MINNETONKA PLANNING COMMISSION
January 21, 2016

Brief Description
Concept plan review for Villa West at 16901, 16913 and 17101 State Highway 7

Action Requested
Provide comments, feedback, and direction.

Background
In 2015, RTS Development submitted a concept plan for redevelopment of the existing single-family residential properties at 16901, 16913 and 17101 State Highway 7. The plan contemplated construction of 30 detached villa homes accessed directly from Highway 7 via a new, one-way street. During review of the concept, area residents, the planning commission, and the city council raised concerns about density, site design, and the concept’s general lack of information. (See pages A1–A12.)

Revised Concept
RTS Development has now submitted a revised concept plan for redevelopment of the 16913 State Highway 7 site only. The revised concept plan contemplates construction of three, two-unit townhomes, accessed directly from Highway 7 via a new roadway. The plan further projects continuation of the concept to the west if and when that property becomes available. (See pages A13–A18.)

Key Issues
City staff has identified the following considerations for any development of the subject property:

- **Access:** MnDOT has jurisdictional control of access from Highway 7. Therefore, the applicant would need to work with MnDOT and the city in order to provide safe access to the development site.

- **Planned Development:** The parcel is part of a larger area that is guided for medium-density residential development. The comprehensive plan anticipates that this area would be developed as a single, medium-density development. This is especially important due to access constraints. It is not desirable to have separate developments with separate accesses from Highway 7. However, it may be difficult for one developer to assemble all of the properties at one time given that there are multiple property owners involved. In this case, any development of a portion of the properties would need to account and plan for the potential of future development on the other properties that are guided medium-density. (See pages A19–A22.)
Review Process

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

- **Neighborhood Meeting.** The developer will hold a neighborhood meeting on January 21, immediately prior to the planning commission meeting.

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

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

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the commission provide comments, feedback, and direction that may lead to the preparation of more detailed development plans.

Originator: Susan Thomas, AICP, Principal Planner
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Next Steps

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

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

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

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

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

Roles and Responsibilities

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

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

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

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

- **City Staff.** City staff is neither an advocate for the public nor the applicant. Rather, staff provides professional advice and recommendations to all interested parties, including the city council, planning commission, applicant and residents. Staff advocates for its professional position, not a project. Staff recommendations consider neighborhood concerns, but necessarily reflect professional standards, legal requirements and broader community interests.
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Odland was concerned with the water table level and what potential negative changes would occur to provide underground parking. A location closer to light rail might make more sense. There are issues that need to be looked at.

Magney felt multi-family housing would be a good choice for the location. A little smaller scale of three or four stories may be preferable. He was not concerned with the groundwater issue. The engineers would work out those details. It might impact the whole project, but the engineers would determine that. There should be more guest parking. In the big picture, multi-family housing would be just fine.

O’Connell concurred that the density of housing would be a good fit for the area with an office park so close to jobs. It fits the long-term vision of using existing infrastructure. The issues raised would have to be addressed. He supports the proposal.

Knight agrees with Magney and O’Connell. The proposal would be an appropriate use of the property. The area has a lot of employment. Right now, employees are driving in from outside the area. If some of the workers lived in the apartment building, then that would be a good thing. The area is not residential where neighbors would be concerned about what could be seen out the window. It would not bother him if a five-story building was constructed next to the building he works in. The size of the building does not bother him at all.

Chair Kirk recapped that more than five stories would be an issue for the commission. Transportation issues need to be addressed because of current problems, but the proposal is not being rejected. He would appreciate more of a clear, long-range vision in the comprehensive guide plan for the Opus area. He did not object to the proposal, but he was worried how the greater Opus area associations and trip counts fit in with each other. Wischnack stated that the city council will look at comprehensive guide plan studies done on the Opus area.

B. Concept plan review for Villa West on State Highway 7.

Staff recommends that commissioners provide feedback to assist the applicant with direction that may lead to the preparation of more detailed development plans.

Bob Schmidt, president of RTS Development, applicant, stated that:

- Thomson did a good job explaining the proposal.
- The property owner of the site used to fix his boat props. It was a unique piece of property located off a gravel road on Highway 7.
• The plan is wonderful. It would create housing for the aging population.
• An association would maintain the grounds.
• He developed townhouses on Covington Road in Minnetonka years ago. He built villa-style townhomes in Golden Valley which is a primary example of the proposed development.
• This property lends itself to a community development master plan.
• He found a way to access the property that MNDot agrees with.
• He was available for questions.

Scott Dahlke, civil engineer of site design, stated that:

• The site is a long, rectangle shape. The plan proposed an access road to run down the center of the property and be constructed on both sides of the road.
• There are currently no sewer or water utilities. The utilities would be extended from the northwest corner down the center of the road.
• He has met with MNDot and reviewed many concept plans. MNDot prefers a single access point on the east end. There would be a private drive 20 feet in width with a turn lane on Highway 7 for the entrance. Traffic would enter on the east side, travel west through the site, and then exit on the west end. The reason MNDot prefers this configuration is because of the existing exit from the adjacent townhomes on the west. The nearest city street is Clear Spring Road. A connection to Clear Spring Road would not be beneficial.
• Topography and drainage details will be provided as the plan moves forward. He described the drainage pattern, location of wetlands, stormwater management plans, and importance of tree preservation and screening.

Rob Eldrich, of Ridge Creek Custom Homes, stated that he is one of the preferred builders for the project. He is looking to do the detached villa concept, rambler houses, and two-story houses. The targeted market would be looking to downsize or get rid of large yards. There would be main-floor master suites and elevators for some. Minnetonka’s median age is 60 years. These would be nice, new homes for local residents. He is available for questions.

Chair Kirk invited residents to provide input.

David Devins, 17100 Sandy Lane, stated that:
The project is too dense. The homes would be substantial in size and be priced around $500,000.

The property is zoned R-1 and guided R-3. He asked for the comprehensive guide plan to be changed to R-1, single-family residential.

He has concerns about tree preservation and keeping the existing berm. It works as natural drainage control.

The area has terrible drainage and is full of springs. The whole area is wet.

There is mixed topography.

The density seems too big. Houses with 2,800 square feet would be too large to still have room for trees, streets, and driveways.

Lisa Brown, 4926 Clear Spring Road, stated that:

- The small area cannot handle going from 5 houses to 30 houses.
- The issues include loss of trees, wetlands, and springs.
- She has seen a lot of change in 26 years. She remembers Snuffy’s and Lilliput.
- The proposal would be too big and cause the removal of mature trees that are significant.
- Removing buckthorn would eliminate a lot of screening.
- She understood something would be constructed, but this would be too big.
- She encouraged commissioners to visit the site. There is a bike trail along Highway 7.

Beth Frost, 4914 Clear Spring Road, stated that:

- The proposal seems massive.
- Her lot and those in the area are huge, but they would abut 40-foot lots if the proposal would be done. The proposal would be out of character with the neighborhood. She feels strongly about that.
- The elevation would be higher, so the proposed houses would be looking down on the existing surrounding houses and create a privacy issue.
- Access to Highway 7 would be crucial for the neighborhood, because it would create too much traffic for Clear Spring Road.
- She wants more history on Mr. Schmidt and his developments. The judgements against him are extensive, so she hopes those are looked at.
John Eiden, 16821 Highway 7, stated that:

- He declined selling. He does not think the proposal is a good idea. It would create a dead end. It would not be the best use of the property.
- The 2030 comprehensive guide plan is dedicated to preserving Minnetonka’s natural beauty. This proposal would impact the drainage. He explained the drainage pattern.
- This corridor is a gateway to a section of Minnetonka. The property owners have taken care of the land for decades. Trees help preserve the ozone, reduce emissions, and prevent global warming.
- He supports extending the Purgatory Creek area to the site. All 7 properties drain into Purgatory Creek.
- He does not want to live next to all of the construction.
- His living room faces Highway 7. It does not look pretty and is not quiet. He cannot see people paying $700,000 for property that is not quiet. The builder did not say anything about sound barriers. The project would be a “slow seller.” Neighbors would have to watch the construction unless barriers are provided.
- He understood that the property owners want to sell, but that does not mean that the neighborhood should be turned into a senior living center.
- He reviewed the traffic pattern. He did not think it made sense.
- The best use of the property would be to turn it into open space. It would look good as a corridor and bring up the value of surrounding properties.
- The proposal would be a mistake.

Pam Scherling, 4925 West End Lane, stated that:

- She had the same concerns as the previous speakers.
- There is a heavily used trail located in the front of the property. There are many near misses. Construction equipment would create a lot of traffic.
- Resident surveys show that parks and trails are a main priority. Residents do not want neighborhoods leveled or trees removed.
- The development should be much lower density. There is no walkability to shopping.
- The price point would be too high for a high-traffic area.
Ms. Frost added that the wetlands on the northwest side are connected by a tunnel that travels under Highway 7 and the bike path connects to Purgatory Creek.

Knight asked how the proposal compares to the development on the west in terms of density. Thomson said that the proposal would be 6.5 to 7 units per acre. Medium density zoning allows 4 to 12 units per acre. Thomas calculated that the Carlysle Townhomes next door are 9 units per acre.

Calvert asked what the price point would be. Mr. Eldrich did not know the lot cost yet, so the price has not been determined. The estimate would be $500,000 for one story with 1,400 to 1,700 square feet on the main level and $600,000 for two stories with 1,000 square feet on the main level and 1,500 square feet above. A market study was completed. There is a project in Minnetonka off of County Road 101 and Highway 5 that starts in the upper $700,000 and goes into the $1 million range.

Odland remembered conversations that Groveland Pond would be too big. The proposal looks like 15 lbs. of potatoes would be put into a 5 lb. bag. It would be too large. She thought the price point would be too high for a resident downsizing and considering that the units would be on a highway.

Chair Kirk was concerned that the access on Highway 7 would not be safe. The development would be too dense. The Carlysle development looks fairly dense. Once the driveways and garages were added to the Groveland Pond proposal, commissioners determined it would be too dense. The houses would have been within 15 feet of each other. There must be a market, because developers are proposing the density. Determining whether the residences would sell is up to the developer. The size, density, and safety of the accesses is within the purview of commissioners.

Knight has been on the trail biking. He did not like the steep hills to the Carlysle Townhomes. He stops for the stop sign and nearly hits a cyclist that does not stop at that intersection often. He crosses the path on his way to work. Motorists stop in the middle of the road because bicyclists do not stop.

Calvert noted that it seems that the Carlysle is protected by old trees that provide a buffer. The proposal would have to reduce the number of trees by an enormous amount. That would not be right.
Chair Kirk asked if commissioners would prefer an extension of Carlysle Place. Calvert said that the proposal is hard to visualize. A neighborhood would be significantly changed and commissioners have it in their purview to encourage responsible development that includes meeting demographic need by attracting young people and helping seniors have housing options. She was not convinced if the proposal would achieve either goal. It is hard to see the impact without a tree survey and the actual plans. Minnetonka does not have a lot of the type of housing that Carlysle would provide. There is not a lot of space to build new single-family housing stock in Minnetonka. It is a conundrum.

Chair Kirk said that it is nice to have some amenities when adding single-family houses. This is not a great spot. It would not be an easy place to get in and out of. It is not walkable to the store. Carlysle is full, but has the same traffic issues.

Thomson requested direction from commissioners regarding potential future development of the area as a whole. Chair Kirk asked if waiting for other parcels to be included in the development site would be an option. Thomson stated that the comprehensive guide plan guides the area to be considered as a whole for redevelopment. Planning for future connections would be a reasonable approach.

Chair Kirk thought that two additional lots on the east would be an easy extension of the proposal.

Thomson clarified that the comprehensive guide plan calls for an understanding that redeveloping the area in part would have some impact on future redevelopment of two properties on the east and what would ultimately happen to them.

Chair Kirk stated that the commission could request that the developer to create an extension of the proposal that would incorporate those two additional lots.

Chair Kirk wants tree preservation and a buffer to the Clear Spring Road neighborhood taken into account. To go from low density to high density suggests that there needs to be an area of buffer. Commissioners agree that the proposal is too dense and a buffer is needed between the proposal and Highway 7.

Calvert took to heart the comments regarding the wetlands.

Chair Kirk was interested to see how acceleration and deceleration would work with the access points.
Odland requested statistics on the number of accidents at Carlysle for motor vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians. Thomson will request that information from the police department.

O'Connell deferred the access issues to MNDot. He was not so certain that it would not be too dense based on the comprehensive guide plan. The same arguments could be made for Carlysle, but residents like living there.

Magney agreed that the proposal would not be too dense. The site is awkward. Safety is a big concern, but he would defer to MNDot on that.

10. Adjournment

*Odland moved, second by O’Connell, to adjourn the meeting at 9:20 p.m.*

*Motion carried unanimously.*

By: ____________________________

Lois T. Mason
Planning Secretary
Aggarwal said he would not be back before the council asking for another variance. He asked if it mattered to the council if the homes had a full basement or a lookout. Schneider said it did matter. The way the 3,200 square foot was calculated was on all exposed levels. Wischnack said that would be included in the resolution.

Allendorf moved, Wiersum seconded a motion to adopt Res. 2015-083 approving the preliminary plat including the condition that:
   • Plat won't be released until the building plans are submitted that meet the specified criteria – Square foot above ground of 3200 or less; FAR of 0.14
   • Building permits won't be approved unless the plans submitted with the building permit application substantially conform to the plans approved prior to release of the final plat

All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

Schneider said if the provision worked there may be other opportunities to do the right thing without making things so complicated.

C. Concept plan review for Villa West

Thomas gave the staff report.

Bob Schmidt, president of RTS Development, said the villa concept was designed for Minnetonka residents looking to downsize or not wanting to do yardwork.

Scott Dahlke, civil engineer of site design, said the biggest challenge was the access. He met with MnDOT staff who provided a recommendation about how to maintain access to the properties. The recommendation was to continue down to the east to the most easterly boundary, come off of Highway 7 and circle back through the site with an exit at the west end. This would provide two exit maneuvers that were in close proximity on to Highway 7. He said all of the properties except the most westerly property were on well and septic. The project would extend sewer and water to all the lots. A survey has been completed and wetland delineation has been done. There is a creek that runs through the center of the site. The development plan would take that into consideration.

Rob Eldrich, of Ridge Creek Custom Homes, said one issue that came up during the neighborhood meeting and the planning commission meeting was the tree canopy and the privacy of the neighboring properties. He said he, Schmidt, and Dahlke went out to the property and were confident that the major woods along the south property line would maintain the privacy.
The goal was to maintain a buffer from between the proposed houses and the existing houses so the woodsy feel remains. He said it was likely that none of the homes would be priced above $750,000. Looking at new construction in the city built during the last two years, there were six homes available under $750,000, five were two stories, one was split level. The median age in the city was 60 years old. He was excited to bring this product to the market.

Schneider asked if the homes would be detached or attached. Eldrich said they would be detached with a rambler style. There were some alternative two story styles for young families looking for new construction.

Schneider asked if there was any effort to cooperatively work with the property to the west of the western exit to have the entrance be combined between the two. The tradeoff would be more setback behind the home. Dahlke said that had been discussed with MnDot and the recommendation was for the exit to be independent.

Allendorf asked for more information about how the circuitous route exiting on the east side would work. Dahlke said traffic coming from the west would go along the entire frontage of the project with a turn lane on Highway 7 coming into the easterly point. Traffic would come back through to the west on the one way private drive that would exit on to Highway 7 continuing to the east. Allendorf asked if there had been any consideration of an internal two way circulation system that would allow entering and exiting on the east to avoid the proximity of the two exits to the west. Dahlke said the limited property boundaries led to the narrower one way configuration. There just wasn't enough space to have a full two way road. Allendorf said that meant no street parking on the property. Dahlke confirmed that was correct. He said more work would be done to look at how to handle the parking.

Schneider said this was less of a concept review and more a reaffirmation of the density of housing. There wasn't enough information to evaluate the pros and cons of the concept.

Wiersum agreed. His natural inclination was to wonder what the houses would look like and that information was not yet available. He recommended that the applicant not come back with an application before doing a more detailed concept review.

Schmidt said the plan began with a single parcel and then the neighbors expressed interest in selling. He said there was a lot of demand and interest for this type of housing. The density would be about half of the density of the neighboring townhouses.
Bergstedt said he attended a neighborhood meeting at the beginning of the process. There were a lot of questions about the concept review process. He noted staff had not seen any type of detailed plans. The area had been planned for medium density since the 1970's so he didn't think anyone should be concerned with a medium density proposal. He said some of the neighbors inquired about the city purchasing the property for park land or open space. This would not happen and he thought the property should be developed but developed sensibly. Along with the existing Carlyle Place townhouses there were six single family parcels, four were under control. Whatever plan that comes forward involving the four parcels should be looked at more broadly to determine how the final two parcels would be integrated in an orderly way. He thought the detached villa townhomes would be very popular but looking at the plan it seemed to be very dense.

Pam Scherling, 4925 West End Lane, said the townhomes were not double the density of the proposed new development. The proposal was for six per acre and the townhomes were nine per acre. She said the proposal had one street while the townhomes had four. The four streets were curved so the townhomes looked like a neighborhood. Because of the amount of open space between the buildings there were mature trees that were able to thrive. This was also where guests parked. One of the association's challenges was the guest parking because many of the residents own boats and sometimes the boat takes up the entire garage space. She said the trees would have to be clear cut in order to get to the proposed density. She questioned who would move into the proposed houses given the pricing.

David Devins, 17100 Sandy Lane, said when he exits his driveway and enters Highway 7, traffic does not yield and he was concerned about an exit on the neighboring property with traffic going out at the same time. He said the density was way out of line. He noted there were serious water and drainage issues when Carlyle Place was built.

D. Concept plan review for redevelopment of the property located at 10101 Bren Road E

Thomas gave the staff report.

Wagner said as the council had discussed the area, the discussion was that it was going to change to a higher density. He thought there was agreement it would be a combination of businesses and residential. It was more logical that the Merchandise Mart area might have more residential, and he had argued for residential on the Datacard site as well but the
Susan Thomas  
Principal Planner  
City of Minnetonka  
14600 Minnetonka Blvd.  
Minnetonka, MN 55345  
email, sthomas@eminnetonka.com

Ms. Thomas

As we have discussed in our previous meetings, I would like to withdraw the site plan proposed for the properties at 17101, 16913 & 16901 State Highway 7.

After careful consideration I would like to submit for your review the attached concept plan for 16913 State Highway 7 that would result in three, two unit townhomes, along with a ghost plat. The ghost plat shows the same number of units on the adjoining property at 17101 State highway 7 plus 1 additional unit on 16913. In order to meet the guide plan of no fewer than 4 units per acre, I intend to transfer 7,000 sq ft of the 16913 property I have under contract to the owner of the adjoining 17101 property. This is achieved by having the one way exit outbound on the 17101 property in the event I can get control of said property.

In designing the layout of the roads and townhomes, the existing entrance(s) to the property was utilized. The homes were positioned to maximize views and stay outside the required setbacks and high priority was given to tree preservation.

House plans start just under 1,500 sq ft, with optional sunroom and loft they increase to 2,223 of above ground finished square footage. The market I am targeting is Empty Nesters who want to stay in Minnetonka but can't (or won't) pay the high prices for existing newly constructed one-level, maintenance free homes. I anticipate the base price will be $489,900.

I look forward to working with you on this project and hope we can get it through all the required steps for full entitlement.

If you have any thoughts or questions, Please give me a call.

THANK YOU

Robert T Schmidt  
612-812-0000 cell

See Attached:

Proposed site plan on 16913, Ghost Plat continuing onto 17101, Front elevation of Twin Home,  
First floor plan and loft floor plan.
VILLA WEST
CONCEPT PLAN
2030 Land Use Plan

Map prepared by: City of Minnetonka
Section F  Land Use Plan Implementation

The following land use implementation section describes the methods that the City of Minnetonka will utilize to initiate the implementation of the Minnetonka 2030 Vision according to the planning strategies for the growth strategy themes listed in Section B of this chapter. The implementation methods also consider the conditions and policies established in the other chapters of the 2030 Comprehensive Guide Plan.

This section establishes the land use categories and review criteria to guide private and public decisions regarding development and redevelopment in accordance with the targeted planning areas (residential neighborhoods, villages, regional areas/corridors, and transportation/natural area corridors) within the city. The implementation methods include:

* the 2030 land use definitions;
* the 2030 land use plan map;
* the 2030 population, household and employment forecasts;
* the overall development review criteria, including those established in Sections C and D of this chapter, to determine consistency of development and redevelopment projects with the land use plan; and
* implementation procedures that include city regulations (the zoning and subdivision ordinances) and specific 2030 Comprehensive Guide Plan amendment criteria that pertain primarily to the land use chapter text and 2030 land use map.

2030 Land Use Definitions

The land use districts should not be confused with the zoning designations of property. The land use districts describe general land uses and may include other criteria to be considered when development and redevelopment projects are reviewed by the city to ensure that the project meets the 2030 Comprehensive Guide Plan policies and the appropriate policies and strategies of other chapters of the plan. The corresponding zoning designation and associated performance standards describe specific criteria that must be met before development can occur on property.

The city’s land use definitions follow, according to the general land use category. Appendix IV-A of this chapter provides illustrative examples of the specific types of uses found within each land use category.

1. Residential Land Use Districts

Prior to 1979, the medium- and high-density residential definitions restricted densities to five to eight, and nine to 12 units per acre, respectively. The definitions were changed, as part of a comprehensive planning effort, to allow a greater density to provide more opportunities for housing choice (variety and cost), recognition of the rising cost of land in Minnetonka, and to bring the density standards more in conformance with other metropolitan area communities and Metropolitan Council policies.
The density definitions are expressed in terms of ranges to allow for development flexibility and compatibility with natural resource and other site specific characteristics of property. Therefore, an appropriate density for a particular use may be at the lower end of the density range rather than the higher end.

Further, the density definitions do not specify the type of housing; rather, the zoning ordinance specifies the type of housing and specific standards that must be met by a particular development. The decision regarding the specific density for a particular property is made during the development review process, where the following conditions are considered by the city:

- The existing environmental conditions of the property including wetlands, floodplains, steep slopes and the quality of existing vegetation;
- The specific site plan including the type of housing units proposed and requirements for development facilities such as stormwater ponding, municipal sewer and water, etc.;
- The existing and requested zoning classification for the property; and
- The surrounding neighborhood characteristics.

A. Low-density residential: development that ranges in density from two to four dwelling units per acre.

Most residential neighborhoods that contain existing single-family homes in the city are designated for low-density residential uses. Although low-density uses include detached single family housing types other residential housing types such as duplexes and attached townhomes are included provided that the overall density does not exceed four units per acre. This land use district is established to recognize the primary residential development pattern in the city and accommodate housing goals, including affordable and mid-priced housing.

B. Medium-density residential: residential density ranges from more than four to 12 units per acre.

Typically, this land use district includes attached housing types such as small-lot single family developments (“zero lot line”), duplexes, townhouses, “quads,” and low-rise multiple family buildings. This land use designation is used to:

- Encourage and allow the opportunity for residential project design techniques that incorporate natural resource protection and open space preservation techniques such as “clustering”.
- Create appropriate transitions between different and more intense land uses and low-density areas.
- Encourage opportunities for residential development near and within village and regional centers, employment centers or major transportation corridors.
- Broaden housing choice, especially with an increasingly aging population and accommodate housing goals, including affordable and mid-priced housing.

Development within medium-density residential areas should incorporate:

1. Design techniques that facilitate natural resource protection and open space preservation; and
2. Buffers and/or transitions between more intense land uses and low-density areas.
Environmental features such as wetlands, floodplains, steep slopes, and heavily vegetated areas should be used, as available, as buffers. Developments should incorporate appropriate transitions, such as landscaping and other land use or design features between non-residential and residential uses of a lower density.

C. High-density residential: residential developments with densities above 12 units per acre.

Typical high density residential development consists of apartment or condominium units in multistory buildings. The intent of this district is to provide the opportunities for residential developments that:

- serve a wide range of income group and changing lifestyles;
- are in close proximity to services, employment centers and transportation corridors, especially transit routes; and
- broaden housing choice, especially with an increasingly aging population and accommodate housing goals, including affordable and mid-priced housing.

As is the case with medium-density residential development, development within high-density residential areas should incorporate:

1. Design techniques that facilitate natural resource protection and open space preservation, and buffers and/or transitions between more intense land uses and low-density areas.

2. Buffers and/or transitions between more intense land uses and lower density areas. Environmental features such as wetlands, floodplains, steep slopes, and heavily vegetated areas should be incorporated, as available, within buffers. Developments should incorporate appropriate transitions, such as landscaping and other land use or design features between non-residential and lower density residential uses.

High-density residential development projects should occur in a planned manner, with specific consideration given to all uses within an area and also to impacts on adjacent developments, services and transportation. Development will not be encouraged to occur until appropriate services and infrastructure are available or programmed.

2. Business Land Use Districts

Business land uses typically include categories of uses that are measured by the intensity of development and off-site impacts. These uses are found in the village areas, regional areas and corridors of the city. Additionally, business land use districts apply to several planned corporate campuses such as the Cargill and Welsch developments in the city.

The following describe the categories of business uses in the city.

A. Office

The office land use district provides locations for administrative, executive, professional or other offices and related service uses, such as financial institutions, lodging, day care and similar uses. It is not intended for retail uses that serve the general public. The office designation can be used, if designed appropriately, as a transitional use between residential and more intense commercial districts.

B. Service commercial

The service commercial land use district is a land use district used in the I-394 Corridor and other specific areas. It is considered a tool that increases flexibility in siting uses that