discretion of natural resources staff, mitigation may be adjusted based on site conditions.
• Include taller shrubbery adjacent to evergreens 1301-1305 to create a buffer to Eden Prairie Road

• Not include new plantings of any trees in easements containing public utilities or within right-of-way

5) Individual letters of credit or cash escrow for 125% of a bid cost or 150% of an estimated cost to construct utility improvements, comply with grading permit, wetland restoration, tree mitigation requirements, and to restore the site. One itemized letter of credit is permissible, if approved by staff. The city will not fully release the letters of credit or cash escrow until: (1) as-built drawings have been submitted; (2) a letter certifying that the streets and utilities have been completed according to the plans approved by the city has been submitted; (3) vegetated ground cover has been established; and (4) required landscaping or vegetation has survived one full growing season.

6) A construction management plan. The plan must be in a city approved format and must outlined minimum site management practices and penalties for non-compliance.

7) A copy of the approved MPCA NPDES permit.

8) Evidence of closure/capping of any existing wells, septic systems, and removal of any existing fuel oil tanks.

9) All required administration and engineering fees.

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

   • The property will be brought into compliance within 48 hours of notification of a violation of the construction management plan, other conditions of approval, or city code standards; and

   • If compliance is not achieved, the city will use any or all of the escrow dollars to correct any erosion and/or grading problems.

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

2) The following permits from outside agencies must be submitted:
   - Access modification permit and right-of-way permit (for utility work) from Hennepin County.
   - Sanitary sewer extension permit from Minnesota Pollution Control Agency.
   - Stormwater permit from Nine Mile Creek Watershed District.

3) Provide evidence that coordination of Eden Prairie Road striping improvements is underway. The roadway must be restriped to incorporate a center turn lane as required by Hennepin County.

4. Prior to issuance of a building permit for the first new house within the development, submit the following documents:
   a) A letter from the surveyor stating that boundary and lot stakes have been installed as required by ordinance.
   b) Proof of subdivision registration and transfer of NPDES permit, if required.

5. Prior to issuance of a building permit for any of the lots within the development:
   a) Submit the following items for staff review and approval:
      1) A construction management plan. This plan must be in a city approved format and outline minimum site management practices and penalties for non-compliance. If the builder is the same entity doing grading work on the site, the construction management plan submitted at the time of grading permit may fulfill this requirement.
      2) Cash escrow in an amount to be determined by city staff. This escrow must be accompanied by a document prepared by the city attorney and signed by the builder and property
owner. Through this document the builder and property owner will acknowledge:

- The property will be brought into compliance within 48 hours of notification of a violation of the construction management plan, other conditions of approval, or city code standards; and

- If compliance is not achieved, the city will use any or all of the escrow dollars to correct any erosion and/or grading problems.

If the builder is the same entity doing grading work on the site, the cash escrow submitted at the time of grading permit may fulfill this requirement.

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

d) Submit all required hook-up fees.

6. All lots and structures within the development are subject to the following:

a) Required setbacks from exterior lot lines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Side</th>
<th>Rear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>35 ft</td>
<td>10 ft</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>35 ft</td>
<td>30 ft</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>20 ft</td>
<td>120 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 4</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>165 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>10 ft</td>
<td>195 ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Maximum floor area ratio on each lot is 0.25. Floor area is defined as the sum of the following as measured from exterior walls: the fully exposed gross horizontal area of a building, including attached garage space and enclosed porch areas, and one-half the gross horizontal area of any partially exposed level such as a walkout or lookout level.

c) Minimum floor elevation on Lots 1 and 2 must be two feet above the 100-year elevation of the proposed infiltration basin.
d) Homes must be protected with a 13D automatic fire sprinkler system or an approved alternative system.

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

8. Unless the city council approves a time extension, the final plat must be recorded by October 4, 2019.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on October 4, 2018.

Brad Wiersum, Mayor

Attest:

David E. Maeda, City Clerk

Action on this resolution:

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

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a duly authorized meeting held on October 4, 2018.

David E. Maeda, City Clerk
EXHIBIT A

That part of Lot 7, Glen Lake Park, lying Southeasterly of a line drawn parallel to and 115 feet North of the Southerly line of the following described property: That part of Lot 7, Northerly of a straight line running from a point on the Easterly line of said lot distant 364 feet from the most Northerly corner thereof to a point on the Westerly line of said lot, distant 125 feet from the Southwest corner of same, subject to existing roadways.

Together with that part of Lot Seven (7), Glen Lake Park, described as follows: Commencing on Westerly line of Lot Seven (7) at a point 64.75 feet Northerly from Southwest corner thereof; thence Northerly along said line 60.25 feet; thence Easterly to a point on Northeasterly line of Lot Seven (7) distant 364 feet Southeasterly from most Northerly corner thereof; thence Southeasterly along said Northerly line 60.3 feet; thence Westerly to beginning, except road.

Hennepin County, Minnesota
Abstract Property