Planning Commission Agenda

April 6, 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: March 23, 2017

5. Report from Staff

6. Report from Planning Commission Members

7. Public Hearings: Consent Agenda

   A. Wetland setback variance to allow dormer additions onto the existing home at 14016 Spring Lake Road.

      Recommendation: Adopt the resolution approving the variances (5 votes)

      • Final Decision Subject to Appeal
      • Project Planner: Ashley Cauley

8. Public Hearings: Non-Consent Agenda Items

   A. Conditional use permits for recreational facility improvements on the Minnetonka Civic Center Campus at 14600 Minnetonka Boulevard.

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

      • Recommendation to City Council (Tentative Date: April 24, 2017)
      • Project Planner: Susan Thomas
B. Amendment to an existing conditional use permit for recreational facility improvements at the Hopkins High School Campus at 2400 Lindbergh Drive.

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

- Recommendation to City Council (Tentative Date: April 24, 2017)
- Project Planner: Drew Ingvalson

C. Items concerning The Cheesecake Factory at Ridgedale Center.

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

- Recommendation to City Council (Tentative Date: April 24, 2017)
- Project Planner: Susan Thomas

9. 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 April 20, 2017 Planning Commission meeting:

   Project Description: The applicant is proposing to construct a monument sign at Shady Oak Beach. The sign contains a dynamic sign. The sign requires a variance to exceed 32 square feet in size with a dynamic sign exceeding 35% of the sign.
   Project No.:89017.17a Staff: Ashley Cauley
   Ward/Council Member: 1—Bob Ellingson Section: 26

   Project Description: The applicant is requesting an expansion permit and variances to construct a detached garage at 2425 Bantas Point Rd.
   Project No.: 05050.17a Staff: Drew Ingvalson
   Ward/Council Member: 3—Brad Wiersum Section: 8

   Project Description: The property owner is proposing to change a portion of the front façade at Ridgedale Festival shopping center. As proposed, the height of the façade in the area of work would be increased from 28 feet to 37 feet. The proposal requires a major amendment to the existing master development plan.
   Project No.: 88085.17a Staff: Susan Thomas
   Ward/Council Member: 3—Brad Wiersum Section: 3

   Project Description: The applicant is requesting site and building plan and conditional use permit approval to construct approximately 24,000 square feet of restaurant and entertainment space in 4 buildings located in the northwest parking area of Ridgedale Mall. The applicant's proposal requires approval of a conditional use permit, master development plan, and site and building plan review.
   Project No.: 17004.17a Staff: Loren Gordon
   Ward/Council Member: 2—Tony Wagner Section: 2
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 Powers, Schack, Sewell, Calvert, Knight, and Kirk were present. O'Connell was absent.

Staff members present: Assistant City Planner Susan Thomas, Water Resources Technician Tom Dietrich, and Natural Resource Manager Jo Colleran.

3. Approval of Agenda

Schack moved, second by Sewall, to approve the agenda as submitted with modifications and additional comments provided in the change memo dated March 23, 2017.

Powers, Schack, Calvert, Knight, and Kirk voted yes. Sewall abstained. O'Connell was absent. Motion carried.

4. Approval of Minutes: March 2, 2017

Schack moved, second by Sewall, to approve the March 2, 2017 meeting minutes.

Powers, Schack, Calvert, Knight, and Kirk voted yes. Sewall abstained. O'Connell was absent. Motion carried.

5. Report from Staff

Thomas briefed the commission on land use applications considered by the city council at its meeting of March 6, 2017:

- Adopted a resolution approving a preliminary plat for a two-lot subdivision on Cottage Lane.
- Adopted a resolution approving a conditional use permit for expansion of a medical clinic on Wayzata Boulevard.
• Adopted a resolution approving a conditional use permit for an over-sized accessory structure and a second curb cut on Avondale Street.
• Adopted a resolution approving a replat of the Seville property. The nuisance conditions were rectified before the city council’s review of the proposal.
• Reviewed a concept plan for an apartment building with 240 units for Newport Midwest.

The next planning commission meeting will be April 6, 2017.

There will be a neighborhood meeting on March 30, 2017 at 7 p.m. at the Hopkins High School to review plans to improve baseball and soccer fields at Hopkins High School.

There will be a neighborhood meeting on April 6, 2017 from 5:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. at the fire station to review plans for improvements to the civic center campus and lighting of a soccer field north of Ice Arena B.

There will be another neighborhood meeting on April 6, 2017 from 4:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. in the Minnehaha Room to review revised concepts for the Shady Oak Road redevelopment project.

6. **Report from Planning Commission Members**: None

7. **Public Hearings: Consent Agenda**: None

8. **Public Hearings**

   A. **Preliminary and final plats with front setback variances and waiving of the McMansion Policy for The Enclave at Regal Oak at 3639 Shady Oak Road and 3627 Regal Oak Lane**.

   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.

   Powers asked if decreasing the house size would save more trees. Thomas explained that reducing the size of the houses would not be sufficient to save additional trees because the topography the site makes the proposed amount of grading necessary. Colleran agreed.
In response to Chair Kirk’s question, Thomas clarified that the buildable area would not be made larger by shifting the front and rear setbacks forward. According to R-1 ordinance requirements, the size of a single-family residence is not restricted as long as it meets setback requirements. The FAR in the report is based on Regal Oak. The Mcmansion Policy looks at properties within 400 feet and 1,000 feet on the same road. The highest FAR on Regal Oak is 0.16, within 400 feet 0.18, and up and down Shady Oak Road 1,000 feet 0.22.

Michael Halley, representing Airborne Construction One, applicant, stated that he supports everything in the staff report. The goal is to build three custom houses. He and the project’s engineer were available for questions.

In response to Chair Kirk’s question, Mr. Halley stated that the proposed lots are conventional, R-1 lots, so the Mcmansion Policy should not apply.

Chair Kirk asked for the size of the proposed houses. Mr. Halley said that the houses would be custom built for each buyer. He did not anticipate that the houses would be as large as the buildable area.

Calvert said that the slope is very steep. Mr. Halley answered that the driveways would have a modest elevation change of three or four percent grade angled up from the street to the garage. There would be some fill added.

Mr. Holley explained that shifting the front and rear setbacks forward would reduce the amount of fill and decrease the driveways’ amount of impervious surface. The front setbacks would be consistent with the rest of the houses in Regal Oak.

Chair Kirk confirmed with Colleran that the required tree mitigation for the proposal would be determined at the time of the building permit review. Colleran explained that under no circumstance could more than 10 of the high-priority trees be able to be impacted.

Thomas explained how FAR is calculated. Based on the Mcmansion Policy, Lot 1 would be allowed to have a house up to 4,900 square feet, Lot 2 up to 4,800 square feet, and Lot 3 up to 5,100 square feet in size. Mr. Halley felt that was a reasonable estimate of the sizes of the proposed houses. He stated that the builder and buyer want to preserve as many trees as possible. Building custom homes would allow as much tree preservation as possible.

Powers asked if he had an idea of the price. Mr. Halley estimated in the $800,000s.
The public hearing was opened.

Vanessa Greene, 3632 Arbor Lane, thought this felt like a bait and switch because she has been told that there is a need for single-level, senior living, but the proposed houses would be huge and trees would be removed. It was shocking to her. She wanted the Mcmansion Policy enforced so that the houses would fit with the character of the neighborhood.

Cheryl Smith, 3624 Arbor Lane, thanked Thomas for keeping her informed throughout the process. She would appreciate tree mitigation on the east side of the site.

Ron Hanson, 12215 Mari Lane, pointed out a slope and pond. There is a concern of erosion and water running off the hill. A two-story house would be visible from Arbor Lane.

No additional testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.

Calvert said that the developer has worked very hard. She shared the neighbors’ sentiments regarding tree loss. All of the lots would meet ordinance requirements and the Mcmansion Policy would not be applied if the building pads would not be shifted forward 10 feet in order to preserve more green space and decrease fill. The shifting of the front and rear setbacks would not allow a larger house to be built. She encouraged staff to work closely with the developer during the grading and building permit review process to enforce the tree ordinance.

Chair Kirk stated that the lots would meet all R-1 ordinance requirements and the Mcmansion Policy would not be applied without the variance to decrease the front setback.

Schack noted that the other lots in the area have 25-foot front setbacks, but the houses are smaller than the proposed houses. She felt that not waiving the Mcmansion Policy would keep with the spirit of the policy by restricting the size of the houses if the setback would be decreased.

In response to Powers’ question, Colleran stated that removal of a tree that should have been saved would cost $500 per inch of diameter with a maximum of $5,000 per tree. A stop work order would be issued for the site until the issue would be resolved.
Chair Kirk noted that neighbors have enjoyed the view of 2.8 acres with one house for many years. The property owner has paid substantial property taxes and has rights to develop the site in accordance with ordinance requirements.

Sewall said that the setback variance seems to be a win-win situation and would not cause the loss of additional trees.

Calvert encouraged the developer to be mindful of the neighbors. It would disrupt the character of the neighborhood to have houses two times larger than the existing houses.

Thomas explained the stormwater management for the site. Dietrich explained that the rate of runoff would be controlled to maintain or reduce the existing conditions. There would be a slight reduction across the board for all of the rain events modeled. Raingardens would be moved to the west, off of Regal Oak, and receive drainage from all three lots. The proposal would reduce the rate of runoff and meet all stormwater requirements while reducing the steep-slope area.

Chair Kirk thanked the neighbors for attending the meetings. He supports the setback. He would like the Mcmansion Policy applied. The final plat makes sense.

Calvert moved, second by Schack, to recommend that the city council adopt the resolution approving preliminary and final plats with front yard setback variances and enforcing the Mcmansion Policy for The Enclave at Regal Oak at 3639 Shady Oak Road and 3627 Regal Oak Lane.

Powers, Schack, Sewell, Calvert, Knight, and Kirk voted yes. O'Connell was absent. Motion carried.

9. Adjournment

Knight moved, second by Sewall, to adjourn the meeting at 7:40 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

By: ____________________________
Lois T. Mason
Planning Secretary
Public Hearing: Consent Agenda
MINNETONKA PLANNING COMMISSION  
April 6, 2017

**Brief Description**  
Wetland setback variance to allow dormer additions on the existing home at 14016 Spring Lake Road

**Recommendation**  
Adopt the resolution approving the request

---

**Background**

The subject property, 14016 Spring Lake Road, is located on the southwestern side of Spring Lake. Despite its namesake, Spring Lake is not regulated as lake but rather as a wetland by the Department of Natural Resources (DNR).

Construction on the existing home began in 1976. Shortly after construction commenced, it was determined that the home would not meet the city’s required wetland setback. Unfortunately, the city does not have the issued building permit for the home on file, but it can be inferred from the Board of Zoning Adjustments (BZA) meeting minutes that a permit was issued with an incorrectly labeled setback. The BZA ultimately approved a variance to reduce the wetland setback from 35 feet to 22 feet to allow the continued construction of the new home.

**Proposal**

Kuhl Design Build, on behalf of the current property owners, is proposing to construct two dormer additions on the north side of the existing home. These additions would allow for additional and functional living space within the home without increasing the footprint of the home.

**Staff Analysis**

Staff finds that the applicant’s requests meets the variance standards outlined in city code:

- **Reasonableness and Unique Circumstance:** The proposed dormer additions would be reasonable and would not intensify the existing home’s proximity to the wetland. The additions would add living space in an environmentally sensitive way without increasing the footprint of the existing home beyond what was approved in 1976.

- **Neighborhood character:** The proposed dormers would not alter the character of the surrounding neighborhood. In fact, the dormers would allow for increased living space within the home without significantly increasing the visual mass of the home as viewed from adjacent roadways or properties.
Staff Recommendation

Adopt the resolution approving a wetland setback variance for dormer additions on the north side of the existing home at 14016 Spring Lake Road.

Originator: Ashley Cauley, Senior Planner
Through: Susan Thomas, AICP, Assistant City Planner
### Supporting Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>17006.17a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>14016 Spring Lake Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Kuhl Design Build, represented by Dan Murphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding Properties surrounding the subject lot are zoned R-1, and guided land uses low density residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Planning            | Guide Plan designation: low density residential  
Zoning: R-1 |
| Expansion Permits and Variances | An expansion permit is required for an expansion of a non-conforming structure when that expansion maintains the same setbacks as the existing non-conformity. By definition, a non-conforming structure is one that is not in full compliance with the regulations of the ordinance and other: (1) was legally established before the effective date of the ordinance provision with which it does not comply; or (2) became non-conforming because of some other governmental action, such as a court order or by a taking by a governmental body under eminent domain or negotiated sale.  

The wetland setback of the existing home is not considered non-conforming because the reduced setbacks were approved by variances. Essentially, the home “conforms” to the setback legally approved in 1976. Because these setbacks are not non-conforming, they are not eligible for an expansion permit and a variance is required. |
| Wetland and Floodplain | The rear of the property is partially encumbered by Spring Lake. This “lake” is not actually regulated as a lake by the DNR but rather is regulated as a wetland.  
Typically, when a wetland exists on a property but a delineation is not required, staff will meet with a property owner onsite to determine an approximate wetland boundary during the growing season. For purposes of this proposal, staff is comfortable recommending approval without the determination or onsite meeting because the proposal would not result in an increase of the footprint of the existing house. |
The property is also encumbered by 100-year floodplain. The 100-year elevation associated with the wetland is 956.0 feet. Typically, any additions would need to maintain a 20-foot horizontal setback and a 2-foot vertical separation from this established floodplain elevation. However, the ordinance excludes any second story additions from this requirement.

**McMansion Policy**

The McMansion Policy is a tool that 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 flood area ration (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.

By City Code §300.02, floor area is defined as “the sum of the following as measured from exterior walls: the fully exposed gross horizontal area of a building, including attached garage space and enclosed porch areas, and one-half the gross horizontal area of any partially exposed level such as a walkout or lookout level. By the same code, FAR is defined as “the floor area of a building as defined by [this] ordinance, divided by area of the lot on which the building is located. Area zoned as wetland, floodplain, or below the ordinary high water level of a public water is excluded from the lot area for purposes of the floor area ratio calculation.”

The largest FAR in the neighborhood is 0.21. The subject property currently has a FAR of 0.11. Because the square footage of the home would not increase, the floor area ratio of the subject property would not change. As such, the proposal complies with the McMansion Policy.

**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)
Pyramid of Discretion

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

- **Appeals**: Any person aggrieved by the planning commission’s decision about the requested variances may appeal such decision to the city council. A written appeal must be submitted to the planning staff within ten days of the date of the decision.

- **Neighborhood Comments**: The city sent notices to 36 area property owners and received no comments to date.

- **Motion Options**: The planning commission has the following motion options:
  1. Concur with staff’s recommendation. In this case, a motion should be made adopting the resolution approving variances.
  2. Disagree with staff’s recommendation. In this case, a motion should be made denying the request. The motion should include findings for denial.
  3. Table the request. In this case, a motion should be made to table the item. The motion should include a statement as to why the request is being tabled with direction to staff, the application or both.

- **Voting Requirement**: The planning commission action on the applicant’s request is final but subject to appeal. Approval requires the affirmative vote of five commissioners.

- **Deadline for Action**: July 8, 2017
Location Map

Project: Kuhl Design Build
Address: 14016 Spring Lake Rd
Project No. 17006.17a

This map is for illustrative purposes only.
PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES WORKSHEET

By state law, variances may be granted from the standards of the city’s zoning ordinance only if:

1) The proposed variance is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the zoning ordinance;
2) The proposed variance is consistent with the comprehensive plan; and
3) An applicant establishes that there are practical difficulties in complying with the ordinance standard from which they are requesting a variance. Practical difficulties means:
   - The proposed use is reasonable;
   - 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
   - The proposed use would not alter the essential character of the surrounding area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe why the proposed use is reasonable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe:
- circumstances unique to the property;
- why the need for variance was not caused by the property owner; and
- and why the need is not solely based on economic considerations.

Describe: this property was built under a variance, which is unique in itself. Due to that we need a variance for any alterations. The current owner was not the owner who requested the variance. There is no economic value in this request.

Describe why the variance would not alter the essential character of the neighborhood

Describe: this house is very much a standalone structure there are not any neighbors who would be affected.

VARIANCE APPLICATIONS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED IF THIS WORKSHEET IS NOT COMPLETE
Richard & Linda Sedgwick

a dormer additions to the home of

31 JAN 2017 For Struct

If another contractor will be using the plans for construction, it will first be necessary for the homeowner to (i) pay all design fees due Kuhl Design Build, and (ii) sign Kuhl Design Build standard copyright license agreement, a copy of which will be made available.

When those conditions are satisfied, the designs may be used without infringement of Kuhl Design Build's Copyright.
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14016 Spring Lake Rd
Minnetonka, MN  55345
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Richard & Linda Sedgwick
31 JAN 2017 For Struct

If another contractor will be using the plans for construction, it will first be necessary for the homeowner to (i) pay all design fees due Kuhl Design Build, and (ii) sign Kuhl Design Build standard copyright license agreement, a copy of which will be made available. When those conditions are satisfied, the designs may be used without infringement of Kuhl Design Build's Copyright.
If another contractor will be using the plans for construction, it will first be necessary for the homeowner to (i) pay all design fees due Kuhl Design Build, and (ii) sign Kuhl Design Build standard copyright license agreement, a copy of which will be made available. When those conditions are satisfied, the designs may be used without infringement of Kuhl Design Build's Copyright.
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If another contractor will be using the plans for construction, it will first be necessary for the homeowner to (i) pay all design fees due Kuhl Design Build, and (ii) sign Kuhl Design Build standard copyright license agreement, a copy of which will be made available. When those conditions are satisfied, the designs may be used without infringement of Kuhl Design Build’s Copyright.

**General Electrical Notes:**
1. PROVIDE OUTLETS PER CODE IN ADDITION TO THOSE SHOWN.
2. VERIFY EXG ELEC PANEL, CIRCUITS, PROVIDE UPGRADES AS REQ’D.

**Main Level Electrical Plan**

**Scale:** 1/4" = 1'-0"
McMansion Map
1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:40 p.m., by Chairperson Smith. At this time, she also welcomed new member, G. Stanley Richards.

2. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Smith, Larsen, Richards, Hutchins and Fenning all present.


There were no corrections or additions; the minutes stand approved as read.

ELECTION OF A NEW SECRETARY


4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. PUBLIC HEARING FOR ARNOLD ROERICK AT 18901 SHADY LANE SOUTH FOR A VARIANCE REDUCING THE MINIMUM FRONT YARD REQUIREMENT FROM 35 FEET TO 8 FEET.

Mr. Roerick was present. Chairperson Smith read the staff report. Mr. Roerick is planning to build a garage 28 x 30 feet with future plans of expanding the upper portion for a room addition. The removal of several trees was discussed as well as where the front door of the garage would be. Mr. Roerick was asked why the garage would be there. In the back and he stated it would take up too much of his lot area and there would be no place for the children to play. There was no one in the audience in objection to this request and Mr. Roerick had presented a petition from his neighbors stating they had no objection to this request. Penning moved for denial of this request. Larsen seconded for discussion. Commissioner Hutchins commented on the fact that 17 residents in the neighborhood signed a petition of no objection to this request. Larsen stated he could go along with a 24 foot garage addition which would leave it 14 feet from the property line. Penning withdrew his motion for denial and Larsen withdrew his second. Motion by Hutchins to approve the variance allowing Mr. Roerick to build a 24 foot garage which would mean reducing the minimum front yard requirement from 35 feet to 14 feet. This variance is for the garage only. Larsen seconded. Commissioners Smith, Larsen, Richards, Hutchins and Penning all voted "aye." Motion carried.

B. PUBLIC HEARING FOR DAVID R. NELSON OF THE JONELL COMPANY FOR A VARIANCE AT 14016 SPRING LAKE ROAD, REDUCING THE SETBACK REQUIREMENT IN WETLANDS FROM 35 FEET TO 22 FEET.

Chairperson Smith read the staff report. Mr. David Nelson of the Jonell Company and Josie Brill, Jr., Attorney, representing the Jonell Company, came forward. Chairperson Smith noted there was a correction on the drawing of a dimension that was left out. Mr. Brill stated that the actual measured distance from the wetlands was 22 feet so there would be a 13 foot variance. He went into some detail on the issuance of the building permit and that there was some confusion on this point. It was noted that Mr. Nelson had appeared before the City Council. Council denied his request and indicated he had to appear before the Board of Zoning Adjustment. Mr. Brill spoke in regard to the cost Mr. Nelson had incurred in this home and about $6,000 in special assessments against the property. Mrs. Eleanor Barchewicz came forward to speak to this question and stated that the Board would have to take a hard look at this situation and make sure that this type of thing is prevented from happening again. Mr. Lee Sorenson also came forward. He resides at 3848 Haven Road - across the lake from this project. He spoke in regard to preservation of the lake. It was noted that staff had received some questions from another resident, Mr. Grant Baseman of 14027 Spring Lake Road, regarding the general construction of the home and if everything was being constructed according to code. Jim Tobias assured the Board that everything was being constructed according to code. The wood foundation used in this home is a new system and is approved. There is a need for an ejector system in the basement for the sewer and there is no water closet in the basement so a sump pump may be used. Mr. Morrison of 3972 Haven Road came forward and stated it is unfortunate that there were errors made on both sides, by the City and Mr. Nelson. He is concerned that this type of variance not set a precedent. He was not contesting but make sure that the home was not occupied until the City sewer was available for hook up. He wanted to make sure that the City and the builder take their responsible parts in these types of matters. Mr. Nelson was asked if he intended to occupy the home after sewer was available. His answer was yes - not until the sewer was in and serviceable. Commissioner Hutchins moved to approve the variance from 35 feet to 22 feet for Mr. David Nelson and included in the motion that the house be connected to sewer and water before occupancy and he cautioned the petitioner, and he is well advised by persons in the audience, that this not occur again. Motion to check with the Ordinances of the City. Larsen seconded, and noted that part of the building permit procedure be to require, wherever precautions seem necessary, to stop erosion and drainage problems. Commissioners Smith, Hutchins, Larsen, Richards, and Penning voted "aye." Motion carried.

THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION WAS LEFT OFF OF THE REGULAR MINUTES:

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED: That the application herein for a variance from the strict provisions of Section 7, Subdivision 5, Ordinance No. 77, reducing the minimum setback from wetlands from 35 feet to 10 feet and reducing the front yard requirement from 35 feet to 24 feet be and hereby is granted in all respects as to the premises at 5729 Whited Avenue, Minnetonka, Minnesota, also known as: Petitioner: Fremont Harms
Planning Commission Resolution No. 2017-

Resolution approving a wetland setback variance for dormer additions
at 14016 Spring Lake Road

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

Section 1. Background.

1.01 Kuhl Design Build, on behalf of property owners Richard and Linda Sedgwick, has requested a variance from the city code to reduce wetland setback from 35 feet to 22 feet to allow for construction of dormers on the north side of an existing home.

1.02 The property is located at 14016 Spring Lake Road. It is legally described on Exhibit A of this resolution.

1.03 The existing home does not meet the city’s required wetland setback as outlined in the current zoning ordinance. However, the setbacks are consistent with wetland setback variances granted in 1976.

1.04 Minnesota Statute §462.357 Subd. 6, and City Code §300.07 authorizes the Planning Commission to grant variances.

Section 2. Standards.

2.01 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.

Section 3.  Findings.

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

1. PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE: The purpose and intent of the zoning ordinance is to ensure appropriate separation between structures and property lines or natural features. The requested variances meet this intent. The proposed dormer additions would not encroach further into the required setbacks than the existing home.

2. CONSISTENT WITH COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: The proposed variance is consistent with the comprehensive plan. The guiding principles in the comprehensive plan provide for maintaining, preserving and enhancing single-family neighborhoods. The requested variance would preserve the residential character of the neighborhood and would provide investment into the property to enhance its use.

3. PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES: There are practical difficulties in complying with the ordinance:

   a. REASONABLENESS: The proposed dormer additions would be reasonable and would not intensify the existing home’s proximity to the wetland. The additions would add living space in an environmentally sensitive way without increasing the footprint of the home beyond what was approved in 1976.

   b. UNIQUE CIRCUMSTANCE: After construction of the home began on the subject property in 1976, the city determined that the home would not meet the then required wetland setback. Ultimately, the city approved a variance to reduce the wetland setback from 35 feet to 22 feet. The proposed additions would not encroach further into the required setback than what was previously approved. This coupled with the properties narrow width provide a unique circumstance not common to other similarly zoned properties.
c. CHARACTER OF LOCATILITY: The proposed dormers would not alter the character of the surrounding neighborhood. In fact, the dormers would allow for increased living area within the home without significantly increasing the visual mass of the home as viewed from adjacent roadways or properties.

Section 4. Planning Commission Action.

4.01 The Planning Commission approves the above-described variance based on 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, excepted as modified by the conditions below:
   - Survey, dated August 23, 1996
   - Floor plans and elevations, dated January 31, 2017

2. Prior to issuance of a building permit:
   a) A copy of this resolution must be recorded with Hennepin County.
   b) Install construction fencing as required by staff for inspection and approval. These items must be maintained throughout the course of construction.

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

Adopted by the Planning Commission of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on April 6, 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 Planning Commission of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, at a duly authorized meeting held on April 6, 2017.

____________________________
Kathy Leervig, Deputy City Clerk
Exhibit A

That part of a strip of land 100 feet in width in the Northwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of Section 22, Township 117, Range 22, Hennepin County, Minnesota, lying between the Northeasterly line of Lot 23, Auditor’s Subdivision No. 227, Hennepin County, Minnesota, and the Southwesterly line of Lot 34, said Auditor’s Subdivision which lies Southeasterly of the extension North across it of the East line of Lot 28, said Auditor’s Subdivision, according to the Government Survey thereof:

AND

That part of the Northwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 22 described as follows:

Commencing at the southwest corner of the Northeast Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 22; thence on an assumed bearing of North 4 degrees 24 minutes 40 seconds East along the west line thereof a distance of 42.04 feet to the point of beginning of the tract to be described; thence continuing North 4 degrees 24 minutes 40 seconds East along said West line a distance of 108.67 feet; thence South 56 degrees 31 minutes 06 seconds East a distance of 91.57 feet; thence South 41 degrees 24 minutes 32 seconds West a distance of 95.90 feet to an intersection with a line which bears South 56 degrees 31 minutes 06 seconds East from the point of beginning; thence North 56 degrees 31 minutes 06 seconds West a distance of 25.54 feet to the point of beginning.
Minnetonka Planning Commission Meeting

April 6, 2017

Agenda Item 8

Public Hearing: Non-Consent Agenda
Brief Description

Conditional use permits for recreational facility improvements on the Minnetonka Civic Center Campus at 14600 Minnetonka Boulevard:

- Trails/boardwalks within required wetland buffers; and
- Installation of lighting on an existing recreational field.

Recommendation

Recommend the city council adopt the resolutions approving the conditional use permits.

Background

In 1986, the city adopted a master plan for the Minnetonka Civic Center Campus. In succeeding years, conditional use permits and site and building plans were reviewed and approved for various components of the master plan. These included the community center building, police station, and ice arenas. (See attached.)

In 2005, the master plan was comprehensively reviewed and an amended plan was adopted. The plan revised previously planned site components and included new buildings and amenities. Since its adoption, some items in the plan have been constructed including a significantly realigned driveway, parking areas, and an outdoor amphitheater. Funds have been allocated to several other components that have not yet been constructed/installed. (See attached.)

Proposal Summary

At this time, the city is proposing two recreational improvements to the civic center campus:

- Trails/Boardwalks. As proposed, two new loop trails/boardwalks would be constructed on the east side of the campus. The northerly loop would extend north and east from the existing water treatment facility. The southerly loop would extend north from the existing Minnetonka Boulevard trail. The two new loops would add roughly 0.5 miles of trails/boardwalks to the campus.

- Field lighting. As proposed, lighting would be installed on the existing athletic field north of Ice Arena B. Four 70-foot light standards would be located on the field, two on its north side and two on the south. Each light standard would be equipped with seven LED fixtures. Consistent with practices at other city-owned athletic
fields: (1) the field lighting could be used May 1 through October 15; and (2) when in use, lighting would be turned off by 9:45 p.m.

Primary Questions and Analysis

The funding of city projects and the programming of city park facilities are not the purview of the planning commission; the city council and park board make such decisions. The commission’s charge is to review proposed land uses and determine whether they are appropriate given zoning ordinance standards and land use policy. The following outlines the primary land use questions associated with the proposed recreational improvements and staff’s findings.

1.  **Are the proposed improvements appropriate?**

   Yes. The trails/boardwalks and lighted athletic field improvements are appropriate for several reasons:

   - The civic center campus is a public space available to community residents and visitors. Recreational trails/boardwalks and lighted athletic fields are appropriate and reasonable uses of this public space and would be similar to existing uses in several city parks.

   - The proposed trails/boardwalks and the athletic field are components of the existing civic center campus master plan.

   - The trails/boardwalks and lighting have been generally reviewed and approved by the city council through allocation of funds in the five-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP). In addition, the park board has specifically reviewed and recommends approval of the lighting improvements. (See attached.)

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

   Yes. The trails/boardwalks would increase the area of the campus that is physically “used” and field lighting would potentially increase the date and time of campus use. However, these increases are acceptable.

   - City and Minnehaha Creek Watershed District natural resources staff have reviewed the proposed trails/boardwalks. These reviews indicate the trails/boardwalks would not negatively impact wetland areas. Rather, the trails/boardwalks would increase the community’s access to, and hopefully enjoyment of, these resources.

   - The proposed LED lighting at the existing athletic field would visually impact the immediate area when the lighting is in use. However, current technology minimizes “spill-over” lighting and the 9:45 p.m. limitation on lighting would
further reduce nighttime impacts. The closest home to the field is located 300 feet to the west. The closest home to the north, located across Minnehaha Creek, is nearly 700 feet way from the field. The surrounding residential areas are further separated from the existing athletic field by large stands of mature trees.

**Staff Recommendation**

Recommend the city council adopt the resolutions approving the following for recreational facility improvements on the Minnetonka Civic Center Campus at 14600 Minnetonka Boulevard:

1) Conditional use permit for trails and boardwalks within required wetland buffers; and

2) Conditional use permit for installation lightning on an existing athletic field.

Originator: Susan Thomas, AICP, Assistant City Planner
Supporting Information

**Surrounding Land Uses**
- Northerly: Minnehaha Creek, single-family homes beyond
- Easterly: Minnehaha Creek, single-family homes and I-494 beyond
- Southerly: Minnetonka Blvd and regional trail beyond
- Westerly: School and church property

**Planning**
- Existing Zoning: PUD
- Guide Plan designation: Institutional and Parks

**CUP Standards: Trails/Boardwalks**
The proposed trail/boardwalk improvements 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 the 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 improvements would not adversely impact wetland areas. Rather, they are 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 improvements are consistent with the comprehensive plan. The plan notes that parks in the Upper Minnehaha Creek corridor should be designed to implement complementary activities in appropriate areas that emphasizes the creek corridor’s natural resources, and recreational, educational, historic, and scenic values.

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

   **Finding:** The proposed improvements would not adversely impact public facilities, utilities, or services. The funds associated with these improvements have been allocated in the CIP.
4. The use is consistent with the city’s water resources management plan;

**Finding:** The proposed improvements have 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 improvements would not adversely impact public health, safety, or welfare. Rather, they are 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 improvements 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 improvements 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 trails/boardwalks have 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 have been approved by the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District; no other agency approval is required.

**CUP Standards:**

**Field Lighting**

The proposed field lighting would meet the conditional use permit standards for public facilities as outlined in City Code §300.16 Subd.3(l).

1. Site and building plans subject to review pursuant to section 300.27 of this ordinance.

**Finding:** See the following section of this report.

2. Direct access limited to a collector or arterial roadway as identified in the comprehensive plan or otherwise located so that access can be provided without conducting significant traffic on local residential streets;

**Finding:** No access changes are proposed.
3. Buildings set back 50 feet from all property lines;

Finding: No buildings are proposed.

4. Parking spaces and parking setbacks subject to section 300.28 of this ordinance; and

Finding: While the proposed lighting may increase the time during which existing parking spaces are utilized, the lighting would not increase the amount of parking required for the athletic field.

5. No more than 70 percent of the site to be covered with impervious surface and the remainder to be suitably landscaped; and

Finding: The proposed lighting would not increase the site’s impervious surface by more than the diameter of the four poles.

6. Stand-alone utility buildings, such as lift stations, are only subject to site and building plan review.

Finding: No buildings are proposed.

SBP Standards: Field Lighting

The proposed field lighting would comply with site and building standards as outlined in City Code §300.27, Subd.5.

1. Consistency with the elements and objectives of the city's development guides, including the comprehensive plan and water resources management plan;

Finding: Members of the city’s community development, engineering, and public works staff have reviewed the proposed lighting and find that it is generally consistent with the city’s development guides.

2. Consistency with this ordinance;

Finding: The proposal would meet all ordinance standards.

3. Preservation of the site in its natural state to the extent practicable by minimizing tree and soil removal and designing grade changes to be in keeping with the general appearance of neighboring developed or developing areas;
**Finding:** The proposed lighting would necessitate minimal soil removal and no tree removal.

4. Creation of a harmonious relationship of buildings and open spaces with natural site features and with existing and future buildings having a visual relationship to the development;

**Finding:** The civic center campus contains a variety of recreational uses and government/service buildings. The proposed lighting of an existing athletic field would not detract from the relationship between existing and future uses and buildings.

5. Creation of a functional and harmonious design for structures and site features, with special attention to the following:

   a. an internal sense of order for the buildings and uses on the site and provision of a desirable environment for occupants, visitors and the general community;

   b. the amount and location of open space and landscaping;

   c. materials, textures, colors and details of construction as an expression of the design concept and the compatibility of the same with the adjacent and neighboring structures and uses; and

   d. vehicular and pedestrian circulation, including walkways, interior drives and parking in terms of location and number of access points to the public streets, width of interior drives and access points, general interior circulation, separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic and arrangement and amount of parking.

**Finding:** The proposed lighting of an existing field would not impact the internal order, circulation, landscaping, or open space on the civic center campus.

6. Promotion of energy conservation through design, location, orientation and elevation of structures, the use and location of glass in structures and the use of landscape materials and site grading; and

**Finding:** LED fixtures would be used.
7. Protection of adjacent and neighboring properties through reasonable provision for surface water drainage, sound and sight buffers, preservation of views, light and air and those aspects of design not adequately covered by other regulations which may have substantial effects on neighboring land uses.

Finding: The proposal would allow for extended recreational use of a site that has long been used for recreational purposes. The closest residential area, located west of the existing field, is 300 feet away. The closest home to the north, located across Minnehaha Creek, is nearly 700 feet way. The surrounding residential areas are further separated from the existing athletic field by large stands of mature trees.

Neighborhood Comments
The city has sent notice to 45 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 resolutions approving the conditional use permits.

2. Disagree with staff’s recommendation. In this case, a motion should be made recommending the city council deny the conditional use permits. 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 requires an affirmative vote of a simple majority. The city council’s final approval requires an affirmative vote of a simple majority.

Deadline for Decision June 12, 2017
Project: Civic Center Soccer Lights
Applicant: City of Minnetonka
Address: 3391 Williston Rd
Project No.02068.17a

This map is for illustrative purposes only.
Civic Center Campus
Master Plan
City of Minnetonka
**GENERAL LAYOUT NOTES:**
Contractor shall verify existing conditions prior to construction start. Contractor is responsible for all located. All located shall be reviewed by the owner/la-e prior to construction start.
Contractor shall be responsible for protecting all existing structures, utilities, trees, site amenities, etc. that are to remain from damage during construction.
Contractor shall be responsible for correcting any damage to existing items to remain at contractor’s expense and is considered incidental to the contract.
Dimensions take precedence over scale. Field verify (fv) items shall be field verified by the contractor.
**ANY DISCREPANCIES FOUND THAT AFFECT THE WORK SHALL BE REPORTED TO THE OWNER/ A.E. FOR CLASSIFICATION PRIOR TO ANY ADDITIONAL WORK BEING COMPLETED.**

**FIELD LAYOUT LOCATION NOTE:**
All site improvements shall be field staked according to plan and the contractor shall meet with the owner/la-e to review stakes and make adjustments as necessary prior to any work being done.

**SPOT GRADES & DRAINAGE REQUIREMENTS:**
The contractor and surveyor shall review all grading with the la-e prior to construction to ensure proper drainage and grading.

The intent of all proposed spot grades and grows in general, is to match existing grades adjacent to new construction and to ensure proper drainage and blending of new grades with existing ones.
Spot grades shown are to finish grade. Contractor shall subcut in accordance with the plans, details and specifications. Contractor shall field verify and confirm all grades with the la-e after initial survey / staking work and prior to start of grading operations.

**EROSION CONTROL REQUIREMENTS:**
Refer to plan sheets l3.1 to l3.3 for location and type of erosion control protection. This must be in place prior to removals and grading.

**ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS:**
1. Install perimeter control per the plan prior to any ground disturbing activities in the drainage area.
2. All streets and adjacent to the project shall remain clean and passable at all times. Adjacent street and curb line to be swept free of debris at the end of each work day, or as ten as needed to ensure public safety.
3. All storm sewer structures shall be protected from infiltration of silt during construction by approved infiltration protection.
4. Stabilization of disturbed areas shall be done by permanent turf establishment whenever possible.
5. In the event that permanent stabilization cannot be implemented within 7 days after construction activity in the disturbed area has ceased, temporary stabilization BMPs must be scheduled to occur within that 7 day time frame. Temporary cover measures may consist of applying hydromulch to the exposed areas.
6. Inlet protection devices and all perimeter control, shall be maintained once sediment accumulates to a depth 1/3 of the designed capacity.
7. In the event that dewatering operations need to occur, the water that will be discharged must be treated with the appropriate BMPs. Such that the discharge is free of turbidity and does not adversely affect the receiving water or downstream landowners.
8. All stockpiles must have perimeter sediment control implemented and maintained at all times. Stockpiles to receive mulch if unmowed for 10 days.
9. Additional erosion and sediment control may be added during any phase of construction as directed by the engineer.
10. Contractor to be responsible for all sediment and erosion control.
11. Operator shall submit a site plan of the construction sequencing of the boardwalk, as described in the SWPPP narrative.

**EARTHEN EXPORT:**
1. Contractor shall haul all excess earthen material to Minnetonka Public Works Facility. Contractor to coordinate exact location with city.
FIELD LIGHTS
Area of lighting proposed
Minnetonka Civic Center Soccer
Minnetonka, MN

Lighting System

### Pole/Fixture Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pole ID</th>
<th>Pole Height</th>
<th>Mtg Height</th>
<th>Fixture Qty</th>
<th>Luminaire Type</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1-S4</td>
<td>70'</td>
<td>70'</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>3.03 kW</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.20 kW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Group Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Avg Load</th>
<th>Max Load</th>
<th>Fixture Qty</th>
<th>MW</th>
<th>MVA</th>
<th>MW</th>
<th>MVA</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>32.2 kW</td>
<td>32.2 kW</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fixture Type Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Wattage</th>
<th>Lumen</th>
<th>L90</th>
<th>L80</th>
<th>L70</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>LED 5700K - 75 CRI</td>
<td>1150W</td>
<td>121,000</td>
<td>&gt;51,000</td>
<td>&gt;51,000</td>
<td>&gt;51,000</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Light Level Summary

| Calculation Grid Summary
| Grid Name | Calculation Metric | Avg | Min | Max | Method | Groups | Fixtures Qty |
|-----------|--------------------|-----|-----|-----|--------|--------|-------------|-------------|
| Minwatt Grid | FOOTVIAL | 6.17 | 10 | 35 | 0.085 | A        | 28          |
| Soccer-1 | Horizontal Illuminance | 39.2 | 33 | 50 | 1.52 | A        | 28          |

| Grid Name | Calculation Metric | Avg | Min | Max | Method | Groups | Fixtures Qty |
|-----------|--------------------|-----|-----|-----|--------|--------|-------------|-------------|
| Minwatt Grid | FOOTVIAL | 6.17 | 10 | 35 | 0.085 | A        | 28          |
| Soccer-1 | Horizontal Illuminance | 39.2 | 33 | 50 | 1.52 | A        | 28          |
ILLUMINATION SUMMARY

Minnetonka Civic Center Soccer
Minnetonka, MN

GRID SUMMARY

Name: Soccer-1
Size: 310' x 210'
Spacing: 30.0' x 30.0'
Height: 3.0' above grade

ILLUMINATION SUMMARY

MAINTAINED HORIZONTAL FOOTCANDLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entire Grid</th>
<th>Guaranteed Average: 30</th>
<th>Scan Average: 39.16</th>
<th>Max: 50</th>
<th>Min: 33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg / Min: 1.18</td>
<td>Max / Min: 1.26</td>
<td>UG (adjacent pts): 1.26</td>
<td>CU: 0.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. of Points: 70

LUMINAIRE INFORMATION

Color / CRI: 5700K - 75 CRI
Luminaire Output: 121,000 lumens
No. of Luminaires: 28
Total Load: 32.2 kW

Lumen Maintenance

Luminaire Type L90 hrs L80 hrs L70 hrs
TLC-LED-1150 >51,000 >51,000 >51,000

Guaranteed Performance:

The ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed per your Musco Warranty document and includes a 0.95 dirt depreciation factor.

Field Measurements: Individual field measurements may vary from computer-calculated predictions and should be taken in accordance with IESNA RP-6-15.

Electrical System Requirements: Refer to Amperage Draw Chart and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.

Installation Requirements: Results assume ±3% nominal voltage at line side of the driver and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.

NOTES:

Prod-r1: Moved S4

EQUIPMENT LIST FOR AREAS SHOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pole Location</th>
<th>LUMINAIRE</th>
<th>QTY / POLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1-S4</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS

28

0

Pole location(s): 4 - dimensions are relative to 0,0 reference point(s)

SCALE IN FEET: 1:50

S1-S4
**ENGINEERED DESIGN**

**NOTES:**

**EQUIPMENT LIST FOR AREAS SHOWN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>EQUIPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCALE IN FEET 1:100**

**S1-S4**

**POLE LUMINAIRES**

**70'**

**SIZE**

**Pole Luminaires**

**70'**

**TLC-LED-1150**

**LUMINAIRE TYPE**

**POLE**

**QTY / 28**

**GRID**

**28**

**7**

**GRID SUMMARY**

**Name:** Blanket Grid

**Spacing:** 20.0' x 20.0'

**Height:** 3.0' above grade

**ELEVATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>100'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRADE**

- -

**TOTALS**

**MOUNTING HEIGHT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>70'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ILLUMINATION SUMMARY**

**1.00**

**Maintenance Horizontal Footcandles**

**ILLUMINATION SUMMARY**

**Name:** Blanket Grid

**Spacing:** 20.0' x 20.0'

**Height:** 3.0' above grade

**ELEVATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>100'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRADE**

- -

**TOTALS**

**MOUNTING HEIGHT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>70'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ILLUMINATION SUMMARY**

**Name:** Blanket Grid

**Spacing:** 20.0' x 20.0'

**Height:** 3.0' above grade

**ELEVATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>100'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRADE**

- -

**TOTALS**

**MOUNTING HEIGHT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>70'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ILLUMINATION SUMMARY**

**Name:** Blanket Grid

**Spacing:** 20.0' x 20.0'

**Height:** 3.0' above grade

**ELEVATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>100'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRADE**

- -

**TOTALS**

**MOUNTING HEIGHT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>70'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ILLUMINATION SUMMARY**

**Name:** Blanket Grid

**Spacing:** 20.0' x 20.0'

**Height:** 3.0' above grade

**ELEVATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>100'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRADE**

- -

**TOTALS**

**MOUNTING HEIGHT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>70'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ILLUMINATION SUMMARY**

**Name:** Blanket Grid

**Spacing:** 20.0' x 20.0'

**Height:** 3.0' above grade

**ELEVATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>100'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRADE**

- -

**TOTALS**

**MOUNTING HEIGHT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>70'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ILLUMINATION SUMMARY**

**Name:** Blanket Grid
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Minnetonka Civic Center Soccer
Minnetonka, MN

EQUIPMENT LAYOUT

INCLUDES:
Soccer-1

Electrical System Requirements: Refer to Amperage Draw Chart and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.

Installation Requirements: Results assume ± 3% nominal voltage at line side of the driver and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.

EQUIPMENT LIST FOR AREAS SHOWN

Pole Luminaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>ELEVATION</th>
<th>MOUNTING</th>
<th>HEIGHT</th>
<th>LUMINAIRE</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>QTY / POLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S1-S4</td>
<td>70'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-70'</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SINGLE LUMINAIRE AMPERAGE DRAW CHART

Ballast Specifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single Phase Voltage</th>
<th>208V</th>
<th>220V</th>
<th>240V</th>
<th>277V</th>
<th>347V</th>
<th>380V</th>
<th>480V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line Amperage Per Luminaire (nominal)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:
Prod-r1: Moved S4
Photographed at 100-feet from field edge

Used equal parameters for:
- On-field light level per pole
- Wattage per luminaire
- Mounting height
- Luminaire aiming angles
- Pole distance from aiming point

1977 SportsCluster
1989 SportsCluster-2
1989 SportsCluster-2 with Level 8™
1989 Total Light Control™
2005 Light-Structure Green™—HID
2015 Light-Structure Green™—LED
KENT-STEIN PARK

Muscatine, Iowa, USA

Soccer Field – 30 horizontal footcandles (300 lux)

System Energy Comparison:
34.8 kW – 81% reduction from typical HID equipment
**Project Category:** Parks, Trails and Open Space  
**Project Title:** Trail Improvement Plan  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $1,920,000 Total Cost  
$ 520,000 City Cost  
$1,400,000 Unfunded  
**Funding Priority:** 3  
**Account Number:** 4701.XXXX.S16206

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail Improvement Fund (PTF)</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin County Funds (HC)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Investment Fund (Unfunded)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Trail Funding</strong></td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Justification:
There is strong community support for the Minnetonka Trail System as evidenced by the heavy use of the completed trail segments and inquiries received about opportunities for extensions. When completed, these trails and walkways will connect five community parks, adjacent communities, and allow users to travel throughout the city on trails physically separated from motorized vehicles.

### Scheduling and Project Status:
*The Opus Area Improvements page additionally designates $520,000 from the Community Investment Fund to construct trail connections to the new Light Rail Transit platform in 2019.*

Staff conducted an educational and community dialogue for missing trail links to assist the Park Board and City Council in recommending projects to be constructed. The avenues for information were the Minnetonka Memo, Summer Festival and Open House.

### Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
This is an integral part of the Parks, Open Space and Trail System and the Comprehensive Guide Plans to construct the Minnetonka Trail for walkers, joggers and bicyclists.

The vision for trail segments uses a feasibility score made up of Community Access (40%), Nature of Use (30%), Cost Effectiveness (20%) and Degree of Construction Difficulty (10%).

### Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Maintenance costs will increase by approximately $1,500/mile.
**Project Category:** Parks, Trails & Open Space  
**Project Title:** Athletic Field Improvements  
**Total Estimated Cost:** $640,000 Total Cost  
- 425,000 City Cost  
- 75,000 Grant Funding  
- 140,000 Unfunded  
**Funding Priority:** 2  
**Account Number:** 4701.XXXX.S17207

### Source of Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail fund- City Facilities</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin Youth Sports Grant Funding</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfunded – Park &amp; Trail Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Justification:

With a lack of available city property for athletic field expansion, lighting of existing fields, along with partnerships with local school districts, provides the best opportunities to expand access to community fields. This program also funds major upgrades to dedicated city owned athletic fields to maintain acceptable playing standards.

### Scheduling and Project Status:

**2017:** $75,000 is allocated to light the existing Civic Center fields. An additional $75,000 would be funded from a Hennepin County Youth Sports Grant. $20,000 is allocated for field renovations at city owned athletic fields.  
**2018:** $20,000 is allocated for field improvements at city owned athletic fields. $140,000 is included as an unfunded request for the lighting of the two existing fields at Lone Lake Park.  
**2019:** $270,000 is allocated to replace the lighting on the softball fields at Big Willow Park.  
**2020 and 2021:** $20,000 is allocated for field improvements at city owned athletic fields each year.

### Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:

The city of Minnetonka has a history of partnerships with the Minnetonka and Hopkins School Districts to provide quality community facilities, most notably, the Lindbergh Center, Arts Center on 7 and athletic improvements at Hopkins West Junior High.

### Effect on Annual Operations Costs:

Under the terms of the partnership agreements in place for previous improvements completed on school district property, the school districts are responsible for all operational and capital replacement costs. Increased energy costs due to field lighting will be recouped through field use fees.
PARK BOARD REPORTS AND MINUTES
Minnetonka Park Board Item 4A  
Meeting of August 3, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>Neighborhood meeting – Civic Center Athletic Field Lighting (7 p.m.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park Board related goal:</td>
<td>To provide quality athletic and recreational facilities and programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Board related objective:</td>
<td>Anticipate, review and respond to community needs not previously identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief Description:</td>
<td>Hold public meeting to gather input regarding the lighting of the Civic Center Field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background**

With a lack of available city property for athletic field expansion, lighting of existing fields provides the best opportunity to expand access to community fields. The park board has recommended that the Civic Center field be lit to address the demand in our community for youth fields for soccer, lacrosse, football and other sports requiring similar field space. In the 2012 Field Needs Study the number one opportunity identified for fields sports was exploring the addition of lights on Civic Center and Lone Lake parks fields as well as addressing the need for additional youth practice field space.

The city of Minnetonka’s Capital Improvements Program (CIP) includes proposed funding to light the Civic Center multi-purpose field in 2017. To complete this project, grant funding from the Hennepin County Youth Sports program would be required. An application for this grant program is scheduled to be submitted in the fall of 2016.

If lights are added to the field, staff would recommend that the Comprehensive Athletic Field Use policy be amended to allow for use (when necessary) until 9:45 p.m. each night from May 1 – October 15. This would be consistent with the current regulations for lighting in place at other city youth fields. Plans show that the proposed lighting would “spill” no more than 160 feet from the field – and this does not take into account the tree barrier which will further diminish the distance light will travel. The nearest home to the field is over 300 feet away, therefore no light is expected to reach neighboring homes. Craig Gallop of Musco lighting has served as a consultant for the project and will be in attendance to provide technical information regarding lighting and address resident questions or concerns.

**Discussion Points**

- Based on input received from residents, is there additional information the park board is requesting from staff?
Recommended Action: Obtain resident information to assist in developing a final recommendation for the project at the September 7, 2016 park board meeting.

Attachments:

1. Neighborhood Meeting Notice
2. Area map
3. 2017-2021 CIP Athletic Field Improvement page
4. Evolution of Lighting
5. 2012 Field Needs Study - Need and Opportunities
6. 2012 Field Needs Study – Field Sports
Neighborhood Meeting Notice

Consideration of a park board recommendation to light the civic center multi-purpose field

Wednesday, Aug. 3, 2016
7 p.m.

Minnetonka City Hall – Minnehaha Room
14600 Minnetonka Boulevard

You are invited...
The Minnetonka Park Board invites you to a neighborhood meeting to review plans for the possible lighting of the multi-purpose field located on the north side of Ice Arena B on the Civic Center Campus at 14600 Minnetonka Boulevard. The park board recommends this field be lit to increase the amount of time youth are able to play soccer, lacrosse, football and other sports requiring similar field space in this location. Lighting this field would address a growing demand for space. You are receiving this notice because your residence is located within 1,000 feet of the field.

See the map on the reverse side for location details.

What is being proposed?
The City of Minnetonka budget includes funding to light the multi-purpose field in 2017. However, to fully fund this project, grant funding from the Hennepin County Youth Sports program is required. An application for this grant is scheduled to be submitted in the fall of 2016.

If lights are added to the field, they would be in use (when necessary) until 9:45 p.m. each night from May 1–Oct. 15, according to city ordinance. Plans show that the proposed lighting would “spill” no more than 160 feet from the field – and this does not take into account the tree barrier which will further diminish the distance light will travel. The nearest home to the field is over 300 feet away, therefore no light is expected to reach neighboring homes.

What happens at the meeting?
The purpose of this meeting is to review the proposal and receive feedback from residents residing in close proximity to the field.

Will there be future meetings?
Yes. The park board will meet again on Sept. 7, 2016 to review the feedback received at the Aug. 3 meeting and to make final recommendations for the project.

How can I stay informed?
You will be kept informed of future meetings related to this project by attending this meeting. If you are unable to attend this meeting and would like to stay informed, or if you have additional questions, please contact Program and Special Events Manager Sara Woeste at swoeste@eminnetonka.com or 952-939-8316.
Minnetonka Civic Center Field

Proposed Lighting Area
Project Category: Parks, Trails & Open Space
Project Title: Athletic Field Improvements
Total Estimated Cost: $640,000 Total Cost
                      $565,000 City Cost
                      $75,000 Grant Funding
                      $140,000 Unfunded
Funding Priority: 2
Account Number: 4701.XXXX.S17207

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Project Funding</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Trail fund- City Facilities</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin Youth Sports Grant Funding</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfunded – Park &amp; Trail Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:
With a lack of available city property for athletic field expansion, lighting of existing fields, along with partnerships with local school districts, provides the best opportunities to expand access to community fields. This program also funds major upgrades to dedicated city owned athletic fields to maintain acceptable playing standards.

Scheduling and Project Status:
2017: $75,000 is allocated to light the existing Civic Center fields. An additional $75,000 would be funded from a Hennepin County Youth Sports Grant. $20,000 is allocated for field renovations at city owned athletic fields.
2018: $20,000 is allocated for field improvements at city owned athletic fields. $140,000 is included as an unfunded request for the lighting of the two existing fields at Lone Lake Park.
2019: $270,000 is allocated to replace the lighting on the softball fields at Big Willow Park.
2020: $20,000 is allocated for field improvements at city owned athletic fields.

Relationship to General Plan and Other Projects:
The city of Minnetonka has a history of partnerships with the Minnetonka and Hopkins School Districts to provide quality community facilities, most notably, the Lindbergh Center, Arts Center on 7 and athletic improvements at Hopkins West Junior High.

Description:
The park board's 2012 update of the city's Athletic Field Needs Study continues to indicate a moderate need for increased game quality athletic fields for the sports of soccer, lacrosse and football; and increased access to quality practice fields for youth softball and baseball through partnerships.

1998: The city provided $100,000 for the redevelopment of fields at Hopkins West Junior High with the Hopkins School District.
2008 – 2010: The city provided $250,000 towards the $3.5 Million construction of Minnetonka School Districts Veterans Field (baseball/football fields).
2009: The city provided $95,000 towards the $1.2 Million construction of Legacy Fields (four youth softball fields) with Minnetonka School District.
2010: The city provided $50,000 towards a $250,000 upgrade of an existing multi-purpose field at Bennett Family Park.
2014: $20,000 is allocated for field renovations at city owned athletic fields and $65,000 for Phase I safety improvements (foul ball netting) at Big Willow Park.
2016: $85,000 is allocated for Phase II safety improvements (spectator and bleacher protection) at Big Willow Park. Hennepin County Youth Sports grant application will be submitted for the 2017 cycle.

Effect on Annual Operations Costs:
Under the terms of the partnership agreements in place for previous improvements completed on school district property, the school districts are responsible for all operational and capital replacement costs. Increased energy costs due to field lighting will be recouped through field use fees.
What Matters in Lighting Technology

1977 SportsCluster®
1989 SportsCluster-2
1989 SportsCluster-2 with Level 8™
1989 Total Light Control™
2005 Light-Structure Green™—HID
2015 Light-Structure Green™—LED

Used equal parameters for:
- On-field light level per pole
- Wattage per luminaire
- Mounting height
- Luminaire aiming angles
- Pole distance from aiming point

Photographed at 100-feet from field edge
## Need & Opportunities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Activity</th>
<th>Community Fields Need</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball - Youth</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Partner with school districts to add practice fields on elementary school properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball - Regulation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Expansion of use through Hopkins School District partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Sports</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>• Explore the addition of lights on Civic Center and Lone Lake fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Explore partnerships with school districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider artificial turf of the Big Willow Park multipurpose field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball - Youth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Partner with school districts to add practice fields on elementary and middle school properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball - Adult</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Expansion of use through city of Hopkins (Lighting and fields)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Roll Call

Park Board members in attendance included Jack Acomb, Nelson Evenrud, Chris Gabler, Cindy Kist, Peggy Kvam, Elise Raarup and Madeline Seveland. Staff members in attendance included Jo Colleran, Ann Davy, Darin Ellingson, Dave Johnson, Kelly O’Dea, Mike Pavelka and Sara Woeste.

Chair Raarup called the meeting to order at 7 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

Evenrud moved and Gabler seconded a motion to approve the meeting Minutes of April 6, 2016 as submitted. All voted “Yes”. Motion carried.

3. Citizens Wishing to Discuss Items Not on the Agenda

None

4. Business Items

A. Neighborhood Meeting – Civic Center Athletic Field Lighting

Sara Woeste, Recreation Services Programming and Special Events Manager, provided the introduction. Woeste noted that the 2012 Athletic Field Needs Study (AFNS) indicates that the most significant needs related to athletic fields in the city are for field sports such as soccer, lacrosse, football and rugby. Woeste further noted that the AFNS recommends the lighting of existing fields such as the Civic Center to address the shortages in place.

Woeste indicated that the Civic Center fields are designated primarily for youth use. Woeste added that the use of lights in the summer time would be minimal, with the greatest need being in the months of May, September and October. To be consistent with other lighted fields in the city, the lights at the Civic Center would not be permitted for use past 9:45 p.m.

Woeste closed by stating that the lighting of the fields is contingent upon park board and city council approval; as well as successfully receiving a Hennepin County Youth Sports Grant for the project. Woeste noted that the application process will be this fall and that city funding is included in the 2017 Capital Improvements Program (CIP).

Woeste introduced Craig Gallop of Musco Lighting. Gallop indicated that he has been a resident of Minnetonka for about 25 years and has been involved in the lighting of several athletic fields in the city. Gallop noted that the Civic Center
provides the ideal lighting situation due to the proximity of the nearest homes by his estimates being over 500 feet away.

Gallop provided a brief history of athletic field lighting to illustrate how far lighting has come. Gallop mentioned that the latest trend is moving from standard metal halide lighting to LED lighting. While currently more expensive, Gallop indicated that he feels the cost for LED lighting will begin to come down over the next few years. Gallop reviewed light spill designs in place, warranty information, and indicated that the lights would be controlled through technology so that they can only be programmed for use by city staff.

Chair Raarup opened the floor to resident comments.

Vincent Troy, 14852 Timberhill Road asked what the expected cost of the project was. Gallop responded that LED lighting would cost $165,000 compared to $128,000 for metal halide. Woeste added that the CIP includes $75,000 in city costs and $75,000 through a Hennepin County Youth Sports Grant. Troy asked what the cost for maintenance would be. Gallop indicated that maintenance was included in the cost.

Earl Jensen, 14855 Timberhill Road, asked if the mailing had gone to residents on the north side of the creek. Woeste indicated it had. Jensen provided a history of past opposition residents from north of the creek; namely their concerns several years back regarding a community building being placed on that site. Jensen then asked if there would be adequate parking for the increased play. Woeste responded that there would not be an increase in the number of people on site at any given time, only that the hours of play could be extended in the months of May, September and October.

Jane Sweet, 3124 Minnehaha Creek, indicated that when the fields were constructed, neighbors were told there would not be lights. Sweet added that from her property, she can see increased lighting from city buildings and parking areas. Thus, she believes that the field lighting will be visible from her home. Darin Ellingson, Public Works Streets & Parks Operations Manager, reported that the city’s engineering department is working on a campus-wide plan to program lights more efficiently and economically. Ellingson felt that this would reduce the impact nearby residents might be currently seeing.

Vincent Troy, 14852 Timberhill Road asked if there would be increased costs for labor on the fields. Ellingson indicated there would not be additional costs.

Hearing no further requests from resident comments, Raarup closed the public comments portion of the meeting and asked for park board member questions and comments.
Acomb asked for an explanation on the differences between LED and metal halide lighting. Gallop responded by saying that LED lighting has tighter spill control, requires less electrical use and has an immediate on/off ability unlike metal halide that takes time to cool and regenerate.

Kvam asked if there were any athletic field LED applications in the immediate area. Gallop indicated there were not. Gabler asked if this lighting would require a 4-post system. Gallop indicated it would. Gabler asked about the sports that would benefit from the addition of lighting. Woeste indicated that primarily soccer, lacrosse and football would benefit.

Evenrud commented that when the fields were constructed back in 2005, there was a likelihood that lighting was not a priority at that time. Evenrud feels that with increased play, it is now more of a need than it was back in 2005. Evenrud then asked if field management practices would need to change due to increased play on the fields. Ellingson responded that the fields handle the current level of use well and that his department would need to monitor the turf for any new concerns due to increased play.

Hearing no further questions, Woeste thanked those in attendance for their comments and noted that the item will come back to the park board on September 7, 2016 for final consideration.

B. Consideration of Pickleball site recommendations

Woeste provided an introduction to the item and informed the board that in response to a related article in the Minnetonka Memo, a total of 16 residents responded. Those responses were best summarized by those wishing to convert the Meadow Park tennis courts to pickleball (2), those opposed to converting the tennis courts at Meadow Park (11), those wanting courts in general (3) and one person suggesting adding sport courts to the Meadow Park hockey rink.

Woeste reported that the Memo article mentioned three potential options to addressing pickleball in the park system that includes:

1. Converting tennis courts at Meadow
2. Adding new courts at Lone Lake
3. Working with a local school district to partner with on courts

Woeste noted that talks with both the Minnetonka and Hopkins School Districts have not provided possible options due to a variety of factors that include current demand for tennis, lack of available space to construct new courts, lack of a pickleball curriculum in both District’s, and parking and traffic concerns during school hours.
Minnetonka Park Board Item 4A
Meeting of September 7, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject:</th>
<th>Consideration of a staff recommendation to add sports lighting to the Civic Center athletic field.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park Board related goal:</td>
<td>To provide quality athletic and recreational facilities and programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Board related objective:</td>
<td>Anticipate, review and respond to community needs not previously identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief Description:</td>
<td>Consideration of lighting the Civic Center field and determination of the type of lighting to be used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

With a lack of available city property for athletic field expansion, lighting of existing fields provides the best opportunity to expand access to community fields. The park board has recommended that the Civic Center field be lit to address the demand in our community for youth fields for soccer, lacrosse, football and other sports requiring similar field space. In the 2012 Field Needs Study the number one opportunity identified for field sports was exploring the addition of lights on Civic Center and Lone Lake parks fields as well as addressing the need for additional youth practice field space.

The city of Minnetonka’s Capital Improvements Program (CIP) includes proposed funding to light the Civic Center multi-purpose field in 2017. To complete this project, grant funding from the Hennepin County Youth Sports (HCYS) grant program would be required. An application for this grant program is scheduled to be submitted in the fall of 2016.

If lights are added to the field, staff would recommend that the Comprehensive Athletic Field Use policy be amended to allow for use (when necessary) until 9:45 p.m. each night from May 1 – October 15. This would be consistent with the current regulations for lighting in place at other city youth fields. Plans show that the proposed lighting would “spill” no more than 160 feet from the field – and this does not take into account the tree barrier which will further diminish the distance light will travel. The nearest home to the field is over 300 feet away, therefore no light is expected to reach neighboring homes.

A neighborhood meeting was held during the August 3, 2016 park board meeting. Craig Gallop from Musco Lighting was in attendance and answered questions from neighbors and the board regarding light spillage and different lighting options. A total of three neighbors spoke at the meeting with questions asked related to light spill, costs for adding the lights and parking for field related activities.
Summary

At the September 7, 2016 meeting, the park board will be reviewing staff’s recommendation to add lights to the Civic Center field, contingent upon final council approval and the successful completion of a HCYS grant. If the park board supports staff’s recommendation, a subsequent discussion is needed to determine the type of lighting options available. The two options presented include:

- **Metal Halide lighting:** Traditional lighting used on other city athletic fields. The cost estimate provided for Civic Center is $128,000. Under this option, the city would pay $75,000 and request a grant for $53,000.

- **LED lighting:** Relatively new application to sports lighting with a cost estimate of $165,000. Musco Lighting indicates that there is tighter spill control and LED requires less electricity to operate. Under this option, the city would pay $75,000 and request a grant for $90,000.

Based on the high demand for fields to accommodate a variety of youth field sports, and the opportunity to fund lights through the HCYS grant program, staff recommends the addition of lights to the Civic Center field as included in the 2017 CIP.

Discussion Points

- Does the park board recommend lighting the Civic Center field?
- If so, what type of lighting is preferred, metal halide or LED?

**Recommended Action:** Staff recommends that the park board direct staff to proceed with the plan to light the Civic Center field using LED lighting for energy efficiency.

**Attachments:**

1. Area map
2. What Matters in Lighting Technology
3. Evolution of Light Control
Minnetonka Civic Center Field

Proposed Lighting Area

This map is for illustrative purposes only.
What Matters in Lighting Technology

Light Control

1977
SportsCluster

1989
SportsCluster-2

1989
SportsCluster-2 with Level 8™

1989
Total Light Control™

2005
Light-Structure Green™—HID

2015
Light-Structure Green™—LED

Photographed at 100-feet from field edge

Used equal parameters for:
- On-field light level per pole
- Wattage per luminaire
- Mounting height
- Luminaire aiming angles
- Pole distance from aiming point

©2015 Musco Sports Lighting, LLC · M-1905-en04-1

Solutions for Lighting
Evolution of Light Control

- **1976** SportsCluster™
- **1989** SportsCluster•2
- **1989** SportsCluster•2 with Level 8™
- **1989** Total Light Control™
- **2005** Light-Structure Green™ — HID
- **2013** Light-Structure Green™ — LED
1. Roll Call

Park Board members in attendance included Jack Acomb, Nelson Evenrud, Chris Gabler, Cindy Kist, Peggy Kvam, Marvin Puspoki, Elise Raarup and Madeline Seveland. Staff members in attendance included Jo Colleran, Ann Davy, Darin Ellingson, Dave Johnson, Kelly O’Dea, Mike Pavelka and Sara Woeste.

Chair Raarup called the meeting to order at 7 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

Gabler moved and Kist seconded a motion to approve the meeting Minutes of August 3, 2016 as submitted. All voted “Yes”. Motion carried.

3. Citizens Wishing to Discuss Items Not on the Agenda

None

4. Business Items

   A. Consideration of a staff recommendation to add sports lighting to the Civic Center athletic fields

Sara Woeste, Recreation Services Programming and Special Events Manager, provided the introduction and began by summarizing the neighborhood meeting conducted by the park board at the September 7, 2016 meeting. She noted that no major concerns were expressed by the neighbors however questions related to cost, parking and light spill impacting homes north of the creek were asked. Woeste then summarized lighting cost information provided at the meeting by Craig Gallop of Musco Lighting. She indicated that Gallop reported on two types of lighting were available including metal halide at a cost of $128,000 and LED lighting at a cost of $165,000. Woeste noted that if the metal halide option was selected by the board, staff would offset the city’s funding amount of $75,000 with a grant application of $53,000 from the Hennepin County Youth Sports Grant (HCYSG) program. And if LED lighting was selected, the grant amount would be $90,000. Woeste closed by noting that LED lighting provides improved spill control and more efficient energy use. Woeste indicated that, if approved, the lights be shut down by 9:45 daily to be consistent with other youth fields in the city.

Woeste requested feedback or questions from the park board members.

Gabler asked if all athletic field lights are shut down on city fields by 9:45 p.m. Dave Johnson, Recreation Services Director, responded that all youth fields are required to be shut down by 9:45 p.m., in part to be consistent with an ordinance
requiring parks be closed at 10 p.m. He noted that the only exception is Big Willow Park, where adult fields are provided and can stay lit as late as 11 p.m.

Puspoki noted that he was not in attendance at the August meeting and asked if a payback period was provided by Musco Lighting for LED lights. Woeste indicated that a payback comparison was not provided, Darin Ellingson, Public Works Streets and Parks Operations Manager, indicated that based on his experience with other applications of LED lighting, the additional cost for LED lighting verses metal halide would be covered over the time of the lights.

Kvam noted that Xcel Energy provides rebates for LED lighting due to their energy efficiency. She added that while Musco indicated that there were no local athletic field installations of LED lighting, she reviewed the Musco Lighting website and noted that they have provided LED lighting for several major projects including the White House and Mount Rushmore.

Raarup asked if the added amount needed for LED lighting would reduce the City’s chances for receiving a grant. Johnson responded that based on what he has seen for project matches for past projects, he felt that the added amount for LED lighting would not be a negative factor.

Evenrud voiced support for going with LED lighting, adding that the concerns expressed by one resident residing on the north side of the Minnehaha Creek would be better addressed with LED lighting.

Raarup noted that there were no residents in attendance for this item and asked if there were any additional questions or comments from the board. Hearing none, she entertained a motion.

Gabler moved and Evenrud seconded a motion to recommend the addition of LED lighting to the Civic Center athletic fields; and to apply for a project grant through the Hennepin County Youth Sports Grant Program. Evenrud, Kist, Gabler, Kvam, Puspoki, Raarup and Seveland voted “Yes”, Acomb abstained due to a full board in attendance. Motion carried.

Johnson noted that contingent upon successfully applying for and receiving a grant, staff will bring the Comprehensive Athletic Field Use Policy back to the board at a later date for consideration of changes related to the use of lights in Civic Center Park.

B. Consideration of Pickleball site concepts

Woeste provided an introduction to the item and a brief review of the options reviewed at the August park board meeting which included the following:
Resolution No. 2017-

Conditional use permit for trails and boardwalks on the Minnetonka Civic Center Campus at 14600 Minnetonka Boulevard

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

Section 1. BACKGROUND.

1.01 The city of Minnetonka is proposing to construct two new loop trails/boardwalks on the east side of the civic center campus. The northerly loop would extend north and east from the existing water treatment facility. The southerly loop would extend north from the existing Minnetonka Boulevard trail.

1.02 Portions of the proposed trails/boardwalks 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.

1.03 On April 6, 2017, the planning commission held a hearing on the proposed trails/boardwalks. The applicant was provided the opportunity to present information to the commission. 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 permit.

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.

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

2. The use is consistent with the goals, policies and objectives of the comprehensive plan;
3. The use does not have an undue adverse impact on governmental facilities, utilities, services or existing or proposed improvements;

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

5. The use does not have an undue adverse impact on the public health, safety or welfare;

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

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

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

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;

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

12. There shall be only minimal interference with wetland vegetation; and

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.

Section 3. FINDINGS.

3.01 The proposed trails/boardwalks 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 improvements would not adversely impact the wetland area. Rather, they are intended to increase enjoyment of these natural resources.

2. The proposed trails/boardwalks are consistent with the comprehensive plan. The plan notes that parks in the Upper Minnehaha Creek corridor should be designed to implement complementary activities in appropriate areas that emphasizes the creek corridor’s natural resources, and recreational, educational, historic, and scenic values.

3. The proposed trails/boardwalks would not adversely impact public facilities, utilities, or services. The funds associated with these improvements have been allocated in the Capital Improvements Program.

4. The proposed trails/boardwalks have been reviewed by the city’s water resources engineer and found to be consistent with the water resources management plan.

5. The proposed trails/boardwalks would not adversely impact public health, safety, or welfare. Rather, they are intended to increase enjoyment of the community’s natural resources.

6. The proposed trails/boardwalks would add a negligible amount of impervious surface to the area surrounding the creek. Adverse impact to the water quality of runoff is not anticipated.

7. The proposed trails/boardwalks would not impact water storage capacity.

8. No habitable structures are proposed.

9. Trails/boardwalks have low flood damage potential.

10. No service facilities are proposed.

11. No storage of materials is proposed.

12. No interference with wetland vegetation is proposed.
13. The trails/boardwalks have been approved by the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District; no other agency approval is required.

3.02 The proposed trails/boardwalks are consistent with the civic center campus master plan.

Section 4. CITY COUNCIL ACTION.

4.01 The above-described conditional use permit is approved, subject to the following conditions:

1. Subject to staff approval, the trails/boardwalks must be developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the following plans, except as modified below.
   - Layout and grading plans with signed date of December 9, 2016

2. No work may be done under this conditional use permit which requires floodplain fill or results in wetland impact.
   a) Any grading work within floodplain areas must result in disturbance of less than 1,000 square feet or 20 cubic yards.
   b) Boardwalk supports located within wetland buffers must each be less than two feet in diameter.

3. Existing wetland buffer areas must be maintained.

4. Prior to construction, install tree and wetland protection fencing and any other erosion control measures as required by natural resources staff. These items must be maintained throughout the course of construction.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on April 24, 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 April 24, 2017.

__________________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk

SEAL
Resolution No. 2017-

Conditional use permit for installation of lighting on an existing athletic field on the Minnetonka Civic Center Campus at 14600 Minnetonka Boulevard

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

Section 1. BACKGROUND.

1.01 The city of Minnetonka is proposing to install lighting on the existing athletic field north of Ice Arena B. Four, 70-foot light standards would be located on the field, two on its north side and two on the south. Each standard would be equipped with seven LED fixtures. Consistent with practices at other city-owned athletic fields: (1) the field lighting could be used May 1 – October 15; and (2) when in use, lighting would be turned off by 9:45 p.m.

1.02 By City Code §300.10 Subd.4, public facilities are conditionally permitted land uses. The proposed light fixtures would essentially increase the potential use of the existing athletic field.

1.03 On April 6, 2017, the planning commission held a hearing on the proposed field lighting. The applicant was provided the opportunity to present information to the commission. 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 permit.

Section 2. STANDARDS.

2.01 City Code §300.16 Subd.2 outlines the following general conditional use permit standards.

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

2. The use is consistent with the goals, policies and objectives of the comprehensive plan;
3. The use does not have an undue adverse impact on governmental facilities, utilities, services or existing or proposed improvements; and

4. The use does not have an undue adverse impact on the public health, safety or welfare.

2.02 City Code 300.16 Subd.3(l) outlines the following specific conditional use permit standards for public facilities.

1. Site and building plans subject to review pursuant to section 300.27 of this ordinance.

2. Direct access limited to a collector or arterial roadway as identified in the comprehensive plan or otherwise located so that access can be provided without conducting significant traffic on local residential streets;

3. Buildings set back 50 feet from all property lines;

4. Parking spaces and parking setbacks subject to section 300.28 of this ordinance; and

5. No more than 70 percent of the site to be covered with impervious surface and the remainder to be suitably landscaped; and

6. Stand-alone utility buildings, such as lift stations, are only subject to site and building plan review.

2.03 City Code §300.27 Subd. 5, outlines several items that must be considered in the evaluation of site and building plans.

1. Consistency with the elements and objectives of the city's development guides, including the comprehensive plan and water resources management plan;

2. Consistency with the ordinance;

3. Preservation of the site in its natural state to the extent practicable by minimizing tree and soil removal and designing grade changes to be in keeping with the general appearance of neighboring developed or developing areas;
4. Creation of a harmonious relationship of buildings and open spaces with natural site features and with existing and future buildings having a visual relationship to the development;

5. Creation of a functional and harmonious design for structures and site features, with special attention to the following:
   a) an internal sense of order for the buildings and uses on the site and provision of a desirable environment for occupants, visitors and the general community;
   b) the amount and location of open space and landscaping;
   c) materials, textures, colors and details of construction as an expression of the design concept and the compatibility of the same with the adjacent and neighboring structures and uses; and
   d) vehicular and pedestrian circulation, including walkways, interior drives and parking in terms of location and number of access points to the public streets, width of interior drives and access points, general interior circulation, separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic and arrangement and amount of parking.

6. Promotion of energy conservation through design, location, orientation and elevation of structures, the use and location of glass in structures and the use of landscape materials and site grading; and

7. Protection of adjacent and neighboring properties through reasonable provision for surface water drainage, sound and sight buffers, preservation of views, light and air and those aspects of design not adequately covered by other regulations which may have substantial effects on neighboring land uses.

Section 3. FINDINGS.

3.01 The proposed field lighting would meet the general conditional use permit standards as outlined in City Code §300.16 Subd.2.

3.02 The proposed field lighting would meet the specific conditional use permit standards as outlined in City Code §300.16 Subd.3(l).
1. No access changes are proposed.

2. No buildings are proposed.

3. While the proposed lighting may increase the time during which existing parking spaces are utilized, the lighting would not increase the amount of parking required for the athletic field.

4. The proposed lighting would not increase the site’s impervious surface by more than the diameter of the four poles.

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

1. Members of the city’s community development, engineering, and public works staff have reviewed the proposed lighting and find that it is generally consistent with the city’s development guides.

2. The proposal would meet all ordinance standards.

3. The proposed lighting would necessitate minimal soil removal and no tree removal.

4. The civic center campus contains a variety of recreational uses and government/service buildings. The proposed lighting of an existing athletic field would not detract from the relationship between existing and future uses and buildings.

5. The proposed lighting of an existing field would not impact the internal order, circulation, landscaping, or open space on the civic center campus.

6. LED fixtures would be used.

7. The proposal would allow for extended recreational use of a site that has long been used for recreational purposes. The closest home, located west of the existing field, is 300 feet away. The closest home to the north, located across Minnehaha Creek, is nearly 700 feet away. The surrounding residential areas are further separated from the existing athletic field by large stands of mature trees.

Section 4. CITY COUNCIL ACTION.

4.01 The above-described conditional use permit is approved, subject to the
following conditions:

1. Subject to staff approval, the lighting must be installed and maintained in substantial conformance with the following plans, except as modified below.
   - Project Summary dated February 17, 2017
   - Illumination Summary dated February 17, 2017
   - Equipment Layout plan dated February 17, 2017

2. Electrical and building permits are required.

3. Prior to construction, install tree and wetland protection fencing and any other erosion control measures as required by natural resources staff. These items must be maintained throughout the course of construction.

4. Lighting may be used May 1 through October 15. When in use, the lights must be turned off by 9:45 p.m.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on April 24, 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 April 24, 2017.

__________________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk

SEAL
MINNETONKA PLANNING COMMISSION
April 6, 2017

**Brief Description**
Amendment to an existing conditional use permit for recreational facility improvements at the Hopkins High School Campus at 2400 Lindbergh Drive.

**Recommendation**
Recommend the city council adopt the resolutions approving the amendment to the conditional use permit.

---

**Background**

Throughout the 1980s and 1990s the city approved conditional use permits for a variety of recreational areas on the Hopkins High School Campus. On May 22, 1995, the city council approved a “blanket” conditional use permit for the three school – Tanglen Elementary, Hopkins Junior, and Hopkins High School – site.

It has been the practice of the city to require new conditional use permits or amendments to existing permits when conditionally-permitted uses are expanded.

**Proposal Summary**

Neil Tessier of SAFEngineering, on behalf of Hopkins School District, is proposing changes to the Hopkins High School Campus at 2400 Lindbergh Drive. The changes to the existing site can be organized into items requiring only a grading, sign, or building permits – which require only administrative approval – and items that require an amendment to the existing conditional use permit – which require city council approval.

Items requiring only grading, sign, or building permits (administrative approval) include:

- converting athletic fields from grass to synthetic turf;
- grading work;
- fences;
- ramps;
- sidewalks; and
- retaining walls.

Items requiring an amendment to the conditional use permit (city council approval), which may also require a building permit, include:

- new recreational fields with structures;
- scoreboards; and
- light poles.
Please see attachments for proposed plans.

Proposed Plan

The applicant has proposed several different items for the High School Campus, including new fields with structures, scoreboards, and field lighting. These items would increase the potential use of the school’s existing recreational area, requiring an amendment to the existing conditional use permit for the property. Please note, only items requiring an amendment to the conditional use permit (needing city council approval) will be discussed below. The proposal has been condensed into three different sections.

- **New Recreational Fields (with structures)** – The applicant proposes to add a new softball field just north of the existing baseball field. This field would be synthetic turf, as would the existing baseball field. The softball field would have a temporary fence that could be moved to allow the east portion of the field to be used as a soccer or lacrosse field. The softball field would have two, 8-foot by 40-foot dugouts for players and a 30-foot-by-30-foot concrete pad for a 10-row bleacher structure.

- **Scoreboards** – The applicant proposes two new scoreboards for the soccer and baseball fields. These scoreboards would be located on top of a retaining wall between the baseball field and an existing parking lot. The scoreboards would both be approximately 20 feet tall and would be 48 square feet and 130 square feet in area respectively.

- **Lighting** – The applicant proposes to add 15 light poles that would vary from 30 feet to 90 feet in height; the taller light poles would be similar in height to the existing football stadium lights. The light poles would be set back over 25 feet from the northern property line and approximately 90 feet from the closest residential property. LED illumination would be used, which would have reduced glare in comparison to older field lighting equipment. Surface lighting would be virtually absent at the northern property line and within Hillside Lane West. The proposal shows no spillover light onto nearby residential properties. (See attached.)

Hopkins School District representatives have informed staff that the school plans to use field lighting for 6-10 baseball games and 0-2 softball games each year. These games would typically start at approximately 6:30 pm and a typical game would end at 9 pm at the latest. Lacrosse or soccer practices may also use the proposed lighting. Currently, these teams practice during day light hours, but future coaching availability could require later practices. These practices would most likely run from 5 pm to 8 pm and could potentially request to use lighting.

Lindbergh Center representatives have informed staff that the field lighting may be used for their programming on Sundays, Mondays, Tuesdays and Thursdays when there is not snow on the ground (spring through fall). These programs would not extend past 10 pm.
To ensure consistency with city-owned lighted fields, staff is recommending a condition of approval that would allow spring through fall field lighting for the site (weather depending), but not past 9:45 pm.

Primary Questions and Analysis

The commission’s charge is to review proposed land uses and determine whether they are appropriate given zoning ordinance standards and land use policy. The following outlines the primary land use questions associated with the proposed recreational improvements and staff’s findings.

1. **Are the proposed improvements appropriate?**

   Yes. The new recreational fields, scoreboards, and field lighting are appropriate for several reasons:

   - The proposed improvements would enhance the use of the Hopkins High School campus.

   - The Hopkins School District currently uses the subject site for recreational purposes. The modification of the recreational fields and addition of scoreboards and field lighting is consistent with the existing use of the site.

   - The Hopkins School District has an existing conditional use permit for an educational institution and facilities. This conditional use permit allows recreational areas designed for group outdoor activities with field lighting. The current proposal would increase the potential use of the existing recreational fields, but it is within the standards outlined in city ordinance.

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

   Yes. The new recreational fields would serve as a flexible space that would increase the use of the site. The field lighting would increase the dates and times of field use. However, the impacts associated with the increase in potential use are acceptable.

   - City ordinance requires recreational areas designed for group outdoor activities to be set back at least 25 feet from residential property and appropriately buffered. The subject field would be located approximately 75 feet from the nearest residential property, across Hillside Lane West. Staff finds that this distance and buffering would appropriately mitigate potential adverse impacts.

   - The proposed LED lighting at the existing athletic field would visually impact the immediate area when the lighting is in use. However, current technology minimizes “spill-over” lighting and the staff suggested 9:45 p.m. limitation on lighting would further reduce nighttime impacts. (See attached.) The closest
home to the new fields is located approximately 125 feet to the north, across Hillside Lane West. With the exception of two other homes, there are no other homes within 250 feet of the lighted field.

**Staff Recommendation**

Recommend the city council adopt the resolution approving an amendment to an existing conditional use permit for recreational facility improvements at the Hopkins High School Campus at 2400 Lindbergh Drive.

Originator: Drew Ingvalson, Planner
Through: Susan Thomas, AICP, Assistant City Planner
Supporting Information

Project No. 96079.17a

Property 2400 Lindbergh Drive

Applicant Neil Tessier, SAFEngineering, PLLC

Owner Hopkins School District, ISD #270 (Patrick Poquette, Director of Facilities)

Surrounding Land Uses
Northerly: single-family homes
Easterly: single-family homes
Southerly: Hopkins School District, ISD 270 - Lindbergh Center
Westerly: Hopkins School District, ISD 270 – Hopkins High School tennis courts and football stadium

Planning Existing Zoning: R-1
Guide Plan designation: Institutional

History
On March 3, 1988, the planning commission approved a conditional use permit for grading/filling activities at the Hopkins School Campus for reconstruction of athletic fields.

On May 6, 1991, the city council approved a site plan with variance and conditional use permit for the expansion and lighting of an athletic field and associated scoreboard at Hopkins High School. The city council also reviewed a preliminary stadium management plan.

On April 6, 1992, the city council approved the Hopkins High School stadium management plan as required by the 1991 conditional use permit.

On May 22, 1995, the city council approved conditional use permits for Tanglen Elementary School, North Junior High School, and Hopkins Senior High School.

On July 31, 2014, the planning commission approved a site and building plan for a storage building used to store the school’s track and field related equipment, as well as some lawn and snow equipment.
### General CUP Standards

The proposed recreational fields, scoreboards, and field lighting would meet the general conditional use permit standards for educational institutions and facilities.

1. The use is consistent with the intent of the ordinance;
2. The use is consistent with the goals, policies and objectives of the comprehensive plan;
3. The use does not have an undue adverse impact on governmental facilities, utilities, services or existing or proposed improvements; and
4. The use does not have an undue adverse impact on the public health, safety or welfare.

### Specific CUP Standards

The proposed recreational fields, scoreboards and field lighting would meet the specific conditional use permit standards for educational and institutions and facilities.

1. Direct access limited to a collector or arterial roadway as identified in the comprehensive plan or otherwise located so that access can be provided without conducting significant traffic on local residential streets; the use is not permitted on property that has access only by way of private or driveway that is used by more than one lot.

**Finding:** No access changes are proposed.

2. Buildings set back 50 feet from all property lines and parking setbacks subject to section 300.28 of this ordinance;

**Finding:** No buildings are proposed.

3. School bus pick-up and drop-off areas located outside of the public right-of-way and designed to enhance vehicular and pedestrian safety;

**Finding:** No changes to school bus drop-off and pick-up routes have been proposed.

4. Recreational areas designed for group outdoor activities setback 25 feet from residential property, suitable buffering provided to protect neighboring properties from noise and adverse visual impacts, and lighted playing fields permitted
only upon demonstration that off-site impacts can be mitigated substantially;

**Finding:** The proposed recreational areas would be located nearly 75 feet from the nearest residential property and would be located across Hillside Lane West. The setback distance combined with the street should provide adequate setback and buffer from residential properties.

5. No more than 60 percent of the site to be covered with impervious surface and the remainder to be suitably landscaped;

**Finding:** The proposed lighting would not increase the site's impervious surface by more than the diameter of the fifteen poles and the proposed fields would be permeable. The proposed bleachers and dugouts would not cause the site to exceed 60 percent impervious coverage.

6. Site and building plans subject to review pursuant to section 300.27 of this ordinance.

**Finding:** See the following section of this report.

7. Not connected to, or part of, any residential dwelling.

**Finding:** The fields would not be connected to, or part of, any residential dwelling.

**SBP Standards:** Field Lighting

The proposed field lighting would comply with site and building standards as outlined in city code.

1. Consistency with the elements and objectives of the city's development guides, including the comprehensive plan and water resources management plan;

**Finding:** Members of the city's community development, engineering, and public works staff have reviewed the proposed project and find that it is generally consistent with the city's development guides.

2. Consistency with this ordinance;

**Finding:** The proposal would meet all ordinance standards.
3. Preservation of the site in its natural state to the extent practicable by minimizing tree and soil removal and designing grade changes to be in keeping with the general appearance of neighboring developed or developing areas;

**Finding:** The existing recreational area is not in a “natural state.” While grading would be required for conversion to synthetic turf, the other proposed improvements would not necessitate any significant soil removal. A grading permit would be required for all earthwork on the site and removed trees would be subject to mitigation requirements.

4. Creation of a harmonious relationship of buildings and open spaces with natural site features and with existing and future buildings having a visual relationship to the development;

**Finding:** The Hopkins High School campus contains a variety of recreational uses and public buildings. The proposed recreational fields, scoreboards, and lighting of existing and proposed fields would not detract from the relationship between existing and future uses and buildings.

5. Creation of a functional and harmonious design for structures and site features, with special attention to the following:

   a) an internal sense of order for the buildings and uses on the site and provision of a desirable environment for occupants, visitors and the general community;

   b) the amount and location of open space and landscaping;

   c) materials, textures, colors and details of construction as an expression of the design concept and the compatibility of the same with the adjacent and neighboring structures and uses; and

   d) vehicular and pedestrian circulation, including walkways, interior drives and parking in terms of location and number of access points to the public streets, width of interior drives and access points, general interior circulation, separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic and arrangement and amount of parking.

**Finding:** The proposed field, scoreboards, and lighting of the existing and proposed fields would not impact the internal
order, circulation, landscaping, or open space on the Hopkins High School campus.

6. Promotion of energy conservation through design, location, orientation and elevation of structures, the use and location of glass in structures and the use of landscape materials and site grading; and

**Finding:** LED fixtures would be used.

7. Protection of adjacent and neighboring properties through reasonable provision for surface water drainage, sound and sight buffers, preservation of views, light and air and those aspects of design not adequately covered by other regulations which may have substantial effects on neighboring land uses.

**Finding:** The proposal would allow for extended recreational use of a site that has long been used for recreational purposes. The closest residential home, located north of the existing field, is 125 feet away from the proposed field. The residential neighborhood is separated from the existing recreational area by Hillside Lane West.

The applicant has proposed to use LED lighting, which would have reduced glare in comparison to older field lighting equipment. Surface lighting would be virtually absent at the northern property line and within Hillside Lane West. The proposal shows no spillover light onto nearby residential properties.

**Neighborhood Comments**

The city has sent notice to 950 area property owners and has received three written comments to date. (See attached.)

**Pyramid of Discretion**

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 resolutions approving the amendment to the existing conditional use permit.

2. Disagree with staff’s recommendation. In this case, a motion should be made recommending the city council deny the amendment. 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 requires an affirmative vote of a simple majority. The city council’s final approval requires an affirmative vote of a simple majority.

**Deadline for Decision**

May 22, 2017
Project: Hopkins HS Ballfield
Applicant: SAFEngineering, PLLC
Address: 2400 Lindbergh Dr
Project No. 96079.17a
A. TOPOGRAPHIC BOUNDARY SURVEY, INCLUDING PROPERTY LINES, LEGAL DESCRIPTION, EXISTING UTILITIES, SITE TOPOGRAPHY WITH SPOT ELEVATIONS, OUTSTANDING PHYSICAL FEATURES AND EXISTING STRUCTURE LOCATION WERE PROVIDED BY THE FOLLOWING COMPANIES, AS A CONTRACTOR TO THE SELLER/OWNER:

CORNERSTONE LAND SURVEYING, INC.
6750 STILLWATER BLVD. N., SUITE #1
STILLWATER, MN 55082
PHONE 651.275.8969
FAX 651.275.8976
DAN@CSSURVEY.NET

CEI ENGINEERING AND ITS ASSOCIATES WILL NOT BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OF THE SURVEY OR FOR DESIGN ERRORS OR OMISSIONS RESULTING FROM SURVEY INACCURACIES.

B. ALL PHASES OF SITE WORK FOR THIS PROJECT SHALL MEET OR EXCEED THE OWNER SITE WORK SPECIFICATIONS.

C. CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE REMOVAL OF EXISTING STRUCTURES, RELATED UTILITIES, PAVING, AND ANY OTHER EXISTING IMPROVEMENTS AS NOTED. SEE SITE WORK SPECIFICATIONS.

D. CONTRACTOR IS TO REMOVE AND DISPOSE OF ALL DEBRIS, RUBBISH AND OTHER MATERIALS RESULTING FROM CURRENT DEMOLITION OPERATIONS. DISPOSAL WILL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ALL LOCAL, STATE AND/OR FEDERAL REGULATIONS GOVERNING SUCH OPERATIONS.

E. THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR WILL BE HELD SOLELY RESPONSIBLE FOR AND SHALL TAKE ALL PRECAUTIONS NECESSARY TO AVOID PROPERTY DAMAGE TO ADJACENT PROPERTIES DURING THE CONSTRUCTION PHASES OF THIS PROJECT.

F. WARRANTY/DISCLAIMER:

THE DESIGNS REPRESENTED IN THESE PLANS ARE IN ACCORDANCE WITH ESTABLISHED PRACTICES OF CIVIL ENGINEERING FOR THE DESIGN FUNCTIONS AND USES INTENDED BY THE OWNER AT THIS TIME. HOWEVER, NEITHER THE ENGINEER NOR ITS PERSONNEL CAN OR DO WARRANT THESE DESIGNS OR PLANS AS CONSTRUCTED EXCEPT IN THE SPECIFIC CASES WHERE THE ENGINEER INSPECTS AND CONTROLS THE PHYSICAL CONSTRUCTION ON A CONTEMPORANEOUS BASIS AT THE SITE.

G. SAFETY NOTICE TO CONTRACTOR:

IN ACCORDANCE WITH GENERALLY ACCEPTED CONSTRUCTION PRACTICES, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE SOLELY AND COMPLETELY RESPONSIBLE FOR CONDITIONS OF THE JOB SITE, INCLUDING SAFETY OF ALL PERSONS AND PROPERTY DURING PERFORMANCE OF THE WORK. THIS REQUIREMENT WILL APPLY CONTINUOUSLY AND NOT BE LIMITED TO NORMAL WORKING HOURS. ANY CONSTRUCTION OBSERVATION BY THE ENGINEER OF THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE IS NOT INTENDED TO INCLUDE REVIEW OF THE ADEQUACY OF THE CONTRACTOR'S SAFETY MEASURES, IN, ON OR NEAR THE CONSTRUCTION SITE.

H. ALL CONSTRUCTION IN RIGHT-OF-WAY SHALL BE COORDINATED WITH THE GOVERNING AGENCY.

I. WETLANDS NOTE:

ANY DEVELOPMENT, EXCAVATION, CONSTRUCTION, OR FILLING IN A U.S. CORPS OF ENGINEERS DESIGNATED WETLAND IS SUBJECT TO LOCAL, STATE AND FEDERAL APPROVALS. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL COMPLY WITH ALL PERMIT REQUIREMENTS AND/OR RESTRICTIONS AND ANY VIOLATION WILL BE SUBJECT TO FEDERAL PENALTY. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL HOLD THE OWNER/DEVELOPER, THE ENGINEER AND THE LOCAL GOVERNING AGENCIES HARMLESS AGAINST SUCH VIOLATION.
Par 5: That part of the following described property:

Par 4: That part of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of Section 12, Township 117, Range 22, described as beginning at the Northeast corner thereof;

Par 3: The Southeast Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of Section 12, Township 117, Range 22, except that part thereof embrace within the plat of Birchview.

Par 2: The West 175 feet of Tract A, Registered Land Survey No. 1194, County of Hennepin.

Par 1: Lots 1, 2 and 3, Block 3, Westview Hills

Subject to a 25.00 foot wide perpetual easement for the installation and maintenance of storm sewer over part of land in Par 5 as shown in deed Doc. No. 1576368;

The following description is as shown on Hennepin County Certificate of Title number 1200845:

Northwesterly of the following described line:

Land Survey No. 1194, except that part thereof lying West of the East 165 feet of the West 1/4 of said Northeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter and South of that part thereof embrace within the plat of Birchview.

306.61 feet; thence Easterly 360.61 feet along a tangential curve concave to the North having a radius of 1432.39 feet and a central angle of 14 degrees 25 minutes 27.8 seconds; thence Northeasterly, tangent to said curve, a distance of 1185.74 feet; thence Northeasterly 1000.19 feet along a tangential curve concave to the Northwest having a radius of 1909.86 feet and a central angle of 30 degrees 00 minutes 21 seconds; thence Northeasterly tangent to said curve, a distance of 69.33 feet in a straight line; thence deflecting right 86 degrees 25 minutes, as measured North to East, a distance of 69.33 feet in a straight line; thence deflecting right 86 degrees 25 minutes, as measured North to East, a distance of 69.33 feet in a straight line; thence North to the West line of the Northeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of Section 12, Township 117, Range 22, a distance of 1346.59 feet; thence West to the West line of said Northeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of Section 12, Township 117, Range 22, a distance of 1346.59 feet; thence North to the point of beginning except the West 210 feet of the most Southerly 150 feet thereof.

The following description is as shown on Hennepin County Certificate of Title number 1200845:

Subject to a 25.00 foot wide perpetual easement for the installation and maintenance of storm sewer over part of land in Par 5 as shown in deed Doc. No. 1576368;

A part of the West boundary of the Northeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter, Section 12, Township 117, Range 22, has been marked by Judicial Landmarks set

The following description is as shown on Hennepin County Certificate of Title number 1200845:

Subject to a 25.00 foot wide perpetual easement for the installation and maintenance of storm sewer over part of land in Par 5 as shown in deed Doc. No. 1576368;

A part of the West boundary of the Northeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter, Section 12, Township 117, Range 22, has been marked by Judicial Landmarks set

The following description is as shown on Hennepin County Certificate of Title number 1200845:

Subject to a 25.00 foot wide perpetual easement for the installation and maintenance of storm sewer over part of land in Par 5 as shown in deed Doc. No. 1576368;

A part of the West boundary of the Northeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter, Section 12, Township 117, Range 22, has been marked by Judicial Landmarks set

The following description is as shown on Hennepin County Certificate of Title number 1200845:

Subject to a 25.00 foot wide perpetual easement for the installation and maintenance of storm sewer over part of land in Par 5 as shown in deed Doc. No. 1576368;

A part of the West boundary of the Northeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter, Section 12, Township 117, Range 22, has been marked by Judicial Landmarks set

The following description is as shown on Hennepin County Certificate of Title number 1200845:

Subject to a 25.00 foot wide perpetual easement for the installation and maintenance of storm sewer over part of land in Par 5 as shown in deed Doc. No. 1576368;

A part of the West boundary of the Northeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter, Section 12, Township 117, Range 22, has been marked by Judicial Landmarks set

The following description is as shown on Hennepin County Certificate of Title number 1200845:

Subject to a 25.00 foot wide perpetual easement for the installation and maintenance of storm sewer over part of land in Par 5 as shown in deed Doc. No. 1576368;

A part of the West boundary of the Northeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter, Section 12, Township 117, Range 22, has been marked by Judicial Landmarks set

The following description is as shown on Hennepin County Certificate of Title number 1200845:

Subject to a 25.00 foot wide perpetual easement for the installation and maintenance of storm sewer over part of land in Par 5 as shown in deed Doc. No. 1576368;

A part of the West boundary of the Northeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter, Section 12, Township 117, Range 22, has been marked by Judicial Landmarks set

The following description is as shown on Hennepin County Certificate of Title number 1200845:

Subject to a 25.00 foot wide perpetual easement for the installation and maintenance of storm sewer over part of land in Par 5 as shown in deed Doc. No. 1576368;
HILLSIDE LANE WEST
LINDBERGH DRIVE
EASTERLY EXTENTS OF 2010 SURVEY.

CONTACT:
NEIL TESSIER
SAFEngineering, PLLC
6574 Sioux Lane
Lino Lakes, MN 55014
Phone: 612-213-9859
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Date:__________________
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EXISTING SITE
HOPKINS HIGH SCHOOL

DETAIL SHEET II

FENCE POSTS IN 18" DIA., 60" SONO TUBES DEEP CONCRETE FOOTINGS

ALL FENCE RAMPS 20' EACH, 20' BEACON ATHLETICS ENGINEERED NET BACKSTOP SYSTEMS OR APPROVED EQUAL

BASEBALL BACKSTOP ONLY NEEDS TOP 16' NETTING

NOTE:

CHAIN LINK FENCE WITH DOUBLE GATE

CHAIN LINK FENCE WITH 6' GATE

BASEBALL BACKSTOP

SOFBALL BACKSTOP

6 GAUGE ALUMINUM COATED MESH FOR BOTTOM 8 FEET

6 GAUGE ALUMINUM COATED MESH

BLACK 1"x1" HEAVY WEIGHT BLACK NETTING

6' O.D. FENCE POSTS

18" x 60" GATE POST WITH SONO TUBE

32' SOFTBALL BACKSTOP

57'

XX

32'

60'

XX

20'

25'

8'

8'

4'

4'

6 GAUGE ALUMINUM COATED MESH

MAINTENANCE STRIP

3" CORNER POSTS

1 5/8" RAILS REQUIRED ON 8' HIGH FENCE POSTS

2.5" O.D. POST

18" x 60" FOOTING FOR ALL 8' HIGH FENCE POSTS

50'

50'

18" x 60" GATE POST WITH SONO TUBE

3" (TYP.)

60" (TYP.)

20' (TYP.)

4000 PSI PC CONCRETE (TYP.)

6' 8'-0" MAX.

6'

6'

2/8/17

AREINISCH

2/9/17

REV-0

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

PRELIMINARY

16" x 60" DRI POST (TYP.)

12" x 60" POSTS FOR ALL 6' HIGH FENCE POSTS

NOTE:

4" O.D. FENCE POSTS

BLACK 1"x1" HEAVY WEIGHT BLACK NETTING

6 GAUGE ALUMINUM COATED MESH

MAINTENANCE STRIP

3" CORNER POSTS

1 5/8" RAILS REQUIRED ON 8' HIGH FENCE POSTS

2.5" O.D. POST

18" x 60" FOOTING FOR ALL 8' HIGH FENCE POSTS

50'

50'

18" x 60" GATE POST WITH SONO TUBE

3" (TYP.)

60" (TYP.)

20' (TYP.)

4000 PSI PC CONCRETE (TYP.)

6' 8'-0" MAX.

6'

6'

2/8/17

AREINISCH

2/9/17

REV-0

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

PRELIMINARY

16" x 60" DRI POST (TYP.)

12" x 60" POSTS FOR ALL 6' HIGH FENCE POSTS

NOTE:

4" O.D. FENCE POSTS

BLACK 1"x1" HEAVY WEIGHT BLACK NETTING

6 GAUGE ALUMINUM COATED MESH

MAINTENANCE STRIP

3" CORNER POSTS

1 5/8" RAILS REQUIRED ON 8' HIGH FENCE POSTS

2.5" O.D. POST

18" x 60" FOOTING FOR ALL 8' HIGH FENCE POSTS

50'

50'

18" x 60" GATE POST WITH SONO TUBE

3" (TYP.)

60" (TYP.)

20' (TYP.)

4000 PSI PC CONCRETE (TYP.)

6' 8'-0" MAX.

6'

6'

2/8/17

AREINISCH

2/9/17

REV-0

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

PRELIMINARY

16" x 60" DRI POST (TYP.)

12" x 60" POSTS FOR ALL 6' HIGH FENCE POSTS

NOTE:

4" O.D. FENCE POSTS

BLACK 1"x1" HEAVY WEIGHT BLACK NETTING

6 GAUGE ALUMINUM COATED MESH

MAINTENANCE STRIP

3" CORNER POSTS

1 5/8" RAILS REQUIRED ON 8' HIGH FENCE POSTS

2.5" O.D. POST

18" x 60" FOOTING FOR ALL 8' HIGH FENCE POSTS

50'

50'

18" x 60" GATE POST WITH SONO TUBE

3" (TYP.)

60" (TYP.)

20' (TYP.)

4000 PSI PC CONCRETE (TYP.)

6' 8'-0" MAX.

6'

6'

2/8/17

AREINISCH

2/9/17

REV-0

NOTE:

BASEBALL BACKSTOP ONLY NEEDS TOP 16' NETTING
Lighting System

Pole / Fixture Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pole ID</th>
<th>Pole Height</th>
<th>Mtg Height</th>
<th>Fixture Qty</th>
<th>Luminaire Type</th>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1-A2</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>1.15 kW</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3-A4</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>3.45 kW</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1-B2</td>
<td>90'</td>
<td>90'</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>10.35 kW</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>5.75 kW</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>4.60 kW</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>5.05 kW</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>8.06 kW</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>5.75 kW</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>9.91 kW</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>6.90 kW</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2-S3</td>
<td>70'</td>
<td>70'</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>8.66 kW</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1-P2</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cree OSQ</td>
<td>0.34 kW</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>5.75 kW</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>4.60 kW</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>6.90 kW</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2-S3</td>
<td>70'</td>
<td>70'</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>8.66 kW</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Avg Load</th>
<th>Max Load</th>
<th>Fixture Qty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>58.86 kW</td>
<td>58.86 kW</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Soccer 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>11.5 kW</td>
<td>11.5 kW</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>12.65 kW</td>
<td>12.65 kW</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Soccer 3 &amp; Lacrosse</td>
<td>26.45 kW</td>
<td>26.45 kW</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Softball/Soccer 3 &amp; Lacrosse</td>
<td>5.75 kW</td>
<td>5.75 kW</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Walkway Area</td>
<td>1.01 kW</td>
<td>1.01 kW</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fixtures Type Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Wattage</th>
<th>Lumens</th>
<th>L90</th>
<th>L80</th>
<th>L70</th>
<th>L60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>1150W</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>&gt;51,000</td>
<td>&gt;51,000</td>
<td>&gt;51,000</td>
<td>&gt;51,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cree OSQ</td>
<td>168W</td>
<td>16,600</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>340W</td>
<td>40,600</td>
<td>&gt;51,000</td>
<td>&gt;51,000</td>
<td>&gt;51,000</td>
<td>&gt;51,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Light Level Summary

Base Bid, Baseball, Soccer 1, Soccer 2:
Poles: A1, A2, B1, B2, B4, C1, C2, S1.
(Poles B4 and C1 have setups for future fixtures)

Alternate Bid, Softball, Lacrosse, Soccer 3:
Poles: A3, A4, B3, S2, S3.
(Poles P1, P2 Walkway Lighting)
**ENGINEERED DESIGN**

**EQUIPMENT LIST FOR AREAS SHOWN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>B1-B2</th>
<th>A1-A2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **QTY**: 1
- **EQUIPMENT LIST FOR AREAS SHOWN**
  - **TOTALS**
    - **80'**
    - **90'**
    - **60'**
    - **80'**

**GRID SUMMARY**

- **Name**: Baseball
- **Size**: Irregular 325' / 400' / 315'
- **Spacing**: 30.0' x 30.0'
- **Height - 3.5' above grade**

**ILLUMINATION SUMMARY**

- **Guaranteed Average**: 50
- **Scan Average**: 50.27
- **Maximum**: 60
- **Minimum**: 37
- **Avg / Min**: 1.38
- **No. of Points**: 25
- **TLC-LED-1150 >51,000**
- **No. of Luminaires**: 54
- **Total Load**: 58.86 kW

- **Guaranteed Performance**: The ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed per your Musco Warranty document and includes a 0.95 depreciation factor.
- **Field Measurements**: Individual field measurements may vary from computer-calculated predictions and should be taken in accordance with ESHA RP-6-16.
- **Electrical System Requirements**: Refer to Amperage Draw Chart and/or the “Musco Control System Summary” for electrical sizing.
- **Installation Requirements**: Results assume ± 3% nominal voltage at line side of the driver and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.

**NOTE**: - I. - Converted to TLC-1150
- A. - Added ordinary lighting
- B. - Verify all pole locations
- C. - Poles A2, B2 and B4 are in a glare zone for soccer

**ILLUMINATION REQUIREMENTS**

- **SUMMARY INFORMATION**
  - **Color / CRI**: 5700K - 75 CRI
  - **Luminous Output**: TLC-LED-1150
  - **Guaranteed Max / Min**: 1.63
  - **2.11**
  - **0.88**
  - **1.50**
  - **25**
  - **109**

- **Guaranteed Average**: 50
- **Scan Average**: 50.27
- **Maximum**: 60
- **Minimum**: 37
- **Avg / Min**: 1.38
- **No. of Points**: 25
- **TLC-LED-1150 >51,000**
- **No. of Luminaires**: 54
- **Total Load**: 58.86 kW

- **Guaranteed Performance**: The ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed per your Musco Warranty document and includes a 0.95 depreciation factor.
- **Field Measurements**: Individual field measurements may vary from computer-calculated predictions and should be taken in accordance with ESHA RP-6-16.
- **Electrical System Requirements**: Refer to Amperage Draw Chart and/or the “Musco Control System Summary” for electrical sizing.
- **Installation Requirements**: Results assume ± 3% nominal voltage at line side of the driver and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.

**NOTE**: - I. - Converted to TLC-1150
- A. - Added ordinary lighting
- B. - Verify all pole locations
- C. - Poles A2, B2 and B4 are in a glare zone for soccer

**ILLUMINATION REQUIREMENTS**

- **SUMMARY INFORMATION**
  - **Color / CRI**: 5700K - 75 CRI
  - **Luminous Output**: TLC-LED-1150
  - **Guaranteed Max / Min**: 1.63
  - **2.11**
  - **0.88**
  - **1.50**
  - **25**
  - **109**

- **Guaranteed Average**: 50
- **Scan Average**: 50.27
- **Maximum**: 60
- **Minimum**: 37
- **Avg / Min**: 1.38
- **No. of Points**: 25
- **TLC-LED-1150 >51,000**
- **No. of Luminaires**: 54
- **Total Load**: 58.86 kW

- **Guaranteed Performance**: The ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed per your Musco Warranty document and includes a 0.95 depreciation factor.
- **Field Measurements**: Individual field measurements may vary from computer-calculated predictions and should be taken in accordance with ESHA RP-6-16.
- **Electrical System Requirements**: Refer to Amperage Draw Chart and/or the “Musco Control System Summary” for electrical sizing.
- **Installation Requirements**: Results assume ± 3% nominal voltage at line side of the driver and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.

**NOTE**: - I. - Converted to TLC-1150
- A. - Added ordinary lighting
- B. - Verify all pole locations
- C. - Poles A2, B2 and B4 are in a glare zone for soccer

**ILLUMINATION REQUIREMENTS**

- **SUMMARY INFORMATION**
  - **Color / CRI**: 5700K - 75 CRI
  - **Luminous Output**: TLC-LED-1150
  - **Guaranteed Max / Min**: 1.63
  - **2.11**
  - **0.88**
  - **1.50**
  - **25**
  - **109**

- **Guaranteed Average**: 50
- **Scan Average**: 50.27
- **Maximum**: 60
- **Minimum**: 37
- **Avg / Min**: 1.38
- **No. of Points**: 25
- **TLC-LED-1150 >51,000**
- **No. of Luminaires**: 54
- **Total Load**: 58.86 kW

- **Guaranteed Performance**: The ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed per your Musco Warranty document and includes a 0.95 depreciation factor.
- **Field Measurements**: Individual field measurements may vary from computer-calculated predictions and should be taken in accordance with ESHA RP-6-16.
- **Electrical System Requirements**: Refer to Amperage Draw Chart and/or the “Musco Control System Summary” for electrical sizing.
- **Installation Requirements**: Results assume ± 3% nominal voltage at line side of the driver and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.
### EQUIPMENT LIST FOR AREAS SHOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pole</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Luminaires</th>
<th>Lamping</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Pole</th>
<th>Qty / Pole</th>
<th>This Grid</th>
<th>Other Grids</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A3-A4</td>
<td>B3-B4</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>161,000 lumens</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### GRID SUMMARY

**Name:** Softball  
**Size:** 200' x 200' - basepath 80'  
**Spacing:** 20.0' x 20.0'  
**Height:** 3.0' above grade

### ILLUMINATION SUMMARY

**MAINTAINED HORIZONTAL FOOTCANDLES**

- **Guaranteed Average:** 50 30  
- **Scan Average:** 50.07 32.23  
- **Minimum:** 38 21  
- **Maximum:** 58 46  
- **Avg / Min:** 1.33 1.55  
- **Guaranteed Max / Min:** 2 2.5  
- **Max / Min:** 1.53 2.21  
- **UG (adjacent pts):** 1.34 1.64  
- **CU:** 0.77  

**No. of Points:** 25 71

### LUMINAIRE INFORMATION

- **Color / CRI:** 5700K - 75 CRI  
- **Luminaire Output:** 121,000 lumens  
- **No. of Luminaires:** 16  
- **Total Load:** 18.4 kW

### Lumen Maintenance

- **Luminaire Type L90 hrs:**  
  - TLC-LED-1150 >51,000  
  - >51,000  
  - >51,000

Reported per TM-21-11. See luminaire datasheet for details.

### Guaranteed Performance

- The ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed per your Musco Warranty document and includes a 0.95 dirt depreciation factor.

### Field Measurements

Individual field measurements may vary from computer-calculated predictions and should be taken in accordance with IESNA RP-6-15.

### Electrical System Requirements

Refer to Amperage Draw Chart and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.

### Installation Requirements

Results assume ± 3% nominal voltage at line side of the driver and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.
**EQUIPMENT LIST FOR AREAS SHOWN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>EQUIPMENT LIST FOR AREAS SHOWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pole A2, B2 and B4 are in a glare zone for soccer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Added walkway lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Converted to TLC-1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Integrated new field layout.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRID SUMMARY**

- **Name:** Soccer 1
- **Size:** 330’ x 165’
- **Spacing:** 30.0’ x 30.0’
- **Height:** 3.0’ above grade

**ILLUMINATION SUMMARY**

- **Guaranteed Average:** 38.75
- **Maximum:** 59
- **Minimum:** 29
- **Avg / Min:** 1.22

**Guaranteed Max / Min:**
- **Max:** 59
- **Minimum:** 29

**CRI:** 5700K - 75 CRI

**Total Load:** 70.36 kW

**Number of Luminaires:** 64

**Luminaire Output:** 121,000 / 64,000 lumens

**Field Measurements:**
- Individual field measurements may vary from computer-calculated predictions and should be taken in accordance with IESNA RP-6-15.
- Electrical System Requirements: Refer to Amperage Draw Chart and/or the “Musco Control System Summary” for electrical sizing.

**Warranty:**
- The ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed per your Musco Warranty document and includes a 0.95 dirt depreciation factor.
- Field Measurements: Individual field measurements may vary from computer-calculated predictions and should be taken in accordance with IESNA RP-6-15.

**Guaranteed Performance:**
- The ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed per your Musco Warranty document and includes a 0.95 dirt depreciation factor.
- Field Measurements: Individual field measurements may vary from computer-calculated predictions and should be taken in accordance with IESNA RP-6-15.

**Electrical System Requirements:** Refer to Amperage Draw Chart and/or the “Musco Control System Summary” for electrical sizing.

**Installation Requirements:** Results assume ± 3% normal voltage at line side of the driver and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.
ENGINEERED DESIGN By: Will Hartl  File #182203-r1  16-Dec-16

ILLUMINATION SUMMARY

Guaranteed Performance: The ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed per your Musco Warranty document and includes a 0.95 dirt depreciation factor.

Field Measurements: Individual field measurements may vary from computer-calculated predictions and should be taken in accordance with ESMA RP-8-95.

Electrical System Requirements: Refer to Amperage Draw Chart and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.

Installation Requirements: Results assume ± 3% nominal voltage at line side of the driver and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.

Guaranteed Max / Min: 1.93
Max / Min: 3.6

Visual Comfort:

Luminance Output: 121,000 / 40,600 lumens
No. of Luminaires: 64
Total Load: 73.3 kW
TLC-LED-1150 >51,000

GRID SUMMARY

Name: Soccer 2
Size: 330' x 165'
Spacing: 30.0' x 30.0'
Height: 3.0' above grade

Illumination

Name: Soccer 2
Size: 330' x 165'
Spacing: 30.0' x 30.0'
Height: 3.0' above grade

EQUIPMENT LIST FOR AREAS SHOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pole</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Grid</th>
<th>Luminarian</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>MOD</th>
<th>Kit</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>UGT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/1*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- C1: Converted to TLC-1150
- D1: Added Auxiliary Lighting
- E1: Verify all pole locations
- F1: Pole A2, A3 and A4 are in a glare zone for soccer

**Dimensions:**
- Height: 3.0' above grade
- Width: 330' x 165'

**Guaranteed Performance:**
- Maximum: 52
- Minimum: 27
- Avg / Min: 30.6

**Guaranteed Average:**
- Scan Average: 33.64
- Maximum: 52
- Minimum: 27
- Avg / Min: 30.6

**Guaranteed Max / Min:**
- 1.93

**Warranty document and includes a 0.95 dirt depreciation factor.**

**Installation Requirements:**
- Results assume ± 3% nominal voltage at line side of the driver and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.
EQUIPMENT LIST FOR AREAS SHOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pole</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>MIN</th>
<th>ELEVATION</th>
<th>HEIGHT</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>POLE</th>
<th>THIS</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>GRID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>70'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>70'</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCALE IN FEET 1 : 40

**GRID SUMMARY**

- Name: Soccer 3
- Size: 360' x 200'
- Spacing: 30.0' x 30.0'
- Height: 3.0' above grade

**ILLUMINATION SUMMARY**

- Guaranteed Average: 34.88
- Maximum: 52
- Minimum: 26
- Avg / Min: 1.33
- Guaranteed Max / Min: 2.5
- Max / Min: 1.99
- UG (adjacent pts): 1.41
- CU: 0.78
- No. of Points: 84

**Color / CRI**: 5700K - 75 CRI

**Luminaires Output**: 121,000 lumens

**No. of Luminaires**: 28

**Total Load**: 32.2 kW

**Lumen Maintenance**

- TLC-LED-1150 >51,000

Reported per TM-21-11. See luminaire datasheet for details.

**Guaranteed Performance**: The ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed per your Musco Warranty document and includes a 0.95 dirt depreciation factor.

**Field Measurements**: Individual field measurements may vary from computer-calculated predictions and should be taken in accordance with IESNA RP-6-15.

**Electrical System Requirements**: Refer to Amperage Draw Chart and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.

**Installation Requirements**: Results assume 3% nominal voltage at line side of the driver and structures located within 3 feet [1m] of design locations.

- **NOTES**
  - -r1: Integrated new field layout.
  - -r1: Converted to TLC-1150
  - -r1: Added walkway lighting.
  - -r1: Verify all pole locations.
  - -r1: Poles A2, B2 and B4 are in a glare zone for soccer

---

**ENGINEERED DESIGN** By: Will Hart • File #182203-r1 • 16-Dec-16

**ILLUMINATION SUMMARY**
EQUIPMENT LIST FOR AREAS SHOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pole</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Mounting Height</th>
<th>Luminaire Type</th>
<th>QTY / POLE</th>
<th>THIS GRID</th>
<th>OTHER GRIDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>-25'</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>90'</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>90'</td>
<td>-25'</td>
<td>75'</td>
<td>90'</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/1*</td>
<td>8/7*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>70'</td>
<td>-70'</td>
<td>70'</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**: 40 28 12

* This structure utilizes a back-to-back mounting configuration.

**SCALE IN FEET 1 : 30**

**GRID SUMMARY**

- Name: Lacrosse
- Size: 330' x 200'
- Spacing: 30.0' x 30.0'
- Height: 3.0' above grade

**ILLUMINATION SUMMARY**

- **GUARANTEED AVERAGE**:
  - Scan Average: 34.94
  - Maximum: 46
  - Minimum: 27
  - Avg / Min: 1.28
- **GUARANTEED MAX / MIN**:
  - Max / Min: 1.68
  - US (adjacent pts): 1.64
  - CI: 0.67
  - No. of Points: 72

**SUMMARY INFORMATION**

- Color / CRI: 5700K - 75 CRI
- Luminare Output: 12,100 lumens
- No. of Luminaires: 28

**HOPKINS HIGH SCHOOL BASEBALL SOCCER LACROSSE**

Hopkins,MN

**GRID SUMMARY**

- Name: Lacrosse
- Size: 330' x 200'
- Spacing: 30.0' x 30.0'
- Height: 3.0' above grade

**ILLUMINATION SUMMARY**

- **MAINTAINED HORIZONTAL FOOTCANDLES**
  - Entire Grid
    - Guaranteed Average: 30
    - Scan Average: 34.94
    - Maximum: 46
    - Minimum: 27
    - Avg / Min: 1.28
    - Guaranteed Max / Min: 2.5
    - Max / Min: 1.68
    - UG (adjacent pts): 1.43
    - CU: 0.67
    - No. of Points: 72

**LUMINAIRE INFORMATION**

- Color / CRI: 5700K - 75 CRI
- Luminaire Output: 12,100 lumens
- No. of Luminaires: 28
- Total Load: 32.2 kW
- Lumen Maintenance
  - TLC-LED-1150 >51,000
    - L90 hrs
    - L80 hrs
    - L70 hrs
  - TLC-LED-1150 >51,000
    - L90 hrs
    - L80 hrs
    - L70 hrs

Reported per TM-21-11. See luminaire datasheet for details.

**Guaranteed Performance**: The ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed per your Musco Warranty document and includes a 0.95 dirt depreciation factor.

**Field Measurements**: Individual field measurements may vary from computer-calculated predictions and should be taken in accordance with E839 RP-6-15.

**Electrical System Requirements**: Refer to Amperage Draw Chart and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.

**Installation Requirements**: Results assume ± 3% nominal voltage at line side of the driver and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.
### Equipment List for Areas Shown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pole</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Tall</th>
<th>RC</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1-A2</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poles A2, B2 and B4 are in a glare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3-A4</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1-B2</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3-B4</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location**: B3-B4, B1-B2, A3-A4

**Scale in Feet**: 1 : 100

**Pole Luminaires**: TLC-LED-1150

**Mounting Height**: 80' 90' 60' 25'

**Color / CRI**: 5700K - 75 CRI

**Total Load**: 115.21 kW

**Lumen Output**: 121,000 / 40,000 Luminos

**No. of Luminaires**: 103

**Total Lumen**: 9,521,400

**Lumen Maintenance**: >51,000 L80 hrs

**Luminaires**: TLC-LED-1150

---

**Guaranteed Performance**: The ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed per your Musco Warranty document and includes a 0.95 dirt depreciation factor.

**Field Measurements**: Individual field measurements may vary from computer-calculated predictions and should be taken in accordance with ESNA RP-6-1x.

**Electrical System Requirements**: Refer to Amperage Draw Chart and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.

**Installation Requirements**: Results assume a 3.1% nominal voltage at line side of the driver and structures located within 3 feet (2m) of design locations.
### Equipment List for Areas Shown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pole</th>
<th>Luminaire</th>
<th>( T_{E})</th>
<th>( L_{E})</th>
<th>( T_{E})</th>
<th>( L_{E})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1-A2</td>
<td>TLC-LCD-1150</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3-A4</td>
<td>TLC-LCD-1150</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1-B2</td>
<td>TLC-LCD-1150</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3-B4</td>
<td>TLC-LCD-1150</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1-C2</td>
<td>TLC-LCD-1150</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3-C4</td>
<td>TLC-LCD-1150</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1-D2</td>
<td>TLC-LCD-1150</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Illumination Summary

**Name:** Blanket Grid  
**Spacing:** 30' x 30'  
**Height:** 3.0' above grade

#### Equipment Information

- **Total Load:** 116.24 kW
- **Luminaire Type:** TLC-LCD-1150
- **Color / CRI:** 5700K - 75 CRI / 5700K - 70 CRI
- **Maximum:** 59 lumens
- **Avg / Min:** 2248402.50 lumens
- **No. of Luminaires:** 108
- **No. of Points:** 686
- **Color / CRI:** 5700K - 75 CRI / 70 CRI - 5700K
- **Luminaire Output:** 121,000 / 41,000 / 16,000 lumens

### Field Measurements

- **Measurements:** May vary from computer-calculated predictions and should be taken in accordance with RSA RP-6-16.

### Electric System Requirements

- **Refer to Amparage Chart and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.**

### Installation Requirements

- **Results assume 3% normal voltage at line side of the driver and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.**

---

**Guaranteed Performance:** The ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed per year Musco Warranty document and includes a D.95 dirt depreciation factor.

**Draw Chart and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.**

**NOTE:**  
- **Integrated new field layout.**  
- **Future addenda lighting.**  
- **Verify at pole locations.**  
- **Future pole A2, B2 and D4 are in a glow zone for soccer.**  

---

**ILLUMINATION SUMMARY**

- **Name:** Blanket Grid
- **Spacing:** 30' x 30'  
- **Height:** 3.0' above grade
- **Total Load:** 116.24 kW
- **Luminaire Type:** TLC-LCD-1150
- **Color / CRI:** 5700K - 75 CRI / 70 CRI - 5700K
- **Luminaire Output:** 121,000 / 41,000 / 16,000 lumens
- **No. of Luminaires:** 108
- **No. of Points:** 686
- **Color / CRI:** 5700K - 75 CRI / 70 CRI - 5700K
- **Luminaire Output:** 121,000 / 41,000 / 16,000 lumens

---

**Guaranteed Performance:** The ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed per year Musco Warranty document and includes a D.95 dirt depreciation factor.

**Draw Chart and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.**

**Installation Requirements:** Results assume 3% normal voltage at line side of the driver and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.

---

**NOTE:**  
- **Integrated new field layout.**  
- **Future addenda lighting.**  
- **Verify at pole locations.**  
- **Future pole A2, B2 and D4 are in a glow zone for soccer.**

---

**ILLUMINATION SUMMARY**

- **Name:** Blanket Grid
- **Spacing:** 30' x 30'  
- **Height:** 3.0' above grade
- **Total Load:** 116.24 kW
- **Luminaire Type:** TLC-LCD-1150
- **Color / CRI:** 5700K - 75 CRI / 70 CRI - 5700K
- **Luminaire Output:** 121,000 / 41,000 / 16,000 lumens
- **No. of Luminaires:** 108
- **No. of Points:** 686
- **Color / CRI:** 5700K - 75 CRI / 70 CRI - 5700K
- **Luminaire Output:** 121,000 / 41,000 / 16,000 lumens

---

**Guaranteed Performance:** The ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed per year Musco Warranty document and includes a D.95 dirt depreciation factor.

**Draw Chart and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.**

**Installation Requirements:** Results assume 3% normal voltage at line side of the driver and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.

---

**NOTE:**  
- **Integrated new field layout.**  
- **Future addenda lighting.**  
- **Verify at pole locations.**  
- **Future pole A2, B2 and D4 are in a glow zone for soccer.**
ENGINEERED DESIGN By: Will Hart • File #182203-r1 • 16-Dec-16

### EQUIPMENT LIST FOR AREAS SHOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pole</th>
<th>Luminaire</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>TLC-L1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>TLC-L1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>TLC-L1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>TLC-L1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>TLC-L1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>TLC-L1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>TLC-L1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>TLC-L1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>TLC-L1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>TLC-L1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>TLC-L1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GRID SUMMARY

Name: Spill  
Spacing: 30'7"  
Height: 3.0' above grade

### ILLUMINATION SUMMARY

**MAINTAINED HORIZONTAL FOOTCANDLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pole Location</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LUMINARIES**

- **TLC-LED-1150**: Luminaire Output: 121,000 / 40,600 lumens

**Guaranteed Performance:** The ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed per your Musco Warranty Document and includes a 0.95 dirt depreciation factor.

**Field Measurements:** Individual field measurements may vary from computer-calculated predictions and should be taken in accordance with IESNA RP-6-15.

**Electrical System Requirements:** Refer to Armarope Draw Chart and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.

**Installation Requirements:** Results assume 3% nominal voltage at line side of the driver and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.
EQUIPMENT LIST FOR AREAS SHOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pole</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>MIN</th>
<th>ELEVATION</th>
<th>NEW MIN. HEIGHT</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2-A4</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>TLC-LCD-1150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A1-B2</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>TLC-LCD-1150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>B3-B4</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>TLC-LCD-1150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>TLC-LCD-1150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>TLC-LCD-1150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>TLC-LCD-1150</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOCATION

B1-B2
A3-A4
A1-A2
0'
S1
C2
C1
80'
80'
80'

ELEVATION

150'
60'
90'
25'
25'
25'

GRADE

- - - -

TLC-LED-1150
TLC-LED-1150
TLC-LED-1150
TLC-LED-1150
TLC-LED-1150
TLC-LED-1150
TLC-LED-1150

TOTALS

HEIGHT

80' 80' 25' 90' 75' 25' 25' 25'

TYPE

NEW CONCRETE
UGT
UGT
UGT
UGT
UGT
UGT

QTY /

=958.3

GRID

GRIDS

OTHER

GRID

0' 0' 0' 0' 0' 0' 0'

Other

NOTES:
This structure...

ENGINEERED DESIGN
By: Will Hart  File #182203-r1  16-Dec-16

ILLUMINATION SUMMARY

Guaranteed Performance: The ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed per your Musco Warranty document and includes a 0.95 dirt depreciation factor.

Field Measurements: Individual field measurements may vary from computer-calculated predictions and should be taken in accordance with IESNA RP-2-15.

Electrical System Requirements: Refer to "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.

Installation Requirements: Results assume ± 3% nominal voltage at line side of the driver and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.

Pole locations are relative to 0,0 reference point(s)

DIMENSIONS ARE RELATIVE TO 0,0 REFERENCE POINT

Hopkins High School Baseball Soccer Lacrosse
Hopkins, MN
**EQUIPMENT LIST FOR AREAS SHOWN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pole</th>
<th>Luminaire</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1-A2</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1-B2</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3-B5</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>B4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ILLUMINATION SUMMARY**

**MAINTAINED CANDELA (PER FIXTURE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pole location(s)</th>
<th>4 dimensions are relative to G5 reference point(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**GRID SUMMARY**

Name: Spill
Spacing: 30'-0" above grade

**ILLUMINATION SUMMARY**

- **Minimum:** 111,200 lumens
- **No. of Points:** 71
- **Total load:** 115.21 kW

**Guaranteed Performance:**

- The ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed per your Musco Warranty document and includes a 0.95 dirt depreciation factor.
- **Field Measurements:** Individual field measurements may vary from computer-calculated predictions and should be taken in accordance with ISA Test Procedure J-15.
- **Electrical System Requirements:** Refer to Armarco Draw Sheet and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.
- **Installation Requirements:** Results assume a 1% nominal voltage at line side of the drivers and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.

---

**Notes:**

- #1: Integrated new field layout.
- #2: Converted to TLC-1150
- #3: Added floodlighting.
- #4: Verify at pole locations.
- #5: Poles A2, B2 and B4 are in a glare zone for soccer.

---

**ENGINEERED DESIGN**

By: Will Hart • File #182203-r1 • 16-Dec-16

---

**ILLUMINATION SUMMARY**

- **Luminaire Type:** TLC-LED-1150
- **Luminaire Output:** 121,000 / 40,600 lumens
- **Total Load:** 115.21 kW

---

**Field Measurements:**

- **Reported per TM-21-11. See luminaire datasheet for details.**
- **MAINTAINED CANDELA (PER FIXTURE):**
  - **Maximum:**
  - **Minimum:**
  - **Average:**

---

**HOPKINS HIGH SCHOOL BASEBALL, SOCCER, LACROSSE**

- **Location:** Hopkins, MN
- **Date:** 16-Dec-16
- **Project BM#2:**
  - **TNH=954.46**
  - **RIM=953.8**
  - **EX. CB**
- **GRID:**
  - **Location:** Spill
  - **Spacing:** 30'-0" above grade
  - **Height:** 3.0' above grade

---

**ILLUMINATION SUMMARY**

- **Luminaire Type:** TLC-LED-1150
- **Luminaire Output:** 121,000 / 40,600 lumens
- **Total Load:** 115.21 kW

---

**Guaranteed Performance:**

- The ILLUMINATION described above is guaranteed per your Musco Warranty document and includes a 0.95 dirt depreciation factor.

---

**Field Measurements:**

- Individual field measurements may vary from computer-calculated predictions and should be taken in accordance with ISA Test Procedure J-15.

---

**Electrical System Requirements:**

- Refer to Armarco Draw Sheet and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.

---

**Installation Requirements:**

- Results assume a 1% nominal voltage at line side of the drivers and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.
ENGINEERED DESIGN

- r1: Added walkway lighting
- r1: Converted to TLC-1150
- r1: Integrated new field layout.

SCALE IN FEET 1 : 120

EQUIPMENT LAYOUT

INCLUDES:
- Baseball
- Lacrosse
- Soccer 1
- Soccer 2
- Softball

Electrical System Requirements: Refer to Amperage Draw chart and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.

Installation Requirements: Results assume 3% nominal voltage at line side of the driver and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.

EQUIPMENT LIST FOR AREAS SHOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Luminaire</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Driver</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ballast Specifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The structure utilizes a back-to-back inverting configuration

Single Phase Voltage:
- 208V
- 240V
- 277V
- 36V

Three Phase Voltage:
- 480V

Pole location(s) • dimensions are relative to (S) reference points

EQUIPMENT LAYOUT

 ситуаций 1: 120

EQUIPMENT LAYOUT

INCLUDES:
- Baseball
- Lacrosse
- Soccer 1
- Soccer 2
- Softball

Electrical System Requirements: Refer to Amperage Draw chart and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.

Installation Requirements: Results assume 3% nominal voltage at line side of the driver and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.

EQUIPMENT LIST FOR AREAS SHOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Luminaire</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Driver</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ballast Specifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The structure utilizes a back-to-back inverting configuration

Single Phase Voltage:
- 208V
- 240V
- 277V
- 36V

Three Phase Voltage:
- 480V

Pole location(s) • dimensions are relative to (S) reference points

EQUIPMENT LAYOUT

situаций 1: 120

EQUIPMENT LAYOUT

INCLUDES:
- Baseball
- Lacrosse
- Soccer 1
- Soccer 2
- Softball

Electrical System Requirements: Refer to Amperage Draw chart and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.

Installation Requirements: Results assume 3% nominal voltage at line side of the driver and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.

EQUIPMENT LIST FOR AREAS SHOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Luminaire</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Driver</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ballast Specifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The structure utilizes a back-to-back inverting configuration

Single Phase Voltage:
- 208V
- 240V
- 277V
- 36V

Three Phase Voltage:
- 480V

Pole location(s) • dimensions are relative to (S) reference points

EQUIPMENT LAYOUT

situаций 1: 120

EQUIPMENT LAYOUT

INCLUDES:
- Baseball
- Lacrosse
- Soccer 1
- Soccer 2
- Softball

Electrical System Requirements: Refer to Amperage Draw chart and/or the "Musco Control System Summary" for electrical sizing.

Installation Requirements: Results assume 3% nominal voltage at line side of the driver and structures located within 3 feet (1m) of design locations.

EQUIPMENT LIST FOR AREAS SHOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Luminaire</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Driver</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ballast Specifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>TLC-LED-1150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40W</td>
<td>Cree OSQ LUMINAIRE</td>
<td>(.90 min power factor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The structure utilizes a back-to-back inverting configuration

Single Phase Voltage:
- 208V
- 240V
- 277V
- 36V

Three Phase Voltage:
- 480V

Pole location(s) • dimensions are relative to (S) reference points

EQUIPMENT LAYOUT
GLARE IMPACT

Summary:
Map indicates the maximum candela an observer would see when facing the brightest light source from any direction.

A well-designed lighting system controls light to provide maximum useful on-field illumination with minimal destructive off-site glare.

GLARE

Candela Levels:
- **High Glare**: 150,000 or more candela
  - Should only occur on or very near the lit area where the light source is in direct view. Care must be taken to minimize high glare zones.
- **Significant Glare**: 25,000 to 75,000 candela
  - Equivalent to high beam headlights of a car.
- **Minimal to No Glare**: 500 or less candela
  - Equivalent to 100W incandescent light bulb.
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BLEACHER DETAIL 1

DISCLAIMER:
DETAILS HAVE BEEN PREPARED BY SOUTHERN BLEACHER COMPANY
What Matters in Lighting Technology

Hopkins HS Football Field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>SportsCluster-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>SportsCluster-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>SportsCluster-2 with Level 8™</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Total Light Control™</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Light-Structure Green™ — HID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Light-Structure Green™ — LED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed

Photographed at 100-feet from field edge

Used equal parameters for:
- On-field light level per pole
- Wattage per luminaire
- Mounting height
- Luminaire aiming angles
- Pole distance from aiming point
## Evolution of Light Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>SportsCluster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>SportsCluster-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>SportsCluster-2 with Level 8&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Total Light Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Light·Structure Green™— HID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Light·Structure Green™— LED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hopkins HS Football Field**


Solutions for Lighting
Total Light Control™ — LED-1150 Luminaire Component
KENT-STEIN PARK
Muscatine, Iowa, USA

Soccer Field – 30 horizontal footcandles (300 lux)

System Energy Comparison:
34.8 kW – 81% reduction from typical HID equipment
Light-Structure Green™ Lighting System

For your **BUDGET**, for the **ENVIRONMENT**.

**5 Easy Pieces™**
Complete System from Foundation to Poletop

- Factory wired, aimed, and tested
- Fast, trouble-free installation
- Comprehensive corrosion package
- Integrated lightning ground system

1. **Precast Concrete Base**
2. **Galvanized Steel Pole**
3. **Electrical Components Enclosure** (Includes Drivers)
4. **Wire Harness**
5. **Poletop Luminaire Assembly**

All you add is concrete backfill, underground wiring, and a service entrance.
This outdoor LED baseball/softball scoreboard displays HOME and GUEST team scores for up to nine innings, total RUNS to 99 for each team, AT BAT to 99, BALL to three, STRIKE to two and OUT to two. Scoreboard can show TIME instead of AT BAT with included caption panel. Scoreboard shown with optional striping and amber PanaView® digits.

### DIMENSIONS
- **6'-6" H x 20'-0" W x 8" D**
  - (1.98 m, 6.10 m, 203 mm)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>UNCRATED WEIGHT</th>
<th>100-240 VAC POWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6'-6&quot; H x 20'-0&quot; W x 8&quot; D</td>
<td>600 lb (272 kg)</td>
<td>900 Watts Max, 9 Amps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Optional 8x32 TNMCs add 270 Watts to scoreboard power and 80 lb (36 kg) to scoreboard weight.

### DIGITS
- AT BAT, BALL, STRIKE and OUT digits are 18" (457 mm) high. All other digits are 15" (381 mm) high.
- Select all red or all amber LED digits. Scoreboard may instead have mixed LED digit colors (see DD1965467).
- Scoreboard features robust weather-sealed digits (see DD2495646).
- Digits may be dimmed for night viewing.

### CAPTIONS
- HOME and GUEST captions are 12" (305 mm) high.
- AT BAT, BALL, STRIKE and OUT captions are 10" (254 mm) high. All other captions are 8" (203 mm) high.
- Standard captions are vinyl. TIME caption is on a changeable panel. All other captions are applied directly to the display face.
- Optional TNMCs are 10.6" (269 mm) high.

### DISPLAY COLOR
Choose from 150+ colors (from Martin Senour® paint book) at no additional cost.

### CONSTRUCTION
Alcoa aluminum alloy 5052 for excellent corrosion resistance

### PRODUCT SAFETY APPROVAL
ETL listed to UL 48, tested to CSA standards, and CE labeled

### OPERATING TEMPERATURES
- Display: -22° to 122° Fahrenheit (-30° to 50° Celsius)
- Console: 32° to 130° Fahrenheit (0° to 54° Celsius)
## Control Console

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Sport® 5000 (see SL03991)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Wired (standard)
One-pair shielded cable of 22 AWG minimum is required. A cover plate with mounted connector and standard 2" x 4" x 2" (51 mm x 102 mm x 51 mm) outlet box is provided. Connector mates with signal cable from control console.

### Wireless (optional)
2.4 GHz spread spectrum radio features 64 non-interfering channels and 8 broadcast groups (see SL04370).

## Time Clock
The two-digit clock can display hours/minutes/seconds. Clock information shifts from hours to minutes to seconds as time counts down.

## Mounting
Scoreboard is typically mounted on two vertical beams or poles. Hardware to mount scoreboard on two beams is included; hardware for more beams is at additional cost. Standard mounting uses I-beam clamps. Optional mounting method using angle brackets is also offered; maximum beam width is 12" (305 mm) and maximum beam depth is 22" (559 mm). Refer to attached drawings for more information on mounting methods.

## Service Access
Digit panels and electronics are serviced from the front of the scoreboard.

## General Information
Scoreboard provides scoring capabilities for two teams. 100% solid state electronics are housed in an all aluminum cabinet. Scoreboard is shipped in one section. Specifications and pricing are subject to change without notice.

## Options & Accessories
- Scoreboard border striping
- Multiple caption and striping colors (see DD2101644)
- Team name caption in place of HOME *
- Team names on changeable panels *
- Programmable Team Name Message Centers (see DD1696958)
- Individual digit protective screens (see SL04939)
- Protective netting
- Optional angle bracket mounting method
- Advertising/identification panels
- Decorative accents
- Electronic message centers and video displays in multiple sizes
- * Only for scoreboard without Team Name Message Centers

## Advertising/Identification Panels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Backlit &amp; Non-Backlit:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1'-6&quot; H x 20'-0&quot; W (457 mm, 6.10 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2'-0&quot; H x 20'-0&quot; W (610 mm, 6.10 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2'-6&quot; H x 20'-0&quot; W (762 mm, 6.10 m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3'-0&quot; H x 20'-0&quot; W (914 mm, 6.10 m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For additional non-backlit panel sizes, see SL03761.

## For Additional Information
- Installation Specifications: DWG-1157190 (attached)
- Standard I-beam Mounting: DWG-1052565 (attached)
- Optional Pole Mounting: DWG-1048184 (attached)
- Component Locations: DWG-1066866 (attached)
- Architectural Specifications: See SL05265
TABLE A - MOUNTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height Above Grade = 10'</th>
<th>Design Wind Velocity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Height (FT)</td>
<td>115 MPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>COLUMN W10X26, 2'0&quot;X10'0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>COLUMN W12X30, 2'0&quot;X10'0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>COLUMN W14X34, 3'0&quot;X10'0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>COLUMN W16X40, 3'0&quot;X12'0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>COLUMN W18X60, 3'0&quot;X15'0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>COLUMN W12X30, 3'0&quot;X12'0&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>COLUMN W14X48, 3'0&quot;X14'0&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOOTING DIMENSIONS = DIAMETER X DEPTH

BUCKLING BRACE REQUIRED FOR ALL DISPLAYS

NOTES:
1. FOOTING AND COLUMN SIZES ARE SUGGESTIONS ONLY, PROVIDED TO ASSIST IN ESTIMATING INSTALLATION COSTS AND ARE NOT INTENDED FOR CONSTRUCTION PURPOSES. THE DESIGN MUST BE CERTIFIED BY A PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER LICENSED IN THE STATE OF THE INSTALLATION BEFORE THEY CAN BE USED FOR FABRICATION OR EXECUTION.

2. INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE 2017 USED IN DESIGN OF COLUMNS AND FOOTINGS WITH IMPACT FACTOR = 1.0, K = 0.85, G = 0.85. SEISMIC DESIGN WAS NOT CONSIDERED.

3. FOOTING DIMENSIONS ARE BASED ON ASSUMED SOIL CLASS 4 (ALLOWABLE LATERAL BEARING PRESSURE OF 150 psi).

4. STRUCTURAL STEEL IS GRADE A499 (50 ksi) STEEL. CONCRETE SHALL HAVE A MINIMUM 28 DAY COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH OF 2500 psi.

5. THE AVERAGE DISPLAY WIDTH FOR A LAYOUT CAN NOT EXCEED 8 PSF.

6. DAKTRONICS INC. IS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR STRUCTURES DESIGNED AND BUILT BY OTHERS.

7. LOCAL BUILDING OFFICIALS SHOULD BE CONTACTED TO DETERMINE THE WIND SPEED AND EXPOSURE CATEGORY FOR THE PROPOSED SIGN LOCATION. THE EXPOSURE CATEGORY IS DEFINED AS:

   EXPOSURE A - URBAN AND SUBURBAN AREAS, OR OTHER REGIONS WITH SCATTERED OBSTRUCTIONS HAVING THE SIZE OF SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING OR LESS. THESE CONDITIONS MIGHT PREVAIL FOR A DISTANCE FROM THE SIGN OF AT LEAST 1.25 TO 3.1 TIMES THE SIGN HEIGHT, WHEREVER GREATER.

   EXPOSURE B - OPEN TERRAIN WITH SCATTERED OBSTRUCTIONS HAVING HEIGHTS GENERALLY LESS THAN 20'. THIS CATEGORY INCLUDES BOTH OPEN COUNTRY CONDITIONS, AND ALL WATER SURFACES IN HURRICANE PRONE REGIONS.

   EXPOSURE C - OPEN TERRAIN WITH SCATTERED OBSTRUCTIONS HAVING HEIGHTS GENERALLY LESS THAN 20'. THIS CATEGORY INCLUDES BOTH OPEN COUNTRY CONDITIONS, AND ALL WATER SURFACES IN HURRICANE PRONE REGIONS.

8. FOR SPECIFIC PRODUCT DETAILS ON WEIGHT, MOUNTING, ETC. REFER TO THE INDIVIDUAL PRODUCT SPECIFICATION SHEETS.
This outdoor LED soccer scoreboard displays period time to 99:59, HOME and GUEST scores to 99 and HALF (or PERIOD or QTR) to nine. When period time is less than one minute, the scoreboard displays time to 1/10 of a second. Scoreboard shown with optional striping and amber PanaView® digits.

### DIMENSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNCRATED WEIGHT</th>
<th>100-240 VAC POWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4'-0&quot; H x 12'-0&quot; W x 8&quot; D (1.22 m, 3.66 m, 203 mm)</td>
<td>180 lb (82 kg)</td>
<td>300 Watts Max, 3 Amps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DIGITS

- All digits are 18" (457 mm) high.
- Select all red or all amber LED digits.
- Scoreboard features robust weather-sealed digits (see DD2495646).
- Digits may be dimmed for night viewing.

### CAPTIONS

- HOME and GUEST captions are 10" (254 mm) high.
  - All other captions are 8" (203 mm) high.
- Standard captions are vinyl, applied directly to the display face.

### DISPLAY COLOR

Choose from 150+ colors (from Martin Senour® paint book) at no additional cost.

### CONSTRUCTION

Alcoa aluminum alloy 5052 for excellent corrosion resistance

### PRODUCT SAFETY APPROVAL

ETL listed to UL 48, tested to CSA standards, and CE labeled

### OPERATING TEMPERATURES

- Display: -22° to 122° Fahrenheit (-30° to 50° Celsius)
- Console: 32° to 130° Fahrenheit (0° to 54° Celsius)
**PRODUCT SPECIFICATIONS**

### SEGMENT TIMER MODE

The segment timer mode is ideal for keeping practices on schedule. The horn at the end of a segment allows coaches and athletes to focus on the practice and to listen for the horn when it is time to change drills (see SL-04004).

### MOUNTING

Scoreboard is typically mounted on two vertical beams or poles. Hardware to mount scoreboard on two beams is included; hardware for more beams is at additional cost. Standard mounting uses I-beam clamps. Optional mounting method using angle brackets is also offered; maximum beam width is 12" (305 mm) and maximum beam depth is 22" (559 mm). Refer to attached drawings for more information on mounting methods.

### SERVICE ACCESS

Digit panels and electronics are serviced from the front of the scoreboard.

### GENERAL INFORMATION

Scoreboard provides scoring capabilities for two teams. 100% solid state electronics are housed in an all aluminum cabinet. Scoreboard is shipped in one section. Specifications and pricing are subject to change without notice.

### OPTIONS & ACCESSORIES

- Scoreboard border striping
- Multiple caption and striping colors (see DD2101644)
- Team name caption in place of HOME
- Team names on changeable panels
- Baseball, football, and lacrosse/field hockey captions on changeable panels
- Horn
- Standalone Time of Day – scoreboard acts as a clock when control console is unplugged/off
- Individual digit protective screens (see SL04939)
- Protective netting
- Optional angle bracket mounting method
- Advertising/identification panels
- Decorative accents
- Electronic message centers and video displays in multiple sizes

### ADVERTISING/IDENTIFICATION PANELS

**Backlit & Non-Backlit:**

- 1'-6" H x 12'-0" W (457 mm, 3.66 m)
- 2'-0" H x 12'-0" W (610 mm, 3.66 m)
- 2'-6" H x 12'-0" W (762 mm, 3.66 m)

For additional non-backlit panel sizes, see SL03761.

### FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

- Installation Specifications: DWG-1157186 (attached)
- Standard I-beam Mounting: DWG-1052565 (attached)
- Optional Pole Mounting: DWG-1048184 (attached)
- Component Locations: DWG-1073981 (attached)
- Architectural Specifications: See SL05182

### ALTERNATE CAPTIONS & SCORING MODES

**Baseball Mode** – Optional vinyl captions shown

**Football Mode** – Optional vinyl captions shown

**Lacrosse/Field Hockey Mode** – Optional vinyl captions shown

### CONTROL CONSOLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Console</th>
<th>Wired (standard)</th>
<th>Wireless (optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Sport® 1600* (see SL04352)</td>
<td>One-pair shielded cable of 22 AWG minimum is required. A cover plate with mounted connector and standard 2&quot; x 4&quot; x 2&quot; (51 mm x 102 mm x 51 mm) outlet box is provided. Connector mates with signal cable from control console.</td>
<td>2.4 GHz spread spectrum radio features 64 non-interfering channels and 8 broadcast groups (see SL04370).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC-100 (see SL07397)</td>
<td>Optional wireless handheld controller features 900 MHz spread spectrum radio with 15 non-interfering channels and up to 10 hours of operation via internal rechargeable battery.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONTROL OPTIONS

- All Sport® 1600* (see SL04352)
- RC-100 (see SL07397)

*May be upgraded to All Sport 5000 (see SL03991)
# Table A - Mounting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Height Above Grade</th>
<th>Design Wind Velocity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>115 MPH</td>
<td>130 MPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Footing</td>
<td>W6x15</td>
<td>W6x15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Footing</td>
<td>W6x18</td>
<td>W6x18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Footing</td>
<td>W6x21</td>
<td>W6x21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Footing</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Footing</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Footing</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Footing</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Footing</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Footing</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Footing</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Footing</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Footings Dimensions = Diameter x Depth**

* DENOTES BUCKLING BRACE REQUIRED

**Notes:**
1. Footing and column sizes are suggestions only, provided to assist with estimating installation costs and are not intended for construction purposes. The design must be certified by a professional engineer licensed in the state of the installation before they can be used for fabrication or erection.
2. International Building Code 2012 Used in design of columns and footings with important factors. *P* = 0.65, *R* = 0.05. Seismic design was not considered.
3. Footing dimensions are based on assumed soil class 4 (allowable lateral bearing pressure of 150 psf).
4. Structural steel is grade A992 (50 ksi) steel. Concrete shall have a minimum 28 day compressive strength of 2500 psi.
5. The average display height for a layout can not exceed 8 FSP.
6. Daktronics Inc. is not responsible for structures designed and installed by others.
7. Local building officials should be contacted to determine the wind speed and exposure category for the proposed site location. The exposure category C is defined as:
   - Exposure B - Urban and suburban areas, or other terrain with numerous spaced obstructing the size of single-family dwellings on larger, these conditions must prevail for a distance from the sign of at least 2,000 ft or 20 times the sign height, whichever is greater
   - Exposure C - Open terrain with scattered, distributing having heights generally less than 30 ft. This category includes flat open country grassland, and all water surfaces in hurricane prone regions.
8. For specific product details on weights, mounting, etc. refer to the individual product specification sheets.

---

**Table A - Mounting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Height Above Grade</th>
<th>Design Wind Velocity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>115 MPH</td>
<td>130 MPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Footing</td>
<td>W6x15</td>
<td>W6x15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Footing</td>
<td>W6x18</td>
<td>W6x18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Footing</td>
<td>W6x21</td>
<td>W6x21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Footing</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Footing</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Footing</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Footing</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Footing</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Footing</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Footing</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Footing</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
<td>W6x24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Footings Dimensions = Diameter x Depth**

* DENOTES BUCKLING BRACE REQUIRED

**Notes:**
1. Footing and column sizes are suggestions only, provided to assist with estimating installation costs and are not intended for construction purposes. The design must be certified by a professional engineer licensed in the state of the installation before they can be used for fabrication or erection.
2. International Building Code 2012 Used in design of columns and footings with important factors. *P* = 0.65, *R* = 0.05. Seismic design was not considered.
3. Footing dimensions are based on assumed soil class 4 (allowable lateral bearing pressure of 150 psf).
4. Structural steel is grade A992 (50 ksi) steel. Concrete shall have a minimum 28 day compressive strength of 2500 psi.
5. The average display height for a layout can not exceed 8 FSP.
6. Daktronics Inc. is not responsible for structures designed and installed by others.
7. Local building officials should be contacted to determine the wind speed and exposure category for the proposed site location. The exposure category C is defined as:
   - Exposure B - Urban and suburban areas, or other terrain with numerous spaced obstructing the size of single-family dwellings on larger, these conditions must prevail for a distance from the sign of at least 2,000 ft or 20 times the sign height, whichever is greater
   - Exposure C - Open terrain with scattered, distributing having heights generally less than 30 ft. This category includes flat open country grassland, and all water surfaces in hurricane prone regions.
8. For specific product details on weights, mounting, etc. refer to the individual product specification sheets.
HOPKINS HIGH SCHOOL
(651) 452-1149
(651) 452-8960
2025 Centre Pointe Blvd., Suite 210
Mendota Heights, MN 55120

L.H. TANGLEN ELEMENTARY
HOPKINS SCHOOL DISTRICT

Primary Parking Lot
Spectator and Student Access to Fields

Secondary Parking Lot
Spectator Access to Fields

Overflow Parking Lot
Spectator and Student Access to Fields

ADA Access to Baseball and Soccer Fields
ADA Access to Softball Field

Site and Athletic Facility Engineering
6574 Sioux Lane
Lino Lakes, MN 55014
612-213-9859
nrtessier@gmail.com

1/20" = 1'-0" Scale in Feet
Tony Wagner
Minnetonka City Councilman, Ward 2
01-612-382-5212
Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jo Debler
Date: March 24, 2017 at 9:21:30 AM GMT-7
To: "dingvalson@eminnetonka.com" <dingvalson@eminnetonka.com>
Cc: "twagner@eminnetonka.com" <twagner@eminnetonka.com>
Subject: Hopkins High School Ballfield
Reply-To: Jo Debler

Will there be a lot of high bright lighting, loud speakers, additional traffic, and/or general interference with quiet residential living with these proposed alterations? It's very difficult for me to attend these meetings and I surely want to know what's going on in my area.

Do you have a small drawing of what/where this will occur? What does "construct other structures" mean specifically?

I would appreciate your explanations, drawings, and any other pertinent information you can share.

Thank you.

Alice J. Debler
Tony Wagner
Minnetonka City Councilman, Ward 2
01-612-382-5212
Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Nick Erpelding
Date: March 28, 2017 at 10:42:30 AM GMT-7
To: <pacomb@eminnetonka.com>, <twagner@eminnetonka.com>
Cc: Lara Erpelding
Subject: Hopkins High School Ballfields Proposal

Patty and Tony--

Next Thursday (April 6) is the Planning Commission meeting for the proposed HHS ballfields project. I reviewed the plans for the project, and overall I think the improvements will be an upgrade. I have concerns about the proposed permanent fencing, however.

One of the things we like about our neighborhood is the proximity to these fields, and the ability to use them for recreation when they're not being used for organized sports, similar to how the adjacent tennis courts function. With the proposed plan, the entire west half of the main field area would be fenced off, gated and presumably locked (like the existing football, baseball and lacrosse fields). Would it be possible to avoid adding (or at least modifying) the gating to allow the fields to remain open for public use, similar to how the tennis courts function?

My other concern is that the plans for the proposed fencing appear similar to the existing fencing around the football field in that it would be covered / non-see-through. Why do the fences have to be covered? Could they just be regular chain link fences like the existing perimeter fencing? Another thing we like about this area is having it as open space. It is great to be able to go on walks on the adjacent sidewalk and enjoy the activity of the sporting events or practices that are happening as we walk past. I don't want that to change into a boring walk next to a wall for no reason. I can understand having covered fencing for the football field since admission is charged, and for the tennis counts, since it functions as a wind screen, but why is covered fencing needed for lacrosse/football/soccer practice fields?
If you could pass these concerns onto the Planning Commission, and consider them in your vote for the proposal at City Council, I'd appreciate it.

Nick Erpelding
10025 Kingman Lane
Minnetonka, MN 55305
Good Morning Drew,

Thank you for taking time the other day to talk to me about my concerns in regards to this project. As the homeowner at 10408 Hillside Lane West for over 20 years, I've personally witnessed the entire construction of the Lindbergh Center and parking area, as well as an extensive addition to Hopkins HS itself. Accordingly, this project affects my family in a more direct way than most. I plan to be at the Planning Commission meeting April 6, as well as the council meeting on April 24, but cannot make the informational meeting at the school March 30. I would love it if you could address these issues for me, and I can follow up with you after the meeting.

My comments fall into 2 areas-the proposed project and the construction work on the project. The concerns I have about the project:

With the premium upgraded fields, I imagine they will be utilized in a greater capacity, than the current fields, and rented out to leagues (non-school) for, scrimmages, tournaments etc. creating increased traffic on Hillside Lane. The property values in areas of high traffic of this type tend to suffer, as it's less favorable for children and general enjoyment of your outdoor spaces. I would like to hear about projected use in comparison to current use.

Aside from the potential property value drop, the additional traffic causes increased parking concerns, including increased parking violations. I have witnessed over the years the fire hydrant (across from my home) blocked repeatedly, as well as other violations; specifically parking on the side of the street that is posted "No Parking" - cars often parked directly under the signs themselves. Since Hillside Lane is not wide enough to support parking on both sides, safety is obviously the biggest concern here. I would ask the school to play a larger role in working with the Minnetonka Police to increase parking enforcement, since it has become well known to those in the know that citations are rare in these cases. Speeding traffic down Hillside Lane and Lindbergh drive (both 25 MPH zones) has always been, and will no doubt continue to become a larger concern. The athletic department can assist in raising awareness among athletes and parents, as well as work with the school board to request increased police presence in the area, particularly during peak traffic hours everyday, and during heavily attended athletic events that will become accordingly more common, per the intent of this project.

The additional lighting closer to Hillside Lane West, and the hours it is in use is a concern. With lighting there is a temptation to play into the night - causing the noise and traffic to be in the area past a reasonable time. How will this be handled? What is the curfew time? 10:00 PM would be reasonable. Who will be policing this to make sure the school or other entity rented to is not abusing? How can we be assured this will strictly be followed?

I have a suggested addition to the project: Additional high chain link or other fencing on a greater stretch of Hillside Lane West and possibly Lindbergh Drive

The proposal states upgrading these eastern natural grass fields for the use in both directions, for football and soccer. I have witnessed for many years - even after the section of high fencing being installed - soccer balls clearing the fencing and bounding across both my and my neighbor's yards, hitting my parked car, and several times plopping into our BBQ patio area while entertaining. As annoying as all of that has been, there is, perhaps more importantly, a safety issue as well; I have watched kids running out across Hillside Lane to fetch balls, encountering close calls, at times, with oncoming vehicles. Enhanced fencing would be a minimal addition to the project, yet have a long term benefit.

The project itself, although affecting only a few of us in the neighborhood directly, could be handled to lessen the unfortunate side effects of construction. I have a business in my home, and am here all day. I well recall the first artificial turf project on the football stadium: the noise, the vibrations as the heavy trucks headed down the street starting at 7AM Monday through Friday that Summer, the idling trucks sitting in a line from my house continuing all the way down Hillside Lane. Also at issue was getting out of the driveway, and additional dirt/rocks covering our street. All in all construction is nothing any of us enjoy in front of our home. I would like to hear about the management of the project from this
perspective, what is in place to lessen the negative impact to the neighborhood, as well as the projected length of time for completion of the project.

I appreciate your review of my comments and look forward to the responses from all involved.

Best,

Deborah

Deborah Bushinski
Designer/Maker
Tessoro Inc.
Resolution No. 2017-

Amending an existing conditional use permit for recreational facility improvements at the Hopkins High School Campus at 2400 Lindbergh Drive

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

Section 1. BACKGROUND.

1.01 Neil Tessier, on behalf of the Hopkins School District, is proposing to construct new recreational fields with structures, scoreboards, and lighting on the subject property at 2400 Lindbergh Drive:

1. The applicant proposes to add a new softball field north of an existing baseball field. The softball field would have a temporary fence that could be moved to allow the east portion of the field to be used as a soccer or lacrosse field. The softball field would have two, 8-foot by 40-foot dugouts for players and a 30-foot by 30-foot concrete pad for a 10-row bleacher structure.

2. The applicant proposes two new scoreboards for soccer and baseball. These scoreboards would be located on top of a retaining wall between the baseball field and the parking lot. The scoreboards would both be approximately 20 feet tall and would be 48 square feet and 130 square feet in area respectively.

3. The applicant proposes 15 light poles, ranging from 30 feet to 90 feet in height. Light use would be allowed in the spring through fall for the site (weather depending), but not past 9:45 pm.

1.02 The subject property is legally described as:

See Exhibit A for the legal description

1.03 By City Code §300.10 Subd.4, educational institutions and facilities are conditionally-permitted land uses. The proposed recreational fields,
scoreboards, and light fixtures would increase the potential use of the Hopkins High School campus.

1.04 On April 6, 2017, the planning commission held a hearing on the proposed recreational fields, scoreboard, and field lighting. The applicant was provided the opportunity to present information to the commission. 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 amendment.

Section 2. STANDARDS.

2.01 City Code §300.16 Subd.2 outlines the following general conditional use permit standards.

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

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

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

4. The use does not have an undue adverse impact on the public health, safety or welfare.

2.02 City Code 300.16 Subd.3(a) outlines the following specific conditional use permit standards for educational institutions and facilities.

1. Direct access limited to a collector or arterial roadway as identified in the comprehensive plan or otherwise located so that access can be provided without conducting significant traffic on local residential streets; the use is not permitted on property that has access only by way of private or driveway that is used by more than one lot.

2. Buildings set back 50 feet from all property lines and parking setbacks subject to section 300.28 of this ordinance;

3. School bus pick-up and drop-off areas located outside of the public right-of-way and designed to enhance vehicular and pedestrian safety;

4. Recreational areas designed for group outdoor activities setback 25 feet from residential property, suitable buffering provided to protect
neighboring properties from noise and adverse visual impacts, and lighted playing fields permitted only upon demonstration that off-site impacts can be mitigated substantially;

5. No more than 60 percent of the site to be covered with impervious surface and the remainder to be suitably landscaped;

6. Site and building plans subject to review pursuant to section 300.27 of this ordinance.

7. Not connected to, or part of, any residential dwelling.

2.03 City Code §300.27 Subd. 5, outlines several items that must be considered in the evaluation of site and building plans.

1. Consistency with the elements and objectives of the city's development guides, including the comprehensive plan and water resources management plan;

2. Consistency with the ordinance;

3. Preservation of the site in its natural state to the extent practicable by minimizing tree and soil removal and designing grade changes to be in keeping with the general appearance of neighboring developed or developing areas;

4. Creation of a harmonious relationship of buildings and open spaces with natural site features and with existing and future buildings having a visual relationship to the development;

5. Creation of a functional and harmonious design for structures and site features, with special attention to the following:

   a) an internal sense of order for the buildings and uses on the site and provision of a desirable environment for occupants, visitors and the general community;

   b) the amount and location of open space and landscaping;

   c) materials, textures, colors and details of construction as an expression of the design concept and the compatibility of the same with the adjacent and neighboring structures and uses; and
d) vehicular and pedestrian circulation, including walkways, interior drives and parking in terms of location and number of access points to the public streets, width of interior drives and access points, general interior circulation, separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic and arrangement and amount of parking.

6. Promotion of energy conservation through design, location, orientation and elevation of structures, the use and location of glass in structures and the use of landscape materials and site grading; and

7. Protection of adjacent and neighboring properties through reasonable provision for surface water drainage, sound and sight buffers, preservation of views, light and air and those aspects of design not adequately covered by other regulations which may have substantial effects on neighboring land uses.

Section 3. FINDINGS.

3.01 The proposed field lighting would meet the general conditional use permit standards as outlined in City Code §300.16 Subd.2.

3.02 The proposed field lighting would meet the specific conditional use permit standards as outlined in City Code §300.16 Subd.3(a).

1. No access changes are proposed.

2. No buildings are proposed.

3. No changes to school bus drop-off and pick-up routes are proposed.

4. The proposed recreational fields would be located approximately 75 feet from the nearest residential property, which is across Hillside Lane West. The setback distance combined with the street should provide adequate setback and buffer from residential properties.

5. The proposed lighting would not increase the site's impervious surface by more than the diameter of the fifteen poles and the proposed fields would be permeable. The proposed bleachers and dugouts would not cause the site to exceed 60 percent impervious coverage.

6. The fields would not be connected to, or part of, any residential
3.03 The proposal would meet site and building plan standards outlined in the City Code §300.27, Subd.5.

1. Members of the city’s community development, engineering, and public works staff have reviewed the proposed project and find that it is generally consistent with the city’s development guides.

2. The proposal would meet all ordinance standards.

3. The existing recreational area is not in a “natural state.” While grading would be required for conversion to synthetic turf, the other proposed improvements would not necessitate any significant soil removal. A grading permit would be required for all earthwork on the site and removed trees would be subject to mitigation requirements.

4. The Hopkins High School campus contains a variety of recreational uses and public structures. The proposed recreational fields, scoreboards, and lighting would not detract from the relationship between existing and future uses and buildings.

5. The proposed field and lighting would not impact the internal order, circulation, landscaping, or open space on the Hopkins High School campus.

6. LED fixtures would be used.

7. The proposal would allow for extended recreational use of a site that has long been used for recreational purposes. The closest residential home, located north of the existing field, is 125 feet away from the proposed field. The residential neighborhood is separated from the existing recreational area by Hillside Lane West. The proposed LED lighting would have reduced glare in comparison to older field lighting equipment. Surface lighting would be virtually absent at the northern property line and within Hillside Lane West. The proposal shows no spillover light onto nearby residential properties.

Section 4. CITY COUNCIL ACTION.

4.01 The above-described conditional use permit is approved, subject to the following conditions:
1. Electrical, grading, sign and building permits are required. Prior to issuance for such permits:
   
a) Submit a construction management plan for staff review and approval.

b) Submit a tree protection and mitigation plan.
   
   1) Two, 2-inch trees are required to mitigate for the removal of the two existing landscape trees to be removed at the northwest corner of the existing parking lot. The replacement trees’ location is subject to staff review and approval.

   2) Grading must be adjusted to protect three spruce trees north of the existing parking lot entrance. If the grading cannot be adjusted, 85 feet of mitigation (in height) must be replanted on the site. The mitigation must be located in the same general area or at least at the general perimeter of the site.

   c) Submit a letter of credit or cash escrow for tree mitigation/landscaping, stormwater, and restoration/stabilization of the site.

   d) Install erosion controls for staff review and inspection. Inlet protection is also required at the catch basins in the existing parking lot and drive entrance, as well as any other adjacent inlets. Inlet project must consist of a prefabricated device. Geotextile will not be accepted. These erosion control measures must be maintained throughout the course of construction.

2. Construction work must abide by all city nuisance ordinances.

3. Field lighting may be used from spring to fall, but may not be used past 9:45 pm.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on April 24, 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 April 24, 2017.

_________________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk

SEAL
EXHIBIT A

Par 1: Lots 1, 2 and 3, Block 3, Westview Hills

Par 2: The West 175 feet of Tract A, Registered Land Survey No. 1194, County of Hennepin.

Par 3: The Southeast Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of Section 12, Township 117, Range 22, except that part thereof embrace within the plat of Birchview.

Par 4: That part of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of Section 12, Township 117, Range 22, described as beginning at the Northeast corner thereof; thence West along the North line of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter to a point 755.2 feet East of the Northwest corner thereof; thence deflecting to the left 94 degrees, 20 minutes, a distance of 439 feet; thence Southerly to a point in a line drawn parallel to and 660 feet North of the South line of said Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter; distant 726 feet East of the West line of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter; thence South parallel to said West line to the South line of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter; thence East to the Southeast corner thereof; thence North to the point of beginning except the West 210 feet of the most Southerly 150 feet thereof.

Par 5: That part of the following described property: Tract F, Registered Land Survey No. 1194, Hennepin County, Minnesota, except that part thereof embraced within the plat of Birchview. That part of the Northeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of Section 12, Township 117, Range 22, lying North of County Road No 16 and West of Registered Land Survey No. 1194, except that part thereof lying West of the East 165 feet of the West 1/4 of said Northeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter and South of the North 460 feet of said Northeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter which lies Northwesterly of a line drawn parallel with and distant 33.00 feet Northwesterly of the following described line:

Commencing at the Southwest corner of Section 12, Township 117, Range 22; thence Northerly 978.40 feet along the West line of said Section 12 to the actual point of beginning of the line to be herein described; thence deflecting right 86 degrees 25 minutes, as measured North to East, a distance of 306.61 feet; thence Easterly 360.61 feet along a tangential curve concave to the North having a radius of 1432.39 feet and a central angle of 14 degrees 25 minutes 27.8 seconds; thence Northeasterly, tangent to said curve, a distance of 1185.74 feet; thence Northeasterly 1000.19 feet along a tangential curve concave to the Northwest having a radius of 1909.86 feet and a central angle of 30 degrees 00 minutes 21 seconds; thence Northeasterly tangent to said last described curve a distance of 376.92 feet and said line there terminating.
MINNETONKA PLANNING COMMISSION
April 6, 2017

Brief Description
Items concerning The Cheesecake Factory at Ridgedale Center:

1) Conditional use permit for a restaurant with outdoor seating area;

2) Site and building plan review; and

3) Sign plan amendment.

Recommendation
Recommend the city council adopt the resolutions:

1) Approving the conditional use permit and final site and building plans; and

2) Denying the sign plan amendment.

Introduction
The Cheesecake Factory Restaurants, Inc. is proposing to operate a Cheesecake Factory restaurant within Ridgedale Center. The new tenant space would be generally located near the southeast entrance to the mall, adjacent to Sears.

Summary Information
The following is intended to summarize the Cheesecake Factory proposal. Additional information associated with the proposal can be found in the “Supporting Information” and attachments sections of this report.

- General Restaurant Information

The Cheesecake Factory is a full-service, sit-down restaurant operating nearly 200 locations throughout United States and throughout the world. The proposed Ridgedale Center location would be the second Cheesecake Factory in Minnesota. As proposed, the restaurant would accommodate seating for 340 customers in three separate dining areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dining Area</th>
<th>Size*</th>
<th>Seating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>8,425 sq.ft.</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Patio</td>
<td>1,030 sq.ft.</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Patio</td>
<td>990 sq.ft.</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* rounded down to nearest 5 sq.ft.
Building Changes. To accommodate the proposed restaurant, three primary changes would be made to the mall itself.

1. The vestibule at the mall’s southeast entrance would be reduced in size by roughly 85 square feet. Two existing doors would be removed, leaving three sets of doors and a vestibule width of roughly 23 feet.

2. A new exterior entrance would be constructed for the restaurant. The proposed design includes a new “tower feature” above the entrance. The tower, which would be just four feet taller than the adjacent mall, would not add square footage to the restaurant space itself. Rather, it would function as a covered entryway and visual element for the restaurant façade. A secondary entrance would be provided from the interior of the mall.

3. An outdoor seating area would be added east of the indoor restaurant space. The area, which would be used for seasonal dining, would be covered by a new roof structure and enclosed with a combination of fencing and landscaping.

Facade Changes. Cheesecake Factory would provide “trade dress” design on the existing and proposed façade to give the restaurant a visual presence on the outside of the mall. Materials would include black granite, mosaic tiles, Venetian plaster, and copper finishes.

Signs. Two wall signs are proposed on the exterior of the mall. The larger of the signs would have a maximum height of 57.5 inches (or 4 feet 9.5 inches) and total area of approximately 100 square feet. The smaller sign would be 24.5 inches in height and 38 square feet in total area.

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 the primary questions associated with the proposal and staff’s findings.

- Is the restaurant use appropriate?

  Yes. The proposed restaurant would increase dining options at the shopping center and add vibrancy to the surrounding area.

- Are the proposed site and building changes reasonable?

  Yes. The proposed site and building changes represent a collaboration between Cheesecake Factory representatives and city planning staff. The changes would
provide the restaurant with recognizable “trade dress” design and a visual presence, while complementing façade work done on other areas of the mall.

- **Is the sign plan amendment reasonable?**

  No. Under the existing Ridgedale Center sign plan, restaurants with exterior access are allowed to display one wall sign with a maximum height of 42 inches. The city approved this covenant, which allows for wall signs significantly larger than permitted under the city’s sign ordinance, in conjunction with review of the Redstone and Kona Grill restaurants now located on the north side of the mall. There is nothing inherently unique about the proposed Cheesecake Factory that would justify signs in greater number and area than is allowed elsewhere at the mall or in the community.

**Summary Comments**

The proposed Cheesecake Factory represents a continuation of the revitalization of Ridgedale Center and its surrounding area. In generally supporting such revitalization, staff recommends approval of the proposed restaurant use and its associated site and building plan changes, but denial of the amendment to the existing sign plan.

**Staff Recommendation**

Recommend the city council adopt the following resolutions associated with the Cheesecake Factory at 12735 Wayzata Blvd.

Originator: Susan Thomas, AICP, Assistant City Planner
Supporting Information

**Surrounding Uses**
The subject property is surrounded by commercial and service commercial uses.

**Planning**
Guide Plan designation: mixed use
Existing Zoning: PID, planned I-394 development

**Parking**
With the addition of Nordstrom and restriping of associated parking lots, there are currently 5,145 parking stalls at Ridgedale Center. The Institute of Transportation Engineering suggests that parking demand for the mall (roughly 1.17 million square feet) would range from 3,919 to 5,102 parking stalls January through November. Parking demand would increase during December.

In staff’s opinion, the proposed Cheesecake Factory does not warrant a completion of a formal parking study for several reasons:

1. Given the ITE estimates, the existing number of parking stalls would satisfy mall parking demand, with the exception of the holiday season;

2. The Cheesecake Factory, in and of itself, would not cause a parking deficit during the holiday season; and

3. Historically, the parking field between Nordstrom and Sears has been the most underutilized parking area at the mall.

**CUP Standards**
City Code §300.31 Subd. 4(b)2(o) lists the following specific standards that must be met for granting a conditional use permit for restaurants located on property designated for retail use. The proposal would meet these standards.

1. Must be in retail multiple tenant centers only and conform to the architecture of a specific center;

   **Finding:** The proposed restaurant would be located within Ridgedale Center. The façade has been designed to complement recent improvements at the mall.

2. Will not be permitted when traffic studies indicate significant impacts on the levels of service as defined by the Institute of Traffic Engineers on the roadway system;
Finding: Staff does not anticipate that the proposed restaurant, in and of itself, would significantly impact levels of service at surrounding roadway systems.

3. Outdoor seating areas will be approved only subject to the following:

a) Must be located in a controlled or cordoned area with at least one opening to an acceptable pedestrian walk. When a liquor license is involved, an enclosure is required and the enclosure shall not be interrupted; access must be only through the principal building;

Finding: This condition is met.

b) Must be set back at least 200 feet and screened from any adjacent property designated in the comprehensive plan for residential use;

Finding: The closest residential use is located across Ridgedale Drive, over 1,000 feet from the proposed outdoor seating area.

c) Must be located and designed so as not to interfere with pedestrian and vehicular circulation;

Finding: The outdoor seating area would not impact on-site circulation.

d) Must be located next to an entrance to the main use;

Finding: This condition is met.

e) Must be equipped with refuse containers and periodically patrolled for litter pick-up;

Finding: This has been included as a condition of approval.

f) Must not have speakers or audio equipment that is audible from adjacent residential parcels; and

Finding: This has been included as a condition of approval.

g) Must meet building setback requirements.
Finding: The outdoor area would exceed all minimum building setback requirements.

4. Drive-up windows and related stacking spaces will be approved only subject to the following:

   a) public address systems must not be audible from any residential parcel; and

   b) stacking for a minimum of six cars per aisle must be provided subject to applicable parking lot setbacks.

   c) must be set back at least 100 feet and screened from any adjacent property designated in the comprehensive plan for residential use.

Finding: No drive-up window is proposed.

5. Restaurants or fast-food restaurants with less than 1,200 square feet gross floor area, designed seating capacity not exceeding 25, having no drive-up window and located in retail multiple tenant centers are exempt from the requirements of this section and are considered to be a standard retail use. For tenants with accessory fast-food restaurants, the 1,200-square-foot calculation will include the total gross area of all restaurants and fast-food restaurants within the tenant space.

SBP Standards

City Code §300.27 Subd. 5, outlines several items that must be considered in the evaluation of site and building plans. The proposed Cheesecake Factory would comply with these standards.

1. Consistency with the elements and objectives of the city's development guides, including the comprehensive plan and water resources management plan;

   Finding: Members of the city's community development, engineering, finance, fire, and public works staff have reviewed the proposal and find that it is generally consistent with the city’s development guides.

2. Consistency with this ordinance;

   Finding: The proposal would meet all ordinance standards.
3. Preservation of the site in its natural state to the extent practicable by minimizing tree and soil removal and designing grade changes to be in keeping with the general appearance of neighboring developed or developing areas;

**Finding:** The proposed restaurant would be located within an existing shopping center. No tree or soil removal would occur.

4. Creation of a harmonious relationship of buildings and open spaces with natural site features and with existing and future buildings having a visual relationship to the development;

**Finding:** The proposed restaurant would be located within an existing shopping center. It would not impact the existing or future relationship between buildings and open space.

5. Creation of a functional and harmonious design for structures and site features, with special attention to the following:
   a. an internal sense of order for the buildings and uses on the site and provision of a desirable environment for occupants, visitors and the general community;
   b. the amount and location of open space and landscaping;
   c. materials, textures, colors and details of construction as an expression of the design concept and the compatibility of the same with the adjacent and neighboring structures and uses; and
   d. vehicular and pedestrian circulation, including walkways, interior drives and parking in terms of location and number of access points to the public streets, width of interior drives and access points, general interior circulation, separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic and arrangement and amount of parking.

**Finding:** The proposed site and building changes would complement and continue recent additions and renovations at Ridgedale Center.

6. Promotion of energy conservation through design, location, orientation and elevation of structures, the use and location of glass in structures and the use of landscape materials and site grading; and
Finding: The proposed restaurant must be constructed consistent with current building and energy codes.

7. Protection of adjacent and neighboring properties through reasonable provision for surface water drainage, sound and sight buffers, preservation of views, light and air and those aspects of design not adequately covered by other regulations which may have substantial effects on neighboring land uses.

Finding: The restaurant would not negatively impact adjacent properties or the neighboring area.

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 resolutions as presented.

2. Disagree with staff’s recommendation. In this case, a motion should be made recommending the city council either: (1) deny both the conditional use permit and sign plan requests; or (2) approve both the conditional use permit and sign plan requests.

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

Voting Requirement

The planning commission will make a recommendation to the city council. A recommendation for approval requires an affirmative vote of a simple majority. The city council’s final approval requires an affirmative vote of a simple majority.
The city sent notices to 354 area property owners. No written comments have been received.

May 22, 2017
Location Map

Project: Cheesecake Factory Restaurant
Address: 12401 Wayzata Blvd
Project No. 03046.17a
Resolution No. 2017-

Resolution approving a conditional use permit and final site and building plans for a restaurant, with an outdoor seating area, in Ridgedale Center at 12735 Wayzata Boulevard

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

Section 1. Background.

1.01 The Cheesecake Factory Restaurants, Inc. is proposing to operate a Cheesecake Factory restaurant within Ridgedale Center. The new tenant space would be generally located near the southeast entrance to the mall. The company has requested approval of a conditional use permit and final site and building plans.

1.02 The property is located at 12735 Wayzata Boulevard. It is legally described as: TRACT A, REGISTERED LAND SURVEY NO. 1826.

1.03 On April 6, 2017 the planning commission held a hearing on the proposed restaurant. The applicant was provided the opportunity to present information to the planning commission. The planning commission considered all of the comments received and the staff report, which are incorporated by reference into this resolution. The commission recommended that the city council approve the conditional use permit and final site and building plans.

Section 2. Standards.

2.01 City Code §300.21 Subd. 2 lists the following general standards that must be met for granting a conditional use permit:

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

2. The use is consistent with the goals, policies and objectives of the comprehensive plan;
3. The use does not have an undue adverse impact on governmental facilities, utilities, services or existing or proposed improvements;

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

5. The use is in compliance with the performance standards specified in §300.28 of the ordinance; and

6. The use does not have an undue adverse impact on the public health, safety or welfare.

2.02 City Code §300.31 Subd. 4(b)2(o) lists the following specific standards that must be met for granting a conditional use permit for restaurants located on property designated for retail use:

1. Must be in retail multiple tenant centers only and conform to the architecture of a specific center;

2. Will not be permitted when traffic studies indicate significant impacts on the levels of service as defined by the Institute of Traffic Engineers on the roadway system;

3. Outdoor seating areas will be approved only subject to the following:
   a) must be located in a controlled or cordoned area with at least one opening to an acceptable pedestrian walk. When a liquor license is involved, an enclosure is required and the enclosure shall not be interrupted; access must be only through the principal building;
   b) must be set back at least 200 feet and screened from any adjacent property designated in the comprehensive plan for residential use;
   c) must be located and designed so as not to interfere with pedestrian and vehicular circulation;
   d) must be located next to an entrance to the main use;
   e) must be equipped with refuse containers and periodically patrolled for litter pick-up;
   f) must not have speakers or audio equipment that is audible
from adjacent residential parcels; and

g) must meet building setback requirements.

4. Drive-up windows and related stacking spaces will be approved only subject to the following:

a) public address systems must not be audible from any residential parcel; and

b) stacking for a minimum of six cars per aisle must be provided subject to applicable parking lot setbacks.

b) must be set back at least 100 feet and screened from any adjacent property designated in the comprehensive plan for residential use.

5. Restaurants or fast-food restaurants with less than 1,200 square feet gross floor area, designed seating capacity not exceeding 25, having no drive-up window and located in retail multiple tenant centers are exempt from the requirements of this section and are considered to be a standard retail use. For tenants with accessory fast-food restaurants, the 1,200-square-foot calculation will include the total gross area of all restaurants and fast-food restaurants within the tenant space.

2.03 City Code §300.27 Subd. 5, outlines several items that must be considered in the evaluation of site and building plans.

1. Consistency with the elements and objectives of the city's development guides, including the comprehensive plan and water resources management plan;

2. Consistency with the ordinance;

3. Preservation of the site in its natural state to the extent practicable by minimizing tree and soil removal and designing grade changes to be in keeping with the general appearance of neighboring developed or developing areas;

4. Creation of a harmonious relationship of buildings and open spaces with natural site features and with existing and future buildings having a visual relationship to the development;
5. Creation of a functional and harmonious design for structures and site features, with special attention to the following:

a) an internal sense of order for the buildings and uses on the site and provision of a desirable environment for occupants, visitors and the general community;

b) the amount and location of open space and landscaping;

c) materials, textures, colors and details of construction as an expression of the design concept and the compatibility of the same with the adjacent and neighboring structures and uses; and

d) vehicular and pedestrian circulation, including walkways, interior drives and parking in terms of location and number of access points to the public streets, width of interior drives and access points, general interior circulation, separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic and arrangement and amount of parking.

6. Promotion of energy conservation through design, location, orientation and elevation of structures, the use and location of glass in structures and the use of landscape materials and site grading; and

7. Protection of adjacent and neighboring properties through reasonable provision for surface water drainage, sound and sight buffers, preservation of views, light and air and those aspects of design not adequately covered by other regulations which may have substantial effects on neighboring land uses.

Section 3. Findings.

3.01 The proposed restaurant would meet the general conditional use permit standards as outlined in City Code §300.21 Subd. 2.

3.02 The proposed restaurant would meet the specific conditional use permit standards as outlined in City Code §300.31 Subd. 4(b)2(o).

1. The proposed restaurant would be located within Ridgedale Center. The façade has been designed to complement recent improvements at the mall.

2. The city does not anticipate that the proposed restaurant, in and of
itself, would significantly impact levels of service at surrounding roadway systems.

3. The outdoor seating area would:
   a) Be located in an enclosed area with access only through the restaurant.
   b) Be set back over 1,000 feet from the closed residential property.
   c) Not impact on-site circulation.
   d) Be equipped with refuse containers and periodically patrolled for litter pick-up;
   e) Not have speakers or audio equipment that is audible from residential parcels.
   f) Exceed all minimum building setback requirements.

4. No drive-up window is proposed.

3.03 The proposal would meet the site and building plan standards as outlined City Code §300.27 Subd. 5.

1. Members of the city’s community development, engineering, finance, fire, and public works staff have reviewed the proposal and find that it is generally consistent with the city’s development guides.

2. The proposal would meet all ordinance standards.

3. The proposed restaurant would be located with an existing shopping center. No tree or soil removal would occur.

4. The proposed restaurant would not impact the existing or future relationship between buildings and open space.

5. The proposed site and building changes would complement and continue recent additions and renovations at Ridgedale Center.

6. The proposed restaurant would be constructed consistent with current building and energy codes.
7. The proposed restaurant would not negatively impact adjacent properties or the neighboring area.


4.01 The above-described conditional use permit and final site and building plans are approved, subject to the following conditions:

1. Subject to staff approval, the property must be developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the following plans, except as modified below.
   - Floor Plan, dated March 17, 2017
   - Building Elevations, dated March 15, 2017

2. This resolution must be recorded with Hennepin County prior to issuance of a building permit.

3. This resolution does not approve any wall signs.

4. The outdoor seating area must be equipped with refuse containers and periodically patrolled for litter pick-up.

5. The city council may reasonably add or revise conditions to address any future unforeseen problems.

6. Any change to the approved use that results in a significant increase in traffic or a significant change in character would require a revised conditional use permit.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on April 24, 2017.

Terry Schneider, Mayor

Attest:

David E. Maeda, City Clerk
Resolution No. 2017-

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 April 24, 2017.

__________________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk
Resolution No. 2017-

Resolution denying an amendment to the existing sign plan for
Ridgedale Center at 12735 Wayzata Boulevard

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

Section 1.  Background.

1.01 Under the existing Ridgedale Center sign plan, restaurants with frontage on the mall exterior are allowed one wall sign not exceeding 42 inches in height.

1.02 The Cheesecake Factory Restaurants, Inc. is requesting an amendment to the sign plan to allow for display of two wall signs. The larger of the signs would have a maximum height of 57.5 inches. The smaller sign would have a maximum height of 24.5 inches.

1.03 On April 6, 2017, the planning commission held a hearing on the proposal. The applicant was provided the opportunity to present information to the commission. The commission considered all of the comments received and the staff report, which are incorporated by reference into this resolution. The commission recommended the city council deny the sign plan amendment.

Section 2.  Findings.

2.01 The existing Ridgedale Center sign plan allows restaurants to display wall signs significantly larger than would be allowed elsewhere in the community.

2.02 There is nothing inherently unique about the Cheesecake Factory restaurant that would justify signs in greater number and area than is allowed elsewhere at the shopping center or in the community.
Section 3. City Council Action.

3.01 The requested sign plan amendment is hereby denied.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on April 24, 2017.

Terry Schneider, Mayor

Attest:

David E. Maeda, City Clerk

Action on this resolution:


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 April 24, 2017.

David E. Maeda, City Clerk