Planning Commission Agenda

May 18, 2017—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: May 4, 2017

5. Report from Staff

6. Report from Planning Commission Members

7. Public Hearings: Consent Agenda

(No Items)

8. Public Hearings: Non-Consent Agenda Items

A. Expansion permit for additions to the existing home at 5013 Mayview Road.

   Recommendation: Adopt the resolution approving the expansion permit (5 votes)

   • Final Decision Subject to Appeal
   • Project Planner: Susan Thomas

B. Items concerning additions and landscaping at 2807 McKenzie Point Road.

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

   • Recommendation to City Council (Tentative Date: June 12, 2017)
   • Project Planner: Drew Ingvalson
C. Preliminary plat, with lot width at setback variances, for HOMESTEAD PLACE, a 2-lot subdivision at 3625 Plymouth Road.

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

   • Recommendation to City Council (Tentative Date: June 12, 2017)
   • Project Planner: Ashley Cauley

D. Items concerning a trail, boardwalk, and pedestrian bridge at 5709 Rowland Road and 5624 Shady Oak Road.

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

   • Recommendation to City Council (Tentative Date: June 12, 2017)
   • Project Planner: Susan Thomas

9. Other Business

   A. Concept plan review for Newport Midwest at 10400, 10500 and 10550 Bren Road East.

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

10. Adjournment
Notices

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

2. Applications and items scheduled for the June 8, 2017 Planning Commission meeting:

   Project Description: Alliant Engineering, on behalf of CSM Corporation, has submitted applications to redevelop the property at 2800 Jordan Avenue. As proposed, the single story building would be removed and the property line for 2800 and 2828 Jordan Avenue would be reconfigured in order to construct a new four-story, 78-unit apartment complex. The proposal requires approval of: (1) preliminary plat; (2) final plat; (3) amendment to the existing master development plan; (4) site and building plans; and (5) vacation of existing obsolete easements.
   Project No.: 86157.17a    Staff: Ashley Cauley
   Ward/Council Member:  2—Tony Wagner    Section: 12

   Project Description: The applicant is requesting a sign plan variance at 1805 Plymouth Road.
   Project No.: 17020.17a    Staff: Susan Thomas
   Ward/Council Member:  2—Tony Wagner    Section: 03
WELCOME TO THE MINNETONKA PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

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

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

2. Staff presents their report on the item.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. Roll Call

Commissioners Calvert, Powers, Schack, Sewall, and Kirk were present. Knight and O’Connell were absent.

Staff members present: City Planner Loren Gordon, Assistant City Planner Susan Thomas, Planner Drew Ingvalson, and Natural Resource Manager Jo Colleran.

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

4. Approval of Minutes: April 20, 2017

   *Schack moved, second by Powers to approve the April 20, 2017 meeting minutes as submitted with the changes from the change memo dated May 4, 2017.*

   *Calvert, Powers, Schack, Sewall, and Kirk voted yes. Knight and O’Connell were absent. Motion carried.*

5. Report from Staff

Gordon briefed the commission on land use applications considered by the city council at its meeting of April 24, 2017 and May 1, 2017:

- Introduced an ordinance for the Minnetonka Hills Apartments proposed to have 78 market-rate units and be located on Jordan Avenue.
- Adopted an ordinance approving a conditional use permit for The Cheesecake Factory.
- Adopted a resolution approving items including field lighting for Hopkins High School.
- Adopted a resolution approving items including lighting and trails for the city hall campus.
• Reviewed an updated plan for the Shady Oak Road redevelopment site.
• Tabled action on an application to amend the master development plan for Ridgedale Festival.
• Adopted a resolution approving the liquor license with conditions.

The next planning commission meeting is scheduled for May 18, 2017.

6. Report from Planning Commission Members: None

7. Public Hearings: Consent Agenda: None

8. Public Hearings

A. Amendment to the existing Ridgedale Center Sign Plan to allow a wall sign that is not for the mall proper, an anchor department store, or a restaurant with exterior wall frontage.

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

Ingvalson reported. He recommended denial of the application based on the findings listed in the staff report.

In response to Powers’ question, Ingvalson explained that the city does not regulate the size or movement of interior signs.

Chair Kirk confirmed with Ingvalson that five votes would be required to approve the amendment.

In response to Powers’ question, Ingvalson explained that sign regulations were created differently for restaurants than other businesses when the mall was first built.

Schack asked if there are other uses in the mall that have exterior access and a sign. Ingvalson responded that there is one use with exterior access that has a sign, but no approval was found to allow that sign. No building permit or sign permit could be located, leading staff to believe that it was put up without approval from the city.

Schack asked where additional doors could be added to the mall to create the same situation. Ingvalson stated that staff saw the potential for other businesses to request additional doors.
Kevin Kendall, of Accent Graphics and national sign coordinator for CycleBar, applicant, stated that:

- He enjoyed working with Ingvalson.
- There are currently 80 operating CycleBars and 135 under construction.
- The proposed sign located above the outside door would be more aesthetically pleasing than locating it inside a window. The visibility and finished product would match the improvements to the mall. It would be a disservice to the community and mall to put the sign on the inside of the window.
- The Minnesota Fire Code classifies a workout area the same as a restaurant, which would allow the CycleBar to have an exterior entrance.
- The business needs the exterior visibility in order to be successful since there is only one entrance and no mall access.
- The facility would look nice and benefit the city.
- He would hate to see the Lens Crafters sign taken down since it would hurt their business.

Greg Randall, of Sign Source, stated that:

- His company would install the sign.
- With online shopping becoming more common, the future will include malls providing more services and less product sales.
- CycleBar would be good for the city and the mall. It would need a sign above the only door.

Mark Schneider, owner of CycleBar, stated that he is excited about bringing CycleBar to the City of Minnetonka. He lives in Minnetonka and has been active in the community. The business would not be in the mall, it would be on the exterior. It would operate well outside of the mall hours, which makes it similar to a restaurant. Customers would be there at 5:30 a.m. He appreciated the commissioners’ time. He asked that the use be considered as something other than retail.

The public hearing was opened. No testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.
Chair Kirk asked what would happen if the sign plan would be changed to allow signs like the current proposal. Ingvalson explained that approval of the application would be an amendment to the sign plan that would allow just the proposed sign.

Gordon explained that the fire code classifications are part of the building code and deal with sprinkler systems and emergency exits. If the mall is interested in having more spaces that have only outside access and do not have access to the interior of the mall, then the mall should submit a comprehensive sign plan. Schack would appreciate a comprehensive fix initiated by the mall.

Chair Kirk noted that setting a precedent without amending the master plan for the mall may be a concern.

Calvert agreed. She favored a comprehensive approach to signage for the mall. The CycleBar logo is attractive and it is a great business.

Powers felt that the space is unique and the door is the only way to get in. He did not think that future changes should impact CycleBar. That is a whole other set of circumstances. He drove around Ridgedale Center and did not see a lot of signs. It looks very nice. He did not think that the proposal would cause a dramatic, near-term precedent to be set. It is a conservative building. Business times are changing and the city needs to change with them. He felt that it is a unique situation.

Schack agreed that it is a unique situation. She was torn.

Powers was leaning towards the proposed sign being an o.k. idea. He noted that the applicant knew the sign would not be allowed without special approval, so he concluded that the applicant was not overly concerned that not having the proposed sign would impact the business' success, but that the proposed sign would enhance the business' success. The issue could be revisited a year from now.

Schack visited the site and thought that a sign visible through a window could look attractive for now. That might give the mall and city staff more time to develop a long-term signage plan.

Chair Kirk stated that any of the main entrances to any of the anchor stores could become a Barnes and Noble or other store similar to Eden Prairie Center. He had no problem with that. It would be a logical course of action for General
Growth Properties to submit a modification to its sign plan to attract additional businesses.

Schack noted that signs are expensive, but felt it might be worth requiring the applicant to complete two steps.

Sewall saw a need for a sign since this would be the business’ only access point. He could not think of another business in the mall that does not have access to the mall interior that does not have an exterior sign. He was o.k. with the commission taking more time to make a decision to not set a precedent, but there does need to be some sort of sign since there would only be one entrance.

Schack agreed that not having interior access to the mall makes the site unique. The front window is huge. There could be a pretty huge sign in the interior visible from the outside of the window. She favors a more holistic approach to signage.

Powers did not want to saddle the small business with the ambitions for the entire mall. That would be unfair. He assumed that the applicant believes that the business would be successful with or without the proposed sign. Schack agreed.

Mr. Schneider stated that the applicant signed the lease because General Growth Properties approved of the proposed sign plan. The business would be a $550,000 to $800,000 investment. A sign is needed to be successful. He appreciated the struggle. There is a benefit to taking a risk in a business. A sign is 99 percent responsible for making a business a success. This is an unusual situation in a mall.

Chair Kirk noted that everyone wants the business to be successful. Setting a precedent was the concern. He did not think it would be a bad precedent to set.

_Calvert moved, second by Schack, to recommend that the planning commission adopt the attached resolution denying the requested amendment to the Ridgedale Sign Plan associated with the CycleBar at 12401 Wayzata Boulevard._

_Calvert, Schack, and Kirk voted yes. Powers and Sewall voted no. Knight and O’Connell were absent. Motion passed._

Chair Kirk stated that written intent to appeal the planning commission’s decision to the city council must be given to city staff within 10 days.

B. **Conditional use permit for an eight-resident, licensed, residential-**
care facility at 5531 Eden Prairie Road.

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

Thomas reported. She recommended approval of the application based on the findings and subject to the conditions listed in the staff report. A future change in the conditions of approval would be reviewed by the planning commission and require approval from the city council.

Sewall asked if parking requirements would be met. Thomas answered affirmatively. The house would be setback 150 feet from the front property line, so the driveway would provide ample parking space.

Michelle Nash, one of two owners of Legacy Care Home, applicant, stated that Thomas did a marvelous job. She was available for questions. She operates another facility on Crown Drive.

The public hearing was opened.

Kristen Mende, 14319 Stewart Lane, asked if there would be a fence and if residents would wonder off.

Sandy Carlson, a real estate agent representing the owner of 5537 Eden Prairie Road, stated that the property is for sale and she planned on constructing a house valued at $600,000. She has a concern for the surrounding property values if the type of residents would change. She understood that six residents are allowed. There is a bluff-line issue. She asked if the bluff line would allow the house to be set far enough back. There is a significant amount of land at the site, but a regular driveway would look better than a parking lot.

No additional testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.

Thomas pointed out the location of the steep slope. The house would meet all ordinance requirements. The city does not require fencing between residential properties.

Ms. Nash stated that the exits would be coded to prohibit residents from leaving by themselves. Building code and state fire requirements would be met. Most of the residents need memory care. Residents may sit on the patio with supervision. A parking plan would be submitted. She does not want the parking area to look like a parking lot. The purpose is to keep the house looking like a residence. There would have to be a turn-around. The conditional use permit would require
a natural buffer made up of trees and shrubs. Thomas said that staff would work with the applicant on a landscape plan. The city does not restrict the width or size of paved parking areas for residential properties. Chair Kirk noted that storm water management would be required if there would be a certain percentage of hard surface coverage and the conditional use permit would require screening. Thomas agreed.

Powers thought the site would be a very good location. The neighbors would benefit from its creation. He likes everything about the idea.

Schack agreed. The applicant did a nice job selecting the lot. The front setback would be nice and deep. That would benefit the facility and neighborhood. Her house has an enormous driveway that can park 30 vehicles. Her residence does not look abnormal. It looks like a normal house with a big driveway. The plan looks similar to hers. A lot of vehicles can fit in a surprisingly small area.

Calvert knew that the rendering does not convey everything, but it looks attractive. She acknowledged the neighbors’ concerns. Seniors would make wonderful neighbors. It would keep the serenity of the neighborhood. It sounds like a wonderful facility that would provide a needed service that many in our community need. She is glad that this space would be utilized for this use.

Sewall has a similar facility in his neighborhood. Other than a ramp, there is no way to tell that it is not a typical single-family residence. His property values and taxes have continued to go up.

*Powers moved, second by Calvert, to recommend that the city council approve a conditional use permit for an eight-resident, licensed, residential-care facility at 5531 Eden Prairie Road.*

*Calvert, Powers, Schack, Sewall, and Kirk voted yes. Knight and O’Connell were absent. Motion carried.*

The city council is tentatively scheduled to review this item May 22, 2017.

C. **Conditional use permit for a telecommunications tower on the property located at 4525 Williston Road.**

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

Gordon reported. He recommended approval of the application based on the findings and subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.
Karen O’Brian, representing the applicant, was available to answer questions. She held a neighborhood meeting, but no neighbors attended. City staff have been wonderful to work with.

Gary Lysiak, engineering consultant, stated that the proposed tower’s height has been increased to provide the needed height for potential additional users. The tower would be erected in one day.

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

In response to Schack’s question, Gordon explained that Verizon would construct the telecommunications tower on city property. Mr. Lysiak added that most cities, including Minnetonka, have an ordinance requiring telecommunication companies to utilize existing towers before constructing a new one. Telecommunication companies are accustomed to the sharing equipment.

Schack noted that the neighbors have probably come to terms with having a water tower on the site, so it would make the telecommunications tower less noticeable. It is a good location. She is glad that there would be space for additional users.

Chair Kirk noted that the first time around, neighbors did provide comments.

Powers thought that the proposal is a good idea. Staff worked hard and figured out the exact right place to locate the tower. The neighbors have already adjusted to the proximity of the water tower.

Calvert said that the additional photos in the presentation were extremely helpful.

*Calvert moved, second by Powers, to recommend that the city council adopt a resolution approving a conditional use permit for a telecommunication facility at 4525 Williston Road.*

*Calvert, Powers, Schack, Sewall, and Kirk voted yes. Knight and O’Connell were absent. Motion carried.*
9. Adjournment

Powers moved, second by Sewall, to adjourn the meeting at 8:32 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

By: ____________________________
Lois T. Mason
Planning Secretary
Minnetonka Planning Commission Meeting
May 18, 2017

Agenda Item 7

Public Hearing: Consent Agenda
(No Items)
Minnetonka Planning Commission Meeting

May 18, 2017

Agenda Item 8

Public Hearing: Non-Consent Agenda
MINNETONKA PLANNING COMMISSION
May 18, 2017

Brief Description  Expansion permit for additions to the existing home at 5013 Mayview Road

Recommendation  Adopt the resolution approving the expansion permit

Background
The subject property was platted in 1950, prior to adoption of the city’s first subdivision ordinance. As it does not meet current lot standards, the lot is considered non-conforming.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Buildable</th>
<th>Right-of-Way</th>
<th>Setback</th>
<th>Depth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>22,000 sq.ft.</td>
<td>3,500 sq.ft.</td>
<td>80 ft</td>
<td>110 ft</td>
<td>125 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>9,600 sq.ft.</td>
<td>2,800 sq.ft.</td>
<td>70 ft</td>
<td>70 ft</td>
<td>135 ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* numbers rounded down to nears 5 ft or 5 sq. ft.

The roughly 2,200 square foot home on the property was constructed in 1952, prior to adoption of the city’s first zoning ordinance. As the home itself does not meet current side yard setback standards, it too is considered non-conforming.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Side</th>
<th>Aggregate Side</th>
<th>Rear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>35 ft</td>
<td>10 ft</td>
<td>30 ft</td>
<td>28 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>43 ft</td>
<td>6 ft</td>
<td>20 ft</td>
<td>69 ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* numbers rounded down to closest 1 ft

Proposal
The property owners, Alan and Sharron Hanson, are proposing a significant remodel of the existing home. As proposed:

- **Basement/Garage**: The existing house would be raised and a new, slightly larger foundation would be constructed. This would increase both living space and garage area.

- **First Floor**: Living space additions would be added over a portion of the garage and to the rear of the home. A covered porch would be constructed on the front of the home and over the remaining portion of the garage.

- **Second Floor**: New trusses would be installed. This would increase both living space and the overall height of the home.
Staff Analysis

Staff finds that the proposed additions would meet the expansion permit standards.

- Reasonableness. The additions’ proposed 6-foot side yard setback and 20-foot aggregate side yard setback are reasonable. The additions would:
  
  a) Not encroach further into the required setbacks than the existing structure;
  
  b) Be located 20 feet from the closest neighboring home; and
  
  c) Allow for functional remodeling, significantly improving the aesthetics of the existing home.

- Unique Circumstance: The existing property is just 9,600 square feet in size, less than half the city’s minimum lot size. However, it is not classified as a “small lot” by city code definition. For more information on “small lots,” see the “Supporting Information” section of this report. Were it a “small lot:”
  
  a) The home would be subject to a minimum 7-foot setback from both side property lines and just 1.7% – or 22 square feet – of the home’s footprint would encroach within the required setback. Because it is not a “small lot,” over 17% of the footprint would encroach. (See attached.)
  
  b) Roughly, 56% of the property would be encumbered by required setbacks. Because it is not a “small lot,” over 70% of the property is encumbered. (See attached.)

- Neighborhood Character: The proposed remodeling and additions resulting from the requested expansion permit would visually impact the property and immediate area. However, the impact would not be negative. Rather, the remodeling and additions would significantly improve the home’s aesthetic.

Staff Recommendation

Adopt the resolution approving an expansion permit for additions to the existing home at 5013 Mayview Road.

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

**Surrounding Land Uses**
The subject property is surrounded by single-family homes.

**Planning**
- Guide Plan designation: low-density residential
- Zoning: R-1

**Small Lot**
By city code definition a “small lot” is one that: (1) was created prior to 1966; (2) is less than 15,000 square feet in area; and (3) is located in an area where the average lot size is less than 15,000 square feet in size. While the subject property was created in 1950 and is just over 9,000 square feet in size, the median average lot size within 400 feet to the property is 15,700 square feet. As such, it’s not considered “small lot.”

**Expansion Permit**
By City Code §300.29 Subd.3(g), an expansion permit is required for an expansion of a non-conforming structure when the expansion would not intrude into a setback area beyond the distance of the existing structure. A variance is required when the expansion would intrude further into the setback area. As the existing home has a non-conforming side yard setback of 4.5 feet, and the proposed addition would not intrude further into this setback, an expansion permit is required.

**Burden of Proof**
By City Code §300.29 Subd.7(c), an expansion permit for a non-conforming use may be granted, but is not mandate, when an applicant meets the burden of proving that:

1. The proposed expansion is reasonable use of the property, considering such things as:
   - Functional and aesthetic justifications for the expansions;
   - Adequacy of off-street parking for the expansion;
   - Absence of adverse off-site impacts from such things as traffic, noise, dust odors, and parking;
   - Improvement to the appearance and stability of the property and neighborhood.

2. The circumstances justifying the expansion are unique to the property, are not caused by the landowner, are not solely for the landowner’s convenience, and are not solely because of economic considerations; and
3. The expansion would not adversely affect or alter the essential character of the neighborhood.

Neighborhood Comments
The city has sent notice to 48 area property owners and has received no written comments to date.

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 adopting the resolution approving the expansion permit.

2. Disagree with staff’s recommendation. In this case, a motion should be made to deny the expansion permit. This motion must include a statement as to why request is denied.

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

Voting Requirement
The planning commission action will be final, subject to approval. Approval of the request requires an affirmative vote of a five commission members.

Appeals
Any person aggrieved by the planning commission’s decision about the requested expansion permit may appeal such decision to the city council. A written appeal must be submitted to the planning staff within ten days of the date of the decision.
Deadline for Action August 14, 2017
Project: Hanson residence
Address: 5013 Mayview Rd
Project No. 17011.17a

This map is for illustrative purposes only.
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lot 12, AUDITOR'S SUBDIVISION NO. 370, Hennepin County, Minnesota.

SCOPE OF WORK & LIMITATIONS:

1. Showing the length and direction of boundary lines of the legal description listed above. The scope of our services does not include determining what you own, which is a legal matter. Please check the legal description with your records or consult with competent legal counsel, if necessary, to make sure that it is correct and that all matters of record, such as easements, that should be included on the survey have been shown.

2. Showing the location of observed existing improvements we deem necessary for the survey.

3. Setting survey markers or verifying existing survey markers to establish the corners of the property.

4. Showing elevations on the site at selected locations to give some indication of the topography of the site. We have also provided a benchmark for your use in determining elevations for construction on this site. The elevations shown relate only to the benchmark provided on this survey. Use that benchmark and check at least one other feature shown on the survey when determining other elevations for use on this site or before beginning construction.

5. Note that all building dimensions and building tie dimensions to the property lines, are taken from the siding and or stucco of the building.

STANDARD SYMBOLS & CONVENTIONS:

- Denotes iron survey marker, set, unless otherwise noted.
1. Contractor shall verify all dimensions and conditions shown on drawings with actual work site prior to the start of construction. Drawings are not contractually binding.

2. Contractor shall be responsible for all utility locations on property and where required consult a soil engineer and correct deficiencies as recommended. Provide well draining granular backfill and slope grade away from building.

3. Plumbing fixtures shall be as selected and approved by owner.

4. New windows shall be as noted on plans. Exact finish and type shall match existing windows and or truss co. prior to manufacturing. All dimensions on plans shall be solely on drawings. 2015 MN. Residential code and manufacturer's installation and instructions shall take precedence over any notes or details shown on these drawings.

5. General contractor shall meet with and update owner on a weekly basis for deflection by contractor. If required provide blocking and or sistering.

6. Keep existing trees.

7. Provide foundation drainage at perimeter of excavated areas using 6" unperforated aluminum foil faced rigid insulation. Spray foam when used clear.

8. All contractors shall provide daily pickup and final cleanup of site related to their work. No construction debris or rubbish shall be allowed to accumulate in the building or on the premises. Under no circumstances shall construction debris or rubbish be removed from project site without prior permission from owner.

9. Exterior doors, windows, and trim shall match existing unless noted.

10. First floor shall be 7'-6" above grade. Second floor shall be 9'-0" above grade. All stairways shall be 3'-0" wide. All corners shall be 90 degrees. All stair stringers shall consist of (3) 2" x 12" min. or max. 18 in. O.C. with 5/4" or 2" thick treads and ¾" thick risers. No splits, checks, or shakes in members. Beams, girders, headers, and girder trusses shall consist of (2) 2'-6" x 4' min. or max. 18 in. O.C. unless noted. Stair stringers shall consist of (3) 2" x 12" min. or max. 18 in. O.C. with 5/4" or 2" thick treads and ¾" thick risers. No splits, checks, or shakes in members. Beams, girders, headers, and girder trusses shall consist of (2) 2'-6" x 4' min. or max. 18 in. O.C. unless noted. Stair stringers shall consist of (3) 2" x 12" min. or max. 18 in. O.C. with 5/4" or 2" thick treads and ¾" thick risers. No splits, checks, or shakes in members. Beams, girders, headers, and girder trusses shall consist of (2) 2'-6" x 4' min. or max. 18 in. O.C. unless noted. Stair stringers shall consist of (3) 2" x 12" min. or max. 18 in. O.C. with 5/4" or 2" thick treads and ¾" thick risers. No splits, checks, or shakes in members. Beams, girders, headers, and girder trusses shall consist of (2) 2'-6" x 4' min. or max. 18 in. O.C. unless noted. Stair stringers shall consist of (3) 2" x 12" min. or max. 18 in. O.C. with 5/4" or 2" thick treads and ¾" thick risers. No splits, checks, or shakes in members. Beams, girders, headers, and girder trusses shall consist of (2) 2'-6" x 4' min. or max. 18 in. O.C. unless noted. Stair stringers shall consist of (3) 2" x 12" min. or max. 18 in. O.C. with 5/4" or 2" thick treads and ¾" thick risers. No splits, checks, or shakes in members. Beams, girders, headers, and girder trusses shall consist of (2) 2'-6" x 4' min. or max. 18 in. O.C. unless noted. Stair stringers shall consist of (3) 2" x 12" min. or max. 18 in. O.C. with 5/4" or 2" thick treads and ¾" thick risers. No splits, checks, or shakes in members. Beams, girders, headers, and girder trusses shall consist of (2) 2'-6" x 4' min. or max. 18 in. O.C. unless noted. Stair stringers shall consist of (3) 2" x 12" min. or max. 18 in. O.C. with 5/4" or 2" thick treads and ¾" thick risers. No splits, checks, or shakes in members. Beams, girders, headers, and girder trusses shall consist of (2) 2'-6" x 4' min. or max. 18 in. O.C. unless noted. Stair stringers shall consist of (3) 2" x 12" min. or max. 18 in. O.C. with 5/4" or 2" thick treads and ¾" thick risers. No splits, checks, or shakes in members. Beams, girders, headers, and girder trusses shall consist of (2) 2'-6" x 4' min. or max. 18 in. O.C. unless noted. Stair stringers shall consist of (3) 2" x 12" min. or max. 18 in. O.C. with 5/4" or 2" thick treads and ¾" thick risers. No splits, checks, or shakes in members. Beams, girders, headers, and girder trusses shall consist of (2) 2'-6" x 4' min. or max. 18 in. O.C. unless noted. Stair stringers shall consist of (3) 2" x 12" min. or max. 18 in. O.C. with 5/4" or 2" thick treads and ¾" thick risers. No splits, checks, or shakes in members. Beams, girders, headers, and girder trusses shall consist of (2) 2'-6" x 4' min. or max. 18 in. O.C. unless noted. Stair stringers shall consist of (3) 2" x 12" min. or max. 18 in. O.C. with 5/4" or 2" thick treads and ¾" thick risers. No splits, checks, or shakes in members. Beams, girders, headers, and girder trusses shall consist of (2) 2'-6" x 4' min. or max. 18 in. O.C. unless noted. Stair stringers shall consist of (3) 2" x 12" min. or max. 18 in. O.C. with 5/4" or 2" thick treads and ¾" thick risers. No splits, checks, or shakes in members. Beams, girders, headers, and girder trusses shall consist of (2) 2'-6" x 4' min. or max. 18 in. O.C. unless noted. Stair stringers shall consist of (3) 2" x 12" min. or max. 18 in. O.C. with 5/4" or 2" thick treads and ¾" thick risers. No splits, checks, or checks, or shakes in members. Beams, girders, headers, and girder trusses shall consist of (2) 2'-6" x 4' min. or max. 18 in. O.C. unless noted. Stair stringers shall consist of (3) 2" x 12" min. or max. 18 in. O.C. with 5/4" or 2" thick treads and ¾" thick risers. No splits, checks, or shakes in members. Beams, girders, headers, and girder trusses shall consist of (2) 2'-6" x 4' min. or max. 18 in. O.C. unless noted. Stair stringers shall consist of (3) 2" x 12" min. or max. 18 in. O.C. with 5/4" or 2" thick treads and ¾" thick risers. No splits, checks, or shakes in members. Beams, girders, headers, and girder trusses shall consist of (2) 2'-6" x 4' min. or max. 18 in. O.C. unless noted. Stair stringers shall consist of (3) 2" x 12" min. or max. 18 in. O.C. with 5/4" or 2" thick treads and ¾" thick risers. No splits, checks, or shakes in members. Beams, girders, headers, and girder trusses shall consist of (2) 2'-6" x 4' min. or max. 18 in. O.C. unless noted. Stair stringers shall consist of (3) 2" x 12" min. or max. 18 in. O.C. with 5/4" or 2" thick treads and ¾" thick risers. No splits, checks, or shakes in members. Beams, girders, headers, and girder trusses shall consist of (2) 2'-6" x 4' min. or max. 18 in. O.C. unless noted. Stair stringers shall consist of (3) 2" x 12" min. or max. 18 in. O.C. with 5/4" or 2" thick treads and ¾" thick risers. No splits, checks, or shakes in members. Beams, girders, headers, and girder trusses shall consist of (2) 2'-6" x 4' min. or max. 18 in. O.C. unless noted. Stair stringers shall consist of (3) 2" x 12" min. or max. 18 in. O.C. with 5/4" or 2" thick treads and ¾" thick risers. No splits, checks, or shakes in members. Beams, girders, headers, and girder trusses shall consist of (2) 2'-6" x 4' min. or max. 18 in. O.C. unless noted. Stair stringers shall consist of (3) 2" x 12" min. or max. 18 in. O.C. with 5/4" or 2" thick treads and ¾" thick risers. No splits, checks, or shakes in members. Beams, girders, headers, and girder trusses shall consist of (2) 2'-6" x 4' min. or max. 18 in. O.C. unless noted. Stair stringers shall consist of (3) 2" x 12" min. or max. 18 in. O.C. with 5/4" or 2" thick treads and ¾" thick risers. No splits, checks, or shakes in members. Beams, girders, headers, and girder trusses shall consist of (2) 2'-6" x 4' min. or max. 18 in. O.C. unless noted. Stair stringers shall consist of (3) 2" x 12" min. or max. 18 in. O.C. with 5/4" or 2" thick treads and ¾" thick risers. No splits, checks, or shakes in members. Beams, girders, headers, and girder trusses shall consist of (2) 2'-6" x 4' min. or max. 18 in. O.C. unless not
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Planning Commission Resolution No. 2017-
Resolution approving an expansion permit for additions to the existing home at 5013 Mayview Road

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

Section 1. Background.

1.01 Alan and Shannon Hanson own the property located at 5013 Mayview Road. The property is legally described as: LOT 12, AUDITOR'S SUBDIVISION NO. 370.

1.02 The home does not meet current side yard set setback requirements as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Existing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard Setback</td>
<td>10 feet</td>
<td>6.1 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Side Yard Setback</td>
<td>30 feet</td>
<td>19.6 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.03 As the existing home was constructed in 1952 prior to adoption of the city's first zoning ordinance, the existing side yard setbacks are considered non-conforming.

1.04 The property owners are proposing additions to the basement, first, and second stories of the home. The additions would maintain the existing non-conforming side yard setbacks.

1.05 Minnesota Statute §462.357 Subd. 1(e)(b) allows a municipality, by ordinance, to permit an expansion of nonconformities.

1.06 City Code §300.29 Subd. 3(g) allows expansion of a nonconformity only by variance or expansion permit.
1.07 City Code §300.29 Subd. 7(c) authorizes the planning commission to grant expansion permits.

Section 2. Standards.

2.01 City Code §300.29 Subd. 7(c) states that an expansion permit may be granted, but is not mandated, when an applicant meets the burden of proving that:

1. The proposed expansion is a reasonable use of the property, considering such things as: functional and aesthetic justifications for the expansion; adequacy of off-site parking for the expansion; absence of adverse off-site impacts from such things as traffic, noise, dust, odors, and parking; and improvement to the appearance and stability of the property and neighborhood.

2. The circumstances justifying the expansion are unique to the property, are not caused by the landowner, are not solely for the landowner's convenience, and are not solely because of economic considerations; and

3. The expansion would not adversely affect or alter the essential character of the neighborhood.

Section 3. Findings.

3.01 The application for the expansion permit is reasonable and would meet the required standards outlined in City Code §300.29 Subd. 7(c):

1. Reasonableness. The additions’ proposed 6.1-foot side yard setback and 19.6-foot aggregate side yard setback are reasonable. The additions would:

   a) Not encroach further into the required setbacks than the existing structure;

   b) Be located 20 feet from the closest neighboring home; and

   c) Allow for functional remodeling, significantly improving the aesthetics of the existing home.

2. Unique Circumstance: The existing property is just 9,600 square feet in size, less than half the city’s minimum lot size. However, it is not classified as a “small lot” by city code definition. Were it a “small lot:”
a) The home would be subject to a minimum 7-foot setback from both side property lines and just 1.7% – or 22 square feet – of the home’s footprint would encroach within the required setback. Because it is not a “small lot,” over 17% of the footprint would encroach.

b) Roughly, 56% of the property would be encumbered by required setbacks. Because it is not a “small lot,” over 70% of the property is encumbered.

Though the size of the property is not unique in the immediately surrounding area, it is not common to every R-1 zoned property in the community.

3. Neighborhood Character: The proposed remodeling and additions resulting from the requested expansion permit would visually impact the property and immediate area. However, the impact would not be negative. Rather, the remodeling and additions would significantly improve the home’s aesthetic.

Section 4. Planning Commission Action.

4.01 The planning commission approves the above-described expansion permit based on the findings outlined in section 3 of this resolution. Approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. Subject to staff approval, the property must be developed in substantial conformance with the following plans, except as modified by conditions below.

   • Proposed Floor plans submitted in conjunction with this application
   • Plan elevations submitted in conjunction with this application

2. Prior to issuance of a building permit:

   a) This resolution must be recorded with Hennepin County.
   b) Submit any outstanding nuisance abatement fees.
   c) Submit a revised survey clearly illustrating the proposed additions.
d) Install temporary erosion control and tree protection fencing for staff inspection. These items must be maintained throughout the course of construction.

3. This expansion permit approval will end on December 31, 2018, unless the city has issued a building permit for the project covered by this expansion permit approval or approved a time extension.

Adopted by the Planning Commission of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on May 18, 2017.

________________________________________
Brian Kirk, Chairperson

ATTEST:

________________________________________
Kathy Leervig, Deputy City Clerk

**Action on this resolution:**

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

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a meeting held on May 18, 2017.

________________________________________
Kathy Leervig, Deputy City Clerk
Brief Description

Items concerning additions and landscaping at 2807 McKenzie Point Road:

1) Expansion Permit;

2) Setback Variances;

3) Floodplain alteration permit; and

4) Conditional use permit.

Recommendation

Recommend the city council adopt the resolution approving the requests.

Proposal

The applicant, Grant Dattilo, is proposing to:

- Construct a 3.7-foot roof overhang;
- Construct a 1.3-foot, 2nd story bump out;
- Add a 2-foot deck expansion; and
- Remove impervious surfaces and retaining walls, add a small retaining wall, and conduct minor earthwork within the 100-year floodplain.

Please see attached documents for illustrations.

Proposal requirements:

This proposal requires:

- Expansion Permit: Expansion of principal structure within required side yard setbacks. The proposed roof overhang and second story bump out would maintain existing, non-conforming setback from the south property line.

- Variance: Principal structure and deck encroaching further into the required shoreland, floodplain, side yard setbacks. The roof overhang would encroach further into the north side yard setback and the proposed deck expansion would encroach further into required shoreland and floodplain setbacks.
• **Floodplain Alteration Permit**: The entire rear yard of the property is located within the 100-year floodplain. The proposed deck construction, removal of the impervious surface, and earthwork within this area is considered an “alteration” and would require a floodplain alteration permit.

• **Conditional Use Permit**: A conditional use permit is required for any structure constructed in the 100-year floodplain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North setback (side yard)</td>
<td>7 ft.</td>
<td>7 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South setback (side yard)</td>
<td>7 ft.</td>
<td>2.5 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreland Setback</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
<td>17 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-year storm setback (vertical)</td>
<td>2 ft.</td>
<td>1 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-year storm setback (horizontal)</td>
<td>10 ft.</td>
<td>0 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* requires setback variance  
** requires expansion permit  
*** requires setback variance and CUP  
Note: Floodplain Alteration Permit required for any earthwork completed in floodplain

**Approving Body**
The planning commission makes a recommendation to the city council, which has final authority to approve or deny the request. (City Code §300.06.4)

**Site Features**
The subject property is located on the south side of Lake Minnetonka, directly west of the Gray's Bay Causeway. The lot was created in 1914 as part of the T.R. MCKENZIE’S GROVELAND PARK subdivision. The existing lot is approximately 4,600 square feet in area.

The property is improved with a 3,454 square foot, two-story home with a tuck under garage. The home was originally constructed in 1939 and reconstructed in 1990. The property has multiple non-conforming setbacks. (See attached).

A large portion of the property is located within the 100-year floodplain itself and the entire property is within the required 100-year floodplain setback. Given this, the property contains no buildable area.
The property currently exceeds the 30 percent impervious surface allowed within 150 feet of the lake. The house alone (not including the deck) covers about 32 percent of the surface of the lot. Thus, it would not be possible to meet the 30 percent required without removing part of the existing home.

**Staff Analysis**

Staff supports the applicant’s proposal and the associated requests.

**Expansion Permit.** The proposed expansion permit would meet the standards outlined in city code:

- **REASONABLENESS:** The intent of the ordinance as it pertains to residential side yard setbacks requirements is to ensure an appropriate distance between structures. The requested permit meets this intent. The majority of homes within the subject neighborhood have non-conforming setbacks similar to the applicant’s proposal. Additionally, the expansion permit would not result in the bump out and roof overhang additions being located any closer to the south side property line.

- **UNIQUE CIRCUMSTANCE:** The subject property is substandard in size and encumbered by various setback requirements and 100-year floodplain setbacks. Any construction on the property would require an expansion permit or variance.

- **NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER:** The immediate area contains several homes that do not meet required setbacks, due to variances or being constructed prior to the adoption of city ordinance. In addition, the second story bump out and roof overhang would not encroach further into the required side yard setback than the existing home. As such, the requested expansion permit would not negatively impact the area or alter the essential character of the neighborhood.

**Variances.** The proposed variances (side yard, shoreland, and floodplain) would meet the variance standards outlined in city code:

- **INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE:** The intent of the ordinance as it pertains to residential side yard setbacks requirements is to ensure an appropriate distance between structures. The intent of the shoreland and
floodplain setback ordinances is to preserve, protect, and enhance the environmental, recreational and hydrological resources and functions of the city’s water systems. The floodplain ordinance intent is also in place to minimize the loss of life and property damage due to flooding.

1. The variances would not result in the existing home being located any closer to property lines, but would extend the overhang further into the required side yard setbacks and would extend the deck into the shoreland and floodplain setbacks;

2. The overhang variances would not negatively impact existing building separations; and

3. The existing deck does not allow the passage of water through it and, thus, is considered an impervious surface. The applicant has proposed using slotted decking that would allow the passage of water and has proposed further impervious surface reduction through removal of a pavers areas and retaining walls. These changes will increase water retention on site and enhance the environmental protection of natural resources.

• COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: The proposed variances are consistent with the comprehensive plan. The property is guided for low-density residential uses. The guiding principles in the comprehensive plan provide for maintaining, preserving and enhancing existing single-family neighborhoods. The variances would not negatively impact the residential character of the neighborhood and would provide investment in the property to enhance its use.

• REASONABLENESS: The request for a roof overhang, bump out, and deck extension are reasonable requests for a single-family property. The overhang and bump out will not negatively impact the neighborhood and the proposed deck, with the proposed landscaping, will enhance natural resource protection.

• UNIQUE CIRCUMSTANCE: The subject property is substandard in size and encumbered by various setback requirements and 100-year floodplain.
1. The subject property is less than 50 feet wide at its widest point, which is less than half the required width (110 feet), and is less than 5,000 square feet in area (22,000 square is required); and

2. The entire property is encumbered by the 100-foot floodplain setback. Any construction on the property would require expansion permits or variances.

- **NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER:** The requested variances would not negatively impact the character of the existing neighborhood. Rather:

  1. The majority of the homes within 400 feet of the subject property have received variances or special approvals for home construction or additions.
  
  2. The variances would allow for investment into a property through the construction of new additions; and
  
  3. The variances would have no negative impact on adjacent properties.

**Conditional Use Permit.** The requested conditional use permit is reasonable for four reasons:

- The requested conditional use permit would result in the removal of an existing impervious deck from the floodplain, construction of a new, pervious deck, and small additions (roof overhang and bump out). The construction of the proposed deck would increase floodplain storage on the property and the small additions would have no impact on floodplain storage as they currently cover existing impervious surfaces.

- The requested conditional use permit would not result in adverse impacts to the floodplain. Rather, the new deck would create floodplain storage on the site.

- As the entire rear yard of the subject property is located within the 100-year floodplain, a conditional use permit would be required for any new construction in this area.

- The proposal would meet the conditional use permit standard for construction within floodplain. The specific
standards are outlined in the “Supporting Information” section of this report.

**Floodplain Alteration Permit.** The requested floodplain alteration permit is reasonable for four reasons:

- The proposal would not result in any net fill of floodplain. Rather, through the slats in the new deck and removal of impervious surface, the proposal would actually increase floodplain storage on the property.
- The floodplain alteration would not result in removal or loss of any protected trees.
- As the entirety of the rear yard of the property is located within the 100-year floodplain, a floodplain alteration permit would be required for any new construction in the area.
- The proposal would meet the general and specific floodplain alteration permit standards. These standards are outlined in the “Supporting Information” section of this report.

**Summary Comments**

Staff acknowledges that the applicant’s proposal requires multiple approvals. However, these approvals are generally based on significant non-conformities of the existing lot and home. The proposed construction and site changes are, in fact, relatively minor.

**Staff Recommendation**

Recommend the city adopt the resolution approving an expansion permit, setback variances, floodplain alteration permit, and conditional use permit for a roof overhang, bump out, deck expansion, and landscaping.

Originator: Drew Ingvalson, Planner
Through: Loren Gordon, AICP, City Planner
### Supporting Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project No.</strong></th>
<th>17009.17a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property</strong></td>
<td>2807 McKenzie Point Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant</strong></td>
<td>Grant Dattilo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Surrounding Land Uses** | North and South: R-1, Single-Family Homes  
East: Lake Minnetonka  
West: Single-Family Homes (City of Woodland) |
| **Planning**    | Guide Plan designation: low density residential  
Zoning: R-1 |
| **History**     | In 1987, the city approved variances to reduce the south side yard setback from 7 ft. to 3 ft. for second story addition and attached garage.  
In 1988, the city approved multiple variances for the construction of a new home. The variances were to:  
• Reduce lot width at setback from 90 ft. to 29 ft.;  
• Reduce south side yard setback from 7 ft. to 2.3 ft.;  
• Reduce north side yard setback from 7 ft. to 3 ft.; and  
• Reduce lowest floor elevation from 2 ft. above ordinary high water mark to elevation of existing foundation. |
| **Natural Resources** | The small bump out and roof extension proposed would not increase the impervious on the site as they are located over existing impervious areas. Furthermore, the proposed plan would reduce existing impervious areas and increase stormwater retention, due to the following:  
• Conversion of the existing deck surface from a solid surface to slotted deck boards would allow water to infiltrate to the soil below.  
• Removal of existing paver areas adjacent to the shoreline as well as the small row of retaining wall block west of the pavers would enhance water infiltration. |
| **Variance and Non-conforming Lots** | The subject neighborhood has a long history of variances and non-conforming properties due to the early platting of the land. The subject neighborhood was platted in 1914 and several of the homes were constructed prior to the adoption of city ordinances or have been granted variances or special approvals for non- |
conformities. With the exception of two lots, all of the properties on McKenzie Point Road have non-conforming lot dimensions. Additionally, 10 of the 12 lots within 400 feet of the subject property have been granted a special approval (variance, expansion permit, floodplain alteration permit, etc.). (See attached.)

**Small lot**

By City Code §300.10 Subd.7, properties that are defined as qualifying small lots are allowed lesser setbacks from property lines than “typical” properties. To be defined as a small lot, a property must be less than 15,000 square feet; have been a lot of record prior to February 12, 1966; and must be located in an area in which the average size of residential lots is less than 15,000 square feet.

After staff review, the subject property does qualify as a small lot. The property is approximately 4,600 square feet in lot size, was platted in 1914, and the average lot size of the surrounding neighborhood is approximately 14,061 square feet.

This provision permits side yard setbacks to be 10 percent the width of the lot, but in no case less than seven feet. The subject lot is permitted seven-foot side yard setbacks.

**McMansion Policy**

The McMansion Policy is a tool the city can utilize to ensure new homes or additions requiring variances are consistent with the character of the existing homes within the neighborhood. By policy, the floor area ratio (FAR) of the subject property cannot be greater than the largest FAR of properties within 1,000 feet on the same street, and a distance of 400 feet from the subject property.

The subject property currently has the largest FAR of properties within 400 feet (0.80). However, the bump out addition would not increase the property’s FAR beyond its current amount, thus complying with the McMansion Policy. (See attached.)

**Expansion Permit**

An expansion permit for a non-conforming use may be granted, but is not mandated, when the applicant meets the burden of proving that:

1) The proposed expansion is a reasonable use of the property, considering such things as:

   a. functional and aesthetic justifications for the expansion;
   b. adequacy of off-street parking for the expansion;
c. absence of adverse off-site impacts from such things as traffic, noise, dust, odors, and parking; and
d. improvement to the appearance and stability of the property and neighborhood.

2) The circumstances justifying the expansion are unique to the property, are not caused by the landowner, are not solely for the landowner's convenience, and are not solely because of economic considerations; and

3) The expansion would not adversely affect or alter the essential character of the neighborhood.

Variance Standard
A variance may be granted from the requirements of the zoning ordinance when: (1) it is in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the ordinance; (2) it is consistent with the comprehensive plan; and (3) when an applicant establishes that there are practical difficulties in complying with the ordinance. Practical difficulties mean that the applicant proposes to use a property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the ordinance, the plight of the landowner is due to circumstances unique to the property not created by the landowner, and, the variance if granted, would not alter the essential character of the locality. (City Code §300.07).

Floodplain Alteration Permit Standards
In reviewing alteration permits, the city will consider whether the following general standards are met:

1) The magnitude of the alteration is appropriate relative to the size of the floodplain district;

2) The amount of any increase in buildable area is appropriate in comparison to the amount of buildable area before alteration;

3) The alteration will not negatively impact the hydrology of the floodplain;

4) Floodplain mitigation areas will not negatively impact adjacent properties;

5) The alteration will meet the intent of the city's water resources management plan and the subdivision and zoning ordinances;

6) The alteration will not adversely impact governmental facilities, utilities, services or existing or proposed public
improvements; and

7) The alteration will not have an undue adverse impact on the public health, safety or welfare.

Notwithstanding the general standards, no alteration permit will be granted unless the following specific standards are met.

1) On all properties within the city:

   a. Water storage must be maintained and provided in an amount at least equal to that filled unless acceptable hydrologic engineering data has been presented and approved by the city engineer indicating that conditions have changed such that the floodplain characteristics will be maintained even with proposed floodplain fill.

   b. Floodplain fill area must be located no more than 20 feet from any existing or proposed structure, except where required by the city engineer to achieve a required evacuation route.

   c. Where floodplain alteration is required for construction of a driveway, the driveway must be no wider than 12 feet and must be located to minimize impact to the floodplain.

   d. Floodplain alteration, including the creation of compensatory water storage, must not result in removal of regulated trees, adversely impact wetlands or existing wetland buffers, or be located within public easements. The city council may waive this condition if the proposed alteration would improve existing site conditions.

   e. If the alteration will change the boundary of the floodplain district, a zoning map amendment is also required under subdivision 10 below. (City Code §300.24(9))

---

**Floodplain District Standards (CUP)**

No conditional use permit may be granted in the floodplain district except in circumstances in which its approval will not have an adverse impact on the intent of this ordinance or the precepts of the comprehensive plan. In addition, no conditional use permit may be issued unless efforts have been made to mitigate to the extent feasible adverse impacts on the subject property and adjacent properties. Granting of a conditional use permit will be conditioned upon review of the request by all other appropriate governmental agencies, including watershed districts, the
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, and the United States Federal Emergency Management Agency and Army Corps of Engineers. (City Code §300.26(4))

**Natural Resources**

Best management practices must be followed during the course of site preparation and construction activities. This would include installation and maintenance of erosion control fencing.

**Pyramid of Discretion**

![Pyramid Diagram]

**Motion Options**

The planning commission has three options:

1. Concur with staff’s recommendation. In this case a motion should be made recommending the city council approve the requests.

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

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

**Neighborhood Comments**

The city sent notices to 19 area property owners and has received no comments.

**Voting Requirement**

The planning commission will make a recommendation to the city council. A recommendation requires an affirmative vote of a
simple majority. The city council's final approval requires an affirmative vote of five members.

Deadline for Decision

July 24, 2017
Location Map

Project: Dattilo Residence
Address: 2807 McKenzie Point Rd
Project No. 17009.17a

This map is for illustrative purposes only.
CERTIFICATE OF SURVEY
SHOWING EXISTING CONDITIONS
FOR: HANS HAGEN HOMES

PROPOSED ELEVATIONS:
A permanent monument for ingress and egress purposes over and across the
northwest 1.0 feet of Lot 4, T.R. McKenzies Graveland Park, Hennepin
County, Minnesota.

3-foot setback

4.5-foot setback

Deck Expansion

Roof Overhang
and Bumpout

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION
Lots 3, 4, and 5, T.R. McKenzies Graveland Park, Hennepin County, Minnesota

I hereby certify that this survey, plan or report was prepared by me or under
my direct supervision and that I am a duly Registered Land Surveyor under
the laws of the State of Minnesota.
Current Site Map

2807 McKenzie Point Road, Wayzata MN, 55391

Key
- House
- Driveway and Sidewalks
- 24” Round Walking Stone Pavers
- 21” Round Walking Stone Pavers
- Tool Shed
- 8” Retaining Wall Blocks
- 12” Retaining Wall Blocks
- Hardcover Patio Block or Deck

NORTH

APR 1 4 2017
Submitted by: [Signature]
Proposed Site Map

2807 McKenzie Point Road, Wayzata MN, 55391

Key

- House
- Driveway and Sidewalks
- Flagstone Style Walking Stone Pavers Large Space
- Tool Shed
- 8" Retaining Wall Blocks
- Hardcover Patio Block
- Large Tree
- Permeable Deck
- Permeable Deck Expansion
- Plants

NORTH

APR 14 2017
Variance Request 2807 McKenzie Point Road, Wayzata
MN, 55391

Legal Description

PID: 08-117-22-33-002
Municipality: Minnetonka
Addition Name: T R MCKENZIES GROVELAND PARK
Lot: 003

Survey

See attached survey for the property.

Practical Difficulties Worksheet

Describe why the proposed use is reasonable.

With regards to the 2nd story bump out, expansion of the current west awning, and addition to the new north side awning. All of this is over current hardcover and will not increase that percentage. The bump out does not get any closer to the property line then the current house, and does not come out even as far as the current awning on the west side. The new awning would provide cover and protection to individuals walking to my front door, and does not create any problems for the neighboring property.

With regards to the 2' expansion of the current deck on the east side. The deck expansion will not be visible to anyone on the lake since there is a flower planter that is currently there. The increase allows a more practical use for the deck with regards to furniture and functionality. By agreeing to take out the large amount of hardcover next to lake I am eliminating a lot of seating area for guests. This small expansion would help replace some of that.

Describe unique circumstance, why the need is not from the property owner, and why it is not solely based on economics.

With regards to the 2nd story bump out, expansion of the current west awning, and addition to the new north side awning. This lot when divided was made very narrow, and was done well before I owned it. I want to do this because it will provide better
cover and safety for people at my house. It will also make the house look better and make the neighborhood overall nicer.

With regards to the 2’ expansion of the current deck on the east side. This lot when divided was made very narrow, and was done well before I owned it. The house sits closer to the shoreline than most properties because of the year that it was built. The expansion allows furniture to fit better and allow extra seating.

**Describe why the variance would not alter the character of the neighborhood.**

With regards to the 2nd story bump out, expansion of the current west awning, and addition to the new north side awning. In addition with regards to the 2’ expansion of the current deck on the east side. The majority of the neighborhood is made up of houses that do not follow the zoning and setback requirements. Both my neighbor to the north and to the south have received variances to place structures closer to the property line than I am requesting.

**Grading and Drainage Plan**

There will be no grading change done during the course of the variance. The above mentioned property is flat, and will stay that way. Where the block is being removed a permeable soil will be put in its place.

**Building Rendering**

See attached building rendering for the property.

**Floor Plan**

See attached Current and Proposed Site Map for the property. The footprint of the house does not increase.

**Written Statement**

With regards to the 2nd story bump out, expansion of the current west awning, and addition to the new north side awning. I am requesting to change the current 24” awning on the west side of the house to 44”. In addition I want to continue the 44” awning to my front door creating a cover over the walkway on the north side. A gutter will run the entire length of the north side awning to prevent additional water from the
neighbor’s property. The 2nd Story bump out would come out from the house 16” towards the west, and be 11’ wide by 10’ tall. The roof line would not be any taller, and would match the current roof. The bump out would not get any closer to the property line than the current house is. By being able to do the above-mentioned changes I will update the look of the house, and make the neighborhood overall nicer.

With regards to the 2’ expansion of the current deck on the east side. This variance would allow a great decrease of hardcover on the property especially in the first 50’ of the shoreline. It would also take steps to preserve water quality and provide natural plantings to make the property look more natural. An adjustment would be made to the current retaining wall on the north. Currently the property is at 84% hardcover, the proposed change would bring the hardcover down to 71%. If you take the first 50’ of property from the lake, and approve this variance, there would be a decrease of 34% hardcover in that area. If you take the first 50’ of property from the lake and remove the house footprint, so all that you were left with was sidewalks, decks, and blocks. There would be a 65% decrease of hardcover. By planting 12” along the seawall except where you need to access the docks you would be preventing contaminants from entering the water, the plants would absorb water instead of it entering the lake, and it will give it a more natural look for those on the lake. Increasing the deck by 2’ would not change the view for anyone looking at the property since currently there is a 4’ planter in front of it. That planter will be made 2’ smaller, and will not get any closer to the water. Due to the fact that I currently have all of the additional hardcover for guests to sit, and would be losing that, the deck expansion would allow me more seating.
Resolution No 2017-

Resolution approving an expansion permit, setback variances, floodplain alteration permit, and conditional use permit for additions and landscaping at 2807 McKenzie Pointe Road

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

Section 1. BACKGROUND.

1.01 The applicant, Grant Dattilo, is proposing the following:

1. Construction of a 3.7-foot roof overhang;
2. Construction of a 1.3-foot, second story bump out;
3. Addition of a 2-foot deck expansion; and
4. Removal of impervious surfaces and retaining walls, add a small retaining wall, and conduct minor earthwork within the 100-year floodplain.

1.02 The proposal requires the following:

1. Expansion permit to maintain existing, non-conforming 4.5-foot setback from south property line.
2. Side yard setback variance from 7 feet to 3 feet from north property line.
3. Shoreland setback variance from 50 feet to 17 feet
4. Floodplain vertical setback variance from 2 feet to 1 foot.
5. Floodplain horizontal setback variance from 20 feet to 0 feet.
6. Floodplain alteration permit for earthwork with the floodplain.
7. Conditional use permit for construction of additions to a non-conforming home.

1.03 The subject property is located at 2807 McKenzie Point Road.

1.04 The property is legally described as follows:

Lot 3, T. R. MCKENZIE’S GROVELAND PARK, HENNEPIN COUNTY, MINNESOTA

1.05 City Code §300.29 Subd. 3(g) allows expansion of a nonconformity only by variance or expansion permit.

1.06 City Code §300.29 Subd. 7(c) authorizes the city to grant expansion permits.

1.07 Minnesota Statute §462.357 Subd. 6, and City Code §300.07 authorizes the city to grant variances.

1.08 City Code §300.24 Subd. 9 authorizes the city to grant floodplain alteration permits.

1.09 City Code §300.06 authorizes the city to grant conditional use permits.

Section 2. STANDARDS

2.01 Setback Requirements:

1. City Code §300.10 Subd. 5 outlines minimum setback requirements from property lines. Those requirements are adopted here by reference.

2. City Code §300.10 Subd. 7 outlines setback exemptions for qualifying small lots. Those requirements are adopted here by reference.

3. City Code §300.24 Subd. 8 outlines minimum horizontal and vertical setback requirements from floodplain elevation. Those requirements are adopted here by reference.

4. City Code 300.25 Subd. 9 outlines minimum setback requirements from the ordinary high water level of Lake Minnetonka. Those requirements are adopted here by reference.
2.02 City Code §300.29 Subd. 7(c) outlines the expansion permit standards. Those standards are adopted here by reference.

2.03 By City Code §300.07 Subd. 1, a variance 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.

2.04 City Code §300.24 Subd. 9 outlines the standards which must be met for approval of a floodplain alteration permit. Those standards are adopted here by reference.

2.05 City Code §300.26 Subd. 2 and Subd. 4 outlines the general and specific conditional use permit standards within the floodplain district. Those standards are adopted here by reference.

Section 3. FINDINGS

3.01 The proposal meets the ordinance standards outlined in the preceding section of this resolution.

1. The proposal meets the variance standard outlined in City Code §300.07 Subd. 7(c):
   a) REASONABLENESS: The intent of the ordinance as it pertains to residential side yard setback requirements is to ensure an appropriate distance between structures. The requested permit meets this intent. The majority of homes within the subject neighborhood have non-conforming setbacks similar to applicant’s proposal. Additionally, the expansion permit would not result in the second story bump out addition and roof overhang being located any closer to the south side property line.
   b) UNIQUE CIRCUMSTANCE: The subject property is substandard in size and encumbered by various setback requirements and 100-year floodplain setbacks. Any construction on the property would require an expansion permit or variances.
   c) CHARACTER OF LOCALITY: The immediate area contains several homes that do not meet required setbacks, due to variances or being constructed prior to the adoption of city
ordinance. In addition, the second story bump out and roof overhang would not encroach further into the required south side yard setback than the existing home. As such, the requested expansion permit would not negatively impact the area or alter the essential character of the neighborhood.

3.02 The proposal meets the variance standard outlined in City Code §300.07 Subd. 1(a):

1. INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE: The intent of the ordinance as it pertains to residential side yard setback requirements is to ensure an appropriate distance between structures. The intent of the shoreland and floodplain setback ordinances is to preserve, protect, and enhance the environmental, recreational and hydrological resources and functions of the city’s water systems. The floodplain ordinance intent is also in place to minimize the loss of life and property damage due to flooding.

   a) The variances would not result in the living space of the home being located any closer to property lines, but would extend the overhang further into the required side yard setbacks and would extend the deck into the shoreland and floodplain setbacks;

   b) The overhang variances would not negatively impact existing building separations; and

   c) The existing deck does not allow the passage of water through it and is considered an impervious surface. The applicant has proposed using slotted decking that would allow the passage of water and has proposed further impervious surface reduction through removal of a paver areas and retaining walls. These changes will increase water retention on site and enhance the environmental protection of natural resources.

2. CONSISTENT WITH COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: The proposed variances are consistent with the comprehensive plan. The property is guided for low-density residential uses. The guiding principles in the comprehensive plan provide for maintaining, preserving and enhancing existing single-family neighborhoods. The variances would not negatively impact the residential character of the neighborhood and would provide investment in the property to enhance its use.
3. PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES:

a) REASONABLENESS: The request for a roof overhang and deck extension are reasonable requests for a single-family property. The overhang would not negatively impact the neighborhood and the proposed deck, with the proposed landscaping, will enhance natural resource protection.

b) UNIQUE CIRCUMSTANCE: The subject property is substandard in size and encumbered by various setback requirements and 100-year floodplain.

1) The subject property is less than 50 feet wide at its widest point, which is less than half the required width (110 feet), and is less than 5,000 square feet in area (22,000 square required); and

2) The entire property is encumbered by the 100-foot floodplain setback. Any construction on the property would require expansion permits or variances.

c) CHARACTER OF LOCALITY: The requested variances would not negatively impact the character of the existing neighborhood. Rather:

a) The majority of the homes within 400 feet of the subject property have received variances or special approvals for home construction or additions.

b) The variances would allow for investment into a property through the construction of new additions; and

c) The variances would have no negative impact on adjacent properties.

3.03 The proposal would meet the general and specific standards for construction of structures within the floodplain district as outlined in City Code §300.26 Subd. 2 and Subd. 4.

1. The requested conditional use permit would result in the removal of an existing impervious deck from the floodplain, construction of a new, pervious deck. The construction of the proposed deck would increase floodplain storage on the property and would have no impact on floodplain.
2. The requested conditional use permit would not result in adverse impacts to the floodplain. Rather, the new deck would create floodplain storage on the site.

3. As the entire rear yard of the subject property is located within the 100-year floodplain, a conditional use permit would be required for any new construction in this area.

3.04 The proposal would meet the standards for approval of a floodplain alteration permit outlined in City Code §300.24 Subd. 9.

1. The proposal would not result in any net fill of floodplain. Rather, through the slats in the new deck and removal of impervious surface, the proposal would actually increase floodplain storage on the property.

2. The floodplain alteration would not result in removal or loss of any protected trees.

3. As the entirety of the rear yard of the property is located within the 100-year floodplain, a floodplain alteration permit would be required for any new construction in the area.

Section 4. CITY COUNCIL ACTION.

4.01 The city council approves the above-described requests for expansion permit, variances, floodplain alteration permit and conditional use permit subject to the findings outlined in section 3 of this resolution. Approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. Subject to staff approval, the site must be developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the following plans, unless modified by the conditions below:
   - Survey/Site Plan dated April 14, 2017
   - Building elevations dated April 14, 2017

2. Prior to issuance of a building permit:
   a) A copy of this resolution must be recorded with the County and a copy of the recorded document returned to the city.
   b) The applicant must obtain approvals from all other interested agencies.
c) As part of the deck permit application, final plans must be submitted which are in general conformance with proposed plan date stamped April 14, 2017 and specifically comply with all of the following requirements:

1) Show removal of the existing paver area adjacent to the lake as well as the short row of retaining wall block along the west side of the pavers.

2) Include plantings to help soften the visibility of the deck surface as viewed from the lake.

3) Provide for a 12-inch landscape strip above the retaining wall adjacent to the lake to help keep lawn care practices away from the lake edge.

d) Install erosion control fencing as required by staff for inspection and approval. These items must be maintained throughout the course of construction.

3. Prior to final inspection of the deck, the soils in areas of the removed impervious must be decompacted as necessary to allow infiltration and the landscaping removed and installed per the approved plan.

4. This approval will expire on December 31, 2018, unless the city has issued a building permit for the project covered by this variance or approved a time extension.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on June 12, 2017.

Terry Schneider, Mayor

ATTEST:

David E. Maeda, City Clerk
ACTION ON THIS RESOLUTION:

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

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a duly authorized meeting held on June 12, 2017.

______________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk

SEAL
Brief Description  Preliminary plat, with lot width at setback variances, for HOMESTEAD PLACE, a two-lot subdivision at 3625 Plymouth Road.

Recommendation  Recommend the city council adopt the resolution approving the proposal.

Introduction

The 1.3-acre subject property located at 3625 Plymouth Road is currently improved with a single-family home and a small accessory structure. The home was originally constructed in 1954 and has a non-conforming side yard setback of 6.5 feet from the north property line. The property is relatively flat and has three high-priority trees. One of the high priority trees is located near the existing home and two are located in the southwest corner of the property.

Proposal

The applicant, HP Holdings, LLC, has submitted an application to subdivide the existing property into two lots. The existing home and accessory structure would be removed in order to accommodate two new homes.

The two lots would meet minimum lot area requirements for properties zoned R-1, as outlined in the subdivision ordinance. However, a variance is required to reduce the lot width at the building setback line on both lots.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Required by ordinance</th>
<th>Lot 1</th>
<th>Lot 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total area</td>
<td>22,000 sf</td>
<td>29,252 sf</td>
<td>28,969 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildable area</td>
<td>3,500 sf</td>
<td>~15,360 sf</td>
<td>~15,130 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width at ROW</td>
<td>80 ft</td>
<td>99 ft</td>
<td>98 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width at setback</td>
<td>110 ft</td>
<td>99 ft *</td>
<td>98 ft *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot depth</td>
<td>125 ft</td>
<td>295 ft</td>
<td>296 ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* requires variance

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 associated with the primary subdivision and staff's findings.
• **Are the proposed lots reasonable?**

Yes. The city’s subdivision ordinance outlines minimum area and dimensional standards for single-family residential lots. While the proposed lots would meet and exceed minimum R-1 standards for lot area, the lots require lot width at setback variances. Staff finds this request reasonable.

When a subdivision requires a variance, the city has a broad discretion in the approval or denial of the proposal. The subdivision ordinance states that variances “may be granted but not mandated” when an applicant meets the burden of proof proving that:

**Reasonableness:** The existing property is 1.3 acres in size and has lot depth of 295 feet. These existing conditions far exceed what is required by ordinance. The property is located in an area that has varying degrees of nonconforming lot widths at the building setback line. In fact, over 60% of the lots within the existing neighborhood have substandard lot widths at setback.

**Unique Circumstance and Character of the Neighborhood:** The subdivision ordinance allows the city to consider variances for lots with substandard lot widths when the subdivision of the property would not set precedent that would alter the character of the neighborhood. The subject property is one of the largest residential properties in the surrounding neighborhood. The proposed lot widths would allow for lots more similar to those within the existing neighborhood. Further, more than half of the lots within the neighborhood have substandard lot widths. As such, staff finds that the proposed variance request would not have an adverse impact on the surrounding neighborhood.

• **Would the proposal meet the tree ordinance?**

Generally, yes. Based on size and species alone, the site has five high priority trees. However, in addition to size and species, to be classified as high-priority trees must be structurally sound and healthy. Two red cedar trees are diseased and would not be considered high priority given their existing condition. As such, the site has just three trees classified as high-priority. The proposal would result in removal of just one – or 33 percent – of the site’s high priority trees.

**Staff Recommendation**

Recommend the city council adopt the resolution approving the preliminary plat, with lot width at setback variances, known as HOMESTEAD PLACE.

Originator: Ashley Cauley, Senior Planner
Through: Loren Gordon, AICP, City Planner
Supporting Information

Project No. 17017.17a
Property 3625 Plymouth Road
Applicant HP Holdings, LLC

Surrounding Land Uses All properties to the north, east, south and west are single family residential homes, zoned R-1 and guided for low density residential homes.

Planning Guide Plan designation: Low density residential Zoning: R-1

McMansion Policy The city has recently reviewed and approved subdivision requests requiring lot width at building setback variances. In those cases, as conditions of approval, the city restricted the floor area ratio (FAR) to the highest existing FAR in the neighborhood. These conditions were consistent with the city’s McMansion Policy, which sets a maximum FAR for homes requiring a variance to the highest FAR of the other single-family homes within 400 feet of the property or 1,000 feet along the same street.

It is important to note that, in those cases, the proposed lots were generally less wide than others in the area. In other words, they were not clearly consistent with existing development pattern. As previously noted, in the case of the proposed HOMESTEAD PLACE, the proposed lot widths would result in lots similar to those within the existing neighborhood. Further, more than half of the lots within the neighborhood have substandard lot widths. Given the existing development pattern, staff does not believe a FAR restriction should be applied. Nevertheless, for information purposes, the highest FAR of the surrounding area is 0.22. Given the large size of the proposed lots, a FAR of 0.22 on the lots would be a home with a total floor area of 6,500 square feet. This includes the above-grade area, half the area of a walkout or lookout basement and an attached garage.

Grading As required by the subdivision application process, generalized home footprints, locations, and grading plans have been submitted by the applicant. Specific plans would be submitted and reviewed by staff at the time of building permits.
Stormwater

Stormwater management would be required for each of the new homes to provide for infiltration, water quality and rate control for all impervious surfaces. Each of the homes would provide individual stormwater management, which would be reviewed at the time of a building permit.

Natural Resources

Best management practices must be followed during the course of site preparation and construction activities. This would include installation and maintenance of a temporary rock driveway, erosion control, and tree protection fencing. As a condition of approval, the applicant must submit a construction management plan detailing these management practices.

Neighborhood Comments

The city sent notices to 55 area property owners and received no comments to date.

Pyramid of Discretion

Motion Options

The planning commission has three options:

1. Concur with staff’s recommendation. In this case, a motion should be made recommending the city council adopt the resolution approving the subdivision.

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

3. Table the request. In this case, a motion should be made to table the request. The motion should include a statement as to why the request is being tabled with direction to staff, the applicant or both.
Subject: Homestead Place, 3625 Plymouth Road

Voting Requirement

The planning commission will make a recommendation to the city council on the applicant’s proposal. A recommendation for approval requires an affirmative vote of a simple majority. The city council’s final approval requires affirmative votes of five members.

Deadline for Decision

August 15, 2017
Project: Homestead Partners Plymouth Rd
Address: 3625 Plymouth Rd
Project No. 17010.17a

City of minnetonka

This map is for illustrative purposes only.


**Project Description.** HP Holdings, LLC, is proposing to remove the existing home built in 1954 at 3625 Plymouth Road and divide the property into two single-family residential lots. The two properties would access onto Plymouth Road and would require lot width variances. By ordinance, the minimum lot width is 110 feet. HP Holdings, LLC, is requesting variances to reduce the lot width from 110’ to 99’ for Lot 1 and 110’ to 98’ for Lot 2.

**Reasonableness and Unique Circumstance.** The existing lot (197’ in width) is larger than any of the lots on Plymouth Road and in the immediate area. Majority of the lots on Plymouth Road and in the immediate area have lot widths less than 110’. This, coupled with the lot’s depth, presents a circumstance not common to all similarly zoned properties in the area.

**Neighborhood Character.** Based on the plat submitted, the homes built on the two newly created lots would be more similar in size to existing and newly homes built in the area than would one large home built on the one exiting lot.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLOCK 1</th>
<th>GROSS AREA</th>
<th>WETLAND AREA</th>
<th>NET AREA</th>
<th>WIDTH @ SETBACK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>29,252 s.f.</td>
<td>0.67 acres</td>
<td>29,252 s.f.</td>
<td>99 +/- 1 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>28,969 s.f.</td>
<td>0.67 acres</td>
<td>28,969 s.f.</td>
<td>98 +/- 1 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58,221 s.f.</td>
<td>1.34 acres</td>
<td>58,221 s.f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>GROSS AREA</th>
<th>WETLAND AREA</th>
<th>NET AREA</th>
<th>WIDTH @ SETBACK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58,221 s.f.</td>
<td>1.34 acres</td>
<td>58,221 s.f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lot Area: 22,000 sq. ft.
Lot Width: 110 feet
Lot 1 Variance: 98 feet
Lot 2 Variance: 99 feet
Lot Depth: 125 feet
Front Setback: 35 feet
Side Setback: Sum of sides 30 feet
Rear: 20% of depth or 40 feet
Buildable Area: 3,500 sq. ft.

EXISTING UTILITIES SHOWN ARE SHOWN IN AN APPROXIMATE WAY ONLY. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL DETERMINE THE EXACT LOCATION OF ANY AND ALL EXISTING UTILITIES BEFORE COMMENCING WORK. HE AGREES TO BE FULLY RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY AND ALL DAMAGES ARISING OUT OF HIS FAILURE TO EXACTLY LOCATE AND PRESERVE ANY AND ALL EXISTING UTILITIES.
VERIFY LOCATION & MAINTAIN EXISTING SERVICES FOR CONNECTION TO NEW HOUSE.

VERIFY LOCATION & ELEVATION

8" PVC DRAINPIPE

CONCRETE WASHOUT

ROCK ENTRANCE BERM

SILT FENCE

POST GRADING SILT FENCE

CONCRETE WASHOUT

EXISTING UTILITIES SHOWN ARE SHOWN IN AN APPROXIMATE WAY ONLY. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL DETERMINE THE EXACT LOCATION OF ANY AND ALL EXISTING UTILITIES BEFORE commencements. HE AGREES TO BE FULLY RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY AND ALL DAMAGES INCURRED OUT OF HIS FAILURE TO EXACTLY LOCATE AND PRESERVE ANY AND ALL EXISTING UTILITIES.

SATHRE-BERGQUIST, INC. RESERVES THE RIGHT TO HOLD ANY ILLEGITIMATE USER OR PARTY LEGALLY RESPONSIBLE FOR DAMAGES OR LOSSES RESULTING FROM ILLEGITIMATE USE.
Highest FAR in neighborhood: 0.22

Surrounding FAR

Map prepared by: City of Minnetonka
Resolution No. 2017-
Resolution approving the preliminary plat of HOMESTEAD PLACE
with lot width at setback variances, at 3625 Plymouth Road

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

Section 1.  Background.

1.01  HP Holdings, Inc has requested preliminary plat approval for HOMESTEAD PLACE, a two-lot subdivision with lot width at setback variances (Project 17017.17a).

1.02  The property is located at 3625 Plymouth Road. It is legally described as follows:

Lot 62 and the south 65 feet of Lot 63, “COUNTRY HOMES”, Hennepin County, Minnesota.

1.03  On May 18, 2017, the planning commission held a hearing on the proposed plat. The applicant was provided the opportunity to present information to the commission. The commission considered all of the comments received and the staff report, which are incorporated by reference into this resolution. The commission recommended that the city council grant preliminary plat approval.

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. One design standard requires that lots be at least 110 feet wide at the front yard setback line. The applicant is proposing to reduce the front width at setback to 99 feet for Lot 1 and 98 feet for Lot 2.
2.02 By City Code §400.055, a variance from the subdivision requirements may be granted but not mandated, when the applicant meets a burden of proving that: (1) the proposed variance is a reasonable use of the property, considering things such as functional and aesthetic justifications for the variance and improvement to the appearance and stability of the property and neighborhood; (2) the circumstances justifying the variance are unique to the property, are not caused by the landowner, are not solely for the landowner’s convenience, and are not solely because of economic considerations; and (3) the variance would not adversely affect or alter the essential character of the neighborhood.

Section 3. Findings.

3.01 But for lot widths at setback, the preliminary plat would meet the design standards as outlined in City Code §400.030.

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

1. Reasonableness: The existing property is 1.3-acres in size and has a lot depth of 295 feet. These existing conditions far exceed what is required by ordinance. In fact, the lot is one of the largest residential parcels within the neighborhood. Further, the property is located in an area where properties have varying degrees of nonconforming lot widths at the setback line. Over 60% of the lots within the existing neighborhood have substandard lot widths.

2. Unique Circumstance and Character of the neighborhood: The subdivision ordinance allows the city to consider variances for lots with substandard lot widths when the subdivision of the property would not set precedent that would alter the character of the neighborhood. The subject property is one of the largest residential properties in the surrounding neighborhood. The proposed lot widths would allow for lots more similar to those within the existing neighborhood. Further, more than half of the lots within the existing neighborhood have substandard lot widths. As such, the proposed variance request would not have an adverse impact on the surrounding neighborhood.


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

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

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

         a. The following drainage and utility easements:

            1. Minimum 10-foot wide drainage and utility easements adjacent to the public right-of-way(s) and along the northern property line.

            2. A minimum 7-foot wide drainage and utility easements along the south property line.

            3. Over the extents of the stormwater management facilities in the rear yards of both lots, as approved by the city engineer.

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

2. Prior to final plat approval:

   a) This resolution must be recorded with Hennepin County.

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

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

   a) Submit the following:

      1) Two sets of mylars for city signatures.

      2) An electronic CAD file of the plat in microstation or DXF.
3) Park dedication fee of $5,000.

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

- Preliminary plat dated March 29, 2017
- Site plan dated April 14, 2017
- Grading plan dated April 14, 2017
- Erosion control plat dated April 24, 2017
- Tree preservation plan dated April 24, 2017

6. 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 applicable.

7. 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) Stormwater maintenance agreements for the stormwater management facilities. These agreements must be reviewed and approved by the city attorney and then recorded with Hennepin County.

      3) Final grading and tree preservation plan for the lot. The plan must be in substantial conformance with Grading Plan and Tree Preservation plans dated April 24, 2017.
a. Show sewer and water services to minimize impact to any significant or high-priority trees. No trees may be removed for installation of services.

b. No more than 35% of the high priority trees can be removed.

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

5) Confirm the water service location.

6) Grading and construction activity to be located to minimize impacts to adjacent trees.

7) Driveway permits will be required for the new driveway entrances. These entrances should be located to avoid the curb stop.

8) 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
c) Install heavy duty fencing, which may include chain-link fencing, at the conservation easement. This fencing must be maintained throughout the course of construction.

d) Submit all required hook-up fees.

8. No tree removal is permitted on either lot prior to issuance of the building permit on that lot.

9. All lots and structures within the development are subject to all R-1 zoning standards.

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

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

12. The property owner is responsible for replacing any required landscaping that dies.

13. The city must approve the final plat within one year of preliminary approval or receive a written application for a time extension or the preliminary approval will be void.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on June 12, 2017.

_____________________________
Terry Schneider, Mayor

Attest:

_____________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk
Action on this resolution:

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

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a duly authorized meeting held on June 12, 2017.

____________________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk
MINNETONKA PLANNING COMMISSION
May 18, 2017

Brief Description

Items concerning a trail, boardwalk, and pedestrian bridge at 5709 Rowland Road and 5624 Shady Oak Road:

- Conditional use permit for a recreational use within required wetland buffer;
- Wetland setback variance; and
- Floodplain alteration permit.

Recommendation

Recommend the city council adopt the resolution approving the requests.

Background

In 2007, the city approved construction of an Applewood Pointe senior cooperative building on the property at 5709 Rowland Road. The approval included construction of a trail partially on the private, residential property and partially within Lone Lake Park immediately to the east. In the short term, the trail was intended to provide access from the existing Rowland Road sidewalk and residential building to a wooded knoll in the park. The written report associated with the proposal noted that, in the long term, the city envisioned a link between this knoll and existing trails within Lone Lake Park. The Applewood Pointe project, and therefore the trail, was not constructed.

In 2015, the city approved construction of The Chase at Nine Mile Creek apartment building on the Rowland Road property. Again, a trail connection between the public sidewalk, private residential building, and Lone Lake Park was contemplated. However, the specific location, feasibility, and costs had not been determined at that time.

Proposal

A plan has now been developed for a trail, boardwalk, and pedestrian bridge connection from Rowland Road and The Chase to existing trails within Lone Lake Park. As proposed, a crushed gravel trail would be extended north and east from the existing public sidewalk and apartment building. The trail would extended eastward along the southern portion of an existing wooded knoll within the park. The trail would then connect to a proposed boardwalk crossing of an existing wetland and floodplain area. After crossing the wetland, the trail would meander northward and connect to a proposed pedestrian bridge over Nine Mile Creek. Finally, the trail would connect to existing trails in Lone Lake Park. The new trail/boardwalk/bridge would add roughly 0.25 miles of pathway to the park’s existing 1.6 miles.
The plan as presented represents a public/private collaboration. Over the last year, public works, natural resources, and planning staff have spent many hours walking the area with representatives of Rowland Investments, the owners of The Chase, to determine an appropriate alignment for the trail/boardwalk/bridge. The proposed alignment requires:

- Conditional Use Permit. By city code, recreational uses – including trails – are conditionally-permitted within required wetland buffers.

- Wetland Setback Variance. By city code, though trails are conditionally-permitted within wetland buffers, they must also maintain a 20-foot setback from wetland edges. Some small areas of the proposed trail – on the south side of the wooded knoll, where it connects to proposed boardwalk, and on the peninsulas north and south of the proposed bridge – would be located less than 20 feet from the wetland edge and would technically require a setback variance. Similarly, abutments supporting the bridge would be located less than 20 feet from wetland edge.

- Floodplain Alteration Permit. Though the final design of the proposed bridge has not been established, staff anticipates that its abutments would likely result in some amount of floodplain alteration.

Primary Questions and Analysis

The following outlines the primary land use questions associated with the proposed trail, boardwalk, and pedestrian bridge.

1. **Are the proposed trail, boardwalk, and bridge appropriate?**

   Yes. The trail, boardwalk, and bridge are appropriate for several reasons, including:

   - Pedestrian trails are reasonable uses of both private and public spaces and would be similar to existing uses in several city parks.

   - The proposal was conceptually considered and approved in both 2007 and 2015.

   - The proposal would afford members of the public greater access to natural areas of Lone Lake Park.

2. **Are the anticipated impacts acceptable?**

   Yes. While some tree removal – 12 significant trees and 2 high-priority trees in marginal health – would occur to accommodate the pathway, the alignment was specifically established to minimize impact to trees and other natural resources. The proposed trail, boardwalk, and bridge are intended to increase enjoyment of the community’s natural resources.
Staff Recommendation

Recommend the city council adopt the resolution approving a conditional use permit, wetland setback variance, and floodplain alteration permit for a trail, boardwalk and pedestrian bridge at 5709 Rowland Road and 5624 Shady Oak Road.

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

**Surrounding Land Uses**

Northerly: Lone Lake Park  
Easterly: Lone Lake Park  
Southerly: Rowland Road  
Westerly: Multi-family residential

**Planning**

Existing Zoning: PUD and R-1  
Guide Plan designation: High-Density Residential and Parks

**Park Dedication Fees**

Park dedication is frequently required during development. By city code, the city may determine whether to receive this dedication in the form of cash or land dedication, or may credit work that creates a public benefit. In several recent approvals the city has used a combination of these options. For instance, developers have agreed to install and maintain trails or other public facilities; the costs associated with such are essentially deducted from the otherwise required cash.

Rowland Investments (also known as At Home Apartments), the developer of The Chase at Nine Mile Creek, submitted required park dedication fees in 2015. Staff has indicated to the developer that some, but not all, of these fees would be refunded based on actual trail/boardwalk/bridge construction costs.

**Materials**

As currently planned, the proposed trail would be constructed of crushed gravel. Staff chose this material for three primary reasons: (1) the majority of the proposed alignment is relatively flat; (2) the trail would connect with an existing crushed gravel trail in Lone Lake Park; and (3) the trail would not be maintained during the winter months. However, to avoid erosion issues, staff would again evaluate the alignment during the course of construction to determine if any small stretches should be paved due to their grade and, therefore, potential for erosion.

As planned, the boardwalk and bridge would be constructed with treated lumber materials, including the decking, and be of similar design to those in Jidana, Minnehaha Creek Headwaters, and Minnetonka Mills parks.

**Construction**

If approved, tree and brush removal would occur sometime after July 10, which is considered the end of oak wilt season. Boardwalk and bridge placement would occur during with winter months.
The city would contract and supervise the tree/brush removal. Rowland Investments, would construct the trail, boardwalk, and bridge. As a condition of approval, appropriate legal agreements would be required between Rowland Investments and the city.

CUP Standards: Trails

The proposed trail would meet the conditional use permit standards for work within the wetland district as outlined in City Code §300.26.

1. The use is consistent with the intent of this ordinance;

   **Finding:** The intent of ordinance requirements as they pertain to the wetland district is to protect the community’s natural water resources while allowing for reasonable development. The proposed trail would not have significant, adverse impact on wetland areas. Rather, it is intended to increase enjoyment of these natural resources.

2. The use is consistent with the goals, policies and objectives of the comprehensive plan;

   **Finding:** The proposed trail would be consistent with the comprehensive plan. Lone Lake Park is classified as a Community Park in the 2030 Plan. Per the plan, such parks are intended to provide a combination of passive and active recreational activities for the entire community.

3. The use does not have an undue adverse impact on governmental facilities, utilities, services or existing or proposed improvements;

   **Finding:** The proposed trail would not adversely impact public facilities, utilities, or services.

4. The use is consistent with the city’s water resources management plan;

   **Finding:** The proposed trail has been reviewed by the city’s water resources engineer and found to be consistent with the water resources management plan.

5. The use does not have an undue adverse impact on the public health, safety or welfare;
Finding: The proposed trail would not adversely impact public health, safety, or welfare. Rather, the pathway is intended to increase enjoyment of the community’s natural resources.

6. Water bodies receiving runoff entering wetlands, floodplain or shoreland areas shall not be adversely impacted by the water quality of runoff;

Finding: The proposed trail would add a negligible amount of impervious surface to the area surrounding the creek. As such, staff does not anticipate any adverse impact to the water quality of runoff.

7. No structure or fill may be placed which adversely affects the minimum required water storage capacity as defined in the water resources management plan of a property;

Finding: The proposed trail would not impact water storage capacity.

8. No structure subject to periodic inundation shall be designed for human habitation or shall the structure be serviced with public utilities;

Finding: No habitable structures are proposed.

9. Structures shall have a low flood damage potential and shall be firmly anchored;

Finding: The trail has low flood damage potential.

10. Service facilities, such as electrical and heating equipment, must be located a minimum of two feet above the flood elevation defined in the water resources management plan;

Finding: No service facilities are proposed.

11. There shall be no storage of materials which are flammable, explosive or otherwise dangerous to human, animal or plant life;

Finding: No storage of materials is proposed.

12. There shall be only minimal interference with wetland vegetation; and
Finding: No interference with wetland vegetation is proposed.

13. Required approvals shall be secured from all appropriate jurisdictions, including the United States Army Corps of engineers, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, governing watershed district and the Lake Minnetonka Conservation District. Any conditions imposed upon such approvals shall be met.

Finding: The improvements must be approved by the Nine Mile Creek Watershed District. City staff has already been in contact with the district regarding the project. No other agency approval is required.

Variance Standard: The proposed trail would meet the variances standard outlined in City Code §300.07 Subd. 1(a):

1. Purpose and Intent of the Ordinance. The intent of the wetland setback requirement is twofold, to protect the functionality and the aesthetic of wetland areas. The proposed trail would meet this intent. Given the size of the wetland complex, the areas of variance would be just small point intrusions that would not have any significant negative impact on the functionality or aesthetic of the adjacent wetlands.

2. Consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Lone Lake Park is guided for park use. The requested variance would not impact this intended land use.

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

   a) Reasonableness: The requested setback variance is reasonable given the size of the surrounding wetland complex, representing a point intrusion that would not have any significant negative impact on the functionality or aesthetic of the wetland complex.

   b) Character of Locality. The areas of setback variance are internal to the park, in areas not currently easily accessible to the public. The setback variance would not impact the aesthetics or character of this area.

   c) Unique Circumstance. There are unique circumstances influencing the location of the proposed trails and, therefore, the proposed setbacks.
1) The required wetland setback could be met on the wooded knoll. However, relocating the trail further to the north would likely result in additional grading and tree impacts.

2) The required wetland setback could not be met on peninsula areas nor at the small portions of the trail where it connects to proposed boardwalks.

**Floodplain Standard:** Any floodplain alteration for bridge abutments would meet the outlined in City Code §300.24 Subd. 9:

1. The magnitude of the alteration is appropriate relative to the size of the floodplain district.

   **Finding:** The alteration area would be relatively small given the large floodplain area within the creek corridor.

2. The amount of any increase in buildable area is appropriate in comparison to the amount of buildable area before alteration.

   **Finding:** The alteration would not increase buildable area of any property.

3. The alteration will not negatively impact the hydrology of the floodplain.

   **Finding:** The alteration would not negatively impact the hydrology of the floodplain, given the small area of fill relative to the larger area.

4. Floodplain mitigation areas will not negatively impact adjacent properties.

   **Finding:** As a condition of approval, the floodplain mitigation area would not negatively impact adjacent properties.

5. The alteration will meet the intent of the city's water resources management plan and the subdivision and zoning ordinances;

   **Finding:** The alteration would meet the intent of the city's water resources management plan and the zoning ordinances.

6. The alteration will not adversely impact governmental
facilities, utilities, services or existing or proposed public improvements; and

**Finding:** This standard is met.

7. The alteration will not have an undue adverse impact on the public health, safety or welfare.

**Finding:** This standard is met.

**Neighborhood Comments**

The city has sent notice to 338 area property owners and has received no written comments to date.

**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 resolution approving request.

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

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

**Voting Requirement**

The planning commission will make a recommendation to the city council. A recommendation for approval of the requests requires an affirmative majority vote. The city council’s final approval requires an affirmative vote of five members.
Location Map

Project: Lone Lake Trail
Address: 5624 Shady Oak Rd

This map is for illustrative purposes only.
**Tree Inventory Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size &amp; Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0001</td>
<td></td>
<td>16&quot; ASPEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0002</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; BOX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0003</td>
<td></td>
<td>8&quot; BIRCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0004</td>
<td></td>
<td>9&quot; POP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0005</td>
<td></td>
<td>5&quot; POP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0006</td>
<td></td>
<td>7&quot; POP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0007</td>
<td></td>
<td>6&quot; BOX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0008</td>
<td></td>
<td>8&quot; COT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0009</td>
<td></td>
<td>10&quot; COT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010</td>
<td></td>
<td>8&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0011</td>
<td></td>
<td>10&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0012</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0013</td>
<td></td>
<td>18&quot; OAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0014</td>
<td></td>
<td>10&quot; ASPEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0015</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; BOX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0016</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; ASPEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0017</td>
<td></td>
<td>8&quot; BIRCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0018</td>
<td></td>
<td>8&quot; COT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0019</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0020</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0021</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0022</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0023</td>
<td></td>
<td>16&quot; ASPEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0024</td>
<td></td>
<td>10&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0025</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0026</td>
<td></td>
<td>8&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0027</td>
<td></td>
<td>10&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0028</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0029</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0030</td>
<td></td>
<td>10&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0031</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0032</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0033</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0034</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0035</td>
<td></td>
<td>10&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0036</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0037</td>
<td></td>
<td>10&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0038</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0039</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0040</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0041</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0042</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0043</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0044</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0045</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0046</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0047</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0048</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0049</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0050</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0051</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0052</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0053</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0054</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0055</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0056</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0057</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0058</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0059</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0060</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0061</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0062</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0063</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0064</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0065</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0066</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0067</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0068</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0069</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0070</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0071</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0072</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0073</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0074</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0075</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0076</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0077</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0078</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0079</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0080</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0081</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0082</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0083</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0084</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0085</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0086</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0087</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0088</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0089</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0090</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0091</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0092</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0093</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0094</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0095</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0096</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0097</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0098</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0099</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0100</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0101</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0102</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0103</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0104</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0105</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0106</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0107</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; CHERRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0108</td>
<td></td>
<td>12&quot; IRON</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GENERAL NOTES

1. DESIGN STRESSES ARE IN ACCORDANCE WITH "STANDARD SPECIFICATION FOR HIGHWAY BRIDGES" A "GUIDE SPECIFICATION FOR DESIGN OF PEDESTRIAN BRIDGES" BY THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS, 1970 EDITION.

2. BRIDGE MEMBERS ARE FABRICATED FROM HIGH STRENGTH, LOW ALLOY, ENHANCED ATMOSPHERIC CORROSION RESISTANT ASTMA473 COLD FORMED WELDED SQUARE AND RECTANGULAR TUBES, AND ASTM A690, ASTM A36, OR ASTM A36 PLATE AND STRUCTURAL STEEL FAMOUSLY T (A36, 36,000 PSF).

3. BRIDGE DECKING MATERIAL 3 X 12 SELECT STRUCTURAL PLANKING (4.40 PSI)

4. USE OF METAL ARC WELDING PROCESS OR FLUX CORED ARC WELDING PROCESS WILL BE USED. WELDING TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH AWS D1.1.

5. ALL TOPE AND BOTTOM CHORDS ARE SPACED TO BE COMPLETE PENETRATION TYPE WELDS, WELD BETWEEN TOP CHORD AND END VERTICAL SHAFT AS IS DETAIL.

6. UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED, WELDED CONNECTIONS SHALL BE FULL WELD BOLTS OR HAVE THE EFFECTIVE "THICKNESS" OF A FULL WELD OF A SIZE EQUAL TO THE THICKNESS OF THE LEAST THICK MEMBER IN THE CONNECTION. WELDS SHALL BE APPLIED AS FOLLOWS:
   A. BOTH ENDS OF VERTICAL, DIAGONALS, AND FLOOR BEAMS SHALL BE WELDED ALL AROUND.
   B. BRIDGE DIAGONALS WILL BE WELDED ALL AROUND.
   C. MISCELLANEOUS NONSTRUCTURAL MEMBERS WILL BE ATTACHED WELDED TO THEIR RESPECTIVE CONNECTIONS.

7. BRIDGE DESIGN WAS ONLY BASED ON COMBINATIONS OF THE FOLLOWING LOADS WHICH WILL PRODUCE MAXIMUM CRITICAL MEMBER STRESSES.
   A. PSP UNIFORM DISTRIBUTED IN THE FULL DECK AREA OR ONE 10,000 LB VEHICLE LOAD.

8. CLEANING: ALL EXPOSED SURFACES OF STEEL SHALL BE CLEANED IN ACCORDANCE WITH STEEL STRUCTURES PRACTICE COUNCIL SURFACES PREPARATION SPECIFICATIONS NO. 19.080.02 CLEANING, SIP-19080.02 CLEANING.

9. MORMIN STRENGTHEN THICKNESS OF 1/16" ON ALL STRUCTURAL MEMBERS.
Resolution No. 2017-

Conditional use permit, wetland setback variance, and floodplain alteration permit for a trail, boardwalk, and pedestrian bridge at 5709 Rowland Road and 5624 Shady Oak Road

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

Section 1. BACKGROUND.

1.01 The city of Minnetonka and Rowland Investments, LLC. are proposing to construct a trail, boardwalk, and pedestrian bridge connection from existing public sidewalks on Rowland Road and The Chase at Nine Mile Creek apartment building to existing trails within Lone Lake Park.

1.02 The properties on which the trail/boardwalk/bridge would be constructed are located at 5609 Rowland Road and 5624 Shady Oak Road. They are legally described on Exhibit A of this resolution.

1.03 Portions of the proposed trail would be located within the required wetland buffer. By City Code §300.23 Subd.7, public recreational uses, such as trails, are conditionally-permitted in wetland buffers.

1.04 Portions of the proposed trail would be located less than 20 feet from the delineated wetland edge. City Code 300.23 Subd.8(b)(2) requires that trails be located at least 20 feet from the wetland district. Minnesota Statute §462.357 Subd. 6, and City Code §300.07 authorizes the city to grant variances.

1.05 Portions of the proposed bridge abutments would require a floodplain alteration permit under City Code §300.24.

1.06 On May 18, 2017, the planning commission held a hearing on the proposed trail, boardwalk, and pedestrian bridge. The commission considered all of the comments and the staff report, which are incorporated by reference into this resolution. The commission recommended that the city council approve
the proposal.

Section 2. STANDARDS.

2.01 City Code §300.26 outlines the following standards that must be met for granting of conditional permits within the wetland zoning districts. These standards are incorporated by reference into this resolution.

2.02 By City Code §300.07 Subd. 1, a variance 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.

2.03 City Code §300.24 Subd. 9(c), states that in reviewing floodplain alteration permits, the city will consider whether certain general standards are met. These standards are incorporated by reference into this resolution.

2.04 City Code §300.24 Subd. 9(d), states that an alteration permit will not be granted unless certain specific standards are met. These standards are incorporated by reference into this resolution.

Section 3. FINDINGS.

3.01 The proposed trail would meet all minimum conditional use permit standards outlined in City Code §300.26.

1. The intent of ordinance requirements as they pertain to the wetland district is to protect the community’s natural water resources while allowing for reasonable development. The proposed trail would not have significant, adverse impact on wetland areas. Rather, it is intended to increase enjoyment of these natural resources.

2. The proposed trail would be consistent with the comprehensive plan. Lone Lake Park is classified as a Community Park in the 2030 Plan. Per the plan, such parks are intended to provide a combination of passive and active recreational activities for the entire community.
3. The proposed trail would not adversely impact public facilities, utilities, or services.

4. The proposed trail has been reviewed by the city’s water resources engineer and found to be consistent with the water resources management plan.

5. The proposed trail would not adversely impact public health, safety, or welfare. Rather, the pathway is intended to increase enjoyment of the community’s natural resources.

6. The proposed trail would add a negligible amount of impervious surface to the area surrounding the creek. As such, staff does not anticipate any adverse impact to the water quality of runoff.

7. The proposed trail would not impact water storage capacity.

8. No habitable structures are proposed.

9. The trail would have low flood damage potential.

10. No service facilities are proposed.

11. No storage of materials is proposed.

12. No significant interference with wetland vegetation is proposed.

13. As a condition of this resolution, the trail must be approved by the Nine Mile Creek Watershed District.

3.02 The proposed trail would meet the variance standard outlined in City Code §300.07 Subd. 1(a):

1. Purpose and Intent of the Ordinance. The intent of the wetland setback requirement is twofold, to protect the functionality and the aesthetic of wetland areas. The proposed trail would meet this intent. Given the size of the wetland complex, the areas of variance would be just small point intrusions that would not have any significant negative impact on the functionality or aesthetic of the adjacent wetlands.

2. Consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Lone Lake Park is guided for park use. The requested variance would not impact this intended land use.
3. Practical Difficulties. There are practical difficulties in complying with the ordinance:

a) Reasonableness: The requested setback variance is reasonable given the size of the surrounding wetland complex, representing a point intrusion that would not have any significant negative impact on the functionality or aesthetic of the wetland complex.

b) Character of Locality. The areas of setback variance are internal to the park, in areas not currently easily accessible to the public. The setback variance would not impact the aesthetics or character of this area.

c) Unique Circumstance. There are unique circumstances influencing the location of the proposed trails and, therefore, the proposed setbacks.

1) The required wetland setback could be met on the wooded knoll. However, relocating the trail further to the north would likely result in additional grading and tree impacts.

2) The required wetland setback could not be met on peninsula areas nor at the small portions of the trail were it connects to proposed boardwalks.

3.03 Any bridge abutments would meet the floodplain alteration standards as outlined in City Code §300.24 Subd. 9:

1. The alteration area would be relatively small given the large floodplain area within the creek corridor.

2. The alteration would not increase buildable area of any property.

3. The alteration would not negatively impact the hydrology of the floodplain, given the small area of fill relative to the larger area.

4. The floodplain mitigation area would not negatively impact adjacent properties.

5. The alteration would meet the intent of the city's water resources management plan and the zoning ordinances.
6. The alteration would not adversely impact governmental facilities, utilities, services or existing or proposed public improvements; and

7. The alteration would not have an undue adverse impact on the public health, safety or welfare.

Section 4. CITY COUNCIL ACTION.

4.01 The above-described conditional use permit, wetland setback variance, and floodplain alteration permit is approved, subject to the following conditions:

1. Subject to staff approval, the trail/boardwalk/bridge must be developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the following plans, except as modified below.

   - Topographic and Tree Inventory Survey dated March 8, 2017
   - Boardwalk specification dated November 2005
   - Bridge specification dated September 19, 2014

2. Prior to any site work on the private or public property:

   a) A public trail easement over the portion of the trail on 5709 Rowland Road must be submitted for review and approval of the city attorney. The easement must then be filed at the County.

   b) Rowland Investments, LLC, and the city of Minnetonka must enter into a legal agreement outlining tree removal, construction activities, cost reimbursement, and on-going maintenance of the trail, boardwalk, and pedestrian bridge.

   c) Appropriate permits must be obtained from the Nine Mile Creek Watershed District.

   d) Tree and wetland protection fencing and any other erosion control measures as required by natural resources staff must be installed and inspected. These items must be maintained throughout the course of construction.

3. Existing wetland buffer areas must be maintained.

4. Compensatory water storage must be provided in an amount at least equal to that filled. The creation of this storage area must not result
in removal of regulated trees, adversely impact wetlands or existing wetland buffers.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on June 12, 2017.

_______________________________________
Terry Schneider, Mayor

ATTEST:

_________________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk

ACTION ON THIS RESOLUTION:

Motion for adoption:
Seconded by:
Voted in favor of:
Voted against:
Abstained:
Absent: Allendorf
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 June 12, 2017.

__________________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk

SEAL
EXHIBIT A

Parcel 1:

All that part of the West Half of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of Section 35, Township 117, Range 22 lying south of the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway right-of-way and lying northerly of Rowland Road as established in Document No. 3806560, according to the United State Government Survey thereof and situated in Hennepin County, Minnesota.

Parcel 2:

That part of the Chicago, Milwaukee and Pacific Railroad right-of-way in the West Half of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of Section 35, Township 117, Range 22, Hennepin County, Minnesota, which lies southeasterly of a line parallel with and distant 75.00 feet southeasterly from the centerline of said railroad right-of-way and which lies northeasterly of the northeasterly right-of-way of Rowland Road, on file and of record in the Office of the Hennepin County Recorder.
Minnetonka Planning Commission Meeting
May 18, 2017

Agenda Item 9

Other Business
MINNETONKA PLANNING COMMISSION  
May 18, 2017

**Brief Description**  
Concept plan review for Newport Midwest at 10400, 10500 and 10550 Bren Road East.

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

---

**Background**

Earlier this year the planning commission reviewed and commented on a 240 unit rental housing concept plan for Newport Midwest. The plan included market rate and affordable housing units. Comments from both planning commission and city council reviews have prompted changes to the development plan. Newport Midwest is seeking additional comments from the city on the revised plan.

The revised plan proposes redevelopment of the same commercial properties at 10400, 10500 and 10550 Bren Road East. The revised concept plan contemplates redevelopment of the existing office buildings to construct 246 units of rental housing on the 3.2 acre site. The proposed project would include 191 units at market rate and 55 units priced between $650 to $1118 per month (60 percent of the area median income). The mix of unit types range from studio to 3 bedroom units. Amenities include a roof top deck, an amenity deck, outdoor play area and additional trail connections. The major revision to the plans is the market rate housing is now on the west portion of the site and the affordable housing is located on the east portion of the site. (See attached plans)

The site is nearly built out with the 3 office buildings and associated surface parking lots. Green space exists adjacent to the buildings and at the periphery of the parking lots. The site is nearly flat with little topographic change and no on-site stormwater treatment facilities in place. An existing trail extends along the northern portion of the site connecting to the broader Opus trail system. Surrounding land uses are primarily office or business warehouse oriented. The site is zoned B-2 limited business district and guided mixed use in the 2030 comprehensive plan.

Adjacent to the site is the future Green Line light rail transit extension and Opus Station. The station platform would be a short walk, 700 feet, from the proposed housing. Construction on the rail line will begin this year with operations anticipated to begin in 2021. The Opus Station area plan identifies the site and other adjacent properties in close proximity to the station as candidates for redevelopment as new housing and employment. In planning for the Green Line extension, a housing analysis was performed for each of the 15 stations to project market demand for housing within ½ mile of the stations within the next 15 years. The analysis projected the market would likely demand over 11,000 housing units for the entire line from Eden Prairie to Minneapolis, of which,
600 housing units were projected for the Opus Station. (See SWLRT Housing Gaps Analysis attachments)

**Key Issues**

City staff has identified the following considerations for any development of the subject properties:

- **Change of land use:** The Opus business park was originally designed as a large mixed use development providing the opportunity for people to live, work and play. (See attached Opus 2 brochure) change of land use from an employment use to housing is consistent with the vision for Opus and the need for additional housing in close proximity to the Opus Station.

- **Site Plan:** The proposed site plan shows two buildings of 5 and 6 stories. Underground parking would connect both buildings with one common access located near the west end of the surface parking lot. Access to the site is provided from Bren Road East and a common private driveway at the east property line. The previous plan included just a single access from the private driveway.

  A play area is provided for residents and is more internal to the site than the previous location along the trail. Other greenspace areas are located at the periphery of the site. Internal trails and walkways are connected to the Opus trail system in multiple locations. Comments about the size, location and level of amenity of these areas are appropriate discussion items.

- **Building Character:** Building elevations show a modern style with an organized and repeated modular arrangement of building elements. Input on building massing and desired character is important. This project could be the first redevelopment project near the Opus Station and will establish a design character for other projects to follow.

**Review Process**

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

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

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

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends the planning commission provide comment and feedback on the identified key issues and others 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.

Originator: Loren Gordon, AICP, City Planner
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Next Steps

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

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

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

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

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

Roles and Responsibilities

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

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

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

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

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

Landon/Domus Group
10400, 10500 and 10550 Bren Road East

This map is for illustrative purposes only.
10400 Bren Rd E, Minnetonka, MN 55343

No. Description Date

Grant Requested Act. Plan.
1" = 40'-0"
1. View from Bren Road, S.E. Corner
2. View from Bren Road, S.W. Corner
3. Typical Ground Floor Unit Entry
4. View from Transit Station, N.W. Corner
Unique to most housing developments, the Mariner will connect a market rate building to an affordable housing building through an above grade “bridge.” All residents of The Mariner will have access to the same amenities, including rooftop deck spaces, a playground, an urban courtyard, dog run, bike repair station, bike paths and green spaces surrounding the property. Residents will be enticed outdoors by these amenities, creating the opportunity for community building among people of all ages and backgrounds. Both indoor and outdoor spaces will be open and available to residents, encouraging healthy lifestyles and positive relationships with neighbors.

Bright and inviting, the front lobby is a great space for residents to gather indoors. With plenty of seating and standing room, residents can conveniently linger to chat with neighbors or guests. Artwork on the walls, throw pillows and floor designs promote creativity while enhancing the aesthetic of the room.

First floor residents have convenient access to the outdoors through their front porches. Another example of community-building space, these porches allow residents to easily converse with one another as they enjoy the outdoors from right outside their homes. The porches add curb appeal to the development and encourage healthy living by making it easy for residents to go outdoors.
A lush, comfortable ROOF-TOP DECK invites residents to enjoy the outdoors.

The large AMENITY DECK will include areas to relax, dine, and play. All residents can enjoy this well-designed, landscaped shared space, creating a cohesive community.

Encouraging exercise, the bike path that runs along the west and north edges of the building is easily accessible to all residents.

First floor walk-up porches add to curb appeal and promote healthy living.

Vehicular access into the development below the “bridge” is designed like an urban courtyard as a way to slow traffic.

The playground for children promotes play, exercise and most of all... FUN!
PREVIOUS SUBMITTAL
Bren Road
Minnetonka, MN
JAN.23.2017

SITE PLAN 1/32" = 1'-0"
Affordable - Third Level

- 1 Bedroom: 3 units
- 2 Bedroom: 12 units
- 3 Bedroom: 4 units

Total Units: 19
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Newport Midwest Plan in context with the transitional station area action plan
9. Other Business

A. Concept plan review for Newport Midwest at 10400, 10500, and 10550 Bren Road East.

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

Gordon reported. He recommended that the planning commissioners provide comments and feedback on the identified key issues and others 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.

Powers asked for the ratio of parking stalls to units. Gordon referred the question to the applicant.

O’Connell asked if there is a design overlay for the site. Gordon explained that there is a trip generation overlay for Opus. Wischnack noted that the SWLRT placed an overlay on the site. Chair Kirk thought that an overall design plan would be beneficial.

In response to Chair Kirk’s question, Wischnack explained that both sections of the SWLRT would go over Bren Road West on the south side. There would be a lot of bridge replacements with the SWLRT project. The light rail would travel underground at Feltl Road and Smetana Road.

Becky Landon, with Newport Midwest, and Pete Keeley, of Collage Architects, introduced themselves. Ms. Landon stated that she is looking for input before creating the plan for the aesthetic look of the building. She hopes to set a standard. The proposal would include 240 units of which 55 units would be affordable at 50 percent and 60 percent median-income levels. The market-rate units would be just below luxury level. The applicant is looking at two buildings which would be broken up.

Mr. Keeley said that the proposal hopes to have a lot of outdoor spaces and ways for the residents to engage with the trails and pedestrian paths. There would be a front, direct access to each unit with porches that would be set a few feet up from the grade to offset the lights from vehicles on Bren Road and the train. He explained the trail and sidewalk locations. There would be a commons area with fitness room, party room, and office spaces available to be rented. The
access would be from the one-way road system. There would be a private road to the underground parking access. The inside road would be a loop. The proposal went to great lengths to not have surface parking without a cover, but to build the building over the top of the surface parking area. There would be visibility throughout the site. Vehicles would be able to circulate under, behind the building, and back out. This would be family housing. The affordable housing would be utilized mostly for two and three-bedroom units. There would be a defined play area and family lounge. There would be a drop off access adjacent to Bren Road. He asked for comments on whether a second access would work at that location to provide a drop off. The look of the building would be a modern, contemporary building with front porches, balconies, and some animation along the train side. It would be more subdued the further it got from the SWLRT. The base being considered would be brick and stone with a fair amount of siding and metal paneling. There would be a roof deck overlooking a courtyard. The building would be broken up in different areas with two, three, and five stories. There would be bike and dog spas.

Mr. Keely stated that a one-bedroom unit would have one parking stall and two and three-bedroom units would have two parking stalls which is how the ratio ended up at 1.35 stalls per unit.

Knight asked how close a U-Haul truck could get to access the building. Mr. Keely explained that there would be an 8.5-foot area underground for a vehicle to reach the elevator. Otherwise, there would be 70 feet to the door. Stalls near the elevator would be able to be reserved for a period of time. There would be trash and recycling chutes.

Powers asked if noise reduction measures would be taken. Mr. Keely answered affirmatively. A laminated piece of glass would be added to increase the STC of the window frame. The new construction codes and energy codes would provide a 2’ x 8’ wall and a lot more insulation. The trains are actually pretty quiet. The bells and station noises would be louder than the light rail train. Vibration has not been an issue on any of the lines.

Landon noted that the units that face the light rail are the first to be rented. That has held true for family and senior housing.

Commissioners discussed the proposed parking with Mr. Keely. Mr. Keely stated that the trends are showing that vehicle ownership is dropping dramatically. He noted that there would be the availability to sign leases for off-hour use of surrounding businesses’ parking lots.
Powers asked about safety for pedestrians. Mr. Keely stated that having many eyes on the site by residents having porches and front stoops along with lighting and safe walkways would be beneficial. Wischnack noted that lighting of the Opus trails is part of the city’s capital improvement plan.

In response to Chair Kirk’s question, Wischnack stated that there would be a fence. The type of fence is being reviewed. Pedestrians would only be able to cross the track at the station.

Gordon confirmed with commissioners that they seemed comfortable with a change in land use from office to residential.

Chair Kirk invited anyone present to comment. There was no response.

Calvert thought that the site is ready for redevelopment. She liked the proposed high-density use. Access to the building that would provide affordable housing has some issues that may need to be resolved. She was glad there would be one, two, and three-bedroom units provided. The proposal would be a visual improvement and be an asset so close to the station.

Knight likes the look of the buildings. Gordon provided that the original plans for Opus included 700 residential units. In the 2030 comprehensive plan, the goal is to add at least 500 units. Major roadwork would be included as part of the light rail project.

Knight liked the play area for little kids. He asked if there was a designated area for older kids. Gordon noted that the trail area would connect the whole area. Shady Oak Beach, Lone Lake, or Hopkins would provide the closest teen areas. The six miles in Opus would be perfect for bikers and scooter users.

Powers thought adding a large number of affordable units and pricing the market rate units just below luxury rates would be smart.

Chair Kirk thought that an awful lot would be going on. He thought scaling it back might provide more of a comfort zone with the parking and access points. He was initially concerned with the affordable units providing a buffer to the light rail for the market-rate units. He liked the common spaces. He supported looking at connecting the site with the walkability of the surrounding area. He favored more visitor parking near the building that would provide affordable housing. He was not as concerned with the access point to the site. He thought that it would be good to have a controlled area and traffic queuing within its own space.
Calvert thought that it would be important that the project appear homogenous and not have the affordable housing building appear different than the other building.

Sewell thought that the project looks great. He favored managing the height. As the starting point for development in the area, it looks great and has a lot of great features.

This concept plan is tentatively scheduled to be reviewed by the city council at its meeting on March 6, 2017.
B. Concept plan review for Newport Midwest at 10400, 10500 and 10550 Bren Road East

Gordon gave the staff report. Wischnack indicated there might be an affordable housing aspect to the proposal. This would be reviewed by the EDAC.

Allendorf said months back the council had approved the largest apartment building that had ever been approved in the city. He asked where that project was related to this development and a comparison of the height of both projects. Gordon said the RIZE at Opus was just east of this site. It was a five story building with two levels of covered parking. He said the height of the two would be fairly similar.

Becky Landon, with Newport Midwest, the plan was for around 240 units of multi-family housing with 55 units being affordable at 50 and 60 percent median income.

Pete Keeley, of Collage Architects, presented the site plans.

Wagner said parking was one of things that Keeley mentioned was challenging. He asked what the thinking was in terms of the number of stalls per unit given the proximity to the light rail. Keeley said that right now the plan was right around 1.35 per unit. The count was based on one stall per bedroom.

Wagner said the council likely would be open to the number being less given the proximity of the light rail. He said there was a great dialogue at the planning commission hearing about the affordable housing and the light rail that might make the units marketable. He noted this would be the first development at the Shady Oak Station. One of the things discussed at the community works meetings was each station having a theme or a feel and having it feel like a place. Historically Minnetonka has not been a design standard community but he thought it might be beneficial to think about what the theme or the look of the area might be.

Acomb said during her time on the council there had been a lot of developments that have had both market rate and affordable units. She never recalled any of them separating the different units but rather they have always been integrated together. She asked if there were examples of developments where the two types were separated. She also asked if there had been consideration given with this plan integrating them.
together. Wischnack said a good example of a similar development was Westridge Market which has separate components. Landon said the reason the market rate and affordable units would be in separate buildings was primarily due to limitations in the types of financing that are available. The market has changed dramatically in the last six months with fewer buyers of the tax credits. She said this is something that is continually being looked at with the tax credit investors. As the developer her company would be involved in the ownership of both sides. There would be one management company and common ownership running between the two. The idea was to make it as integrated as possible.

Wiersum asked what the target market was for the two parts of the proposal. Keeley said a market study for the market rate units had just been received within the past few days. This would be a constant evaluation to try to understand what the market is. At the start of the planning the thought was it would be more family oriented. From the feedback received, it was more likely the market was people catching the train, more workers, more millennials. Wiersum said in general he thought the plan was interesting and attractive. Although there was a great trail system in the area, green space would be in short supply. Anything that could be done to enhance that would be important.

Allendorf said the units were labeled market rate and affordable because of the financing. He hoped it would be an integrated complex in terms of people not saying “that’s the affordable side…” Landon said there may be some differences in some of the interior finishes but from an exterior perspective they would be the same. Keeley said the challenge was not wanting it to look like one large project with a wall of buildings. Allendorf said he was intrigued with the townhouse part. He thought it was an innovative first level look. He said if the access issues could be figured out he thought this was a good location for this product.

Acomb said as far as the site plan and access issues she was concerned with not having any surface parking near the affordable units. She appreciated the look of the buildings and all the different outdoor spaces. She agreed with Wiersum’s comments about green space.

Schneider said the density was very warranted for this area. The city had focused on getting some high-density housing and this was truly high density housing. There had been other potential sites for high-density housing that went to institutional schools and other nonprofits. He acknowledged the challenge of not knowing what would happen to the property to the north but it would be nice to be able to tie into development of that property. A trail to the LRT station would be nice but it would be better to have a walkway with some landscaping, seating areas and
gathering spaces somewhat coordinated between the properties. This would leverage the limited amount of green space to a more urban greenway. This type of thing is enjoyed by millennials more than a big park. He suggested keeping this possibility in mind. He said he was fine with the parking ratio given the light rail. There would be a challenge with the size of vehicles that could be accommodated by the underground parking. A garbage truck or a furniture truck would not be able to be accommodated. A pull off area off of one of the streets might be important.
ABOUT THIS CHAPTER:
The Transitional Station Area Action Plans are the product of a Hennepin County led effort to help communities along the Southwest LRT corridor prepare for SW LRT’s opening day in 2018 and beyond.

An individualized plan has been created for each of the 17 stations in the Southwest corridor, each plan comprising a chapter in the larger Southwest Corridor Investment Framework. The station area action plans suggest ways to build on local assets, enhance mobility, identify infrastructure needs, and capitalize on promising opportunities for development and redevelopment near each station.

Plan Components:

INTRODUCTION
A brief overview of the station location and its surroundings

WHERE ARE WE TODAY?
A description of existing conditions in the station area, including:

» Land Use
» Transit Connections
» Access + Circulation Issues (Bike, Ped, and Auto)
» Infrastructure Needs

WHERE ARE WE GOING?
This section presents a number of recommendations for the station area in anticipation of opening day needs and the long-term TOD environment. This includes:

» Access + Circulation Plan
» Station Area Site Plan
» Infrastructure Plan
» Development Potential
» Summary of Key Initiatives

OPUS STATION WITHIN THE CORRIDOR:
A prestigious employment area connected to the station via an extensive network of trails and centered upon a walkable mixed-use core.

EMPLOYMENT
The Opus station is a major employment center located near Highway 169, Highway 62, and Shady Oak Road (see Place Types discussion beginning on p. 1-19). It is the largest employment center in Minnetonka and home to many high-profile businesses including United Health Group, Comcast, and American Family Insurance. The station will be an important stop for the thousands of employees that commute to the Opus Business Park from surrounding areas.

TRAIL CONNECTIONS
The area is characterized by a 6-mile trail network which gives the area a park-like feel, and a distinctive looped roadway network that links employment buildings with hotels, retail establishments, and local residential neighborhoods in the surrounding area. The trail system can be accessed off Smetana Road and Shady Oak Road at Red Circle Drive. Along with providing area employees with a space for passive recreation and exercise, the trails provide important connections to areas throughout the business park and beyond, however, it rarely connects to the front doors of the businesses.

NEIGHBORHOODS
Residential areas are located within the business park in the north and east areas, including a mix of apartments, condominiums, and townhomes. Additional residential density will occur in the area over time and will generate transit ridership. While these areas are not transit-supportive in nature, they are all linked to the station via the extensive trail network.
Station Location

The Opus station is located in the center of the Opus Business Park, a major employment center with a mix of light industrial, office, housing, hotel accommodations, retail, and restaurants in the station area. The area is characterized by its campus-like setting, circuitous one-way road network, and off-street trail system. The Opus station is anticipated to serve local businesses and residents in the area. This station has strong potential to be a transit stop for reverse commuters.

**OPUS STATION AREA TODAY:**

West entrance on Shady Oak Road

Existing office

Local wetland

Existing trail underpass

NOTE: 10-minute walkshed approximates the area accessible within a 10-minute walk from the station platform using only the existing sidewalk/trail network. See Glossary for walkshed assumptions and methodology.
The following section describes the station area’s EXISTING CONDITIONS, including the local context, land uses, transit and transportation systems, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, assets, destinations, and barriers to accessing the station. This analysis of current conditions presents key issues and opportunities in the station area and informs the recommendations for future station area improvements.

NOTE: Existing conditions maps are based on data provided by Hennepin County and local municipalities. The data used to create each map is collected to varying degrees of accuracy and represents infrastructure and conditions at varying points in time. Actual conditions may vary slightly from what is shown.

**Where Are We Today?**

**Land Use**

The Opus station area is an important employment center with a mix of industrial, light industrial, and office uses. These are the predominant uses in the area, however, there are other uses that will potentially benefit from LRT transit, including nearby residential, hotel, and retail/commercial uses located near Shady Oak Road and Highways 62 and 169. There is also a fair amount of park and open space located to the north of the Opus station.
**Roadway Network**

The roadway network near the Opus station is a circuitous, one-way road network. It presents challenges to uninitiated motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists. Roadways are limited and block sizes are large. Major roadways in the area include Shady Oak Road, located about a half-mile to the west of the station, Highway 62, located about a half-mile to the south of the station, and Highway 169, located about a half-mile to the east of the station.

**Transit**

Existing bus service near the Opus station includes bus route #12, which runs along Bren Road West, with bus stops on Bren Road West and Bren Road East near the proposed station platform. In addition to public bus transit, some local businesses offer a circulator bus shuttle service.
Sidewalk, Trails and Bikeways

The sidewalk system in the Opus station area is extremely limited. The off-street multi-use trail system that runs throughout the Opus campus offers connections to most areas and businesses. While trail access is generally good, many businesses lack trail connections to building entries. The existing trail network in the area offers grade separation from roadways, reducing conflicts between trail users and motorists.

Existing Sanitary Sewer

Sanitary sewer infrastructure consists of a collection of gravity flow sewer mains, lift stations, and pressurized forcemains that transport sewage to a wastewater treatment plant (WWTP). An efficient collection system has the capacity to accommodate all of the existing land uses within its particular sewershed. Beyond capacity, the material and age of pipes within a system can also impact a system’s effectiveness.

Sanitary sewer infrastructure within the project area is typically maintained by either the City of Minnetonka or by the Metropolitan Council Environmental Services (MCES) Division. MCES maintains a series of interceptor trunk sewers which collect sewage at key locations and convey sewage across community boundaries to regional WWTPs. Wastewater from the station area is treated by the MCES Blue Lake WWTP located in Shakopee.
**Existing Water Main**

Water main distribution systems serve to supply potable water to individual properties and to support fire suppression throughout the community. A well-designed system can maintain adequate pressure to support demand of individual properties and provide high flow rates to fire hydrants/fire suppression systems in emergency situations. Because of the complexity of water distribution networks and the importance of pressure, flow, and water quality, City water system models are used to evaluate a system’s adequacy. The material and age of the system’s water mains can also be factors in system breaks, leaks, and pressure and flow degradations.

Water pressure and flow rates can be influenced by: the size of water main serving an area, proximity and elevation relative to a water tower, proximity to a trunk water main with high flow capacity, if the main creates a loop, the demand of adjacent land uses, and the condition of the main.

**Stormwater**

Opus station is located in Nine Mile Creek Watershed District. A significant portion of the drainage is directed north into wetlands and then into Nine Mile Creek. The creek is impaired by chloride and fish biology. In addition, there are numerous wetlands throughout the area, many of which receive piped stormwater. The 100-year floodplain from the creek extends into the north portion of the walk zone.

Discharging within one mile of impaired water may trigger additional National Pollution Discharge Elimination System measures which require additional stormwater management. For impaired waters with a Total Maximum Daily Load, the requirements may increase further. Zoning requirements for areas within the 100-year floodplain may limit development/ redevelopment potential.

Any development/redevelopment is anticipated to improve existing drainage as a result of enforcing City and Watershed requirements.
Where Are We Going?

The plans and diagrams on the following pages illustrate a range of recommendations for infrastructure improvements, station amenities, and potential redevelopment opportunities within the station area.

The ACCESS AND CIRCULATION PLAN shown in Figure 13-9 provides a high level view of how future transit, automobile, bike, and pedestrian systems will connect to the station area and its surroundings.

Figure 13-10 illustrates the STATION AREA IMPROVEMENTS that will facilitate access to and from the station and catalyze redevelopment in the station area. This includes opening day and long-term station area improvements.

Figure 13-11 focuses on OPENING DAY STATION AREA IMPROVEMENTS only. These recommendations represent the improvements necessary to enhance the efficient function of the transit station, roadways, pedestrian and bicycle connections, and transit connections on opening day in 2018.

Station Area Improvements

The discussion below outlines a range of future station area improvements. While some of the identified improvements may be constructed as part of the LRT project itself, other improvements must be funded, designed and constructed by other entities and will require coordination between the City, County, and Metro Transit as well as local stakeholder and community groups.

ROADWAYS

Opening Day Improvements:

» Rely primarily on the existing street and block network to support pedestrians and cyclists. No new roadways are anticipated for opening day.

» Select roadway changes near the LRT station (noted below as long-term improvements) could be constructed by opening day to provide better traffic flow into and out of the area. Such improvements include the reversal of traffic flow on Red Circle Drive and/or Green Oak Drive. As of December 2013, these improvements are not part of the SW LRT anticipated base project scope and are not slated for opening day implementation (subject to change).

Long-Term Improvements:

» Over time, introduce new roads near the station platform. These new roads should be organized to create smaller blocks for future development and intensification near the transit station as well as enhance connections to the stations. Consider two-way movement near the station on these new roads to calm traffic near the station.

» Other future roadway changes near the LRT station include minor realignment and routing changes to Opus Parkway, Yellow Circle Drive, Blue Circle Drive, Green Oak Drive, Red Circle Drive, Bren Road East and Bren Road West, based upon a recent Opus Area Traffic Study prepared for the City of Minnetonka by WSB & Associates.

PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIONS

Opening Day Improvements:

» Extend the path connections from bus stops, Park and Ride, and Kiss and Ride locations to the proposed LRT station platform.

» Develop a new grade-separated crossing of Bren Road East leading to and from the north end of the station platform.

» Locate wayfinding signage at the station and key decision making points along the path network away from the station to direct people to area businesses, homes, and other destinations.

» Initiate path improvements throughout the network (as shown in Figure 13-9 including pedestrian-oriented lighting and underpass improvements.)
WHERE ARE WE GOING?

TRANSPORT CONNECTIONS

Opening Day Improvements:

» Provide new bus facilities near the station platform for connecting bus routes.

» Develop a place for an employer-operated shuttle pick-up and drop-off.

BIKE CONNECTIONS

Opening Day Improvements:

» Provide bike parking to the east of the northern entrance to the platform where it is easily accessible to trail users and is highly visible.

» Explore the potential for bike share facilities at the station and key destinations away from the station to support riding to work from the station.

KISS AND RIDE

Opening Day Improvements:

» Develop a Kiss and Ride / Shuttle loop near the station platform.

PARK AND RIDE

Opening Day Improvements:

» Develop a small temporary Park and Ride facility to the northeast of the station with the intent of redeveloping the site over time.

STATION AMENITIES (Beyond SW LRT Base Project Scope)

Opening Day Improvements:

» Wayfinding – include signage and wayfinding near the station area platform, the Park and Ride/Kiss and Ride facility, and along trails near the station.

» Seating – provide comfortable and durable seating near the station platform and at the Park and Ride facility.

» Lighting – provide adequate lighting for the safety of pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists near the station platform, at the Park and Ride facility, and near the Kiss and Ride/shuttle drop-off.

» Plaza – provide a public plaza area near the station platform to provide transit users with a paved queue area to wait for LRT trains, gather, and move about the station area.

» Bike Facilities – provide bicycle parking, lockers, and bike share facilities in a highly visible area near the station platform.

» Public Art – provide public art in the station area.

LONG-TERM DEVELOPMENT

Long-Term Improvements:

» See the “Development Potential” discussion on page 13-16 for more on long-term development opportunities.

UTILITIES

» See the “Station Area Utility Plan” beginning on page 13-18 for all utility recommendations.
FIGURE 13-9. ACCESS + CIRCULATION PLAN

WHERE ARE WE GOING?

This illustration includes both existing and proposed facilities to show the full network of future bike, pedestrian, automobile, and transit connections.

LRT PLATFORM  F FREIGHT LINE
LRT LINE  NEW ROADWAY
BUS STOP  KISS AND RIDE
PARK AND RIDE  EXISTING WALKSHELD
EXISTING PEDESTRIAN CONNECTION
PROPOSED(DASHED) PEDESTRIAN CONNECTION
EXISTING BIKE CONNECTION
PROPOSED(DASHED) BIKE CONNECTION
EXISTING MULTI USE CONNECTION
PROPOSED(DASHED) MULTI USE CONNECTION

FUTURE WALKSHELD (WITH TSAAP IMPROVEMENTS)

NOTE: Existing walkshed approximates the area accessible within a 10-minute walk from the station platform using only the existing sidewalk/trail network. Future walkshed incorporates all proposed improvements to the sidewalk/trail network. Walksheds are based on GIS modeling and available sidewalk/trail information and may not reflect exact on-the-ground conditions. See Glossary for detailed explanation of walkshed assumptions and methodology.
FIGURE 13-10. STATION AREA IMPROVEMENTS

Where are we going?

Potential Redevelopment Site (2.19 Acres)

Potential Redevelopment Site (2.93 Acres)

Potential Redevelopment Site (2.64 Acres)

Potential Redevelopment Site (2.14 Acres)

Potential Redevelopment Site (0.86 Acres)

Potential Redevelopment Site (0.90 Acres)

Station Area Action Plans

- LRT Platform
- Freight Line
- Bus Stop
- Bus Shelter
- New Sidewalk / Sidewalk Improvement
- On Street Bike Infrastructure
- Multi-Use Path
- New Crossing / Crossing Improvement
- New Roadway
- Bike Parking
- Streetscape
- Park and Ride
- Kiss and Ride
- New Signalized Intersection
- Potential Development Site
- Plaza Space / Building Setback Area

Faded symbology indicates existing facilities and infrastructure.
FIGURE 13-11. OPENING DAY STATION AREA IMPROVEMENTS
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### Opening Day Improvements

The following tables and diagrams outline the proposed improvements to be implemented in advance of SW LRT’s opening day in 2018. Table 13-1 and Figure 13-12 show opening day improvements that are part of the SW LRT anticipated base project scope; these improvements will be part of the overall project cost for construction of the LRT line. Table 13-2 and Figure 13-13 include opening day improvements that are recommended as part of the Southwest Corridor Investment Framework and are beyond SW LRT’s anticipated base project scope.

#### TABLE 13-1. SOUTHWEST LRT ANTICIPATED BASE PROJECT SCOPE - OPENING DAY STATION AREA IMPROVEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAN KEY</th>
<th>IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>PROJECT LOCATION</th>
<th>PROJECT NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>LRT Platform</td>
<td>Along the east side of Bren Rd. E.</td>
<td>Includes related LRT infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Park and Ride</td>
<td>Northeast of station platform</td>
<td>Approx. 90 stall surface lot, leased (includes private shuttle stop/turnaround)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Kiss and Ride</td>
<td>Northeast of station platform</td>
<td>Dropoff area and turnaround within Park and Ride lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Bus Facilities</td>
<td>Bren Rd. W., north of park and ride</td>
<td>New bus bay on Bren Rd W. for 2 bus routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Roadways</td>
<td>Intersection of Bren Rd. E and Bren Rd. W.</td>
<td>Realigned left turn lane from Bren Rd. W. to Bren Rd. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sidewalk/Trail</td>
<td>Bren Rd. E., west of LRT station platform</td>
<td>Grade separated trail crossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Sidewalk/Trail</td>
<td>Bren Rd. W., north of park and ride</td>
<td>ADA access ramp to existing grade separated trail crossing of Bren Rd. W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Bike Facilities</td>
<td>Near station platform</td>
<td>Allowance for bike storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Wayfinding</td>
<td>Near station platform</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>Near station platform</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Water*</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>New water service and fire hydrant to station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Utilities*</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Adjustment of existing utilities w/in project area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Stormwater management*</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Anticipated Southwest LRT Base Project Scope as of December 2013 (subject to change)

* Improvement not symbolized on opening day figures (exact location to be determined as part of the base project scope)

#### TABLE 13-2. SOUTHWEST CORRIDOR INVESTMENT FRAMEWORK (TSAAP) - OPENING DAY STATION AREA IMPROVEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAN KEY</th>
<th>IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>PROJECT LOCATION</th>
<th>PROJECT NOTES</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Park and Ride</td>
<td>Northeast of station platform</td>
<td>Enhanced planting areas/trees</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Roadways</td>
<td>Red Circle Drive Reversal</td>
<td>New connections associated with reversing the traffic flow.</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sidewalk/Trail</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Multi-use trails to complete gaps in trail system w/in 10 min walkshed</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Intersection Enhancement</td>
<td>Bren Rd. E. and Yellow Circle Dr., southeast of station</td>
<td>Grade separated crossings</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bike Facilities</td>
<td>Near station platform</td>
<td>Bike parking, lockers, pump station and bike share facilities (beyond SPO improvements)</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Wayfinding</td>
<td>Near station platform and park and ride</td>
<td>Signage and wayfinding (beyond SPO improvements)</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Stormwater management</td>
<td>Near station platform and park and ride</td>
<td>Green infrastructure (beyond SPO improvements)</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Public Art</td>
<td>Near station platform and park and ride</td>
<td>Public art (beyond SPO improvements)</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Public Plaza</td>
<td>Near station platform</td>
<td>Public plaza with paving, seating, plantings, lighting, and signage (beyond SPO improvements)</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sanitary Sewer</td>
<td>Near station platform</td>
<td>Upsize existing 8-inch sanitary sewer to 10-inch minimum in conjunction with LRT rail construction</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 13-12. SOUTHWEST LRT ANTICIPATED BASE PROJECT SCOPE - OPENING DAY STATION AREA IMPROVEMENTS

FIGURE 13-13. SOUTHWEST CORRIDOR INVESTMENT FRAMEWORK (TSAAP) - OPENING DAY STATION AREA IMPROVEMENTS

# PRIMARY PRIORITY  # SECONDARY PRIORITY
Development Potential

OVERVIEW
Key factors at the Opus station that present opportunities for future redevelopment include the presence of older, low-rise, light industrial buildings near the proposed station platform that may be ripe for redevelopment into more intense, mixed-use.

The land uses in the Opus station area include a mix of office, light industrial, commercial/retail, residential, hotel, and park/open space uses. Several underutilized industrial sites present opportunities for future redevelopment in the area. The property directly east of and adjacent to the proposed station platform presents an opportunity for higher density and mixed land uses.

Key challenges that should be addressed to facilitate development potential include land uses, additional roadways and existing roadway improvements, smaller block sizes near the station, trail connectivity in the station area, and wayfinding.

LAND USES
Development potential for the Opus station area could include a mix of office, light industrial, residential, hotel, and retail uses.

PLANNING STRATEGIES
Strategies that should be considered to facilitate future development in the station area include the introduction of a finer grain of streets and block sizes to enhance station mobility and set up a framework for higher density development near the station. Streetscape and trail improvements connecting the station area with potential development sites, local destinations, neighborhoods, and bus transit facilities will enhance development potential in the area.

FIGURE 13-14. POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

FUTURE LAND USE:
- RETAIL & OTHER COMMERCIAL
- OFFICE
Key Considerations for Change and Development Over Time

Development within the station area should focus on increasing density and mix of uses and creating a walkable street and block network within the Bren Road loop that can connect pedestrians via paths to more remote offices throughout station area. Key considerations should include:

**BUILT FORM AND LAND USE**

» Introduce higher density office, hotel, and commercial development with active street level uses facing the station and key pedestrian routes leading to and from the station.

» Design new buildings in the Bren Road loop to enhance pedestrian access by orienting them towards the street and locating them as close to the street line as possible.

» In employment buildings with manufacturing uses, locate the office components adjacent to pedestrian paths, streets and/or open spaces where they can contribute to street life and promote more “eyes on the street”.

» Should the Merchandise Mart site be redeveloped, ensure new development establishes a new east-west pedestrian connection linking the southern end of the station platform with areas to the east.

» Design and size the Park and Ride facility so that it has the potential to be redeveloped with higher density uses over time.

» Design parking structures to reflect the characteristics of more active building types by screening diagonal ramps, screening parked cars from view, and when next to a street incorporating active uses at street level.

**PUBLIC REALM**

» Restrict outdoor storage within the station area so that it does not detract from the image of the area or discourage new higher density employment uses.

» Initiate pathway improvements including pedestrian-oriented lighting, underpass enhancements, and wayfinding at key decision-making points along all paths leading to and from the station.

**MOBILITY**

» Develop a new walkable street and block pattern on the lands within the Bren Road loop including a new two-way street system connecting Bren Road East with Bren Road West to create an address for new development.

» Extend the existing multi-use path network into the Bren Road Circle from all sides and connect the path extensions to the LRT platform.

» Minimize the impact of parking and circulation on pedestrians by locating parking in structures or to the rear or side of new buildings, and consolidating access and service drives.

» Parking access, loading, and servicing elements should be shielded and located to the rear of the building.

» Limit vehicular access points along Bren Road.
Station Area Utility Plan

OVERVIEW
The station area utility plan and strategies recommended below were developed by considering future transit-oriented development within the station area, as depicted by the Station Area Improvements Plan (Figure 13-10). Minnetonka will need to apply these localized recommendations to the city wide system to ensure that the potential development/ redevelopment will not be limited by larger system constraints. Existing models or other methods can be used to check for system constraints in the station areas.

Minnetonka should also consider reviewing the condition of their existing utilities in the station development area. The station construction would provide Minnetonka an opportunity to address any utilities needing repairs. Once the larger system has been reviewed for system constraints, Minnetonka will be able to accurately plan for necessary utility improvements in their city Capital Improvement Program (CIP). All utilities located beneath the proposed LRT rail or station platform should be encased prior to the construction of these facilities. The cost associated with encasing these facilities is assumed to be a project cost and is not included in potential improvements identified for the City of Minnetonka CIP.

APPROACH
Utility improvement strategies are outlined in this report for the ultimate station area development (2030), as well as improvements which should be considered prior to opening day anticipated in 2018. Although recommendations are categorized in one of these two timeframes, Minnetonka should weigh the benefits of completing more or less of these improvements as land becomes available for future development. Minnetonka should take the utility analysis a level further and model future utilities in their city utility system models.

The proposed development and redevelopment areas were evaluated based on Metropolitan Commission Sewer Availability Charge (SAC) usage rates and estimated flows. Estimated flows for one possible development scenario in this area indicate that internal to the station area, no more than eight inch pipe are necessary to serve the mix of proposed and existing development. Each utility system should still be reviewed to identify capacity and demand constraints to the larger system associated with increase in flows from the proposed developments and existing developments in the area. Minnetonka should anticipate the construction of new municipal utilities in conjunction with new or realigned roadways.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS - SANITARY SEWER
Sanitary sewer recommendations for station area improvements include opportunities for Minnetonka to improve the existing sanitary sewer network, without necessarily replacing existing sewers. When recommendations for “improving” existing sanitary sewer are noted, Minnetonka should consider the level to which each specific sewer should be improved. Methods of improvement could include: lining the existing sewer, pipe joint repair, sewer manhole repair, relocation, and complete replacement.

The following items should be evaluated prior to opening day of the station, although action may not be required until necessary for development:

» Televising existing sewer mains in the station area and proposed development area to determine the condition of the sewer mains, susceptibility for backups or other issues and evaluate for infiltration and Inflow (I&I).

» Locations of known I&I. If previous sewer televising records, city maintenance records, or an I&I study have shown problems, the city should consider taking measures to address the problem.

» The age and material of existing gravity and/or forcemain sanitary sewer in the identified station area. If the lines are older than the material’s typical design life or materials which are susceptible to corrosion relative to soils in the area, the city should consider repairing, lining or replacing the mains.

» Locations of known capacity constraints or areas where city sewer models indicate capacity issues. If there are known limitations, the city should further evaluate the benefit of increasing pipe sizes.

» City sewer system models (existing and future). A review of these models with future development would assist Minnetonka in determining if sewers in the project area should be increased to meet existing or future city system needs.

» Existing sewer pipes should be relocated or encased in areas where they cross or are immediately adjacent to the LRT line/station.
GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS - WATER MAIN

Water main recommendations for station area improvements also include opportunities for Minnetonka to improve the existing water system network. Creating loops in the network can help prevent stagnant water from accumulating along water main stubs, and creating loops of similar sized water main provides the city a level of redundancy in their water network. Redundancy helps reduce the impacts to the community during system repairs, and also helps stabilize the pressure in the network.

The following items should be evaluated prior to opening day of the station, although action may not be required until necessary for development:

» The age and material of the existing mains in the identified station area. If the mains are older than the materials typical design life or materials which are susceptible to corrosion relative to soils in the area, the city should consider replacing the main.

» Locations of previous water main breaks. If water main breaks repeatedly occur in specific areas, the city should consider replacing or repairing the main.

» Locations with known water pressure issues or areas where city models indicate low pressure. If there are known limitations (for either fire suppression or domestic uses), the city should further evaluate the benefit of increasing main sizes.

» Locations with known or potential water quality issues. If there are mains known to be affecting the water quality (color, taste, odor, etc.) of their system, Minnetonka should consider taking measures to address the problem affecting water quality.

» City water system models (existing and future). A review of these models with future development would assist Minnetonka in determining if mains in the project area should be improved to meet existing or future city system needs based on demand constraints.

» Existing water main pipes should be relocated or encased in areas where they cross or are immediately adjacent to the LRT line/station.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS – STORM SEWER

Local storm sewer improvements are recommended to be completed in conjunction with other improvements in the station area. Improvements which will likely require storm sewer modifications include: roadway realignments, roadway extensions, and pedestrian sidewalk/street scape improvements. Storm sewer improvements may consist of: storm sewer construction, manhole reconstruction, drain tile extensions, storm sewer relocation, and complete replacement. These local storm sewer improvements are included as part of the overall cost of roadway and streetscape improvements recommended in this plan. Where roadway/streetscape improvements are part of the SW LRT anticipated base project scope, associated storm sewer improvements are assumed to be a project cost. Minnetonka should also consider coordinating with the local watershed district and other agencies to review the condition of and capacity of existing trunk storm sewer systems serving more regional surface water needs.

STORMWATER BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

There are numerous stormwater best management practices (BMPs) that can be used to address stormwater quality and quantity. As part of this project, BMP guides were developed for four stations (Royalston, Blake, Shady Oak, and Mitchell) which exemplify the range of development intensity and character in the urbanized environment along the Southwest LRT Corridor. The recommendations and practices identified in each of the four BMP guides are applicable to various stations along the corridor.

Potential stormwater management strategies for this station area may be similar to those shown in the BMP guide for the Shady Oak station (see p. 12-28). Minnetonka should consider implementing applicable best management practices similar to those in the Shady Oak Station BMP guide. Stormwater management recommendations should be constructed in conjunction with public and private improvements and future development/renovation in the station area.
Station Area Utility Plan (Continued)

STATION AREA UTILITY RECOMMENDATIONS

Utility recommendations (illustrated in Figure 13-15) are based on a localized analysis of proposed development. It is recommended that the City of Minnetonka take this analysis a step further and review system constraints to the existing and future sanitary sewer and water main systems using existing sewer CAD or water CAD models, or other methods of modeling these systems.

Opening Day Recommendations:

1. Encase existing sanitary sewer crossing the LRT rail construction.
2. Encase existing water main crossing the LRT rail construction.
3. Consider upsizing existing 8-inch sanitary sewer crossing Bren Road E. to 10-inch minimum in conjunction with LRT rail construction (confirm with City model).

Long-Term Recommendations:

1. Construct 8-inch minimum sanitary sewer in conjunction with roadway construction of new streets east of the station.
2. Construct 8-inch minimum water main in conjunction with roadway reconstruction/construction of new streets east of the station.
NEW LIFE IN THE RAW FRONTIER

In the early 1800's, Minnesota was a vast tract of land inhabited only by various bands of Chippewa and Sioux Indians. Around the middle of the century things started to change. Settlers arrived in increasing numbers at St. Paul Landing, the recently designated political capitol for the large expanse of land between the St. Croix and Missouri Rivers.

After a short stay in St. Paul, many of the settlers moved further up river to the smaller village of St. Anthony, the sawmill town by the falls. St. Paul and St. Anthony, both raw frontier communities, offered the excitement, hustle and bustle characteristic of newly created boom towns.

The trail to points west led from these fledgling cities past Lake Calhoun, Lake Harriet, paralleled Minnehaha Creek and eventually ended in the rich farm land surrounding Lake Minnetonka. Those here for the purpose of homesteading or farming followed this trail westward in search of fertile land.

The area comprising Hopkins, Minnetonka, Edina and Eden Prairie soon was settled with families. Civilization had come to this newly instituted Territory of Minnesota. The areas that were populated by these pioneers eventually became towns and villages that still exist today.
The Township of Eden Prairie and Minnetonka came into existence in 1858. Eden Prairie's name was bestowed on it by Elizabeth Ellet, an author of national fame. She was impressed with the beautiful rolling prairies and likened them to her conception of the Garden of Eden. Others must have agreed with her as the township was officially chartered under the name of Eden Prairie in 1858.

About the same time, the Township of Minnetonka was officially chartered, taking its name from the large lake close by. The lake was originally named Peninsula Lake by Calvin Tuttle and Simon Stevens, earlier pioneers. Governor Alexander Ramsey later renamed it Minnetonka, a Sioux word meaning big water.

Hopkins, then a part of Minnetonka Township, had its beginning roughly around 1870. The Minneapolis and St. Louis Railway purchased right-of-ways across farmers' land for their line to St. Louis, Missouri. Once the line was completed, a station was constructed opposite the home of Harley Hopkins and was given the name of Hopkins. With the added growth brought by the railroad, Hopkins became an entity in its own right and in 1887 the village was formally incorporated and separated from Minnetonka Township.

In 1888, Edina followed suit, electing to make their settlement a separate village from that of Richfield. Andrew and John Craik, immigrants from the Old World and pioneers in the new Territory, had come to Minnesota from Edinburgh, Scotland. They opened a flour mill and named it Edina in honor of their homeland. It is from the Craik brothers' Edina flour mill that the village of Edina took its name.

From their first perilous foothold, these four cities grew and prospered. Today, they offer Minnesota a heritage rich in determination, vision and progress, a history as much a part of the present and future as it is of the past.

At the convergence of these four progressive communities, a new pioneering effort has begun. 410 acres of small truck farms and private estates that once belonged to the Minnesota Pioneers has been acquired by Rauenhorst Corporation. The land, located in Minnetonka, Edina, and Eden Prairie, and bordered by Hopkins, will be the site of a new innovative community geared to our modern way of working and living.
There has long been a need for a new approach to community planning, especially on a large scale. Major cities, unlike smaller communities, are decades behind in responding to our present needs, work habits and life styles. Traffic systems and patterns can no longer handle the growing number of commuters. Present day transportation is producing a pollution problem that was undreamed of back in the 1950's and early 60's. Today's major cities are no longer people oriented.

Mr. Rauenhorst, aware of the direction community planning has taken in the last twenty years and of the problems that have resulted, devised an entirely new approach, one that was people oriented. He called it Opus 2.

Opus 2 combines the history of the past, needs of the present and the projected requirements of the future into a self-contained working/living center offering 95% of what is essential to life. It coordinates office, industrial, commercial and residential areas into an integral working/living environment able to provide jobs, recreation, housing, shopping, medical and cultural facilities. It is self-sustaining, making it profitable for companies to locate there, and it is convenient for commuting. Opus, which means creation, is an appropriate name to apply to this unusual approach to community planning.
A SEARCH SPARKS THE BEGINNING

Opus 2 went from concept to reality when Data 100 approached Rauenhorst Corporation to build new Corporate Headquarters, an office and plant facility. Rauenhorst was asked to find a suitable site within a designated area. Twenty-five acres were eventually located west of the Twin Cities bordered by Shady Oak Road, County Road 18 and Crosstown Highway 62. While in the process of acquiring the land for Data 100, Rauenhorst noticed that the adjoining acreage was also available. The area was ideal for the Opus 2 concept. The most important criteria were there: Proximity to the surrounding communities, existing access through roads and freeways and over 400 acres of undeveloped land in a suburban location. Rauenhorst Corporation decided to use this opportunity to implement Opus 2.
PREPARATION AND CONSERVATION

Much in-depth research was required concerning the environmental aspects of Opus 2's impact on the area. Independent studies were initiated to determine the feasibility of the automobile primary road system and the pedestrian traffic secondary road system concept as it related to the land use pattern. An environmental assessment was performed. Informal meetings were held with several different agencies, councils, commissions, and governments at the staff level including: the Nine Mile Creek Watershed District, the Environmental Quality Control Council, the Metropolitan Council, the Hennepin County Highway Department, the planning and engineering staffs of Edina, Eden Prairie, Hopkins, and Minnetonka, the Hennepin County Conservation Department and the Metropolitan Transit Commission.

Input received from these groups helped to determine the strength of each element of the Opus 2 concept and how well it would work with other elements of the plan. One of the main elements Rauenhorst Corporation considered during planning was preservation of the area's natural amenities. Rather than redesign the topography to fit the needs of Opus 2, Opus 2 has been designed to coordinate with the environment that already exists. Great care is being taken to preserve ecosystems such as wooded sections, marshes, knolls, valleys and natural water retention areas that enrich and enhance the environmental setting. It is this care and concern for the unspoiled beauty of the land that makes Opus 2 unique.
WORKING IN OPUS 2

Opus 2 is a staged development, taking an estimated ten years for completion. The industrial and office portions of Opus 2, consisting of 2 million square feet, are presently being developed. These will be coordinated with the 55,000 square foot neighborhood convenience shopping center, some residential housing and the 300,000 square foot multi-purpose service center.

Designed to fit today's working/living needs, Opus 2 offers many advantages not found elsewhere. Opus 2's location is nearly perfect for the businessman. Services such as restaurants, hotels, shopping centers, and some of the Twin Cities' greatest recreational facilities are located either in Opus 2 or are just moments away. Opus 2 is serviced by one of the metropolitan area's major arteries, Crosstown Highway 62, which puts the office, commercial and industrial areas of downtown Minneapolis, downtown St. Paul, the suburbs that circle the metropolitan area and the Minneapolis/St. Paul International Airport within minutes of the busy executive. Opus 2 is situated in the heart of the blue and white collar labor markets and is surrounded by four executive residential communities.

Added to this, buildings constructed in Opus 2 are architecturally designed to meld with the environment, avoiding visual congestion and enhancing the natural scenic amenities.

As Opus 2 was being engineered, much thought was given to controlling traffic peaks, thus avoiding rush hour traffic jams. The result is a dual roadway system.
that intra-connects Opus 2. It consists of a one-way primary roadway for standard automobiles and a two-way secondary roadway for pedestrian, bicycle traffic and electric vehicles. The two systems are totally separate and are bridged wherever they intersect. Traffic from the primary system can’t cross over or interfere with traffic on the secondary system. Counter-rotating traffic circles and the use of one-way streets in the primary system enable 50,000 vehicles to move in and out of Opus 2 daily without ever encountering oncoming vehicles, traffic signals or stop signs. This transportation system permits easy employee and customer access to all areas of Opus 2 in a continuous and uninterrupted fashion.

Opus 2 is in an ideal location for eventually connecting with mass transportation systems of the surrounding communities of Hopkins, Edina, Eden Prairie, Minnetonka, Minneapolis and St. Paul. Although Opus 2 is presently only minutes from these office, commercial and industrial areas, interconnected mass transportation will further tie Opus 2 into the Metropolitan business community.
LIVING IN OPUS 2

The central feature that blends the office, commercial and industrial portion of Opus 2 with the residential areas is the focal point of the working/living community, the multi-purpose service center. This structure, intended to serve Opus 2 and the surrounding area, will combine a number of uses on the same site. Proposed are high-value specialty shops, cultural facilities such as a community theater, an ecumenical chapel, dining establishments, police, fire and medical auxiliary services, all combined and located in a uniquely designed building.

Situated within casual walking distance of the multi-purpose service center will be a number of neighborhoods, each with its own architectural style and individual characteristics. They will be serviced by the same primary and secondary roadway system that intra-connects the office, commercial and industrial portions of Opus 2.

The treatment of the residential areas will reflect the Rauenhorst Corporation commitment to preserve and enhance the natural environment. Exquisitely manicured grounds will accent the aesthetically designed buildings. Each neighborhood will vary in density and will be convenient to the office, commercial and industrial portions of Opus 2, as well as to the surrounding services, communities, mass transportation systems, parks and recreational areas. The housing will range from rental units to condominiums, providing a way of life that is both distinctive and elegant. Residents will enjoy comfort, beauty, quality and peace of mind living.

Opus 2 living is designed for the discriminating. The over one thousand units planned will provide the ultimate in modern living, offering a new vista in housing experience.
EXCITING CHALLENGES

Numerous challenges are presented by the Opus 2 project; corporate headquarters with adjacent housing, mixed professional, commercial, office, and research facilities, industrial condominiums, preservation of natural amenities, aesthetically designed buildings, new techniques of crime prevention through internal security systems, experimentation with energy supply, the primary/secondary roadway concept, mass transit systems and people movers. These are just a few of the exciting developments planned for Opus 2.

Intense research is presently underway concerning the last category, people movers. Proposed are electric vehicles. They would be advantageous to residents as they would adapt to the dual roadway concept, would cost a fraction of the present sub-compact car, both to purchase and to operate, and they would be non-polluting.

RAUENHORST CORPORATION AND OPUS 2

Opus 2 originated from Mr. Rauenhorst's deep-seated conviction that he and his firm have a responsibility to society to research and create new methods and ideas for living and working. These new ideas are then implemented through the Rauenhorst Corporation concept of Total Responsibility which includes: site selection, architectural design, financing, development, engineering, construction, leasing, management and maintenance—all under one unified contract. As applied to Opus 2, the Total Responsibility concept has played a major role in helping to create a compatible working/living environment, developed and maintained along stringent standards, that will provide 95% of what is essential to life as well as ensure steadily increasing property values for your firm's investment. Therefore, Opus 2 isn't just another development. It's a singular working/living experience at the crossroad of what was, and what ought to be.

OPUS 2—CROSSROADS OF TOMORROW, TODAY.
THE CITY OF MINNETONKA

Critical to the development of an enterprise such as Opus 2 is the understanding, and support of local governmental bodies during the planning, programming, and construction phases. We have been fortunate indeed to have had a cooperative endeavor emerge with a number of such governmental groups, but especially with the City of Minnetonka. Even as we wrote our Opus 2 brochure, events were moving forward with gratifying rapidity. Zoning of our industrial park and commercial areas was obtained, concept plan approval for the housing area of the plan was granted, and an industrial revenue bond issue providing for the timely completion of the industrial/commercial areas was authorized by the City Council.

We at Rauenhorst Corporation extend special thanks and appreciation to the Council, Planning Commission, and Staff of Minnetonka for their assistance in making the promise of Opus 2 a reality today.

[Signature]

Gerald Rauenhorst
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INTRODUCTION

Marquette Advisors was retained by the Family Housing Fund as the fiscal agent on behalf of Southwest LRT Community Works, Twin Cities LISC, and the partner cities of Minneapolis, St. Louis Park, Hopkins, Edina, Minnetonka and Eden Prairie to provide a “Housing Gaps Analysis” in reference to the planned Southwest Light Rail Transit (“SWLRT”) Corridor. SWLRT will span approximately 15 miles, with 17 planned stations in Minneapolis, St. Louis Park, Hopkins, Minnetonka and Eden Prairie. The Housing Gaps Analysis is a critical component in developing a corridor-wide housing strategy, the goals and principles of which are outlined below.

SWLRT Community Works Goals:

- Economic competitiveness and job growth
- Promoting opportunities for business and employment growth
- Housing choices
- Positioning the Southwest LRT communities as a place for all to live
- Quality neighborhoods
- Creating unique, vibrant, safe, beautiful, and walkable station areas
- Critical connections
- Improving affordable regional mobility for all users

SWLRT Community Works Guiding Principles for Investment:

- Partner for Effective Planning and Implementation
- Create Great Quality Transit Oriented Development and Achieve Unique, Vibrant Places
- Stimulate Employment and Economic Development
- Provide a full Range of Housing Choices
- Strengthen Communities through Connections and Access to Opportunity
- Maintain and Improve Natural Systems
- Build Healthy Communities
- Enhance Tax Base

The Housing Gaps Analysis utilizes prior research, notably the SW Community Works Housing Inventory, along with station-area plans, maps and related data and research compiled to date through the SW Community Works Corridor Investment Framework.
The primary objectives of the Housing Gaps Analysis are as follows:

The Housing Gaps Analysis provides a review of existing conditions and interprets prior studies, building upon complementary research and data, and engaging a full range of stakeholders in the analysis of the corridor, demographics, land use, growth patterns, and housing market conditions. The Gaps Analysis provides a forward-looking analysis regarding the potential for residential development within the SWLRT corridor, and future housing supply gaps, answering the following key questions:

**Work Scope Key Questions**

- **Who** will want to live here, and why?
- **How many** households would choose to reside in TOD housing within the SWLRT Corridor?
- What are the **characteristics** of those households, particularly with respect to age, income, household size and employment status?
- What **types of housing** are needed to accommodate this level of growth?
- Furthermore, what are expected future **supply gaps**, comparing what the market is expected to produce with a “full range” of housing choices by affordability level?
- What are **market inefficiencies** and barriers to development (and/or preservation) of a full range of housing choices within the Corridor? And what are some specific **strategies, policies and tools** to mitigate those barriers?
- What is the **impact of SWLRT upon the existing housing stock and resident base**? (i.e. what are risks associated with gentrification?)
- What **tools, policies and strategies** are appropriate in order to set the stage for quality development and the provision of a full range of housing choices for the SWLRT corridor?

“**Corridor**” **Definition:** For this Housing Gaps Analysis, the SWLRT Corridor is defined as that area comprising a ½ mile radius around each of the planned LRT stations.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This section describes, in brief, key findings and recommendations derived from the Housing Gaps Analysis. The information presented in this section are meant as a summary of, not a substitute for the body of the report, which contains additional information and detail critical to a full understanding of the analysis, the recommendations provided, and the context within which they were formulated.

Background & Context

Marquette Advisors was retained to provide a Housing Gaps Analysis related to the SWLRT Corridor. The “Corridor” as defined for purposes of this analysis comprises a ½ mile radius surrounding each of the planned LRT stations. The Housing Gaps Analysis is a critical component in the development of a corridor-wide housing strategy by SWLRT Community Works, along with its partner communities (Minneapolis, St. Louis Park, Edina, Hopkins, Minnetonka and Eden Prairie), and a full range of stakeholders. To date, considerable research and planning has already been done, inclusive of the SW Community Works Corridor Housing Inventory and the Investment Framework. The Housing Gaps Analysis interprets and builds upon these work elements and provides further research and analysis, culminating in recommendations intended to guide future planning that will “set the stage” for a “full range of housing choices” within the corridor.
The Housing Gaps Analysis provides recommendations for new residential development for the corridor as a whole, and for individual station areas, and identifies future supply gaps. The report discusses market inefficiencies and addresses the need for creative public/private partnerships that will help to facilitate the provision of a full range of housing choices in the corridor over the long-term.

Demographics -- Key Findings:

The SWLRT corridor is home to 37,000 residents and 19,000 households. The majority (about 2/3) are renters. Trend is likely to continue, based on demographics, lifestyle, and market factors.

The Twin Cities Metro Area is expected to grow by 11,000 to 13,000 households/year through 2030. 80% of growth is expected to be households without children, and nearly 1/3 of regional growth expected to be single-person households.

Millenials and Baby Boomers are having a major impact on Twin Cities housing market. Both segments are drawn to high-density multifamily housing products which feature “efficiency in living,” and connectivity to work, goods/services, public facilities, and entertainment/amenities. We expect that TOD housing products and SWLRT will appeal to both market segments.
Corridor Employment – Key Findings:

107,000 workers in corridor -- The corridor features a strong corporate presence, with a deep and diverse economic base. The corridor provides a “full range” of jobs, ranging from entry-level part time positions up to high-level management and executive positions in a wide range of industries.

Corridor workers a target for new TOD housing -- Less than 4% of the corridor’s 107,000 workers also reside within ½ mile of SWLRT presently. New housing products near SWLRT are expected to appeal to corridor workers.

Earnings & housing affordability -- Importantly, we note that a full 20% of the corridor employee-base earns less than $1,250 per month. A household with a single wage-earner at this level could afford a monthly housing payment of just $375 per month. Two workers at this level could afford a monthly housing cost of about $750. Worker earnings were a key factor considered by Marquette Advisors in developing recommendations for housing construction & preservation in the corridor.

Educational Facilities -- Key Findings:

Expect modest impact of housing development upon local schools – Considering demographic trends and expected development patterns, fueled by growth from single-persons households and households without children, TOD housing developments along SWLRT are not expected to have a substantial impact on enrollment at any one educational facility within the corridor.

TOD may boost open enrollment – The development of SWLRT will improve connectivity of residents with schools and, thus, will create opportunities for open enrollment, with students utilizing SWLRT to commute to/from their place of residence to school.

SWLRT housing will likely appeal to school teachers and other staff – The development of new workforce and market rate rental housing, as well as entry-level for sale housing, may in fact be attractive to teachers and other school staff who presently commute longer distances due to an affordability gap between current salaries and corridor housing costs.

Residential Development Outlook – Key Findings:

Market demand = 13,000  Outlook – Key Fin (2015-2030). This represents a gap between existing housing inventory and the number of households who will want to live along the corridor.

Recommended Development Goal = 11,000 new units. Tempered to reflect development constraints: land availability, land use factors, development cost factors, etc. However, at least 20% of these units still not feasible but for public/private partnerships and gap financing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station Area</th>
<th>0-30% AMI</th>
<th>30-60% AMI</th>
<th>60-80% AMI</th>
<th>80-100% AMI</th>
<th>100% of AMI+</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Entry-Level</th>
<th>Mid-Mkt</th>
<th>High-End</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Royalston</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van White</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lake</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bettline</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooddale</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake Rd.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Hopkins</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Oak</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City West</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Triangle</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP Town Center</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** Total</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>6,402</td>
<td>9,922</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>11,236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Future development potential for 21st St. Station Area to be determined.

Source: Marquette Advisors
New unit mix - 90% rental, 10% home ownership -- Why? Considers demographics, economics and lifestyle factors. Regional and corridor growth dominated by small households. Market preference for efficient and convenience in housing, with strong connectivity to jobs and “urban” amenities. Approximately 1/3 of new construction recommended affordable up to 100% of AMI.

- 12% (1,300 units) - <60% AMI
- 9% (1,000 units) - 61% to 80% AMI
- 12% (1,300 units) - 61% to 80% AMI

Station Area recommendations for new construction take into account the following factors:

- Current housing inventory, demographic composition and economic base
- Land availability - ownership of undeveloped and/or under-utilized parcels
- Characteristics of surrounding land use (as-is and future expectations)
- Proximity to jobs, types of jobs & incomes levels, proximity to goods/services, public and educational facilities and other modes of transit

Mixed-income residential development a “best practice” related to inclusionary housing in the corridor -- Publicly owned sites present the best short-term opportunity for this type of development.

Housing Preservation – Key Findings:

Affordable housing is a primary asset within the corridor presently – Corridor features an estimated 7,700 units which are affordable to households earning <60% of AMI, representing almost ½ of the existing rental stock.

Limited risk of gentrification – Existing supply includes older product mix (1960’s/70’s vintage). Rents in many cases are well below 60% of AMI target. Age/quality and market obsolescence limits potential for major rent increases.

Housing preservation far less expensive than construction of new units – Providing new housing at levels which are affordable to households earning <60% of AMI, even up to 80-100% of AMI, is a significant challenge due to cost factors. Barriers to development are significant. Thus, particular focus should be given to preserving and improving the existing housing stock.
Corridor Strengths – Key Findings:

Strong demographics and high-quality real estate – The SW corridor features some of the region’s highest-quality and highest-valued real estate. High-quality housing stock, stable neighborhoods, close to parks and recreational opportunities, shopping and restaurants.

Strong corporate presence and jobs base -- There corridor features depth and diversity in its employment base, with 107,000 jobs in the corridor. Proximity of the station areas to major employment nodes bodes well for connectivity and desirability of future TOD housing.

City staff are experienced and familiar with development tools – Our analysis and interviews indicates that city planning staff and administration have a firm grasp of redevelopment “tools” and experience in the types of public/private partnerships which will be required to achieve corridor housing goals.

Key Development Challenges:

Limited vacant land supply and shortage of publicly-owned sites – Much of the corridor is already built-out. The limited supply of developable land, paired with expected strong market demand for housing (and commercial forms of development) results in escalating land values. This poses the single-most significant barrier to the development of a full range of housing choices in many station areas.

Land use issues reduce redevelopment potential - Private ownership; highest and best use issues. Redevelopment is complicated and costly. It requires substantial investment or sale by private land/property owners. The objectives and risk tolerance of current property owners varies substantially.

Auto-oriented areas, lacking pedestrian/bike friendly amenities & connectivity – Several of the station areas are presently auto-oriented. Considerable investment in pedestrian/bike connectivity and public realm elements will be required in order to create the type of lifestyle environment preferred by prospective TOD residents.

Many stations lack street “vibrancy” and supporting commercial/restaurant nodes and public amenities – The region’s population base has shown a strong preference for housing in mixed-use neighborhoods which provide walkability and easy access to a variety of amenities – shops, restaurants, parks, trails, and recreational features, and entertainment. These elements should be incorporated in station area planning.
Recommendations & Next Steps:

Consensus, “buy-in” and commitment are critical to success – Joint powers agreements and representation of all corridor communities and stakeholder groups will be paramount to achieving the housing goals set forth by SWLRT Community Works.

Housing preservation strategy needed to invest in quality and sustainability of existing affordable housing stock – The strategy and investment model(s) should include the following elements:

- **Deploys capital which invests in the quality, sustainability and long-term affordability of this aging housing stock.** This will require dedicated funds and creative partnerships with private owners and non-profit development/management partners.
- **Match services with the resident base** -- fostering upward mobility within the community’s economy and housing market. Partnerships involving the public sector and varied advocate groups with corporate partners and educational institutions should be developed in order to provide services such as job/life skills education and household economics/financial advisory services and counseling.

Develop “branding” and promotions strategy for SWLRT lifestyle – What is TOD? And what kind of lifestyle will TOD housing and SWLRT provide? Promote market awareness of the benefits to TOD living in SW corridor.

Station area master planning -- Focus on stations with significant public land ownership and near-term development opportunities. This presents an opportunity for a “signature” development on SWLRT which demonstrates all desired “lifestyle” elements and provides a “full range” of housing choices. Success is critical in short-term developments, and sets the stage for future success in other station areas. To ensure success, the master planning process must engage a full range of stakeholders, both public and private. The Corridor Development Initiative (CDI) model is a best-practice and should be an integral component of future station area planning, as it provides a framework for collaboration and consensus building around quality planning.

Develop consensus and adopt housing policy goals – The partner communities should work together to build consensus around the concept of “full housing choice” and preservation and production goals. We suggest the creation of a coordinated SWLRT Housing Policy Overlay Zone, for the area within ½ mile of each LRT station. This area should be established for application of housing goals, policy and oversight. The structure and composition of which should be determined by the stakeholders, as buy-in from all corridor cities is key to success. We recommend that cities maintain development review/approval authority, utilizing their own “toolbox” and strategies which promote housing development and preservation which is consistent with the goals established within the SWLRT housing strategy.
Establish a $200m+ TOD Affordable Housing Fund -- Why? Existing tools/strategies are not enough to have impact at major scale. A dedicated funding source is needed to support construction of 1,300 new units at <60% of AMI and to preserve/improve 7,700 existing units affordable at <60% of AMI.

**Fund Structure:**
- Independently financed pool of funds that provides a return to investors
- More risk tolerant than traditional financing
- Patient financing with longer term payback

**Possible Capitalization:**
- Local foundations & intermediaries
- Family funds and partnerships
- Corporate interests (e.g. major businesses in SW corridor)
- Traditional institutional investment sources (insurance companies, etc)

While Marquette Advisors believes a program which provides a return to investors and generates cash flow for re-investment is the preferred structure, some type of public/private alignment might work under certain governing circumstances. While not a charge of this engagement, Marquette believes that some form of overarching authority driving the Fund would enhance achievement of housing policy and development/preservation goals.

A $200 million fund, properly designed and leveraged, should be able to provide key (and currently missing) capital to drive development and preservation which meets stated housing production and preservation goals.
ASSESSMENT OF PRIOR RESEARCH

A primary objective of this assignment is to answer the following key question: What housing types and values are missing from the corridor to capture future market demand? The following points summarize the varied data elements and trends considered in developing our analysis and estimates regarding the potential for housing development (and preservation) within the SWLRT½ mile corridor. This is followed by a summary of our findings and estimates of household growth and housing development potential for the corridor as a whole and for each individual station area.

Data Sources and Research Considered

We have reviewed and utilized the *SW Community Works Housing Inventory*, completed in 2013, which contains extensive data on the existing housing stock, resident and employment base for the corridor. More recently, we were able to review a June 2014 report entitled *“Twin Cities Metropolitan Council Area Trends, Preferences, and Opportunities: 2010 to 2020, 2030 and 2040,”* prepared for the Met Council Community Development Committee by Arthur C. Nelson, Ph.D., FAICP. This study presents a timely analysis of demographic trends and household characteristics at the metro level and relates these trends to future housing needs in light of changes ongoing relative to our population base and how future households will live and work in the region. Numerous other research, documents and planning studies were reviewed by Marquette Advisors as part of this engagement and are accordingly referenced throughout this report where relevant.

In assessing the potential for housing development (and preservation) within the corridor, Marquette Advisors has considered all relevant data and market factors, such as economic and demographic data and forecasts by the Met Council and ESRI, a nationally recognized econometric forecasting firm. Importantly, we have analyzed the current economic base and employment conditions within the corridor and metro-wide, together with growth forecasts by industry and occupation from sources including the Met Council and MN-DEED.

As well, we have reviewed land use, commuting patterns, and current residential market conditions in the southwest metro area, utilizing Marquette Advisors proprietary multi-family database along with published data and reporting on Twin Cities housing market conditions. We have also utilized prior research such as the *SW Community Works Housing Inventory (2013), The Space Between Report (2013)*, and all station area planning and studies compiled to date, notably the *SW Community Works Corridor Investment Framework (“Investment Framework”)* and related *Transitional Station Area Action Plans (“TSAAP”)* from 2013.

Based on our review of the Investment Framework planning documents and our own field research and analysis we have taken into consideration current land use, land availability and cost, and the “ripeness” of sites for development (and/or change in use) in each station area. Our recommendations take into consideration Investment Framework recommendations regarding future land use and housing within the context of other uses, inclusive of retail, office,
industrial, recreational and institutional components, together with our own assessment relative to market and land use trends.

We have also evaluated TOD development trends throughout the Twin Cities and in other markets such as Seattle, Charlotte, Denver, Washington DC and Dallas. We have analyzed housing construction trends along both the Blue Line (Hiawatha) and the Green Line (Central Corridor). We have evaluated national TOD trends through sources such as the Center for Transit Oriented Development and publications and interviews with TOD analysts and policy experts in other markets, including those at the National Housing Conference, Center for Housing Policy, and Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

**Current Resident Base**

The ½ mile corridor is home to approximately 37,000 residents and 19,000 households. The table on the following page, taken from the *SW Community Works Housing Inventory*, shows the population and household composition within ½ mile of each station site.

*Key findings are as follows:*

- The majority of corridor residents are renters, with 12,425 renter households (66%) and 6,400 homeowners (34%). By comparison, for the Twin Cities Metro Area as a whole, an estimated 70% of households own their homes.

- Approximately 1.3% of Twin Cities Metro Area households reside in the corridor presently. The corridor grew by an estimated 6,800 persons and 3,600 households between 2000 and 2012, capturing only about 3.2% of Metro Area household growth during this timeframe.

- Interestingly, the corridor at this time is somewhat younger, on average, compared to the region as a whole, as 52% of the resident base is under the age of 35, with a relatively large group of persons between the ages of 25 and 34. As well, the corridor features a relatively high concentration of renters, as 66% of corridor households were renters, compared to 36% throughout Hennepin County.
## POPULATION AND HOUSEHOLD GROWTH TRENDS
### SWLRT STATIONS HALF-MILE RADIUS
#### 2000-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2000</strong></td>
<td><strong>2010</strong></td>
<td><strong>Change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalston</td>
<td>1,716</td>
<td>3,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van White</td>
<td>1,298</td>
<td>2,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn</td>
<td>2,717</td>
<td>2,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st Street</td>
<td>1,692</td>
<td>1,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lake</td>
<td>4,122</td>
<td>4,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beltline</td>
<td>3,706</td>
<td>3,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooddale</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>2,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>1,986</td>
<td>2,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake Road</td>
<td>4,212</td>
<td>5,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins</td>
<td>3,476</td>
<td>3,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Oak</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opus</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>1,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City West</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Triangle</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.P. Town Center</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>29,951</td>
<td>36,730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>2010-2017</strong></th>
<th><strong>2000-2010</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Pct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalston</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van White</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn</td>
<td>1,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st Street</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lake</td>
<td>2,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beltline</td>
<td>2,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooddale</td>
<td>891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>1,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake Road</td>
<td>2,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins</td>
<td>1,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Oak</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opus</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City West</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Triangle</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.P. Town Center</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>15,193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Metropolitan Council Regional Forecast to 2040

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forecast Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2,850,000</td>
<td>1,118,000</td>
<td>1,548,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>3,102,000</td>
<td>1,257,000</td>
<td>1,819,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>3,381,000</td>
<td>1,386,000</td>
<td>1,953,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>3,674,000</td>
<td>1,509,000</td>
<td>2,097,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau; ESRI; Maxfield Research, Inc.
Twin Cities Population & Household Growth Forecasts

We have considered growth forecasts by both the Met Council and ESRI, and data regarding the composition of the population/household base, in developing estimates of future household growth potential for the SWLRT corridor. It is important to understand not only the pace of growth, but also changes in the composition of the area’s population base over time.

Long-term forecasts by the Met Council predict that the Twin Cities Metro Area (7 counties) will grow by an average of about 13,000 households per year over the next 20 years. By comparison, short-term forecasts by national econometric forecasting firm ESRI suggest that the region will grow by around 11,000 households per year in the between 2014 and 2019. The ESRI (short-term) and Met Council (long-term) forecasts are complementary and integral to our analysis and recommendations. The forecasts indicate that the pace of household growth will likely increase over the long-term. Meanwhile, the short-term projections by ESRI provide significant detail and segmentation by household income, size, type and tenure which we have used in providing detailed development recommendations for specific station areas in the short-term.

An analysis of short-term household growth by age cohort is presented on the following page. The table depicts projected household growth for the seven-county metro area between 2013 and 2018, according to short term forecasts by ESRI. It is interesting to note where the growth is expected to occur, by age cohort, and the aging of the population base. The “Millenials” (a.k.a. Generation Y or “Gen Y”) is having a major impact upon our society, economy and housing markets, as the size of this generation is considerably larger compared to those preceding it. This group was born between the late 1970s and about 2000. Millenials, also known as the “echo boomers” (children of baby boomers), have generated strong demand for apartments throughout the nation and in the Twin Cities market, and this trend continues to date.
### Twin Cities Metro Area

#### Projected 5-Yr Growth Trend -- Households by Age and Income, 2013-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households by Age of Householder</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Households</td>
<td>47,954</td>
<td>46,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pct. Metro Household Base</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median HH Income</td>
<td>$29,358</td>
<td>$32,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average HH Income</td>
<td>$38,991</td>
<td>$43,503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Change, 2013-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Households</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1,329</td>
<td>2,807</td>
<td>11,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,678</td>
<td>-17,043</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sources: ESRI Business Information Solutions; Marquette Advisors

---

**Impact of Millenials and Baby Boomers on Housing Choice & Development Trends**

**Millenials...**

Young renters (i.e. mid-20’s to early 30’s) have shown a strong positive response to multifamily housing products in recent years, particularly in urban neighborhoods and well-sited suburban locations, showing a preference for small, but efficient units in close proximity to their place of employment, with strong “walkability” and connectivity elements and good access to urban amenities (recreational, cultural and shops/restaurants in particular).

It is interesting to note the aging of Millenials and the impact of this trend upon the overall Twin Cities resident composition. Between 2013 and 2018 (and beyond), many of these households will be aging into their mid-30’s and 40’s. **We expect that TOD (SWLRT included) will appeal to many of these same households who may have recently demonstrated a preference for more urban living (Downtown or Uptown Minneapolis neighborhoods for example, which have seen a major increase in upscale apartment developments).**
In the near future, many of these same renters will consider alternative housing that is no longer in the “middle of the action” but still provides good access (via LRT) to those same urban amenities. As well, as the demand and price of the Downtown and Uptown submarkets continues to rise ($2.10-$2.30+ psf today and rising) (generally $1,200-$2,500+ per unit), we expect that more price sensitive renters (and buyers) will seek “urban” housing opportunities outside the Downtown and Uptown markets.

**Boomers…**

At the same time, we note the aging of the large Baby Boom generation and this impact on housing needs. Senior housing and care needs are expected to be significant, particularly in the long-term (10-20 yrs), as large numbers of Twin Cities residents age into their 70s and beyond. Meanwhile, already in the short-term, we expect that older adults and “empty nesters” (many in the age 55-64 cohort) will consider alternative housing arrangements. Many Baby Boomers currently reside in single family homes and will seek out somewhat more “efficient” living arrangements, often times smaller, less maintenance intensive, well-located multifamily housing products in locations which afford them convenient access to amenities and employment. TOD housing products, then, must be sensitive to this trend and the potential to accommodate these groups. As well, the development of new housing products for this group (and seniors over the long term) will also provide opportunities for home-ownership among younger groups (note the growing age 35-44 group, for example) who will purchase the homes of older adults and seniors.

**Key Growth Segments: Households without Children & Single-Person Households**

We have also analyzed data and forecasting regarding the size and type of household growth expected to occur in the Twin Cities Metro Area. The table on the following page is extracted from that report, and shows household growth and composition (with children, without children, and persons living alone) for the 2010 to 2020 and 2010 to 2030 timeframes.

According to the Met Council, households without children are expected to account for approximately 80% of the household growth in the Twin Cities Metro Area between 2010 and 2020. The majority of household growth is expected to be comprised of single persons and couples without children. In fact, 34% of metro area household growth is expected to be single-person households. In the central counties (Hennepin and Ramsey) single-person households are expected to comprise an even greater share of household growth, at 42%.

These trends have a major implication with respect to required housing products in the region during this timeframe, and through 2030. In fact, the Arthur Nelson report concludes that these growth segments will show a strong preference for urban housing, and primarily high-density multifamily residential configurations. From our analysis of demographic data paired with review of housing supply and demand factors, we concur.
### Change in Households by Type, 2010-2020, 2030 and 2040

**[Figures in thousands]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Minnesota</th>
<th>Metro Council</th>
<th>Central Counties</th>
<th>Non-Central Counties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline, 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>116,045</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs with Children</td>
<td>34,814</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs without Children</td>
<td>82,131</td>
<td>1,473</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People living alone</td>
<td>31,284</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Change in Households by Type, 2010-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Minnesota</th>
<th>Metro Council</th>
<th>Central Counties</th>
<th>Non-Central Counties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households 2020</td>
<td>130,556</td>
<td>2,335</td>
<td>1,267</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Growth</td>
<td>13,811</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs with Children</td>
<td>30,857</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs w/o Children Change</td>
<td>1,843</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs w/o Children Share</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs without Children</td>
<td>93,699</td>
<td>1,691</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs w/o Children Change</td>
<td>11,768</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs w/o Children Share</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People living alone</td>
<td>37,773</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People living alone Change</td>
<td>6,509</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People living alone Share</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Change in Households by Type, 2010-2030

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Minnesota</th>
<th>Metro Council</th>
<th>Central Counties</th>
<th>Non-Central Counties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households 2030</td>
<td>143,232</td>
<td>2,566</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Growth</td>
<td>26,287</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs with Children</td>
<td>38,368</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs with Children Change</td>
<td>3,544</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs with Children Share</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs without Children</td>
<td>104,874</td>
<td>1,899</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs w/o Children Change</td>
<td>22,743</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs w/o Children Share</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People living alone</td>
<td>45,299</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People living alone Change</td>
<td>14,035</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People living alone Share</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** graphic taken from “Twin Cities Metropolitan Council Area Trends, Preferences, and Opportunities: 2010 to 2020, 2030 and 2040.”

Public and Private Educational Facilities

We evaluated educational facilities in order to a) determine the potential impact of these facilities upon housing demand in the corridor, and b) assess the possible impact of new housing developments in the corridor upon these facilities, particularly in terms of enrollment.

The SWLRT corridor spans five K-12 school districts, including Minneapolis, St. Louis Park, Edina, Hopkins, and Eden Prairie. According to the SW Community Works Housing Inventory, there are 38 public schools located within the 2-mile corridor. However, only four public schools are located within ½ mile of SWLRT stations, including two in Minneapolis (Bryn Mawr Elementary and Anwatin Middle School) and two in St. Louis Park (Park Spanish Immersion Elementary and St. Louis Park High School). Notably, there are 18 private and charter schools located within ½ mile of SWLRT station sites, including several within a 10-minute “walk-shed” which will be easily accessible for pedestrians and cyclists.

Four post-secondary institutions are located within the two-mile corridor. This includes two schools within a ½ mile of stations: Dunwoody College of Technology (Minneapolis) and Minneapolis Community and Technical College. Others within two miles include Hennepin Technical College and ITT Technical Institute, both in Eden Prairie.

The following are key findings from our research:

The proximity of educational facilities within close range of the LRT stations is without question appealing and compatible with residential and mixed-use development nearby. However, considering household growth trends as discussed herein, the composition of household growth (smaller household sizes and predominately households without children), and the suggested housing product mix presented later in this report, we do not expect that TOD housing within ½ mile of the SWLRT stations will have a substantial impact upon student enrollment within any school district or upon any individual school. The development of SWLRT could provide additional opportunities for open enrollment based upon new access by others due to LRT; however, we do not expect that LRT will have a significant impact upon enrollment in any one district or any specific educational facility in the corridor.

Interestingly, we have learned our market research, interviews and assessment of school staffing and salaries, that teachers and school support staff represent a significant potential market for TOD housing in the corridor. By comparing teacher salaries with the cost of housing in the various communities, we note a considerable affordability gap, particularly for younger teachers. From our interviews we are aware that teachers often commute considerable distances to schools in Edina, Minnetonka and Eden Prairie in particular, because they are not able to afford housing in close proximity to their place of employment. Because of this, we expect that workforce and market-rate apartment products, as well as entry-level priced for-sale housing units will appeal to teachers and other school staff working in the SWLRT corridor.
Corridor Employment

There is a strong corporate presence along the corridor, with a deep and diverse mix of jobs. According to U.S. Census data, total employment within ½ mile of SWLRT is estimated at 107,000 workers, comprising approximately 6.7% of total employment (by place of work) in the 7-county Twin Cities Metro Area.

It is also interesting to note that, according to the *SW Community Works Housing Inventory*, only 3.7% of the 107,000 workers within ½ mile of SWLRT also reside within this same area. This presents a significant opportunity. It is reasonable to expect that a considerably larger share of persons currently employed at businesses located within ½ mile of the line would consider new TOD housing options here in the future. We expect that many of these workers would utilize SWLRT to travel to-from their place of employment. This assumes, however, that an adequate supply of attractive and appropriately-priced housing products are developed within proximity of SWLRT.
### COMMUTING PATTERNS (INFLOW/OUTFLOW)
#### SWLRT CORRIDOR – within 1/2 mile of SWLRT Line *

**2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station Area</th>
<th>Total Employed in Station Area</th>
<th>Total Living in Station Area</th>
<th>Net Job Inflow (+) or Outflow (-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Living and Employed in Station Area</td>
<td>Employed in Station Area but Living Outside</td>
<td>Living and Employed in Station Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalston</td>
<td>10,208</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van White</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st Street</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lake</td>
<td>2,426</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beltline</td>
<td>3,155</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooddale</td>
<td>2,973</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>8,469</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>1,808</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins</td>
<td>5,386</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>5,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Oak</td>
<td>3,058</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opus</td>
<td>3,018</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City West</td>
<td>7,629</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Triangle</td>
<td>5,649</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.P. Town Center</td>
<td>5,438</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>2,885</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>3,080</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Corridor * | 107,236 | 3,975 | 3.7% | 103,261 | 96.3% | 24,240 | 3,975 | 16.4% | 20,265 | 83.6% | 82,996 |

*Sources: US Census; Maxfield Research Inc.*

**Notes:**
- Graphic taken from SW Community Works Housing Inventory
- “Corridor” as defined for purposes of the SW Community Works Housing Inventory comprises the full ½ mile corridor, including ½ mile from each station area, plus all other areas lying ½ mile from any point along the LRT line.
We have also completed an analysis of the types of jobs and employee earnings in the corridor and throughout the region. The SWLRT corridor features a heavy concentration of well-paying jobs in the information, finance, and professional services sectors (often referred to as “knowledge”-based jobs). As shown below, according to data from the U.S. Census, 15,312 workers are employed within ½ mile of SWLRT in the Professional, Scientific and Technical Services Sector, representing a full 14% of employment within ½ mile of the line. By comparison, this sector accounts for just 7% of employment region-wide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor-Wide Worker Profile</th>
<th>Half-Mile</th>
<th>One-Mile</th>
<th>Hennepin County</th>
<th>Metro Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Jobs</td>
<td>107,236</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>243,385</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Jobs</td>
<td>1,566,200</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Earnings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,250 or Less</td>
<td>22,083</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>38,498</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,251 to $3,333</td>
<td>28,937</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>58,736</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Than $3,333</td>
<td>56,216</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>146,151</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker Ages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 29 or Younger</td>
<td>25,827</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>54,453</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 30 to 54</td>
<td>64,368</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>150,037</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 55 or Older</td>
<td>17,041</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>38,895</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker Race and Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Alone</td>
<td>93,518</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>211,481</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>6,225</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14,913</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Alone</td>
<td>5,733</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12,509</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or other</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Race Groups</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2,864</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker Education Attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than High School</td>
<td>4,922</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9,614</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School or Equivalent, No College</td>
<td>17,736</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>36,389</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College or Associate Degree</td>
<td>25,937</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>57,224</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree or Advanced Degree</td>
<td>32,814</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>65,705</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Attainment Not Available</td>
<td>25,827</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>54,453</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs by NAICS Industry Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, Quarrying, and Oil and Gas Extraction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>5,962</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9,968</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3,490</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>12,277</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16,487</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>6,622</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11,153</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>7,508</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14,024</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>1,816</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2,338</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>3,121</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13,016</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Insurance</td>
<td>5,817</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>39,365</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate and Rental and Leasing</td>
<td>2,093</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8,914</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services</td>
<td>15,312</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>33,031</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Companies and Enterprises</td>
<td>2,084</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>17,876</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin &amp; Support, Waste Mgmt and Remediation</td>
<td>4,837</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11,213</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>3,906</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9,084</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>13,262</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20,496</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation</td>
<td>6,115</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7,756</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services</td>
<td>7,621</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13,762</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services (excluding Public Administration)</td>
<td>3,514</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7,609</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>1,589</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8,386</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau; Maxfield Research, Inc.

Note: graphic taken from SW Community Works Housing Inventory
The Health Care and Social Assistance sector is also an important sector within the corridor, accounting for 12% of employment within ½ mile of SWLRT. Manufacturing accounts for 11% of corridor employment, also similar to the Metro Area employment distribution. Our analysis indicates that the SWLRT corridor includes a diverse mix of public and private-sector employment, with workers employed in many industries and at a full range of pay levels.

According to U.S. Census data, the distribution of jobs by monthly earnings within ½ mile of SWLRT is similar to that of the Metro Area as a whole. However, it is interesting to note that the larger 1-mile corridor features a somewhat higher concentration of well-paying jobs, as more than 60% of workers within the 1-mile corridor earned more than $3,333 per month ($40,000+ per year), compared to 52% at the ½ mile buffer and 47% Metro-wide.

Our housing recommendations for the SWLRT corridor, both in aggregate and for individual station areas, are based in part on our examination of both household income data and also the business mix, employment counts and employee earnings. The graphic below and on the following pages shows the number of workers by income level (monthly earnings) for a ½ and 1 mile radii surrounding each station area, and for a ½ and 1 mile buffer surrounding the line for 2005 and 2010. Data is from the U.S. Census.

### EMPLOYMENT BY EARNINGS

**SWLRT STATIONS -- 1/2 and 1 Mile from SWLRT**  
2005 to 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Half-Mile</th>
<th>One-Mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,250/mo. or less</td>
<td>2,334</td>
<td>2,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,251 - $3,333/mo.</td>
<td>2,828</td>
<td>3,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $3,333/mo.</td>
<td>3,088</td>
<td>4,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,250</td>
<td>10,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,250/mo. or less</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,251 - $3,333/mo.</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $3,333/mo.</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,726</td>
<td>1,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,250/mo. or less</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,251 - $3,333/mo.</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $3,333/mo.</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,250/mo. or less</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,251 - $3,333/mo.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $3,333/mo.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,250/mo. or less</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,251 - $3,333/mo.</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $3,333/mo.</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,391</td>
<td>2,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,647</td>
<td>1,808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, Madfield Research, Inc.

Note: graphic taken from SW Community Works Housing Inventory
### Employment by Earnings

**SWLRT Stations -- 1/2 and 1 Mile from SWLRT**

**2005 to 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Half-Mile</th>
<th></th>
<th>One-Mile</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># jobs based in local area</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td># jobs based in local area</td>
<td>Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,250/mo. or less</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>-186</td>
<td>-21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,251 -$3,333/mo.</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>-298</td>
<td>-25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $3,333/mo.</td>
<td>1,407</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,437</td>
<td>3,155</td>
<td>-282</td>
<td>-8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,250/mo. or less</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>-1,038</td>
<td>-57.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,251 -$3,333/mo.</td>
<td>1,624</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>-646</td>
<td>-39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $3,333/mo.</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>-110</td>
<td>-8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,767</td>
<td>2,973</td>
<td>-1,794</td>
<td>-37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,250/mo. or less</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>-379</td>
<td>-32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,251 -$3,333/mo.</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>3,144</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $3,333/mo.</td>
<td>3,773</td>
<td>4,532</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,070</td>
<td>8,469</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,250/mo. or less</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>-685</td>
<td>-59.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,251 -$3,333/mo.</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>-363</td>
<td>-35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $3,333/mo.</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,647</td>
<td>1,808</td>
<td>-839</td>
<td>-31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,250/mo. or less</td>
<td>2,365</td>
<td>2,318</td>
<td>-47</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,251 -$3,333/mo.</td>
<td>1,688</td>
<td>1,743</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $3,333/mo.</td>
<td>1,891</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>-566</td>
<td>-29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,944</td>
<td>5,386</td>
<td>-558</td>
<td>-9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,250/mo. or less</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>-1,396</td>
<td>-72.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,251 -$3,333/mo.</td>
<td>1,848</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>-827</td>
<td>-44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $3,333/mo.</td>
<td>1,865</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>-358</td>
<td>-19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,639</td>
<td>3,058</td>
<td>-2,581</td>
<td>-45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,250/mo. or less</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>-55</td>
<td>-20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,251 -$3,333/mo.</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>-566</td>
<td>-54.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $3,333/mo.</td>
<td>3,248</td>
<td>2,339</td>
<td>-909</td>
<td>-28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,548</td>
<td>3,018</td>
<td>-1,530</td>
<td>-33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,250/mo. or less</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>2,595</td>
<td>2,072</td>
<td>396.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,251 -$3,333/mo.</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>1,751</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $3,333/mo.</td>
<td>2,353</td>
<td>3,283</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,101</td>
<td>7,629</td>
<td>3,528</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,250/mo. or less</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,251 -$3,333/mo.</td>
<td>2,337</td>
<td>1,518</td>
<td>-819</td>
<td>-35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $3,333/mo.</td>
<td>2,929</td>
<td>3,624</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,873</td>
<td>5,649</td>
<td>-224</td>
<td>-3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** U.S. Census Bureau; Maxfield Research, Inc.

*Note: graphic taken from SW Community Works Housing Inventory*
The base of employees working near each of the planned SWLRT stations varies considerably throughout the corridor, not only in terms of the number of workers, but also by type of job and by level of earnings. While there are large concentrations of high-paying jobs in several of the station areas, notably the various Eden Prairie station areas, as well as Louisiana (Methodist Hospital, for example) and Royalston (Downtown Mpls), in these areas and throughout the corridor there is also considerable employment in lower paying positions. This includes entry-level support, clerical and maintenance positions, as well as lower-level service workers which service the various businesses along the corridor (e.g. office cleaning, grounds maintenance, and retail/restaurant workers who serve the businesses which serve area employees and residents).

As well, it is important to remember the connectivity enhancement that SWLRT will provide, linking workers in all industries and all occupations with jobs throughout the corridor and in primary job centers such as the Downtown Minneapolis CBD and even beyond, by way of an integrated LRT network (with connectivity to the Hiawatha and Central Corridors, and other modes of transit). As such, we do not suggest that high-end housing products be situated only near those station areas which feature a high concentration of upper-income employment. Rather, the connectivity and lifestyle efficiencies that SWLRT will provide are expected to create strong market demand for a full range of housing product types at all affordability levels, at various stations along SWLRT. We note that while we expect that
housing affordable at <60% of AMI will garner a strong positive market response at any/all LRT station areas, the economic viability of constructing such units will be a challenge in all station areas due to development costs. This will be particularly challenging in station areas with a limited land supply and/or high land costs. In fact, the provision of housing products affordable at or below 100% of income will in many cases require public subsidy for this same reason.

Presented below is an analysis of worker earnings for persons employed within ½ mile of SWLRT. The table shows the number of workers by monthly earnings (according to 2010 US Census data), as well as estimates of monthly housing costs affordable to them. Note the calculations show the “affordability range” based on 1 or 2 workers per household. Our analysis of demographic data indicates that the majority of corridor households feature just a single worker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment - Monthly Earnings / Housing Affordability Calculations</th>
<th>Employment within 1/2 mile of SWLRT (per 2010 US Census)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobs by Monthly Income - 1/2 Mile from SWLRT line</td>
<td># of Workers by Monthly Earnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,250/mo. or less</td>
<td>22,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,251 -$3,333/mo.</td>
<td>28,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $3,333/mo.</td>
<td>56,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107,236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Affordable monthly housing cost based on 30% of monthly income.

**Key Point** -- A full 20% of persons presently employed within ½ mile of SWLRT would require housing priced at $750 per month or less, based on their current monthly earnings. (This assumes up to 2 workers per household with a similar job, with each of those workers earning less than $1,250 per month).

The Family Housing Fund (FHF) has also conducted considerable research in the areas of housing cost, employee wages and housing affordability. The graphic on the following page, published by FHF in May 2014 effectively demonstrates the gap in housing affordability and worker earnings for a number of key essential employment positions in the Twin Cities region. The table shows the median wage by type of position, and their maximum monthly housing cost at 30% of income, along with the % of income required to rent an average two-bedroom apartment or purchase a median-priced home. In the case of all workplace positions shown, a single-earner household would have considerable “excess housing cost burden,” in contributing well in excess of 30% of their income toward housing cost.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workplace Position</th>
<th>Median Yearly Salary for Full-Time Worker</th>
<th>Monthly Amount Can Afford for Housing</th>
<th>Percentage of Income Required to Rent 2-BR Apartment</th>
<th>Percentage of Income Required to Own a House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Worker</td>
<td>$31,054</td>
<td>$776</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashier</td>
<td>$19,635</td>
<td>$491</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Worker</td>
<td>$22,152</td>
<td>$554</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter &amp; Rental Clerk</td>
<td>$20,696</td>
<td>$517</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Cleaner</td>
<td>$26,582</td>
<td>$665</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Clerk</td>
<td>$29,037</td>
<td>$726</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Health Aide</td>
<td>$23,816</td>
<td>$595</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host/Hostess</td>
<td>$18,158</td>
<td>$454</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitor, Cleaner</td>
<td>$24,003</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaper/Groundskeeper</td>
<td>$27,997</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maid/Housekeeping Cleaner</td>
<td>$21,882</td>
<td>$547</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Assistant</td>
<td>$28,891</td>
<td>$722</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot Attendant</td>
<td>$21,902</td>
<td>$548</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptionist</td>
<td>$29,786</td>
<td>$745</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant Cook</td>
<td>$22,838</td>
<td>$571</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salesperson, Retail</td>
<td>$20,717</td>
<td>$518</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Bus Driver</td>
<td>$33,779</td>
<td>$844</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Driver</td>
<td>$26,562</td>
<td>$664</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Assistant</td>
<td>$30,201</td>
<td>$755</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telemarketer</td>
<td>$27,726</td>
<td>$693</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teller</td>
<td>$25,605</td>
<td>$640</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Source: MN Dept. of Employment & Economic Development
2 Based on 30% of income
3 Based on 1st Quarter 2014 Marquette Advisors average rent of $1,083 for two-bedroom apartment in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area.
4 Based on Minneapolis Area Association of Realtors Median Sale Price of $185,000 for a single family home sold in the Twin Cities metropolitan area for the year-to-date 2014 (as of March).

Source: "Working Doesn't Always Pay for a Home" -- Family Housing Fund, Public Education Initiative, updated May 2014.
Review of SW Community Works Corridor Investment Framework & Key Findings

We have reviewed the Investment Framework, finalized in 2013, in regards to the development/redevelopment potential for land surrounding each of the planned 17 stations. Based on our review of Investment Framework planning documents and our own field research and analysis, we find that the supply of land (and cost) will be a primary challenge with respect to the provision of full and optimal housing choice along the line going forward. This varies by station area, of course. However, we note from our work that in the case of many stations there is a very limited supply of developable land.

Further, many of the parcels identified through the Investment Framework for potential future development/redevelopment are privately held and in many cases currently in a productive use, other than housing. Development of housing at SWLRT station areas will in many cases require a change in land use, and it is likely that in many cases housing will simply not be the highest-and-best use due to land value/cost, as continuation in current use or more intensive commercial uses become viable.

Still, we believe there are significant opportunities for housing near multiple stations along SWLRT. However, the residential development potential as identified herein has been tempered due to the issues noted related to land availability, land cost, redevelopment complexity, and highest-best-use challenges.

Based on our analysis to date, we believe there will be a very strong positive market response to new housing products along SWLRT over the next several years. Market economics continue to improve, and infill development is already starting to occur within several of the SWLRT corridor communities. Much of our region’s housing development recently and ongoing is comprised of luxury apartments being constructed in Downtown and Uptown Minneapolis. Suburban development deals are just starting to “pencil out” from a feasibility standpoint, in some locations, due to increasing market demand and rising rental rates. New apartments completed recently or in development now in the corridor communities generally feature rents in the $1.60-$1.90 psf range ($900-$1,900+), compared to $2.10-$2.30+ psf in Downtown Minneapolis ($1,200-$2,500+), which is presently the most active construction market in the Twin Cities region, and one of the busiest in the Midwest region.

From our analysis and expertise, we expect that SWLRT housing will appeal to a diverse group of both renters and home buyers in the future.

- “Gen Y” and empty nesters are likely short-term demand drivers, although we believe “aging” Gen Y renters and Gen X singles, couples and young families also provide substantive target markets in the near term – we note that far fewer new housing options are being provided at the present time for these groups in the region.

- Senior housing demand will also be significant, particularly in the long-term (10-15+ years out) as more of the Baby Boomers age into their late 70s and 80s.
SWLRT CORRIDOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OUTLOOK

Based on this analysis and our professional experience we have developed estimates of “pure market demand” for new housing units within ½ mile of the planned station areas over the long-term (approximately 15 years). The “pure market demand” estimate is the number of units that would be marketable within ½ mile of the LRT stations, prior to consideration of issues such as land availability, land use and highest and best use factors, and development cost constraints.

Next, we developed “suggested residential development goals” for the SWLRT corridor (comprising ½ mile surrounding each station). The development goals are tempered to reflect our detailed analysis of each station area in terms of land availability, land ownership and current use structure, and development cost factors. It is important to note that while the suggested residential development scenarios do account for development/redevelopment challenges, the creation of these unit totals will still require a “heavy lift,” inclusive of significant public subsidy and creative public/private partnerships.

Our discussion and estimates of “pure market demand” and “suggested residential development goals” is presented as follows:

**Pure market demand: 13,000 – 15,000 units.** Based on our review of demographic/economic factors, growth forecasts, and our assessment of housing market conditions, we believe that it is very reasonable to expect that there will be market demand for between 13,000 and 15,000 units (or more) within the SWLRT corridor by 2030. This represents about 7% to 8% of projected Metro Area household growth over the next 15 years; which we believe to be a reasonable capture rate based on all factors analyzed. The SWLRT corridor benefits from strong underlying demographics and market dynamics, a deep and diverse economic base, quality public facilities and schools. Further, the connectivity and lifestyle features resulting from development of SWLRT greatly enhance the appeal of housing near the planned stations.

However, while this potential exists, there are significant challenges and barriers to the development of housing along SWLRT and therefore have developed tempered housing development targets for SWLRT station areas.

**Suggested residential development goal: 11,000 units.** We have completed an analysis of each submarket and station area. The following section provides detailed recommendations regarding new housing construction within ½ mile of each station area over the next 15 years. This includes recommendations for new units by product type, affordability level, and approximate timing. Note that the recommended unit count at 11,000 assumes that sufficient gap financing will be available to support a full range of housing products. We estimate a need for at least $65 million in gap financing to support 1,300 new housing units as suggested at price points affordable households earning <60% of AMI. Another $20 million in gap financing could be required to support the recommended new unit inventory affordable to households earning between 60%-100% of AMI. We also opine on the strengths and challenges of each of station area from a housing standpoint and offer suggestions for investment in public realm elements which will enhance livability and the appeal of these locations for housing.
Presented on table on the following page are suggestions regarding a market-appropriate housing product mix by station area. This is followed by a discussion of each station area. For purposes of this analysis we have segmented our product type recommendations by product type and affordability level as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Income Range</th>
<th>Max. Monthly Housing Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0% to 30% of AMI</td>
<td>&lt; $19,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% to 60% of AMI</td>
<td>$19,921 - $39,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% to 80% of AMI</td>
<td>$39,841 - $51,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% to 100% of AMI</td>
<td>$51,151 - $66,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of AMI+</td>
<td>&gt; $66,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Max. Monthly Housing Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$560 - $1,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,121 - $1,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,281 - $1,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,660+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MN Housing Finance Agency

Our recommendations include a mix of rental housing by affordability range, inclusive of general occupancy and senior rentals, along with homeownership products including for-sale condos, townhomes (including row homes) and single-family “Pocket Neighborhood” product types, which are suggested in the case of multiple station areas.
## SW LRT Corridor -- Projected Phased Residential Development Potential by Station Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station Area</th>
<th>Short Term (3-5 Yrs)</th>
<th>Mid-Term (6-10 Yrs)</th>
<th>Long Term (10+ Yrs)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Royalston</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van White</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st St.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>** (to be considered)**</td>
<td>** (to be considered)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lake</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minneapolis Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>4,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beltline</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooddale</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St. Louis Park Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>260</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Hopkins</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Oak</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hopkins Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>950</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>2,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minnetonka Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City West</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Triangle</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP Town Center</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eden Prairie Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>532</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SW LRT Corridor Total</strong></td>
<td>3,622</td>
<td>3,684</td>
<td>3,930</td>
<td>11,236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Marquette Advisors
Opus Station Area

SW Community Works Corridor Investment Framework, 2013
Current Housing Supply:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opus Station Area (1/2 Mile Radius)</th>
<th>Units by Affordability Range (% of AMI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Station Area</td>
<td>0%-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opus</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Units</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Unit Inventory</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: SWLRT Housing Inventory; Marquette Advisors

Strengths:

- 402 units within ½ mile which are affordable to households earning 30-60% of AMI, and another 365 units affordable at 60-100% of AMI.

- The Opus Station Area is situated within the Opus Business Park. This area is a major employment center, with more than 3,000 jobs based at businesses within ½ mile of the station and 12,000 within 1 mile. Employment in the area has a strong “white collar” office orientation based in real estate, medical device, health care and technology industries. Major employers in the area include Opus, United Health Group, American Medical Systems and Comcast.

- More than six miles of pedestrian and bike trails in the area.

- Proximity to neighborhood commercial development and restaurants.

Development Challenges:

- Private and fractured ownership limits redevelopment potential, as does high value of land at this location. Very few presently under-utilized sites in this area. The neighboring “Merchandise Mart” site is one possible exception which presents an opportunity for future redevelopment.

- Commercial nature of this area makes change in use to residential unlikely. Future development is more likely to include primarily corporate and multi-tenant office buildings and commercial development.

- Large block size and circuitous street network.

- Pedestrian environment in some portions of the Station Area could use strengthening.
Residential Development Recommendations – Opus Station Area:

Marquette Advisors estimates that approximately **500 to 600 new units** of multifamily housing are viable near Opus Station, likely over the mid- to long-term. Development will depend largely upon land availability and change in use over time in this area. We recommend a mix of housing products approximately as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Type/Affordability Range</th>
<th>Short Term (3-5 Yrs)</th>
<th>Mid-Term (6-10 Yrs)</th>
<th>Long Term (10-15 Yrs)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Pct.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rental &lt;30% of AMI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental 30-60% AMI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental 60-80% AMI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental 80-100% AMI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental 100%+ AMI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For-Sale (entry level-mid market)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For-Sale (high-end)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Marquette Advisors*

We understand that the “Merchandise Mart” property (industrial facility constructed in 1977) may become available for redevelopment, immediately east of the planned Station. This property contains approximately 15 acres of developable land and should be considered for residential along with complementary commercial uses, including office and retail/restaurant concepts. Given the value of land in this area (subject site last traded in 1995 for $12.7 million), future redevelopment must exhibit considerable increase in density/intensity in use and would most likely contain significant commercial components along with housing.
Merchandise Mart property – approximately 15 acres developable. Possible future redevelopment site.

Investment in Public Realm:

- Work to improve connection of existing trail system in the business park to the planned station area.

- Consider development of circulator transit bus which will help connect area residents and commuters with local businesses and the LRT station.

- Should land become available, construct park & ride facility just north of the LRT platform, as planned, inclusive of a public plaza and gathering area.
Memorandum

To: Planning Commission

From: Loren Gordon, AICP, City Planner

Date: May 18, 2017

Subject: Change Memo for the May 18th Planning Commission Agenda

ITEM 8A – 5013 Mayview Road

One of the applicant’s names was incorrectly noted in the report as “Sharron” rather than “Shannon.” The resolution is correct.

ITEM 8B – 2807 McKenzie Point Road

The applicant has requested to split their request into two separate approvals.

1. Approval for a street-side roof overhang and bump-out. This request requires planning commission approval, subject to appeal to city council, for a:
   - Side yard setback variance from 7 feet to 3 feet from the north property line; and
   - Expansion permit to maintain existing, non-conforming 4.5-foot setback from south property line.

2. Approval for a lakeside deck expansion and landscaping. This request requires city council approval for a:
   - Shoreland setback variance from 50 feet to 17 feet;
   - Floodplain vertical setback variance from 2 feet to 1-foot;
   - Floodplain horizontal setback variance from 20 feet to 0 feet;
   - Floodplain alteration permit for earthwork in floodplain; and
   - Conditional use permit for construction of additions to a non-conforming home.
The request is based on the fact that the planning commission has final authority on the bump-out and roof overhang, but not the deck expansion and landscaping. If the commission approves the bump-out and overhang, a building permit could be issued for this work.

This would allow the applicant an earlier construction start for this portion of their project, while waiting for the City Council’s decision on the deck expansion and landscaping proposal.

Amended resolutions are attached.

**ITEM 8D: Lone Lake Trail**

Since publication of the report, staff realized that an additional conditional use permit (CUP) is technically required. Under the floodplain ordinance, a permitted use – such as the proposed trail/boardwalk/bridge – requires a conditional use permit if it would result in impact to more than 1,000 square feet or 20 cubic yard of floodplain area. While final designs have not been established, staff anticipates that bridge abutments may impact this threshold of floodplain. To accommodate this CUP, please make the following changes to the resolution:

1.01 Portions of the proposed trail would be located within the required wetland buffer and floodplain areas. By City Code §300.23 Subd.7, public recreational uses, such as trails, are conditionally-permitted in wetland buffers. By City code 300.24 Subd.5, uses generally permitted in floodplain areas – such as the proposed bridge – require a conditional use permit if involving excavation or fill of greater than 1,000 square feet or 20 cubic yards of floodplain.

2.01 City Code §300.26 outlines the following standards that must be met for granting of conditional permits within the wetland and floodplain zoning districts. These standards are incorporated by reference into this resolution.

3.01 The proposed trial would meet all minimum conditional use permit standards for uses within the wetland and floodplain areas as outlined in City Code §300.26.

1. The intent of ordinance requirements as they pertain to the wetland district is to protect the community’s natural water resources while allowing for reasonable development. The proposed trail would not have significant, adverse impact on wetland or floodplain areas. Rather, it is intended to increase enjoyment of these natural resources.

4.01 Subject to staff approval, the trail/boardwalk/bridge must be developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the following plans, except as modified below.

The **stricken** language is deleted; the **underlined** language is inserted.
• Topographic and Tree Inventory Survey dated March 8, 2017
• Boardwalk specification dated November 2005
• Bridge specification dated September 19, 2014. **Final design must minimize impacts to the shore impact zone.**

1. Prior to any site work on the private or public property:

   a) **A pre-construction meeting must be conducted between city staff, Rowland Investments, and pertinent contractors. A pre-construction meeting between city staff, Rowland Investments, and pertinent contractors must be conducted.**

   b) **A public trail easement over the portion of the trail on 5709 Rowland Road must be submitted for review and approval of the city attorney. The easement must then be filed at the County.**
Resolution No 2017-

Resolution approving an expansion permit and side yard setback variance for additions at 2807 McKenzie Pointe Road

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

Section 1. BACKGROUND.

1.01 The applicant, Grant Dattilo, is proposing the following:
   1. Construction of a 3.7-foot roof overhang; and
   2. Construction of a 1.3-foot, second story bump out;

1.02 The proposal requires the following:
   1. Expansion permit to maintain existing, non-conforming 4.5-foot setback from south property line.
   2. Side yard setback variance from 7 feet to 3 feet from north property line.

1.03 The subject property is located at 2807 McKenzie Point Road.

1.04 The property is legally described as follows:

Lot 3, T. R. MCKENZIE'S GROVELAND PARK, HENNEPIN COUNTY, MINNESOTA

1.05 City Code §300.29 Subd. 3(g) allows expansion of a nonconformity only by variance or expansion permit.

1.06 City Code §300.29 Subd. 7(c) authorizes the city to grant expansion permits.

1.07 Minnesota Statute §462.357 Subd. 6, and City Code §300.07 authorizes the city to grant variances.
Section 2. STANDARDS

2.01 Setback Requirements:

1. City Code §300.10 Subd. 5 outlines minimum setback requirements from property lines. Those requirements are adopted here by reference.

2. City Code §300.10 Subd. 7 outlines setback exemptions for qualifying small lots. Those requirements are adopted here by reference.

2.02 City Code §300.29 Subd. 7(c) outlines the expansion permit standards. Those standards are adopted here by reference.

2.03 By City Code §300.07 Subd. 1, a variance 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.

Section 3. FINDINGS

3.01 The proposal meets the ordinance standards outlined in the preceding section of this resolution.

1. The proposal meets the expansion permit standard outlined in City Code §300.07 Subd. 7(c):

   a) REASONABLENESS: The intent of the ordinance as it pertains to residential side yard setback requirements is to ensure an appropriate distance between structures. The requested permit meets this intent. The majority of homes within the subject neighborhood have non-conforming setbacks similar to applicant’s proposal. Additionally, the expansion permit would not result in the second story bump out addition and roof overhang being located any closer to the south side property line.

   b) UNIQUE CIRCUMSTANCE: The subject property is substandard in size and encumbered by various setback requirements and 100-year floodplain setbacks. The subject house encroaches into several of these setbacks and most
addition proposals would require an expansion permit or variances.

c) CHARACTER OF LOCALITY: The immediate area contains several homes that do not meet required setbacks, due to variances or being constructed prior to the adoption of city ordinance. In addition, the second story bump out and roof overhang would not encroach further into the required south side yard setback than the existing home. As such, the requested expansion permit would not negatively impact the area or alter the essential character of the neighborhood.

3.02 The proposal meets the variance standard outlined in City Code §300.07 Subd. 1(a):

1. INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE: The intent of the ordinance as it pertains to residential side yard setback requirements is to ensure an appropriate distance between structures. The requested permit meets this intent. The majority of homes within the subject neighborhood have non-conforming setbacks similar to applicant’s proposal. As such:

   a) The variances would not result in the living space of the home being located any closer to property lines, but would extend the overhang further into the required side yard setbacks; and

   b) The overhang variance would not negatively impact existing building separations.

2. CONSISTENT WITH COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: The proposed variance is consistent with the comprehensive plan. The property is guided for low-density residential uses. The guiding principles in the comprehensive plan provide for maintaining, preserving and enhancing existing single-family neighborhoods. The variances would not negatively impact the residential character of the neighborhood and would provide investment in the property to enhance its use.

3. PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES:

   a) REASONABLENESS: The request for a roof overhang is a reasonable request for a single-family property. The overhang would not negatively impact the neighborhood.

   b) UNIQUE CIRCUMSTANCE: The subject property is
substandard in size. The subject property is less than 50 feet wide at its widest point, which is less than half the required width (110 feet), and is less than 5,000 square feet in area (22,000 square required).

c) CHARACTER OF LOCALITY: The requested variances would not negatively impact the character of the existing neighborhood. Rather:

a) The majority of the homes within 400 feet of the subject property have received variances or special approvals for home construction or additions,

b) The variance would allow for investment into a property through the construction of new additions; and

c) The variance would have no negative impact on adjacent properties.

Section 4. CITY COUNCIL ACTION.

4.01 The planning commission approves the above-described requests for expansion permit and variance subject to the findings outlined in section 3 of this resolution. Approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. Subject to staff approval, the site must be developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the following plans, unless modified by the conditions below:

   • Survey/Site Plan dated April 14, 2017.

   • Building elevations dated April 14, 2017.

2. Prior to issuance of a building permit:

   a) A copy of this resolution must be recorded with the County and a copy of the recorded document returned to the city.

3. This approval will expire on December 31, 2018, unless the city has issued a building permit for the project covered by this variance or approved a time extension.

Adopted by the Planning Commission of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on May 18, 2017.
Brian Kirk, Chair

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 Planning Commission of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a duly authorized meeting held on May 18, 2017.

David E. Maeda, City Clerk

SEAL
Resolution No 2017-

Resolution approving setback variances, floodplain alteration permit, and conditional use permit for additions and landscaping at 2807 McKenzie Pointe Road

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

Section 1. BACKGROUND.

1.01 The applicant, Grant Dattilo, is proposing the following:
   1. Addition of a 2-foot deck expansion; and
   2. Removal of impervious surfaces and retaining walls, add a small retaining wall, and conduct minor earthwork within the 100-year floodplain.

1.02 The proposal requires the following:
   1. Shoreland setback variance from 50 feet to 15 feet
   2. Floodplain vertical setback variance from 2 feet to 1 foot.
   3. Floodplain horizontal setback variance from 20 feet to 0 feet.
   4. Floodplain alteration permit for earthwork with the floodplain.
   5. Conditional use permit for construction of additions to a non-conforming home.

1.03 The subject property is located at 2807 McKenzie Point Road.

1.04 The property is legally described as follows:

Lot 3, T. R. MCKENZIE’S GROVELAND PARK, HENNEPIN COUNTY, MINNESOTA
Section 1. AUTHORITY

1.05 Minnesota Statute §462.357 Subd. 6, and City Code §300.07 authorizes the city to grant variances.

1.06 City Code §300.24 Subd. 9 authorizes the city to grant floodplain alteration permits.

1.07 City Code §300.06 authorizes the city to grant conditional use permits.

Section 2. STANDARDS

2.01 Setback Requirements:

1. City Code §300.25 Subd. 7 outlines minimum setback requirements from ordinary high water levels. Those requirements are adopted here by reference.

2. City Code §300.24 Subd. 8 outlines minimum horizontal and vertical setback requirements from floodplain elevation. Those requirements are adopted here by reference.

3. City Code §300.25 Subd. 9 outlines minimum setback requirements from the ordinary high water level of Lake Minnetonka. Those requirements are adopted here by reference.

2.02 By City Code §300.07 Subd. 1, a variance 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.

2.03 City Code §300.24 Subd. 9 outlines the standards which must be met for approval of a floodplain alteration permit. Those standards are adopted here by reference.

2.04 City Code §300.26 Subd. 2 and Subd. 4 outlines the general and specific conditional use permit standards within the floodplain district. Those standards are adopted here by reference.

Section 3. FINDINGS

3.01 The proposal meets the variance standard outlined in City Code §300.07 Subd. 1(a):

1. INTENT OF THE ORDINANCE: The intent of the shoreland and
floodplain setback ordinances is to preserve, protect, and enhance the environmental, recreational and hydrological resources and functions of the city’s water systems. The floodplain ordinance intent is also in place to minimize the loss of life and property damage due to flooding.

a) The variances would not result in the living space of the home being located any closer to property lines, but would extend the deck into the shoreland and floodplain setbacks;

b) The deck variance would not negatively impact existing building separations; and

c) The existing deck does not allow the passage of water through it and is considered an impervious surface. The applicant has proposed using slotted decking that would allow the passage of water and has proposed further impervious surface reduction through removal of paver areas and retaining walls. These changes will increase water retention on site and enhance the environmental protection of natural resources.

2. CONSISTENT WITH COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: The proposed variances are consistent with the comprehensive plan. The property is guided for low-density residential uses. The guiding principles in the comprehensive plan provide for maintaining, preserving and enhancing existing single-family neighborhoods. The variances would not negatively impact the residential character of the neighborhood and would provide investment in the property to enhance its use.

3. PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES:

a) REASONABLENESS: The request for a deck extension is a reasonable request for a single-family property. The proposed deck extension would not negatively impact the neighborhood and, with the proposed landscaping, would enhance natural resource protection.

b) UNIQUE CIRCUMSTANCE: The entire property is encumbered by the 100-foot floodplain setback. Any construction on the property would require expansion permits or variances.

c) CHARACTER OF LOCALITY: The requested variances would not negatively impact the character of the existing
neighborhood. Rather:

a) The majority of the homes within 400 feet of the subject property have received variances or special approvals for home construction or additions.

b) The variances would allow for investment into a property through the construction of new additions; and

c) The variances would have no negative impact on adjacent properties.

3.02 The proposal would meet the general and specific standards for construction of structures within the floodplain district as outlined in City Code §300.26 Subd. 2 and Subd. 4.

1. The requested conditional use permit would result in the removal of an existing impervious deck from the floodplain, construction of a new, pervious deck. The construction of the proposed deck would increase floodplain storage on the property and would have no impact on floodplain.

2. The requested conditional use permit would not result in adverse impacts to the floodplain. Rather, the new deck would create floodplain storage on the site.

3. As the entire rear yard of the subject property is located within the 100-year floodplain, a conditional use permit would be required for any new construction in this area.

3.03 The proposal would meet the standards for approval of a floodplain alteration permit outlined in City Code §300.24 Subd. 9.

1. The proposal would not result in any net fill of floodplain. Rather, through the slats in the new deck and removal of impervious surface, the proposal would actually increase floodplain storage on the property.

2. The floodplain alteration would not result in removal or loss of any protected trees.

3. As the entirety of the rear yard of the property is located within the 100-year floodplain, a floodplain alteration permit would be required for any new construction in the area.
Section 4. CITY COUNCIL ACTION.

4.01 The city council approves the above-described requests for variances, floodplain alteration permit, and conditional use permit subject to the findings outlined in section 3 of this resolution. Approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. Subject to staff approval, the site must be developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the following plans, unless modified by the conditions below:

   - Survey/Site Plan dated April 14, 2017
   - Building elevations dated April 14, 2017

2. Prior to issuance of a building permit:

   a) A copy of this resolution must be recorded with the County and a copy of the recorded document returned to the city.

   b) The applicant must obtain approvals from all other interested agencies.

   c) As part of the deck permit application, final plans must be submitted which are in general conformance with proposed plan date stamped April 14, 2017 and specifically comply with all of the following requirements:

      1) Show removal of the existing paver area adjacent to the lake as well as the short row of retaining wall block along the west side of the pavers.

      2) Include plantings to help soften the visibility of the deck surface as viewed from the lake.

      3) Provide for a 12-inch landscape strip above the retaining wall adjacent to the lake to help keep lawn care practices away from the lake edge.

   d) Install erosion control fencing as required by staff for inspection and approval. These items must be maintained throughout the course of construction.
3. Prior to final inspection of the deck, the soils in areas of the removed impervious must be decompacted as necessary to allow infiltration and the landscaping removed and installed per the approved plan.

4. This approval will expire on December 31, 2018, unless the city has issued a building permit for the project covered by this variance or approved a time extension.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on June 12, 2017.

Terry Schneider, Mayor

ATTEST:

David E. Maeda, City Clerk

ACTION ON THIS RESOLUTION:

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

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a duly authorized meeting held on June 12, 2017.

David E. Maeda, City Clerk

SEAL