Planning Commission Agenda

November 30, 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: November 16, 2017

5. Report from Staff

6. Report from Planning Commission Members

7. Public Hearings: Consent Agenda

   No Items

8. Public Hearings: Non-Consent Agenda Items

   A. Site and building plan review, with a setback variance, for gymnasium and office, storage and classroom additions at Clear Spring Elementary at 5701 Co Rd 101.

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

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

   B. Preliminary and final plat of WILLISTON ACRES 3rd ADDITION, a two-lot subdivision at 14819 Margaret Place

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

         • Recommendation to City Council (Tentative Date: December 18, 2017)
         • Project Planner: Susan Thomas
C. Conditional use permit for a seven to twelve-resident licensed residential care facility at 5022 Baker Road.

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

- Recommendation to City Council (Tentative Date: December 4, 2017)
- Project Planner: Drew Ingvalson

9. Other Business

A. Concept plan for Ridgedale Executive Apartments, a 112-unit luxury apartment building, at 12501 Ridgedale Drive.

Recommendation: Discussion only. No formal action required

- Recommendation to City Council (Tentative Date: December 4, 2017)
- Project Planner: Loren Gordon

10. Adjournment
Notices

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

2. Applications and items scheduled for the December 14, 2017 Planning Commission meeting:

   Project Description: Morrie's Minnetonka is proposing three site changes to the property at 13700 Wayzata Boulevard: (1) relocation of an existing trash enclosure; (2) construction of a single-stall car wash in the vacated area of the trash enclosure; and (3) construction of new parking stalls on the east side of the existing parking lot. The changes require approval of: (1) a minor amendment to the existing master development plan; and (2) approval of final site and building plans with setback variances.

   Project No.: 89005.17a
   Staff: Susan Thomas
   Ward/Council Member: 3—Brad Wiersum
   Section: 03

   Project Description: The city is proposing to amend city code as it pertains to telecommunication facilities within public rights-of-way.

   Project No.: TBD
   Staff: Susan Thomas
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 Sewall, Calvert, Knight, O’Connell, Powers, Schack, and Kirk were present.

Staff members present: Community Development Director Julie Wischnack and City Planner Loren Gordon.

3. Approval of Agenda

Calvert moved, second by Knight to approve the agenda as submitted with the removal of item 8A, a sign plan review with a setback variance for a gym, office, storage, and classroom additions at Clear Spring Elementary at 5701 County Road 101, which was postponed until the meeting on November 30, 2017.

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

4. Approval of Minutes: October 26, 2017

Calvert moved, second by Powers, to approve the October 26, 2017 meeting minutes as submitted.

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

5. Report from Staff

Gordon briefed the commission on land use applications considered by the city council at its meeting of November 13, 2017:

- Adopted a resolution approving a conditional use permit for the Bright Eyes Clinic.
The sixth comprehensive guide plan steering committee meeting was held the evening prior. It focused on natural resources. The next meeting will be held December 11, 2017 which will focus on economic development.

The next planning commission meeting will be November 30, 2017.

6. Report from Planning Commission Members

Chair Kirk congratulated Calvert for being elected to the city council and noted that Knight will finish his term on the planning commission at the end of the year. He encouraged any resident interested in serving on the commission to apply.

Schack reported that staff did a great job presenting a lot of information at the comprehensive guide plan steering committee. She encouraged everyone to view the meeting on line.

Calvert enjoyed serving on the commission and encouraged others to apply.

Powers was impressed with how complete the staff reports were at the comprehensive guide plan steering committee meeting. Dietrich and Colleran did a great job presenting.

7. Public Hearings: Consent Agenda

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

Schack moved, second by O’Connell, to approve the item listed on the consent agenda as recommended in the staff report as follows:

A. Side and rear yard setback variance for a vertical expansion of an accessory structure at 3841 Baker Road.

Adopt the resolution approving side and rear yard setback variances for a vertical accessory structure expansion at 3841 Baker Road.

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

8. Public Hearings
A. Site and building plan review with a setback variance for a gymnasium, office, storage, and classroom additions at Clear Spring Elementary at 5701 County Road 101.

This item was postponed until the planning commission meeting on November 30, 2017.

9. Other Business

A. Concept plan review for Dominium at 11001 Bren Road East.

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

Gordon reported. He recommended that commissioners provide comments and feedback on the identified key issues and additional issues commissioners deem appropriate. The discussion is intended to assist the applicant with future direction that may lead to the preparation of more detailed development plans.

Gordon stated that the income limit for a tenant residing in affordable housing would be in the middle $50,000 range. The rent would be estimated at $800 to $1,200 depending on the type of unit. The average rental rate for an apartment in Minnetonka is about $1,300. The applicant would apply for tax credits.

Chair Kirk asked how easily a pedestrian could walk from Opus to other locations. Gordon pointed out existing trails. There is a gap now that would be addressed during future redevelopment. Wischnack stated that there is an Opus walkability study that details every connection and makes suggestions for improvements that are included in the capital improvement plan for the city. Most of the trails pass under the roads in Opus.

Ryan Lunderby, applicant, stated that he appreciated the opportunity to receive feedback and answer questions. He introduced Mike Rich, architect for the project. He stated that:

- Dominium properties is building a lot of new construction similar to the proposal around the metropolitan area. Dominium is a long-term owner. Decisions are made for the long term. Quality finishes would be used.
- Regardless of a property’s ability to fund capital improvements, Dominium reinvests in its properties.
- The site is a great opportunity to add affordable housing.
• Costs will continue to rise especially with the lite rail being completed. The market is favorable right now to build affordable housing.
• The proposal would be for a 256-unit senior community with independent living and 198 units of affordable, work-force housing.

Mike Rich introduced Brady Halvorson, a landscape architect, and George Johnson, who assisted with the plans. He stated that:

• The wooded areas, trail system, future Opus station, and townhouse development are important elements of the site.
• There is a 30-foot grade change.
• He reviewed the site plan.
• The drive would link the three buildings.
• A second entrance and exit is being considered for the site.
• The site would be fully accessible to transit.
• Pavers may be used to customize the trails as walking paths are identified.
• The senior building would be six stories. It would be positioned so that it would not create shadows on its neighbors. There would be a drop off area. There would be underground parking beneath the footprint of the building. The underground parking area would connect with the family-housing building.
• The trail would be enhanced with landscaping and more like a linear park.
• There would be separate tot lots and play areas outside and inside the building.
• The senior housing would have amenity areas, an on-site trail system, and a tot lot.
• A dog run is being considered.
• The building would be shifted back to break up the elevations.
• Dense landscaping would be planted to provide a buffer to neighbors.
• An outdoor pool is being considered for a common area.
• Public art may be incorporated at the entrance.
• The first floor of family housing would be walk-outs with individual patios that connect to paths.
• He provided a similar example in Minneapolis.
• The buildings would have colors and material to match its natural surroundings. Stone, brick, and wood would be used in earth tones.
• A very pedestrian-friendly environment would be created.
• There would be a series of retaining walls to create a living environment and maintain the urban forest to provide a buffer to the neighbors on the west.
• A substantial amount of parking would be located below grade.
• Each building would have its own set of amenities.
• He would appreciate comments and feedback.

Powers asked if incorporating services like a hair salon had been considered for the senior building. Mr. Lunderby answered affirmatively. He stated that salon space would be available to providers that would use the space for free and coordinate their times with the residents. Additional amenities would be large gathering rooms with kitchens, card and craft rooms, a movie theater, and a fitness room. Local groups could provide exercise classes. Residents would not be charged for exercise classes. Dominium has purchased a shuttle bus that takes seniors to different services and events on a set schedule or as needed.

Schack asked what prompted the change in design of the senior building from a horseshoe shape to a straight building with an additional story. Mr. Rich explained that the proposed building would provide the ideal unit-type mix and the sizes of the units were increased. The previous configuration had a wing closer to the street. The entrance would have been on the side which would have caused conflicts. The current proposal would allow direct access to underground parking and eliminate the need to drive through the site. It would also provide an adequate number of parking stalls for each unit underground. The first shape conflicted with the location of the wetland.

Mr. Rich clarified that there was a concept plan that included two underground parking levels and five residential floors. The current concept plan has one underground parking level and six residential floors.

Schack thought the elevation illustration was very helpful. In response to her question, Mr. Rich stated that it would be possible for townhome residents to see over the four-story building roof and see the six-story building in the distance. There are existing trees that would remain on the site and additional trees would be added to create a buffer and block the view.

Powers thought this was the most comprehensive concept plan he has ever seen. He loved how the project team considered so many angles. The concept plan would create an ownership feel for the village. Residents would regret ever leaving.
Mr. Lunderby agreed. Residents could age and continue to raise their families without having to move. The management staff would live at the property. The design pays attention to running and maintaining the buildings.

Calvert found the materials attractive. She liked the color scheme, rhythmic sense of the design, and broken-up mass. She encouraged the use of public art. Her grandparents lived in the same one-bedroom apartment their entire married life. She liked the buffer, preservation of trees, and additional landscaping. Preserving as many natural features as possible would make the proposal a more appealing place to live. She liked the village-center concept with communal spaces.

In response to Chair Kirk’s question, Mr. Lunderby stated that the demand for affordable housing is so great that his company cannot build enough of it. The proposal would provide a mix of varieties for the neighborhood.

Chair Kirk liked the number of amenities in the proposal. He suggested that pictures of examples of the amenities be provided.

Chair Kirk asked how much the proposal would depend on the SWLRT being completed. Mr. Lunderby said that the SWLRT would benefit the proposal, but it would move forward without the SWLRT.

Chair Kirk encouraged connecting the trail that would travel south.

In response to Chair Kirk’s question, Mr. Lunderby stated that the amount of parking was determined by studies conducted at similar facilities and would equal 1.5 stalls to 1 general-occupancy unit and 1.2 stalls to 1 senior unit.

In response to Chair Kirk’s question, Mr. Lunderby stated that the possibility of decreasing the number of units is limited by the fixed land price, rent caps, and investors’ comfort levels. Chair Kirk noted that the amenities package is contingent on the number of units.

Mr. Lunderby stated that The Bluffs at Nine Mile Creek in Eden Prairie has density similar to the proposed concept plan.

Calvert asked if the building could be used for residents of other ages in 20 years. Mr. Lunderby answered in the affirmative. The minimum compliance period for affordable housing is 15 years. The rent differential is $400 to $600 a month from affordable units to market-rate units. There are not many independent-living, high-quality developments for seniors. Retail businesses and
services would follow the completion of the proposal. This is the logical, front-end use of redevelopment coming to the area.

Wischnack provided that Minnetonka has 2,900 units of senior, age-restricted units and 24,000 households. Of the 2,900 senior units, 700 are cooperatives and condominiums and 2,200 are rental. The vacancy rates indicate quite a demand.

Chair Kirk invited those present to comment. No one responded.

Chair Kirk would prefer a second street access.

Schack liked how the proposal would provide a transition to the SWLRT. Keeping the area open and fluid is an important concept. A change in visual impact would slow traffic down and make the area more pedestrian safe. She previously lived in Opus and really liked it. It is a unique area. The proposal would be a great opportunity. The trail system would be really cool. It would provide an “uptown alternative” and an opportunity to enjoy the nature in the area.

Calvert encouraged pedestrian safety be taken into account near the SWLRT station. Connecting the trails would be important to improve walkability of the area.

Powers would like the site to have a distinct feel of being in Minnetonka from a pedestrian’s view and from an aerial view. He encouraged the applicant to provide information regarding the energy conservation component of the proposal.

Sewall agreed with providing as many pedestrian safety measures as possible. He encouraged buffering, especially to the neighbors on the southwest. He recognized the big need for affordable housing and he was comfortable with an entire building of affordable housing, but thought there would be benefits of spreading it out throughout the city. He was excited for the area to be developed.

O’Connell supports the concept plan. The density does not scare him. The area already has market-rate units and more will be added as the area continues to be developed. He recommended the applicant be prepared to address traffic concerns. The area already has traffic issues. He liked the design. The applicant has a great reputation. There is a demand for this product on the investors’ side.

Knight agreed with O’Connell. He works south of Opus. There are a lot of employees at his workplace that would benefit from this proposal by reducing their commute. He likes the proposal. The Opus area is the perfect location for
the proposed density. He likes the looks of the building. He cycles to work on the street, so he would oppose reducing the number of lanes on Bren Road.

Chair Kirk summarized his understanding that commissioners found the change in land use and affordable housing component appropriate and that buffering and walkability are important priorities. The look of the building is agreeable.

Chair Kirk liked how the SWLRT and new development in the area could provide an urban vibe that could become part of Minnetonka.

Chair Kirk noted that the city council is tentatively scheduled to review the concept plan on December 4, 2017. He looked forward to an application for the project being submitted in the future.

10. Adjournment

_Schack moved, second by Knight, to adjourn the meeting at 8:20 p.m. Motion carried unanimously._

By: ____________________________

Lois T. Mason
Planning Secretary
Minnetonka Planning Commission Meeting
November 30, 2017

Agenda Item 7

Public Hearing: Consent Agenda

(No Items)
Minnetonka Planning Commission Meeting

November 30, 2017

Agenda Item 8

Public Hearing: Non-Consent Agenda
Clear Spring Elementary has submitted a proposal to construct an addition onto the southeast corner of the existing Clear Spring Elementary school building. The roughly 8,000 square foot addition would consist of a gymnasium, classroom, office and storage space. The proposal requires site and building plan approval with a setback variance.

**Proposal Summary**

- **Existing site features**

  The site is located on the east side of County Road 101. The school site is roughly 9.5-acres in size. The northeast corner of the site is encumbered by a small portion, of a much larger, Manage 1 wetland and associated 100-year floodplain.

  Since the school’s construction in 1957, the configuration of the building, parking and playfields have slowly changed. The most recent change was in 2015 when the bus access was relocated from County Road 101 to a newly constructed turnaround and parking area off of Covington Road.

- **Proposed Use.**

  As proposed, an 8,000 square foot addition would be constructed on the southeast side of the building. The addition would include gymnasium space, gymnasium office and storage space, and specialty classroom space. Access to the addition would be from a newly constructed entrance on the west of the building and a reconfigured entrance on the east. The addition requires site and building plan approval.

  By ordinance, conditionally-permitted educational facilities must be set back a minimum of 50 feet from all property lines. The proposed addition would have a setback of 25 feet from the south property line. As such, a setback variance is required.

- **Site impacts.**

  The following site impacts are proposed to accommodate the addition:
1. **Sidewalks.** The existing sidewalk around the perimeter of the building would be relocated to allow access to the new addition and the play area east of the addition. While some minor adjustments would likely be required, the sidewalk would be wide enough to allow for emergency and maintenance vehicle access. The existing track would also be reconfigured to allow for the addition.

2. **Play areas.** An existing basketball court would be removed to accommodate the proposal. The play area within the track would be temporarily unavailable during construction of the gymnasium.

3. **Grading and drainage.** Some grading is required to accommodate the addition. Two retaining walls – one to the north and one to the south – are proposed to provide a more comfortable walking path around the school. The northern retaining wall is roughly 70 feet long and ranges from 6 inches to two feet in height. The 110-foot southern wall would “wrap” around the addition and ranges in height from two feet to seven feet.

To accommodate runoff from the increased impervious surface, an underground stormwater facility is proposed east of the school. Stormwater runoff would be captured and directed to the underground facility.

**Staff Analysis**

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

- **Is the proposed building addition reasonable?**

  Yes. The proposed addition would allow for increased functionality of the school without major interior renovations.

- **Is the requested variance reasonable?**

  Yes. Previous school plans, including the school’s master plan, showed the gymnasium addition centered along the southern wall of the school. If the addition were proposed for this location, a more intense setback variance and grading would have been required. Additionally, the southernmost corner of the existing school has a nonconforming setback of 40 feet from the southern property line. While the proposed structure would have a 25-foot setback, it would be more than 150 feet from the nearest residential structure and would be screened by existing vegetation and topography.
- **Are the proposed site impacts reasonable?**

  Yes. The Clear Spring Elementary school property is 9.2 acres in size. Of this, roughly 4.5 acres would be impervious. This is less than the maximum 60-percent impervious allowed by ordinance. The proposal includes retaining walls to reduce the amount of necessary grading.

**Staff Recommendation**

Adopt the resolution approving final site and building plan review, with a setback variance, for gymnasium, classroom, office, and storage additions at Clear Spring Elementary School at 5701 Co Rd 101.

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

Project No. 8604.17a

Property 5701 Co Rd 101

Applicant Paul Bourgeois, on behalf of Minnetonka Public School District and Clear Spring Elementary

Surrounding Land Uses Property to the north is owned by District #276 for use as a service center, zoned R-1 and guided institutional. Properties to the east, west and south are single family homes on properties zoned R-1 and guided for low density residential.

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

Neighborhood Meeting The applicant held a neighborhood meeting on November 14, 2017. Two people attended the meeting and asked questions about the project. One resident expressed some concerns related to traffic and speeds on Covington Rd and County Road 101. Another resident expressed support of the school and the addition.

A second neighborhood meeting will be held on November 28, 2017. A summary of that meeting will be provided during the planning commission presentation.

SBP Standards The proposal would comply with all 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:** The proposal has been reviewed by the city planning, engineering, and natural resources staff and has been found to be generally consistent with the city's development guides, including the water resources management plan.

2. Consistency with this ordinance;

   **Finding:** But for the setback variance, the proposal is consistent with all ordinance standards and requirements.
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:** While the proposal would require grading in the southwest corner of the site, the gymnasium addition would generally be located in a relatively flat area. Retaining walls are proposed to provide for a more suitable walking environment and to reduce the amount of required grading.

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 addition would have reasonable visual and physical relationships to the existing site features and building.

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 addition would be appropriately located and integrated into the existing site and building. While sidewalks would need to be relocated, they would continue to provide reasonable access to the building and site.
5. 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 proposal would need to comply with the recently adopted energy code.

6. 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:** While the proposal would visually change the site, the addition would be reasonably screened from the residential properties to the south. An underground storage facility is included in the proposal to accommodate the increased impervious surface. As a condition of approval, the applicant must submit erosion control and tree protection plans.

**Variance Findings**

**PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE:** The intent of the zoning ordinance is to provide for appropriate separation between adjacent buildings. The variance request would allow for reasonable siting of the addition on the property; the addition would be located more than 150 feet from the nearest residential structure. Further, additional screening would be provided by existing vegetation and topography.

**CONSISTENT WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:** The request is consistent with policies identified in the comprehensive plan. A primary policy identified in the plan is to support and collaborate with schools, agencies non-profits and others that support a diverse lifecycle and cultural services to attract and retain residents and families to Minnetonka.

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

a. **REASONABLENESS:** The proposed variance is reasonable, as the existing school does not currently meet the required 50-foot setback. While the addition would be setback 25 feet from the property line, it would be more than 150 feet from the nearest residential structure. Screening
of the addition would be provided by existing topography and vegetation.

b. UNIQUE CIRCUMSTANCE: Despite the property's large size, the orientation and configuration of the building and existing site improvements restrict the available buildable area of the property. The existing school currently has a 40-foot nonconforming setback from the south property line.

While the addition could be constructed on the east side – or rear – of the school building without a setback variance, additional site disturbance would be required to create a suitable exterior access to the space. Coupled with the existing setback, this presents a unique circumstance not common to all educational facilities.

c. CHARACTER OF THE LOCALITY: The addition would be reasonably screened from adjacent residential properties to the south. The lower third of the 30-foot tall gymnasium would be screened by existing topography. Additional screening would be provided by off-site topography and vegetation.

Natural Resources

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

Pyramid of Discretion

 Approving Body

The planning commission makes has final authority to approve or deny the request, subject to appeal. Approval requires the affirmative vote of five commissioners, given the setback variance.
## Motion Options

The planning commission has three options:

1) Concur with the staff recommendation. In this case, a motion should be made to adopt the resolution approving the final site and building plans, with setback variance.

2) Disagree with staff’s recommendation. In this case, a motion should be made directing staff to prepare a resolution for denying the final site and building plans, with setback variance. This motion should include findings for denial.

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

## Appeals

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

## Neighborhood Comments

The city sent notices to 91 area property owners and received one comment to date.

## Deadline for Decision

February 6, 2018
Clear Springs Elem Gym
Address: 5701 Co Rd 101
Project No. 86104.17a

This map is for illustrative purposes only.
Current aerial
Renovations and Additions to:
Clear Springs Elementary School

Minnetonka Public Schools District 276
5701 County Road 101
Minnetonka, Minnesota  55345
2013 Site Plan
Master Plan
Neighborhood feedback
Ashley Cauley

From: Barak Dar <reddacted>
Sent: Thursday, November 09, 2017 12:09 PM
To: Ashley Cauley
Subject: Clear Springs Elementary - addition

Ashley,

Further to telephone call regarding the Clear Springs Elementary Public hearing Notice:

Please note I strongly object this addition.
I live on 5730 Dumas Ave. Minnetonka.
My yard is adjacent to the proposed addition.
I am very concerned regarding the proximity of the proposed building site to my yard and house.
The playground that was moved next to my yard a couple of years ago is already causing a major disturbance. There is noise until late hours in the evening. Trash and other objects are thrown into my yard daily.

I wish to protest the short notice – I received the notice in the mail last night with a dead line today. I called at 11:45AM today and was told it is too late to be included in the written staff report. You also mentioned a neighborhood meeting on the 14th of which I had no knowledge of and never invited to. Considering that my yard is next to the proposed addition, I believe I should have received ample notices and offered the best chance to study the situation, obtain consultation and voice my concern. You may be within your legal right to provide such short notice but it most certainly does not look good.

Please confirm this letter is entered for the committee’s review.

Sincerely,

Barak Dar
5730 Dumas Ave.
Minnetonka, MN 55345
Resolution No. 2017-xx

Resolution approving final site and building plans, with setback variance, for an addition at Clear Spring Elementary, 5071 County Road 101

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

Section 1. Background.

1.01 Minnetonka Public School District #276 has requested approval of final site plans, with setback variance from 50 feet to 25 feet, for an addition to the Clear Spring Elementary School building.

1.02 The property is located 5071 County Road 101. It is legally described as follows:

That part of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of Section 31, Township 117 North, Range 22 West, of the 5th Principal Meridian described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the west line of said Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter, distant 825.34 feet northerly from the southwest corner of said Southwest Quarter of the Northeast Quarter; thence easterly, a distance of 508.17 feet, along a line passing through a point on the east line of said Southwest Quarter of the Northeast Quarter, distant 815.61 feet northerly from the southeast corner of said Southwest Quarter of the Northeast Quarter to the center line of State Highway No. 101; thence southerly along said center line, a distance of 12.66 feet, to the intersection with a line 503.85 feet southerly of, measured at a right angle to and parallel with the northerly line of said Southwest Quarter of the Northeast Quarter, said point being the point of beginning of the land to be described; thence easterly along said parallel line, a distance of 794.69 feet to said east line; thence southerly along said east line, a distance of 477.55 feet to the intersection with a line 330.00 feet northerly of, measured at a right angle to and parallel with the south line of said Southwest Quarter of the Northeast
Quarter; thence westerly along last said parallel line, a distance of 1021.00 feet to the center line of said State Highway No. 101; thence northerly along said centerline to the point of beginning.

1.03 On November 30, 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.

Section 2. General Standards.

2.01 City Code §300.27, Subd. 5, states that in evaluating a site and building plan, the city will consider its compliance with the following:

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.

2.02 By City Code §300.07 Subd. 1, a variance may be granted from the requirements of the zoning ordinance when: (1) the variance is in harmony with the general purposes and intent of this ordinance; (2) when the variance is consistent with the comprehensive plan; and (3) when the applicant establishes that there are practical difficulties in complying with the ordinance. Practical difficulties means: (1) The proposed use is reasonable; (2) the need for a variance is caused by circumstances unique to the property, not created by the property owner, and not solely based on economic considerations; and (3) the proposed use would not alter the essential character of the surrounding area.

Section 3. Findings.

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

1. The proposal has been reviewed by the city planning, engineering, and natural resources staff and has been found to be generally consistent with the city’s development guides, including the water resources management plan.

2. But for the setback variance, the proposal is consistent with all ordinance standards and requirements.

3. While the proposal would require grading in the southwest corner, the gymnasium addition would generally be located in a relatively flat
area. Retaining walls are proposed to provide for a more suitable walking environment and to reduce the amount of required grading.

4. The proposed addition would have reasonable visual and physical relationships to the existing site features and building.

5. The proposed addition would be appropriately located and integrated into the existing site and building. While sidewalks would need to be relocated, they would continue to provide reasonable access to the building and site.

6. The proposal would need to comply with the recently adopted energy code.

7. While the proposal would visually change the site, the additions would be reasonably screened from the residential properties to the south. An underground storage facility is proposed to accommodate the increased impervious surface. As a condition of this resolution, the applicant must submit erosion control and tree protection plans.

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

1. PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE: The intent of the zoning ordinance is to provide for appropriate separation between adjacent buildings. The variance request would allow for reasonable siting of the addition on the property; the addition would be located more than 150 feet from the nearest residential structure. Further, additional screening would be provided by existing vegetation and topography.

2. CONSISTENT WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: The request is consistent with policies identified in the comprehensive plan. A primary policy identified in the plan is to support and collaborate with schools, agencies non-profits and others that support a diverse lifecycle and cultural services to attract and retain residents and families to Minnetonka.

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

   a. REASONABLENESS: The proposed variance is reasonable, as the existing school does not currently meet the required 50-foot setback. While the addition would be setback 25 feet
from the property line, it would be more than 150 feet from the nearest residential structure. Screening of the addition would be provided by existing topography and vegetation.

b. UNIQUE CIRCUMSTANCE: Despite the property’s large size, the orientation and configuration of the building and existing site improvements restrict the available buildable area of the property. The existing school currently has a 40-foot nonconforming setback from the south property line.

While the addition could be constructed on the east side – or rear – of the school building without a setback variance, additional site disturbance would be required to create a suitable exterior access to the space. Coupled with the existing setback, this presents a unique circumstance not common to all educational facilities.

c. CHARACTER OF THE LOCALITY: The addition would be reasonably screened from adjacent residential properties to the south. The lower third of the 30-foot tall gymnasium would be screened by existing topography. Additional screening would be provided by existing, off-site topography and vegetation.

Section 4. Planning Commission Action.

4.01 The Planning Commission approves final site plans for Clear Spring Elementary. Approval is based on the findings outlined in section 4 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, except as modified by the conditions below:
   
   • Demolition and erosion plan date-stamped October 24, 2017
   • Layout plan date-stamped October 24, 2017
   • Grading and drainage plan date-stamped October 24, 2017
   • Section and Elevations date-stamped October 24, 2017
   • Floor plan date-stamped October 24, 2017
   • Retaining wall details date-stamped September 12, 2017

2. Prior to issuance of a building permit:

   a) Submit the following items associated with site work:
1) An electronic PDF copy of all required plans and specifications.

2) Three full size sets of construction drawings and sets of project specifications.

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

   a. Final landscaping plan must meet minimum landscaping and mitigation requirements as outlined in ordinance. However, at the sole discretion of natural resources staff, mitigation may be adjusted based on site conditions.

   b. Final stormwater management plan must:

      1. Meet the requirements of the city’s Water Resources Management Plan, Appendix A. Design. In addition, supplemental calculations must be submitted detailing conformance with the city’s:

         • Rate Control: maintain existing rates leaving the site for the 2-, 10-, and 100-year events.

         • Volume: the storm chambers must capture 1” of the entire site’s impervious surface. Soil borings are required to verify infiltration rates.

         • Water Quality: materials must be submitted (MIDS or p8 model) to demonstrate that 68% of the total phosphorus and 90% of the TSS are removed.

   c. Final construction plan. The applicants should work with staff to reduce the minimize tree loss for the southern construction access.
4) Individual letters of credit or cash escrow for 125% of a bid cost or 150% of an estimated cost to construct comply with grading permit and landscaping requirements and to restore the site. One itemized letter of credit is permissible, if approved by staff. The city will not fully release the letters of credit or cash escrow until: (1) as-built drawings have been submitted; (2) a letter certifying that the underground facility has been completed according to the plans approved by the city has been submitted; (3) vegetated ground cover has been established; and (4) required landscaping or vegetation has survived one full growing season.

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

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

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

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

7) Submit a construction and future access map for staff review and approval. This plan must show that emergency vehicle access can be provided around the perimeter of the building.

b) The following must be completed:

1) This resolution must be recorded at Hennepin County.
2) Install erosion control, and tree protection fencing and any other measures identified on the SWPPP for staff inspection. These items must be maintained throughout the course of construction.

3) Schedule and hold a preconstruction meeting with building, planning, and natural resources as determined by city staff.

c) Permits may be required from other outside agencies including, Hennepin County, the Riley Purgatory Bluff Creek Watershed District, and the MPCA. It is the applicant’s or property owner’s responsibility to obtain any necessary permits.

4. All rooftop and ground mounted mechanical equipment, and exterior trash and recycling storage areas, must be enclosed with materials compatible with the principal structure, subject to staff approval. Low profile, self-contained mechanical units that blend in with the building architecture are exempt from this screening requirement.

5. Retaining walls over four feet in height must be structurally engineered and be signed by a licensed structural engineer.

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

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

8. Construction activity or access must not utilize the newly constructed bus corral.

9. Construction must begin by December 31, 2018 unless the planning commission grants a time extension.

Adopted by the Planning Commission of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on November 30, 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 November 30, 2017.

Kathy Leervig, Deputy City Clerk
Brief Description  Preliminary and final plat of WILLISTON ACRES 3rd ADDITION, a two-lot subdivision at 14819 Margaret Place

Recommendation  Recommend the city council adopt the resolution approving the preliminary and final plats

Introduction

The roughly 1.2-acre subject property is located on the south side of Margaret Place, just west of Williston Road. The highest point property is situated in the southeast corner of the lot; grade falls downward from this point to the north and west. The property contains 17 high priority trees – of primarily oak, spruce, and walnut species – and a single-family home.

Proposal

Lake West Development, LLC is proposing to divide the property into two, single-family lots. The existing home would remain. However, the existing garage would be removed and a new garage constructed on the west side of the home. A new home would be constructed east of the existing home.

Staff Analysis

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

- **Would the proposal meet minimum subdivision standards?**
  
  Yes. The subdivision ordinance outlines minimum area and dimensional standards for single-family residential lots. As submitted, the subdivision would meet all minimum standards. However, in reviewing the submittal, staff noticed that an area of Margaret Place lies outside of the dedicated public right-of-way. To resolve this issue, additional right-of-way must be dedicated. With this dedication, a slight shift of the proposed common lot line would ensure that the two-lot subdivision would meet minimum ordinance standards. (See the “Required Changes” exhibit.)
### Area Lot Width

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Buildable</th>
<th>Right-of-Way</th>
<th>Setback</th>
<th>Lot Depth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>22,000 sq.ft.</td>
<td>3,500 sq.ft.</td>
<td>80 ft</td>
<td>110 ft</td>
<td>125 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>27,560 sq.ft.</td>
<td>12,105 sq.ft.</td>
<td>150 ft</td>
<td>160 ft</td>
<td>165 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>22,230 sq.ft.</td>
<td>10,680 sq.ft.</td>
<td>110 ft</td>
<td>110 ft</td>
<td>210 ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* numbers exclude existing and required ROW easement
** all numbers rounded to nearest 5 sq.ft.

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

  Yes. Based on the submitted grading plans, four of the site’s 17 high-priority trees would be removed or significantly impacted. This 24 percent removal/impact would be allowed under the tree protection ordinance.

### Staff Recommendation

Recommend the city council adopt the resolution approving the preliminary and final plat of WILLISTON ACRES 3rd ADDITION, a two-lot subdivision at 14819 Margaret Place

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

**Surrounding Land Uses**

- North: townhomes and industrial building
- South: single-family homes
- East: single-family homes
- West: single-family homes

**Planning**

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

**Grading**

As is required for all preliminary plat applications, the applicant has submitted a general grading plan. Specific grading plans would be submitted and reviewed in conjunction with any building permit applications.

To accommodate a new home, the general grading plan suggests construction of a one to three foot retaining wall in the southeast corner of the new lot; commensurate excavation/removal of soil would occur northwest of the wall. To accommodate a new garage on the westerly lot, the general grading plan suggests roughly two feet of fill directly west of the existing home.

**Tree Removal**

By city code, no more than 35% of a property’s high priority trees may be removed to accommodate subdivision. A tree is considered removed if: (1) it is physically removed; (2) 30% or more of the trunk circumference is injured; (3) 30% or more of the crown is trimmed; (4) an oak is trimmed between April 1st and July 15th; or (5) the following percentage of the critical root zone is compacted, cut, filled or paved – 30 percent of the critical root zone for all species, except 40 percent for ash, elm, poplar species, silver maple and boxelder.

The subject property contains 17 high priority trees, 16 significant trees, and 5 trees that are not regulated due to their size or health. Based on the submitted plans:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Type</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Removed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Priority</td>
<td>17 trees</td>
<td>4 removed or 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>16 trees</td>
<td>4 trees or 25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tree Mitigation**

By city code, tree mitigation is required for certain trees removed/impact. Based on the submitted plans, the required mitigation would be 62 to 80 inches, equating to 31 to 40, 2-inch
trees. Specific mitigation amounts would be determined during review of specific building permit applications.

**Stormwater**

The proposal does not trigger the city’s stormwater management rule.

**Utilities**

There is an existing sanitary sewer pipe extending east from the Margaret Place cul-de-sac manhole. City records indicate that this pipe is a 6-inch, private service pipe. The utility plan submitted by the applicant incorrectly identifies this pipe as an 8-inch, public sanitary main.

The submitted plan illustrates that the sanitary service for proposed Lot 2 would connect to the existing pipe. However, the city will not allow connection of a private service to a private service. As a condition of approval, the 8-inch sanitary main must be extended to the east. Private services must then be connected to this extended main.

**Motion Options**

The planning commission has three options:

1) Concur with the staff recommendation. In this case, a motion should be made recommending the city council adopt the resolution approving the preliminary and final plats.

2) Disagree with staff recommendation. In this case, a motion should be made recommending the city council deny the plats. This motion must include findings for denial.

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

**Neighborhood Comments**

The city sent notices to 39 area property owners and received no comments to date.

**Deadline for Decision**

February 5, 2018
Location Map

Williston Acres 3rd Addition
Address: 14819 Margaret Pl
Project #17026.17a

This map is for illustrative purposes only.
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I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PLAN, SPECIFICATION, OR REPORT WAS PREPARED BY ME OR UNDER MY DIRECT SUPERVISION AND THAT I AM A DULY LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA.

TREE PRESERVATION PLAN

1. Contractor shall identify and maintain construction limits as indicated on plan. Install silt fencing or tree protection fencing as needed to ensure no construction traffic or activity occurs outside the denoted limits.

2. Where pavement is to be removed, care shall be taken to ensure that demolition and removal activities do not harm underlying roots that may be present.

CIVIL METHODS, INC.
1551 Livingston Avenue, Suite 104
West St. Paul, MN 55118

LAKE WEST DEVELOPMENT CO., LLC.
15400 HIGHWAY 7
MINNETONKA, MN 55345

TREE PRESERVATION NOTES:

- HIGH PRIORITY TREE
SANITARY SEWER LEGEND:
- WATER SERVICE
- PAVEMENT PATCH
- DRAINAGE IDENTIFICATION NO. / BIBET

TRENCH EXCAVATION, BEDDING & BACKFILL:
1. Trench excavations shall be in accordance with the requirements of CEAM Standard Specifications Section 2600.3B.
2. Granular bedding and Granular Encapsulation - Bedding and granular encapsulation materials used in the pipe zone area (4" below the pipe to 12" over the pipe) shall conform to Mn/DOT 3149.2F.
3. Backfill material shall consist of soil from trench, in the case of unsuitable material, backfill shall consist of Mn/DOT 3149.01.
4. Bedding and encapsulation shall be compacted to 90% Standard Proctor using Specified Density Method, or as recommended by manufacturer, whichever is denser.
5. Backfill shall be compacted in 12" lifts to Specified Density Method.
6. 100% Standard Proctor from subgrade elevation down 3 feet.
7. 95% Proctor from bottom of excavation up to 3 feet below.
8. Backfill material around all manholes, catch basins, valve boxes, curb boxes, and hydrants shall be compacted with hand-machines. The maximum lift thickness shall be 6 inches.

INSTALLATION OF PIPE & FITTINGS:
1. When connection to an existing conduit is required at proposed manhole or conduit connection, the Contractor shall expose and verify the elevation of the existing conduit prior to laying any pipe toward, or away from, the connection point. If the elevation of the existing conduit does not match the elevation shown on the plans, the Contractor shall notify the Engineer, at which time the Engineer may adjust the proposed grades.
2. The invert of the existing sewers (storm and sanitary), culverts, unfortunately, etc., shall be protected during construction. The Contractor is responsible to inspect and clean, if necessary, all lines which have become compromised by the construction operations.
3. Pipes shall be tested per City standards.

SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM:
1. Sanitary sewer pipe and fittings shall consist of solid-wall PVC SDR 21 / S40 with joints of elastomeric or solvent cement as recommended by the manufacturer for water-tight connection.
2. Sanitary service lateral shall be installed at a minimum grade of 2.0%. Any deviation shall be approved by the Engineer prior to installation.
3. When connecting to existing lines, Contractor shall first verify location, elevation, and type of existing material to ensure proper connection. An adequate coupling shall be used to connect to existing pipe with a water-tight connection.
4. All water must be kept out of the bell of the pipe until the joint is completed.
5. Extend pipe to 'f' of building wall, coordinate location & elevation with building contractor / mechanical drawings. Sanitary stub end to be plugged until building connection made.

TRENCH EXCAVATION, BEDDING & BACKFILL:
1. Trench excavations shall be in accordance with the requirements of CEAM Standard Specifications Section 2600.3B.
2. Granular bedding and Granular Encapsulation - Bedding and granular encapsulation materials used in the pipe zone area (4" below the pipe to 12" over the pipe) shall conform to Mn/DOT 3149.2F.
3. Backfill material shall consist of soil from trench, in the case of unsuitable material, backfill shall consist of Mn/DOT 3149.01.
4. Bedding and encapsulation shall be compacted to 90% Standard Proctor using Specified Density Method, or as recommended by manufacturer, whichever is denser.
5. Backfill shall be compacted in 12" lifts to Specified Density Method.
6. 100% Standard Proctor from subgrade elevation down 3 feet.
7. 95% Proctor from bottom of excavation up to 3 feet below.
8. Backfill material around all manholes, catch basins, valve boxes, curb boxes, and hydrants shall be compacted with hand-machines. The maximum lift thickness shall be 6 inches.

INSTALLATION OF PIPE & FITTINGS:
1. When connection to an existing conduit is required at proposed manhole or conduit connection, the Contractor shall expose and verify the elevation of the existing conduit prior to laying any pipe toward, or away from, the connection point. If the elevation of the existing conduit does not match the elevation shown on the plans, the Contractor shall notify the Engineer, at which time the Engineer may adjust the proposed grades.
2. The invert of the existing sewers (storm and sanitary), culverts, unfortunately, etc., shall be protected during construction. The Contractor is responsible to inspect and clean, if necessary, all lines which have become compromised by the construction operations.
3. Pipes shall be tested per City standards.

SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM:
1. Sanitary sewer pipe and fittings shall consist of solid-wall PVC SDR 21 / S40 with joints of elastomeric or solvent cement as recommended by the manufacturer for water-tight connection.
2. Sanitary service lateral shall be installed at a minimum grade of 2.0%. Any deviation shall be approved by the Engineer prior to installation.
3. When connecting to existing lines, Contractor shall first verify location, elevation, and type of existing material to ensure proper connection. An adequate coupling shall be used to connect to existing pipe with a water-tight connection.
4. All water must be kept out of the bell of the pipe until the joint is completed.
5. Extend pipe to 'f' of building wall, coordinate location & elevation with building contractor / mechanical drawings. Sanitary stub end to be plugged until building connection made.

CONCRETE CURBING:
1. ACI 330 R-08, ACI 330.1-03 Specifications and Mn/DOT Specification Section 2327 shall apply to ready-mixed concrete pavement materials, construction, curing, and quality control for curb and gutter construction and miscellaneous concrete work.
2. Concrete mix to be used shall be 3 A20 for manual placement, or 3 A20 for slip form placement (2351).
3. Provide contraction and expansion jointing per Mn/DOT 2351; curb contraction joints shall be placed at even increments of 10 feet.
4. Concrete shall be placed with white pigment compounded curing compound immediately after finishing is complete in accordance with Mn/DOT 3149, meeting ASTM C395, Type 2.
5. The mixing and inspection requirements of ACI 330 R-08 and ACI 330.1-03. Contractor responsible for testing per ASTM C34. Concrete failing to meet strength shall be remedied as appropriate. Concrete tests for slump, air content, density, and temperature shall be performed at least once per day.
6. Minimum 6" depth of C-5 aggregate base shall be furnished under all curb. All base material shall be compacted to 100% Standard Proctor per log. Abraded subgrade.
7. Base course shall be moist, but not saturation during concrete placement. Apply water not less than 6 hours before placement, if base dries, sprinkle water to maintain to avoid potholes.
8. Suitable salvaged material shall be used for backfill behind curb.

HOT MIX ASPHALT PARKING LOT AND STREET PATCH:
1. Bituminous pavement shall be of type indicated in the details, meeting all material and installation requirements of Mn/DOT Specification Section 2326.
2. The bituminous surfacing shall be prepared, handled, and constructed per Mn/DOT 2350, with a maximum deviation of plus or minus 1/2 inch from the planned compacted thickness.
3. The bituminous material for tack coat shall be CSS-1, CSS-1h, CRS-1, or CRS-2 meeting requirements of Mn/DOT 2357.
4. When connecting to an old bituminous pavement, a clean, straight, vertical edge will be provided by saw-cutting full depth through the existing pavement. New bituminous pavement shall match grade of existing pavement, with no noticeable difference at joint.
5. The contact surfaces of all fixed structures, the edge of the in-place mixture in all courses at transverse joints, and the weaving course at longitudinal joints shall be given a uniform coating of Liquid Asphalt or Emulsified Asphalt tackifier before placing the adjoining mixture. The bituminous material shall be applied at a rate of 0.5 Gallons per 1000 square feet.
6. Compaction of all street patch / driveway / parking lot bituminous asphalt mixtures shall be by the Ordinary Compaction Method (2350).
Resolution No. 2017-
Resolution approving the preliminary and final plat of WILLISTON ACRES 3rd ADDITION at 14819 Margaret Place

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

Section 1. Background.

1.01 Lake West Development, LLC. has requested approval of preliminary and final plats of WILLISTON ACRES 3rd ADDITION, a two-lot residential subdivision, at 14819 Margaret Place

1.02 The property is legally described as:

Lots 11 and 12, including adjoining vacated alley, subject to road, Williston Park Acres, Hennepin County, Minnesota

1.03 On November 30, 2017, the planning commission held a hearing on the proposed plat. The applicant was provided the opportunity to present information to the commission. The commission considered all of the comments received and the staff report, which are incorporated by reference into this resolution. The commission recommended that the city council approve the preliminary and final plats.

Section 2. General Standards.

2.01 City Code §400.030 outlines general design requirements for residential subdivisions. These standards are incorporated by reference into this resolution.
Section 3. Findings.

3.01 With slight shift of the proposed property line, which is a condition of this resolution, the preliminary plat would meet the design standards as outlined in City Code §400.030.


4.01 The above-described preliminary and final plats are hereby approved, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to release of the final plat for recording, submit the following:
   
a) A revised final plat drawing that clearly illustrates the following:

   1) All existing easements, including those described by Document No. 4750938 and 9625170.

   2) Dedication of additional right-of-way adjacent to the south side of Margaret Place. The required dedication is generally illustrated in an exhibit to the November 30, 2017 staff report. The right-of-way must cover the existing road encroachment, plus a 6-foot wide boulevard.

   3) A 5-foot shift of the proposed common property line to ensure minimum lot area is met. The required shift is generally illustrated in an exhibit to the November 30, 2017 staff report.

   4) A minimum 10-foot wide drainage and utility easement adjacent to the public right-of-way and minimum 7-foot wide drainage and utility easements along all other lot lines.

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

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

d) Two sets of mylars for city signatures.

e) Park dedication fee of $5000.
2. Prior to issuance of a building permit

a) Submit the following:

1) A revised utility plan. The plans must illustrate:

   a. Extension of the 8-inch public sanitary sewer main from the cul-de-sac manhole to the east. The extension must be along the north side of the existing water main in accordance with Minnesota Department of Health requirements.

   b. Removal of existing 6-inch private sanitary sewer service to Lot 1 and reconfiguration of the service to provide a perpendicular connection to the extended main.

   c. Connection of Lot 2 to the new sanitary main.

   d. The water service on Lot 2 shifted to the west in order to save tree 840.

   e. Minimum 1.5 inch water service to Lot 2.

2) A Sanitary Sewer Extension permit from Minnesota Pollution Control Agency or documentation from the agency that such permit is not required.

3) A right-of-way permit application for work within the public right-of-way.

4) A driveway permit.

5) A final grading and tree preservation plan. The plan must:


   b. Not impact more than 30% of the critical root zones of the following trees:
c. Show sewer and water services to minimize impact to any significant or high-priority trees. No trees may be removed for installation of services.

Note: no tree removal or grading may begin until a building permit is issued.

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

7) A letter of credit or cash escrow for 125% of a bid cost or 150% of an estimated cost to extend the sanitary main and patch Margaret Place. One itemized letter of credit is permissible, if approved by staff. The city will not fully release the letter of credit or cash escrow until: (1) as-built drawings have been submitted; and (2) the city engineer has accepted, in writing, the sanitary sewer extension and street repair.

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

- The property will be brought into compliance within 48 hours of notification of a violation of the construction management plan, other conditions of approval, or city code standards; and
If compliance is not achieved, the city will use any or all of the escrow dollars to correct any erosion and/or grading problems.

9) All required hook-up fees.

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

c) Hold a preconstruction meeting for extension of the sanitary sewer main.

3. A half-width patch of Margaret Place, at a minimum, is required for the length of the sanitary sewer construction. If the construction requires road disturbance to cross the centerline, then a full-width patch is required.

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

5. This approval will be void on December 18, 2018, if: (1) a final plat is not recorded; and (2) the city council has not received and approved a written application for a time extension.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetonka, Minnesota, on December 18, 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 December 18, 2017.

_____________________________________
David E. Maeda, City Clerk