

**CHANHASSEN PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING  
JULY 17, 2018**

**Chairman Aller called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Andrew Aller, Mark Undestad, Steve Weick, Nancy Madsen, John Tietz, and Mark Randall

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Michael McGonagill

**STAFF PRESENT:** Kate Aanenson, Community Development Director; Bob Generous, Senior Planner; Vanessa Strong, Water Resources Coordinator; and George Bender, Assistant City Engineer

**PUBLIC PRESENT:**

Katrina Fiihr	BDH & Young
Jeff Gears	BDH & Young
Patrick Schneider	
Bob Ayotte	6213 Cascade Pass
Danly Jones	7026 Pima Lane
Kris Lenk	6895 Lucy Ridge Lane
Mark Gempler	1877 Topaz Drive
Kevin Sundem	1845 Topaz Drive
Geri & Greg Stewart	1893 Topaz Drive
Meredith McGuirk	1770 Lucy Ridge Court
Jeff Cannon	1810 Emerald Lane
Charles Loeffler	7327 Fawn Hill Road
Deborah Medeiros	6820 Lucy Ridge Lane
Tamara Sather	7090 Utica Lane
Joanne & Bill Lambrecht	6990 Utica Lane
Ryan Johnson	Assessor
Denny Scheppmann	6740 Lakeway Drive
Barry Dallavalle	6960 Utica Lane
Sam Kimball	6748 Kingston Drive
Joy Gorra	1680 West 78 <sup>th</sup> Street
Cara & Angelo Galioto	1805 Emerald Lane
Dale & Gloria Carlson	6900 Utica Lane
Josh Kimber	2060 Majestic Way
Mehdi Ayouché	2102 Majestic Way
John & Julie Butcher	6915 Lucy Ridge Lane
Andy Lenk	6895 Lucy Ridge Lane

Matt & Deb Chambers	2169 Red Fox Circle
Stacy Semler	517 Mission Hills Way West
Laura Tiebert	6420 Fox Path
Tim Nordberg	2126 Majestic Way
Dake Chatfield	2200 Majestic Way
Ron & Mary Kneedten	6850 Utica Terrace
Jon Hebeisen	2150 Majestic Way
Brian Hugh	7441 Windmill Drive
Steve Wallace	6900 Lucy Ridge Lane

**PUBLIC HEARING:**  
**CONTROL CONCEPTS: SITE PLAN REVIEW.**

Generous: Thank you Chairman Aller, commissioners. Control Concepts, Planning Case 2018-11 is a public hearing for a site plan review for a 54,600 square foot office warehouse building. The public hearing is tonight. This item is scheduled to go forward to City Council on August 13<sup>th</sup>. The property is located at 8077 Century Boulevard. It's one of the last two properties in the Arboretum Business Park. To the north of this site is a city owned land, part of the Chanhassen Nature Preserve. This property is Lot 2, Block 1, Arboretum Business Park 7<sup>th</sup> Addition. The subdivision for this addition was approved in 1997. The overall project for Arboretum Business Park actually began in 1992 with initial preliminary approval in 1997 so this has been a long time coming and this completes one of the elements that the City's been looking forward to. It's called the Wetland Trail which goes along the north side and to the east of this property and connects to an existing trail in the Chanhassen Nature Preserve. The request is for a two story, 54,000 square foot multi tenant building. There's only space in it for two tenants but that's what makes it a multi tenant building. The property is guided in our Comprehensive Plan for office industrial uses. It's zoned planned unit development and is part of the Arboretum Business Park. Office manufacturing and warehouse uses are permitted within this PUD so the uses that are proposed in the building would be permitted by the zoning district. The property itself is approximately 5.2 acres in size. The floor area ratio is less than, is around 2 so there's twice as much, 5 times as much land as there is building that is going on this site. However there's a plateau where the building is going in that's about 970 feet. The property drops down to the northeast to a 940 foot elevation so there is significant elevation change on the property and that's part of the issue or the concern that staff has had. There's a retaining wall that wraps around the parking lot area. At it's high point in the northeast corner it's about a 17 foot tall retaining wall. This is the wetland trail that is being developed in conjunction with this. It was part of the original approval but they were waiting for this site plan to come forward before it was constructed. Control Concept is proposing taking over the west end of this building. The extreme western portion of the building is two stories. The eastern half is one story construction but it's a 38 foot tall to the top of the parapets so it's a pretty tall looking building. Again this is something that the, has been a little bit in flux. This picture doesn't present a true representation of the building materials and so the applicant's architect will be discussing that as part of their presentation but it would be an exposed, an aggregate or concrete tip up construction panels.

They are proposing the use of metal panels in the corner of the building and as highlights on the top and to help break up the expanse of the walls. This would be the entrance for the, it's sort of backwards and I'll let them get into that but the height of the building, it's articulated. It provides a lot of windows on the west side of the building which will be visible from Century Boulevard. That's their primary office space and then as you go into the building they have manufacturing and warehouse space going on. Again here's the first floor layout. This is a future tenant space. They don't have the ultimate design so it'll be a shell and when someone leases the space they'll come in and do the tenant finish that they need for it. Warehouse area. Office area. And on the second floor which is only the extreme western end of the building they have additional office space and manufacturing space. The grading plan, they are going to mass grade the site including providing grading for this trail system. Some of our issues with the design and layout of the building is this parking lot area is very near to the top of the retaining wall and we're concerned about snow storage in the winter and where they're going to push the snow. We have been working with them on the retaining wall design and we're still in conversations with that. We received the schematic for what they're proposing which would be the big block type retaining wall that you'd see like at Bandimere Park and it's subject to the Parks Director approval and review of the final plans. We believe that shall be going forward. However there is insufficient space on site for snow storage and we're looking potentially in the southeast corner of the parking lot that they would be able to provide an open area for them to put the snow and store for it until it can be removed from the site. Again there's a 17 foot elevation drop from the top of this retaining wall down to the trail below it. To meet ADA requirements they're trying to maintain a 5 percent slope maximum on the trail system and then once we get off the site it will connect to existing trail that is in place. Landscaping plan. They're providing a basic landscaping. There are, there's a condition in there that there's additional oaks that are being required of the developer as a part of the site plan. And shrubs along this parking area on Century Boulevard to help screen it from traffic that goes by. Utilities. Sewer and water are in Century Boulevard so they will connect to it. One of the conditions is that they connect to our existing manhole for our sanitary sewer rather than putting in a new one and the applicant has agreed to make that change as part of their approval. There is an underground stormwater system that they're proposing for the site. There are some, we would need to get additional information from them to verify that it's providing true treatment for the water before it discharges into the city stormwater system and goes down to our stormwater pond which is located just south of Coulter Boulevard off of Century so. Again their stormwater system would tie in and discharge around to the northwest corner of the property. Sewer and water come in on the south side of the building. Staff is recommending approval of the site plan subject to the conditions in the staff report and adoption of the Findings of Fact and Recommendation. Again the applicant as a part of their presentation will discuss the architectural detailing on this and mention also the retaining wall discussion that we're having. With that I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Aller: Does any of the commissioners have questions at this point in time? Alright, hearing none. Would the Water Resources Coordinator like to wait until the applicant discusses my

questions regarding the water flow and runoff issues or would you like to espouse some comments on what your thoughts are on that now?

Strong: We'll wait until they had their chance.

Aller: Thank you.

Strong: They might address them there.

Aller: Okay, if the applicant would like to come forward. Please state your name and representational capacity and tell us about your project.

Jeff Gears: Good evening commissioners, I'm Jeff Gears with the architectural firm BDH & Young and we've been working with Control Concepts to develop the building plan to date. We also have the civil engineer with us and I'll let them address some of the comments pertaining to stormwater management but what I'd like to speak about this evening, as Bob had mentioned when we submitted drawings for site plan review to the City we were still working with the client in regards to the exterior precast material. We knew that we were going to be using a precast panel. We've been working with, the intent is to be working with Fabcon and so the original renderings that were submitted suggested a design intent. Since then we've elaborated on that design so I'll start with where the concept image started. Right here? Alright. This is a photo from an existing building and what was decided upon is the aesthetic that was, the client was hoping to achieve is a, what Fabcon refers to as a random rake on the bottom portion and then exposed aggregate on the upper portion. That being said one potential option that we're still exploring, Fabcon is in the process of producing larger samples for our review would be this scenario where on the bottom they could apply a sealer that would not actually, that's not a different color or stain. It's just a sealer that makes the concrete look darker so we have a little bit more tonal quality. That's still, we're still exploring that. We haven't seen a final sample. But as that relates to the elevations, the intent is very similar to I think what was presented in the drawings submitted. It's just the panels have a little more accuracy so you can see what we're proposing in attempts to break down the building massing slightly. We have over in this area and on this area where the office space is we have this random rake going up to the second floor area. And as we work our way to the east side of the building where the warehouse space is located the raking is only on the bottom portion. So this would be a scenario if we did not use the sealer. And then this is a rendering that depicts what it might look like if we choose to go that route. Again we're still in exploration with the precast manufacturer. This is a sample of the color of the panel. This is not showing any of the raking. They cannot achieve that raking for our review at a sample of this size so once we get a bigger sample we can share that. As mentioned there will be some accent materials. There will be, this front corner which would be facing northwest is the main entry for the office space so in lieu of precast panels in this area we're proposing a metal panel and it will be a combination of a metal panel that has a clean anodized look to match the windows. There'll be an accent color if red, The areas that are reflected, that are shown darker. Unfortunately I don't have that sample but it's a perforated

metal. It's basically there's round holes punched through it and so that's what we're seeing up here and above these other glass elements to help break up the building massing. Originally on the rendering that was submitted originally we had a red flashing at the top of the parapet. We have changed that to be a dark metal that would be similar to what we have at the main entry. So we're limiting the amount of red on the building just to an accent band. So that is all I have for the presentation of the changes that we've made to the exterior from what was submitted.

Aller: I guess any questions at this point in time? As far as the articulation for the color or the materials. Commissioner Madsen.

Madsen: And this question may be, staff may have to address it but are all these materials that you're using, are they, well for a PUD it's for a better design. To use better materials. Those sorts of things and are all the materials that you're proposing in alignment with the materials that the City would require for a PUD?

Generous: They were all specified as a part of the design standards for this PUD as acceptable material. They're using the metal as an accent rather than a primary material and so that's one of the requirements that we have. So plus they have a lot of window space in here that really helps to break up the mass and they've alternated the massing on the side with that metal panel and the glass door front openings so yes we'd say it complied with the PUD standards.

Madsen: Okay thank you.

Tietz: Chairman Aller.

Aller: Commissioner Tietz.

Tietz: I don't know if this is an appropriate question for Bob or for the architect but I'm just, I'm concerned a little bit about the location of the trail beneath a 17 foot wall and so tight to the property line. It's a pretty expansive use of the site. I assume that there's been other options explored and I'm just wondering if, you know looking at the aerial photo it's not probably indicative of what's on site but it looks like if you went off the northeast corner of the property, it appears to be some trees out in that wetland area which might tell me that there's some ground out there. I'm just wondering if there's a route that could get extend north from the northeast corner up to the parkway or if there could be a route that's adjacent. Even though it's between two industrial properties if there could be a route that hugs the south property line directly east and west. Just seems like we're pushing a trail in a very, I don't want to say precarious but it's not a real hospitable area if you've got a 17 foot block wall looming above you.

Jeff Gears: I think you ask a very good question. It's actually been something that we've been having great amounts of conversation about in the last couple days. To answer your question yes. We've looked at a couple solutions. The location of the trail, and correct me if I'm wrong was something that we had negotiated and worked out with the park department where their

preferred route was. There was conversation about the possibility of locating it on the south side of the site. I don't think that was, the choice that the park department nor the client would prefer so it's location is I think the route that was most preferred. The challenge we have is, the economics of the site and the amount the site can be developed with the Bluff Creek overlay district and the wetlands and the building size and massing is really a reflection of the size required to make it an economic success for the client and then the net result of the parking is what's required to meet that size so we're really kind of between a rock and a hard place. If the building gets much smaller it's not going to be economically feasible for the client. If we reduce the number of parking we're not meeting city requirements. The trail is in a location that we understand the park would prefer and we all understand that the 17 foot high retaining wall is not the best potential solution but right now it's the one that works. So we're looking at alternatives. Other ways that we can maybe address that. I do understand that we've had communication with the park department and they have similar walls of similar height in the city that are used in parks and it's my understanding, I wasn't part of the conversation but I've been told that that was an application that they were okay with that if we used the larger block type wall with a fencing material on the top. I don't know if that answers your question.

Tietz: Well I guess that's as far as I can go today.

Jeff Gears: Yeah.

Tietz: But I'm looking at this ceiling and it's probably not even 12 feet.

Jeff Gears: Yeah if there would be opportunity to potentially develop the site a bit into the Bluff Creek area I think that would be an advantage to everyone but understood that might be, there would be a variance process involved with that and we're trying to see if there's a way we can resolve this without having to go that route.

Tietz: Okay thank you.

Aller: Any additional questions Vanessa his response... What I would like to hear is about the water runoff. How you're going to deal with the environmental impact. It looks like we're still waiting on some information to go to Riley-Purgatory-Bluff Creek regarding the Bluff Creek and the watershed district and it's rules and regulations. Where are we on that?

Jeff Gears: I will defer to the civil engineer who is with me tonight.

Trevor Guys: Commissions, my name is Trevor Guys. I'm a civil engineer with Loucks.

Aller: Welcome.

Trevor Guys: And we have been working with Riley-Purgatory. We received their initial review comments and they had deemed us incomplete but gave us quite a bit of feedback. We have

since adjusted our design to go with more of an underground filtration system since there were spots in the site where the soils allowed that to happen so we adjust to do an underground infiltration system. We have addressed most of their comments and we have resubmitted.

Aller: Do we have an idea when they expect a response back?

Trevor Guys: I don't, no. It's been a week and a half though. Typically they're around a 3 week review period so.

Aller: Great. So why don't you explain for the people that are present here and for myself included what that, what your plan process is to get rid of the water.

Trevor Guys: So we are capturing runoff around the site with on site catch basins that's going into a large diameter pipe that's solid that wraps around the site. That helps reduce rates that the water's going to run off the site and then after that it dumps into a secondary system that's perforated so that allows even more water to percolate back into the soils underground and that would refeed that wetland and the pond coincidentally.

Aller: Okay. Any questions regarding environmental at this point?

Tietz: No. We seem to be moving in that direction with a lot of projects in the city. It appears to be a good solution to work with stormwater.

Aller: Alright. And then with regard to the wall, is there any runoff impact based upon the wall?

Trevor Guys: So the nice thing with, well there's parking above it which is a concern but the nice thing with that is we are capturing all the runoff that would potentially go at the wall and you might see some freeze thaw issues on other sites but we are taking that aware from the wall underground and remediating any issues that we might have with water infiltrating behind the wall.

Aller: Great. Additional questions or comments? Commissioner Randall.

Randall: ...for the snow capture.

Trevor Guys: So as Bob had mentioned we're looking at the southeast corner. What I think ideally us and the client want to do is maybe look at regrading that to take that wall and bring it up north so it doesn't extend so far and then we can open up that area to push snow and store in that Bluff Creek overlay district and it is our understanding that that is permitted in the city so that is our plan of attack.

Aller: Alright any additional questions based on the application? Thank you very much.

Trevor Guys: Thank you.

Jeff Gears: Thank you.

Aller: So my question before we open it up to the public hearing would be, what are your thoughts on the water runoff situation and the application that's been, I assume we've got a copy of the new application.

Strong: Yeah I haven't had a chance honestly to fully review it. We have taken the policy at the moment that we try not to dual regulate so I've been following along with their process through Riley-Purgatory and then not duplicating that one. At the moment it's not how unique for them to not make it through completion the first time around. They do have some challenges. There are some challenges with verifying that their connection to the city is a connection that they can make and the city system has that capacity to take it. They have to prove that. That's not through the watershed district. That's just through the City but that's also pretty standard. They certainly have the land to do you know underground detention so it depends on how they design their system. We'll see.

Aller: Very good, thank you. And Mr. Bender, with regard to the wall and the, we obviously have the requirement that it be properly engineered. Based on your experience and review of the plans are we fairly comfortable with the fact that this can actually happen?

Bender: I believe the wall certainly can be built in a safe manner. One thing that comes to my mind when I'm looking at something like that is, the same as Commissioner Tietz was referring to is, you know when you walk along that you know you might feel kind of like the ant below the skyscraper a little bit and you know making sure that when I'm walking along a trail like that that I don't have anything that's going to be coming off of it. You know blowing on top of me so they are proposing a fence along there. Another thing that comes to my mind is maybe that wall could be extended upwards a little bit so that it creates a little bit of a parapet to kind of catch things that could be blowing in the wind or you know that could be going over the wall so.

Aller: Thank you. Commissioner Weick.

Weick: Now that you've brought it up I guess. I assume there's no space to split the wall like, to have it be offset.

Bender: Terraced.

Weick: Yeah. There's just not enough space to do that with the parking spaces that are required right?

Bender: We have had that conversation with the applicant. Trying to give appropriate advice as far as alternatives. That was one that we asked them to look at. Again the response was that you



know the site is viability of the site regarding parking and building size you know as taking priority versus terracing.

Weick: Yeah.

Bender: And trying to create a flat spot that would be less imposing.

Weick: And for reference do we know roughly how, there's some tall retaining walls at Bandimere. Do we know?

Aanenson: Yeah and also the one that's under construction right now at, on the other side at Lyman and 101.

Weick: Yeah.

Aanenson: Yeah going by that new subdivision.

Weick: I mean roughly do we know? It's okay if you don't.

Aanenson: They're pretty tall.

Weick: Yeah I was going to say.

Aanenson: You can't see somebody. It's got to be 13-20 feet yeah.

Weick: Yeah and I run along there so I would assume it's going to be similar to that.

Bender: It will feel open on the other side and so you know I mean I wouldn't be surprised if people naturally kind of walk on the part that's almost 12 feet away from the wall just you know so it isn't as imposing so.

Aller: Okay. Anything else from the commissioners at this point? If not we'll open up the public hearing portion of this item. This again is an opportunity for an individual present to come forward. Speak either for or against an item before us. Anyone wishing to come forward? Seeing no one come forward I'm going to close the public hearing at this point and put it out for commissioner comments and action. Commissioner Weick.

Weick: I thought the, you know there were some questions in the report that were answered well. I'm satisfied with the water runoff as well so I think it's a good use on the land.

Aller: Any other comments?

Tietz: We're playing designer over here. If you, if as George indicated you step that wall and pushed it out and because as there's as indicated there's a ADA or accessibility issue with the grade of the path. If that step out was wide enough that that could that path or trail be on that mid-portion? Or is that not practical or is that a problem with the city ownership and maintenance and who knows what?

Bender: Maybe I'll try to respond to this.

Aller: It's not to scale.

Bender: This portion of the trail right here, this is the wetland itself and this is the buffer and then the trail is squeezed between here and where kind of the top where the site starts. So there's your design point that is creating you know the toughest spot. So for it to go further to the north it could do that along here but keep in mind that that are is dropping so when the trail needs to tie back in, you know the grades will have to increase to get back up to where it needs to meet here so they'd have to kind of look at that a little closer to see whether they could create any additional space by moving that trail along this area but you know it can't really go any further to the northeast at this point.

Tietz: Thanks.

Aller: Any additional comments? Commissioner Weick.

Weick: Every time you ask a question about the trail I think of something else so keep going. Where are people going now?

Generous: There's a connection off of 82<sup>nd</sup> and Century.

Weick: Right. Here right?

Generous: So yeah. It comes down in this corner. Wraps around this stormwater pond and then connects to there. Just to the south of...

Weick: And then it dead ends?

Generous: No, then it continues around the wetland complex. So what they're, this is the last connection to bring it.

Weick: Otherwise there's an existing path then that goes along the back of the?

Generous: Yes it goes right here.

Weick: I mean there's a way around this building.

Bender: There are some people trails through that, you know people are just walking over land similar to a deer trail. They're making their own path so.

Generous: Which follows basically the alignment that this trail that's proposed.

Weick: Okay.

Aller: Additional comments, questions? Otherwise I'll entertain a motion. Commissioner Madsen.

Madsen: I make a motion the Chanhassen Planning Commission recommends approval of the site plan for a 54,600 square foot office warehouse and manufacturing building subject to the conditions of approval and adoption of the Findings of Fact and Recommendation.

Aller: I have a motion. Do I have a second?

Weick: Second.

Aller: Any further discussion or comments? I think it meets all the standard requirements and since we're, as long as it does that we're kind of obligated to go ahead and approve. I would suggest we approve and move it along to the City Council for action. I would only request that the City Council take to heart the comments that are made and I guess we'll see what happens with the new Riley creek decision and how that comes down and to continue to explore any modifications that would be favorable for both safety as well as efficacy of the wall. Any other comments?

**Madsen moved, Weick seconded that the Planning Commission recommends the City Council the site plan for a 54,600, two story building, plans prepared by Loucks and BDH & Young, dated 06-15-2018, subject to the following conditions:**

### **Building**

1. Sheets C4.1 & C4.2
  - a. Utility notes 8 & 9. Sanitary sewer must be schedule 40. MPC table 701.1
  - b. Utility notes 11, 12 & 13. Minnesota rules 4715 is no longer the State plumbing code. Minnesota rules 4714 is the current code. Please change all references to 4714 along with the current code sections.
2. Submit details on the storm detention system.

3. Retaining walls over 4 feet in heights require an engineered design.
4. Plans must be submitted by a design professional on the proposed structure. All design information should be included (i.e. exiting, code analysis, proposed occupancies and occupancies).

### **Environmental Resources**

1. The applicant shall revise the landscape plan to add three bur oaks to the north property line native seed area.
2. The applicant shall revise the landscape plan to add a row of shrubs for screening of the parking area along Century Blvd. The screening shall be a minimum of 3 feet tall at maturity.
3. The Bluff Creek Overlay District shall be shown on the site and landscape plans.
4. The applicant shall install Conservation Area signs at the edge of the Bluff Creek Overlay District at the north and south property lines and at the trail. The signs are available for purchase at the Chanhasen Public Works.

### **Fire**

1. Fire Lane No Parking areas for all the curbing except those directly adjacent to parking spaces will need to be painted yellow with NO PARKING FIRE LANE signs posted per city/fire code.

### **Parks**

1. The developer shall be responsible for planning, engineering, and constructing the “wetland trail.” Connection points for this new trail shall be the terminus of the Trotters Ridge trail, the intersection of Century Boulevard and West 82<sup>nd</sup> Street, and the intersection of Century Boulevard and Water Tower Place. Bid documents, including plans and specifications, shall be approved by the Park & Recreation Director and City Engineer prior to soliciting bids. Project bidding shall occur in a competitive environment with a minimum of three bids being received. The results of the bidding process shall be reviewed with the Park & Recreation Director and City Engineer prior to award. Cash payment for trail construction shall be made from the City of Chanhasen to the developer upon completion, inspection, and acceptance of the trail.
2. Trail easements within Lot 2, Block 1, Arboretum Business Park 7<sup>th</sup> shall be dedicated to the city to accommodate the “wetland trail”.

### **Planning**

1. The applicant shall enter into a site plan agreement and provide the security required by it prior to receiving a building permit.
2. Additional architectural articulation shall be provided for the second unit primary access.
3. Add bike racks as well as an outdoor seating/picnic area.
4. A separate sign permit application, review and approval shall be required prior to site sign installation.

### **Water Resources and Engineering**

1. The limits of the Bluff Creek Overlay District shall be identified throughout the plan set.
2. Show the western curb line along Century Boulevard and the crosswalk at Water Tower Place throughout the plan set.
3. Vacate drainage and utility easements except the standard 10 foot wide easement associated with the front of the parcel in addition to the standard 5 foot wide easement associated with the side and rear portions of the parcel.
4. The wetland, wetland buffer, and the Bluff Creek Overlay District shall be designated as Outlots.
5. Provide a permanent easement over the trail throughout the parcel.
6. Apply for an Encroachment Agreement for the private sidewalk.
7. Add detailed design for the retaining wall including a profile, proposed construction materials, and railing/fence. The trail is designed to be on the bottom side of a retaining wall that has portions of it detailed to be 17 feet in height. The safety of the users of the trail needs to be coordinated.
8. Consider adjustment of the site design to facilitate maintenance and snow removal.
9. Include a detail for tree protection.
10. Add note to protect the existing line of trees on the shared property with the parcel to the south.
11. Detail asphalt cut-out and replacement in the street to facilitate the installation of the concrete aprons.
12. Install ADA pedestrian ramp for trail crossing at Century Boulevard.

13. Adjust curb radius design to meet city detail #5207 in association with the commercial entrances. A radius smaller than 20 feet may be appropriate for the shared property with the parcel to the south.
14. Adjust slope of the northern commercial entrance to meeting city detail #5207.
15. Replace any striping removed in Century Boulevard.
16. All parking stalls shall be 9 feet in width including handicapped stalls.
17. Add a radius to the trail where it connects to the existing bituminous trail to facilitate maintenance. Include additional tree removal area.
18. All striping and signage shall meet the requirements of the MN-MUTCD manual.
19. Indicate lineal slope design for the trail.
20. All disturbed areas require a minimum of 6 inches of topsoil and must meet decompaction requirements.
21. Salvage existing topsoil and indicate stockpile location.
22. Add inlet protection in the catch basins on the west side of Century Boulevard.
23. Add rock construction entrance at the southern commercial entrance.
24. Extend the silt fence installation as appropriate to protect from construction.
25. The patch for the watermain connection shall be the full width of Century Boulevard.
26. Detail 5302A is shown twice on the SWPPP plan sheet.
27. Utilize C900 PVC pipe for the water service pipe material in lieu of DIP. Fittings shall be epoxy coated.
28. Sanitary manhole detail #5101 requires the pipe connections to be sealed with a cored and sealed connection. The utility plan details a build over manhole for the sanitary service connection. Add notes identifying the pipe connection requirements.
29. Review sanitary design from a future maintenance and a cost perspective. Adding Sanitary manhole #1 approximately 35 feet to the south of an existing manhole is questionable. The sanitary service line could be routed directly to the existing manhole. The invert would need to be reconstructed and a cored and booted connection would be required.

30. Applicant is permitted a connection to municipal stormdrain system after meeting treatment and discharge requirements of city and RPBCWD. Applicant is responsible for ensuring municipal system is capable of handling the additional capacity.
31. Applicant is responsible for any improvements necessary to the municipal system to meet capacity and regulatory requirements from the point of connection up to and including the outlet/receiving water body
32. Connection is not permitted in catchbasin. Must connect to storm main in Century Blvd. Include access manhole. Invert elevation in the manhole shall allow for 0.1 inches of fall through the structure.
33. Access MH missing from western most section of Contech structure.
34. Proprietary filtration devices should be used as pretreatment vs post treatment.
35. Identify snow storage location on plans.
36. Identify stockpile locations on plan.
37. Bluff Creek Overlay District (BCOD) signs and locations are required on plans. Signs are required at each point the BCOD crosses the property boundary, every 100 feet, every point of deflection.
38. Include BCOD sign detail.
39. The proposed redevelopment will need Riley-Purgatory-Bluff Creek Watershed District (RPBCWD) permits.
40. It is the applicant's responsibility to ensure and submit proof that permits are received from all other agencies with jurisdiction over the project (i.e. Army Corps of Engineers, DNR, MnDOT, Carver County, RPBCWD, Board of Water and Soil Resources, PCA, etc.).
41. Project will require stormwater management fees associated with city development review and permitting process.
42. The city is in agreement with the RPBCWD comments identified in the email dated June 26, 2018 titled 'RPBCWD Permit 2018-43: Control Concepts – Initial Completeness Review Comments.' With one exception: J10 – the city requests applicant provide additional performance monitoring field data to support manufacturers removal estimates.

**All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously with a vote of 6 to 0.**

**PUBLIC HEARING:**  
**2040 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.**

Aller: Second item before us tonight is the review of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. This matter has been before us throughout the year. We took it section by section. It's been on the website and there have been meetings where this has been discussed. The current form has been provided and again is on the website for review. I don't think it will take too long to move through the sections and maybe highlight the sections and the purpose of this hearing is to again take public comment on the matter before us and forward it to the City Council for final action. So at this time we'll take that matter up.

Generous: Thank you Chairman Aller, commissioners. As you stated we've had numerous opportunities to review this plan. We've had at least 8 meetings in this chamber regarding it. There were 2 open houses that the City had. We also went out to last year's 4<sup>th</sup> of July celebration. Had a little kiosk and the Feb Festival to try to get people's comments and interest in this document. The Comprehensive Plan provides a guide for the future development of the city. We look at as the build out plan for the community. What the land uses would be approximately and it provides the goals and policies to reaching that buildout. We anticipate that we will be fully developed by 2040. The Comprehensive Plan contains 10 chapters. The first one is an introduction which expresses the City's vision for itself as well as we've incorporated all the goals and policies from all the chapters in the Comprehensive Plan right up front so people could know what our vision is and how we intend to get there. The second chapter is our land use. There were some changes that were made based on comments that we received from the review agencies. Down in the Minnesota River valley there are some wildlife refuges that were shown as agricultural land uses. We've not re-guided them for parks and open spaces which is what they really are and there's no misunderstanding about what the future holds for that. The City did also, we have a 1.9 acre parcel of land off of Powers Boulevard in the northern part of the city that we're preserving as permanent open space. People see it on the land use plan as low density residential and they want to develop it for us and so we're taking that out also so. We do as part of the land use element there were 3 requests for land use amendments. We provided all the information in the report from what they presented in our analysis. At the present time we are not recommending that any of those amendments be adopted for the individual properties. They would have an opportunity when they came in for development to request either land use amendments or changes in the zoning and so we believe that would be the appropriate time for that to happen. Again as part of our review of this we, our GIS system has gotten better. We picked up 40 acres of land as part of our analysis. However we de-annexed 5 acres of that with Cathcart Park and that's now in the city of Shorewood so that's why some of the numbers have changed. The total numbers have changed over time but it's better geographic information system analysis. As part of the housing plan we've looked at the, how the city's going to meet the diversity of housing that we have in here. We've done our analysis for the multi-family land that say there is sufficient land available to meet Met Council targets for the community to provide housing that is affordable or work force type housing. We also discuss the different strategies that are involved in providing that type of opportunity and we acknowledges when we would use those tools and when we would not use them. Natural resources. The only change we had was about the solar, we clarified the goal on solar. We want to provide the opportunity for people to do it and in fact our ordinance does permit it already so. The City's biggest thing is preserving our water resources and preservation of trees and diversifying our tree canopy because the rule of not having any one species dominate our



community because of insects coming in. Parks and trails. That we just adopted, it's long term the City's need for facilities that people want and it provides analysis of initiatives that the City will be undertaking in the future. Under transportation we had to expand that to show where the freight is moving. Where the trucks are actually moving on that so we got that information from Carver County as well as expansion of the light rail or the transit opportunities in the community. We showed where the park and ride lots are. There's only 2 in the city but there are some in Chaska. Victoria's looking at one and then Eden Prairie is the main hub for Southwest Transit. We want to provide transportation, we went through all our deficient roadways in here. We have a system classification that has a hierarchy of roadways and based on that hierarchy the city also reviews it as part of any development to preserve it's transportation capacities. The sewer chapter looks at providing sewer to the community. Again we long term we believe that we can service everyone and our plan shows that we can do it. We provide a staging plan. Our preference is to use existing facilities rather than expanding new facilities but we show how they can be expanded and what the sizes would generally be. It has a general staging plan. There are several critical facilities that need to be constructed for the rest of the community to develop. There's several lift stations south of 212 that need to go in before we can develop the southern part of the community. A water, we know that we need one more storage facility of approximately a million gallons and then we'll need 4 more wells and then we should be able to supply sufficient water to service our buildout numbers. I should go back as part of the transportation element we did make all our numbers consistent this time so that each chapter has the same number. As part of our negotiations with the Met Council we were able to up our final employment numbers by about 1,400 in 2040 so they agreed with our analysis and that the total way we wanted to go but they were moving to show that we can accommodate that with our land uses. Surface water management, I'll have Vanessa talk to you on that. And then finally in Chapter 10 is the capital improvements. That's just a snapshot right now of what we would need over the next 10 years to implement portions of the Comprehensive Plan.

Aanenson: If I may.

Aller: Yes Kate.

Aanenson: Planning Commission members. So our goal here tonight, because you've reviewed each of these and then your most recently your April 3<sup>rd</sup> we went through all this so we had jurisdictional comments which means we already had a public hearing on this whole document. This is for anybody that may be listening. And then we got feedback from the Met Council and all the other jurisdictions which would mean the DNR, surrounding communities, to making sure we're consistent and we had some of our graphics were a little bit truncated in the publication so all those have been remedied and so this is the second public hearing, just incorporating those as Mr. Generous has gone through. So the biggest component that we were still working through, which was very complex is the four watershed districts. Making sure how with the new regs that we're aligned with all those so Vanessa's been working very hard on making sure that's all consistent so that's the biggest part of the public, we expect of the public hearing tonight. I know Mr. Erhart's here to still talk about the land use request that he has in place so I'm sure he'll comment during the public hearing process but I'd like to maybe give a little bit more time to Vanessa just to explain too kind of how we worked or she worked to get all that through and into the chapter for the surface water.

Aller: Thank you and as an additional comment this is really a dual purpose chapter because for our permitting we have to have this completed and we've been behind the 8 ball on that for a little bit of a while now and so it's great that we're coming forward and we're catching up with all our requirements for the NPDES and other permits so please let us know what we're doing in Chapter 9.

Strong: Thank you. So as Kate mentioned this is a chapter of the Comprehensive Plan. It also has it's own rules and regulations under Minnesota Statute 103B and it's own requirement for review and comment which means I have to send this to the 4 watershed districts as well as Met Council for approval. Since that time, after a 60 day comment period we received all of our comments back from the watershed districts. They were all very positive in we received 3 approvals with conditions. Now these of course as you know conditions can be extensive but as in Minnehaha Creek watershed district we received an incomplete and that was primarily because their plan was actually approved while our's was out for comment. There was an overlap with that. At this point you know this version is not 30 percent bigger to have addressed all of those comments. It might not look that way but each watershed organization kind of had it's own comments and requirements that must be included in the plan. The City wanted to take on the role of being a single stop shop so in addition to just meeting state requirements we absolutely must address everything the watershed district has asked for in order to take back that regulatory role that would improve the development process for our residents and property owners so some of these are specifically to allow us to have that role. The other issue of course which is not something that necessarily is addressed by the watershed districts is we do have an older infrastructure. We have a lot of ponds and a lot of pipe and how do we take care of that and how do we maintain that when you know there, we have over 300 ponds. Over 500 wetlands. We have 12 lakes. We are a very water rich city and that's a lot of benefit but it's also something you need to balance with wanting to be a very lean and responsible city so that was another issue that we've kind of had to address on our own. So just to give you a surface view of kind of what we covered in this update. This comment response update. So as I said each watershed district had it's own comments and requirements that must be addressed in the plan and they must be included in the plan. Many of these requirements and most of them involve the adoption of their strategies, standards, goals and capital improvement projects. A lot of this was including their language verbatim. They're reflected either in the plan narrative, policies or in the implementation plan. Each watershed district did have it's own unique focus. They are all different and so they all have their own way of looking at ways that are important to them. Lower Minnesota River, many of you might assume and it would be true that they focus a lot on the river bluff standards. Unique and natural resources and features, native protection of wetlands and native areas. The Carver County WMO really wanted more focus on education and wetland and ground water protection. That was kind of their focus. Riley-Purgatory was very technical focused as well as including research studies and standards in their specific technical language that they want to make sure are included. Minnehaha Creek watershed district, their new plan if you hadn't had a chance to read it is very interesting and it's a good read. They really want to incorporate planning. They're very progressive about planning now and wanting to add value into the city's planning process and where they can come in and best fit. Help best assist the city and best work with the city. As well as then of course they were very focused on understanding our inventories and what our procedures were for implementing our surface water

management plan so, and then each one had it's own capital improvement project and policies as well and standards so that's kind of the big overview of that additional 30 percent.

Aller: Great thank you. And so my follow up question would be, as a homeowner, a business person or a developer when I come in where you use the term one stop shop. Just what would be an overview of that process if I wanted to come in and do something with my property and it involved this chapter?

Strong: So for example Control Concepts. When they were in here they would have to come in through the City. They have to apply through the City. You know we are required to have our own requirements but then they also then have to go through the watershed districts and that process as well and so they're running a dual process which seems burdensome to many people and I can understand that so in the future they would just come to the city. They still have to follow the same rules and requirements but they don't have to go through two agencies to do that now. They just go to one place.

Aller: Alright, and so if a homeowner or business person or a developer wants to know what our guidance on that is they can come in and they look at this book now and they can see that, along with that process these are the guidelines and our goals with regard to what we want to do.

Strong: Yep and the watershed districts will always be there as technical reference and also as a resource as well. They're not going anywhere and they're still the...

Aller: Thank you. Any additional questions?

Aanenson: I was just going to add one more comment before you open up the public hearing. So with the Comprehensive Plan there's going to be some follow up implementation things so you'll be seeing some ordinance changes too and maybe some of the wetland buffers. It may be some of the, yeah and surface water but there might be also too some in the code alignment too so those will all require public hearings too so there'll be plenty of opportunities to comment on those too but as part of the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan we have a timeline to go through to get some of those in place. Again going back to the one stop shop. We used to do it that way and it's burdensome for the developers and for residents when you're bouncing between the two. Especially if you have to place security. Often you have to place security in both places which is very onerous, especially for homeowners so trying to reconcile that.

Aller: Okay, thank you. Commissioner Weick.

Weick: Are we open to questions about any of this? Can I ask?

Generous: Yes.

Aanenson: Sure.

Weick: And this is specific to Section 8 on water. I recall having good conversations about not just being able to supply the amount of water that we think we need to supply but also incentive

programs potentially to conserve and encourage homeowners to use less. Is this the, in the future is this the appropriate document to start?

Aanenson: That's correct and those will be some of the implementation strategies.

Weick: Yeah.

Aanenson: But they look at as part of you have to show what your, how much water are you using. There's reduction requirements so those will be some of the things. Right now we do Water Wise. We have a tiered system on our utility so those will be some of the things that we may be revisiting.

Weick: Okay, thank you.

Aller: And of course there's crossover to just about every chapter here so we'll be hitting that with the education process as well and that's required so, yes.

Strong: We do also address in the surface water re-evaluating our credit system to allow for more of those opportunities as well because again our credit system for that type of thing is, was written in 2006 so.

Weick: Thank you.

Aller: Okay. Nothing further from the commissioners at this point in time I'll open up the public hearing portion of this particular item. So any individual wishing to come forward and speak either for or against or comment on the proposed 2040 plan. Seeing no one come forward I'll close the public hearing and remind all of you present and at home that these items can be found on the city's website for your review and that you can follow this item for action with the City Council when it moves forward. I'll entertain a motion.

Weick: I'll propose a motion.

Aller: Thank you Commissioner Weick.

Weick: The Chanhassen Planning Commission recommends that the City Council approve the 2040 Comprehensive Plan and submit the plan to the Metropolitan Council for their determination of consistency with the Metropolitan System Plans.

Aller: I have a motion. Do I have a second?

Randall: Second.

Aller: I have a valid motion and a second. Any further discussion or comment?

**Weick moved, Randall seconded that the Chanhassen Planning Commission recommends that the City Council approve the 2040 Comprehensive Plan and submit the plan to the**

**Metropolitan Council for their determination of consistency with the Metropolitan System Plans. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously with a vote of 6 to 0.**

Aanenson: Chairman just for anybody that's following this we will go at a work session at the next City Council meeting which is August 13<sup>th</sup>. At that meeting we'll go through the changes in a little bit more detail and so then it will be on for a later date for the adoption so there's an opportunity for kind of a work session with the City Council.

Aller: Great, thank you.

**GALPIN PROPERTY: PUD CONCEPT REVIEW.**

Aller: Moving onto new business. We have the item for Galpin Property which is a PUD concept review. Again the City Council and the City had a process in place back around 2012 which was modified to allow for this concept review type of process. You can come before the administrative review on smaller different projects or for the larger projects like this one you come before the Planning Commission to give a broader perspective and the developer receives input and direction before making further decisions on how it's going to move forward and the Planning Commission prefers it to be a less formal process which allows for all of you to have input at this type of concept hearing. With that we'll go ahead and have the matter heard.

Aanenson: Thank you Chairman, members of the Planning Commission. This is a concept review, PUD review. Applicant U.S. Homes doing business as Lennar. Again the work session here, excuse me the conceptual review here tonight and then the City Council will review it on August 13. As you stated the concept review is not a public hearing but is the intent to get public comment because the goal for this is to allow the developer to hear the comments from the residents in order to see how they want to advance the project. So with that I'll give a little bit of the background. So the property as was listed by Comerica Bank who is the trustee for the estate of P.R. Nelson and Paisley Park Enterprises worked with a local broker and put this on the market and Lennar was the property developer selected for the site. So what we've included here is all of the property which is 188.58 acres and it is guided low density. Low density is the in the city is the largest zoning district we have in the city. It's about 32 percent of the city so that's a majority of the city. Within the low density district there's a lot of different zoning applications that you can use as long as it stays within the 1.2 to 4 units an acre. So that's kind of how we got to this point. So quite a frameworks that we looked at and when we sat down with Lennar, when they introduced themselves as the developer of the property and I'm going to kind of go through those framework issues on how we got to this proposed development. So the park master plan which is currently in place, while it's also been reiterated in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan it's currently in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan so the park master plan around and it's intentions around Lake Ann certainly was a major factor in how the project got laid out. The second is that there's a Met Council sewer line that runs through it. It's actually a large interceptor line that runs through the property. There's significant natural features. Wetlands and in addition to that some forest, heavily forested areas which we'll talk about and in addition the county is working on the upgrade of Galpin Boulevard and there's been neighborhood meetings on that so all those factors come into play on how this property could be developed. So the first thing I'd like to talk about is the park master plan. As you can see on this

proposal here, this area here is, well here's the park right here. It's the City's intention as this trail goes around is to continue that trail all the way around and ultimately when the property, the Gorra property comes in for development that would be the continuation of that so this wooded area here would be preserved in perpetuity and that's been on the plan. The other plan would be the connection of these trails. In addition to that a trail connection that would tie into Galpin and that connection touchdown point is being in consideration with the upgrade and redesign of Galpin Boulevard. In the staff report I went through and talked about the surrounding properties that are neighboring this site. So the property to the south, the Gorra property actually has a couple different zoning districts in there and that's this property down in this area here so they have some low density. Some medium density. And also some high density so there's a potential for quite a few units there in the southern part. Otherwise the rest of this property is guided for, and maybe I can go back to this map. So this is the Gorra property and then you have a couple of different subdivisions. Majestic Way. The Brinker and then Ashling Meadows and the Lucy Ridge area and then the Longacres on the west side. So the Rottlund piece to the south is probably similar to what you'd see on this side so you've got some attached product there. Some smaller patio homes and then they transition into the two subdivisions to the north here. So back to the park issue. So this area right here where the interceptor runs through is a large wetland. Typically the sewer lines follow the low land in the city so with that this would be a preservation area. So that was kind of a beginning of the genesis of some of the discussions. In addition to this, this is currently in the Comprehensive Plan shows in addition the expansion of the Lake Ann trail has always been the goal and then tying that somewhere into Galpin. Again that would be worked into the subdivision design itself. So this is part of the new 2017 or going into the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. Again this revisiting, reaffirming that decision to connecting that so there would be no homes inbetween Lake Lucy and Lake Ann. That would just be a trail and then a bridge crossing over the creek there connecting those two. So that's one of the driving issues of the potential layout. In addition to that wetland delineation was done on the property so as a part of this development they will have to go through any filling of wetlands still has to go through the wetland process which we do not, we have the jurisdiction over that but they have to show and demonstrate going through all the steps and that's still a permitting process that has to work but in order to understand the property itself, looking at the site, that was done. The delineation of the wetland and also for the potential buyer to understand how much property was upland. I failed to mention on the first section there are some other issues that were driving this factor. There is two pieces of property. One is owned by the City. That's a well station. Then there's also another piece of property that a little under 3 acres that's also not included in this. Otherwise it encompasses that entire area. So back over to this side over here. You can see the comments that were attached then there. The watershed district, DNR, Board of Soil and Water Resources liked the fact that this area would be intended for preservation. So this is the forest cover. So in looking at that, that was another issue that we felt certainly drove the factor of preservation of this area over here so you can see there's a an oak, maple overstory and then there's maple overstory with some buckthorn underneath here so everything in this area including the low end hardwoods in this area would also be preserved in this area here. So some of these trees up in this area, when we look at the development scenario, some of those trees would be removed. Our tree ordinance allows for tree removal. If you looked at historical photos of the, for example The Woods at Longacres. There was a lot of woods in there and then also to the north. Some of these areas also had woods in there that were removed so what we do is say if you take all the trees out then you're heavily penalized. Our

goal would be to try to create some buffers along the subdivisions to the south and around some of the adjacent properties at some of those trees preservation. There's a significant grade change from the north to the south right here and some of those are minor bluffs. I know one of the other issues that were included in your, the email packets which you, I had shared with the Planning Commission was the connection of the streets. All these stub streets to the south were intended to in some way in the future tie into development. That's how they get access to those parcels because this piece of property would most likely be landlocked if not providing those so that's something we needed a little bit more information and I'll talk about that in some of the proposals. But looking at the wetland and forest then, if all this is preserved they would still have to do the individual landscaping per lot. We require certain amount of trees per lot and the like so those were the framework issues that when we met with Lennar to tell them these are the things that they need to take into consideration how they make their subdivision work. So they brought in, showed us a traditional residential single family and as you know if a residential single family meets all the requirements of zoning districts then, and goes through the permitting process for the wetlands and the like then that would be one that you could permit but there's also other zoning districts within the low density. One would be the RLM which we've done on the other side of Galpin. The most recent is, the name of that one escapes me. It's under construction right now. The extension.

Generous: Fawn Hill.

Aanenson: Thank you, Fawn Hill. That one's under construction. That's an RLM subdivision and the PUD. The PUD, to get the PUD you have to dedicate additional or a significant amount of upland in order to get the, that zoning designation. Twin homes are also permitted in a low density zoning district and those are permitted by right. As are the residential single family so this, I had this wrong in my staff report. There was 202 units could be permitted on here. Again this is a conceptual drawing so we don't know all the wetland permitting. If that affects anything. If all the lots work. All the street grades work. There's a lot of information that still needs to be generated but this is the conceptual, the direction that they're moving. So again this plan, you can see it on the aerials here, some of their intentions here and these were some of the road connections. Still would have to meet all the requirements but it doesn't meet the requirements of the City's desire to, and the park commission did look at this, to preserve this area as a open space. So everybody on this side could benefit from that. So the developer came back with the PUD concept so that provides 3 different types of lot sizes within that district which are permitted under the PUD. Dedicates a significant amount of open space so within that the transition to the north would be similar lot sizes as is in Ashling Meadows. Again Lennar did the Ashling Meadow project and then to the south. Again our concern here on that south side too is some of the tree preservation creating a buffer along that. In addition with the upgrade of Galpin Boulevard they'll be dedicating an additional 1 acre for the widening of that road so the timing of that road would be after this project. I believe the County's got that scheduled for 2021 and so that project would be done after this project is completed so not all of this development goes north and not all of the, from the north goes south so this is a separate kind of a development or neighborhood than would be to the south so this is the developer's and the City's preferred concept meeting some of the overriding goals so here it is with the aerial to give you a better idea of some of the issues regarding the tree preservation and the like. One of the other goals that we talked about is, and we talk about some of the, we have a lot of two story

homes in the city. Again it's our predominant land use. Some of the older parts of town, maybe some ramblers. We like to see a mix of some other types of homes in the city and so we did ask them to provide a mix of different types of housing. You saw in the packet what they, their models. What they're looking at for different types of housing so that would be something. Again this is all conceptual. Some direction of that, they are pursuing so those were included in the packet and to give you some idea. I also included some of the letters from the other jurisdictions that we got and, because we did send it out for comments so they would be apprised of any red flags that would be coming forward so with that we're asking that you give open to take public comment and I think the best way to respond is maybe let the developer make a presentation and then if people want to make comments then we would just forward those comments onto the City Council. I'm not sure it's at this point that we can refute or you know have a dialogue with all them but just listen to those comments and the developer can hear those too. With that I'd be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Aller: Any questions at this time from the commissioners? Commissioner Madsen.

Madsen: There's a section in the water resources comments that addresses lot coverage and this has been an issue that's come up a lot that we've seen lately. The proposed coverage is 25 percent in the shoreland overlay district and 35 percent in the other lots and they're, however they're wondering if we could, the developer should limit it to 20 percent and 30 percent respectively for those areas. Can that be limited so that it would provide enough room so a homeowner could add a patio and not be outside their lot coverage?

Aanenson: Well that was the goal of preserving all this is it allows you, you're creating a greater preservation area by not allowing any development on here. This line right here is the shoreland overlay district line so most of those lots are already the 15,000 which is standard. I mean that's what the big, our traditional lot we have in the city so those are the lots that it would be impacting. So how we traditionally do it too, when we do the RLM we give them a higher percentage because they're actually benefitting from the preservation of a larger area, if that makes sense. So that would kind of turn it on it's head. It wouldn't be the benefit that the developer would want to pursue by making it more restrictive if that makes sense yeah.

Madsen: Okay because they have the benefit of the open area.

Aanenson: That's correct and that's why they would be willing to do that correct.

Madsen: Okay, thank you.

Strong: If I might add. If you might recall the conversation around pervious pavers and the council's, the Commissioners concerns about new developments coming in and building up to their lot coverage as they come in the door and this, that comment was specifically in consideration of that concern. That was why I put it in there. I wanted that to be something that was thought of in advance with this one because of your concerns from the previous.

Aller: Great, so I'll just ask really quickly to set a little bit of foundation here. The preservation of the area around the lakes was something that was guided by the 2030 plan.



Aanenson: That's correct.

Aller: As well as the preference that we would continue the trail around.

Aanenson: That's correct.

Aller: And the 2030 plan, even before the 2030 plan but in general we are guided not to upzone until a project is actually there so we look at parcels preferably on a parcel by parcel basis or a project by project basis as it comes forward to maintain that overall guidance that's in the plan, whether it be the 2030 or in the future the 2040.

Aanenson: Let me answer that a couple different ways. So it's consistent, it's still low density. It's just, it's taking the opportunity for preservation and taking that green space and attributing that to some of the individual lots that they're all getting the benefit of that. Also we believe in it, if you look at what, and we've been up there next to Avienda where we preserved that large area of Bluff Creek. Those are all smaller lots up there. A lot of those are the RLM because they're all benefitting from the trails and the preservation that we have around the Bluff Creek corridor. So this is a similar situation around a unique feature in the city. Our premiere park around the city so it's the City's belief that all those lots will be benefitting from the opportunity not to have their, you know to be able to walk around the trail and enjoy that benefit as opposed to similar to what we did with Foxwood. That's also an RLM. The City has all the woods that we acquired behind that and there's trails through there. Similar situation so they benefit being able to have access to all those opportunities and in trade off for that they, what we allow them for dedicating that to do somewhat smaller lots. It's still consistent with the 1.2 to 4 units an acre.

Aller: And we've done it many times before with the trade off in density so we would allow for another feature to be maintained or created whether it be a park area or additional wetland protection and then we traded with the density so that we were able to get those benefits.

Aanenson: That's correct and that's one of the criteria to get the RLM or the PUD to dedicate a significant amount of upland or usable area, something like that.

Aller: Great. Commissioner Weick.

Weick: Is it accurate to say though when we say low density zoning options of 1.2 to 4 units per acre as averaged across the development? I mean that's a more accurate statement.

Aanenson: Correct, yes.

Weick: Because my issue when I read it is, I assume that means everything sits on at least a quarter of an acre.

Aanenson: No. No.

Weick: And that's not what it says.

Aanenson: No. No that's not what it says. We would never apply it that way.

Weick: I understand that.

Aanenson: Yep. No it's a good question.

Weick: Because the reality is less than 25 percent of the home actually are on that size lot and I understand the reason why. I understand.

Aanenson: Yep.

Weick: I just want to make sure.

Aanenson: Yeah exactly. The same with Foxwood. The same with Pioneer Pass. Those are all RLM. Those are...so the way we used to do the PUD probably 5-6 years ago was we had this one key average that you could go. If you look at how Longacres was, the smallest lot could be 11,000 but then they made one or two lots really big and then it skewed everything so we said there's not an average. The goal is to have a great development so and that's what...make it a good development.

Weick: Okay.

Audience: Excuse me, would I be out of line to ask you to please use your microphone because I'm not able to hear very well. Thank you.

Aller: Absolutely not out of line, thank you.

Tietz: Kate is the, to follow up on Steve's. Is that 1.2 to 4 units per acre based upon developable acreage or total site acreage?

Aanenson: It's upland acreage yeah.

Tietz: So all the wetlands, so essentially you're saying the 88 acres is what, is the base then?

Aanenson: Well anything that's wetland, yeah and if you look at their map that's how they took all that out too.

Tietz: But that does take out the shoreland property on Lake Ann and Lake Lucy. To get the 88 acres that's developable.

Aanenson: Well you could, if you could put a larger lot on there yes. If you could meet the setbacks. Maybe.

Tietz: Yeah I'm just wondering how they established the maximum.

Aanenson: Taking out the wetlands. Yes. And our ordinance also says you can't build on a bluff so anything that's on a bluff.

Tietz: Okay, because you don't have to develop to the maximum. There's no criteria that says that because the codes and the land use ordinances allow you to build to a certain level that you as a developer or we as the City have to allow that to occur.

Aanenson: Absolutely. They could build an RSF zoning district. Sure they could plat the whole thing as, they could do that one sure.

Aller: Great. Hearing no additional comments or questions at this time from the commissioners I will open the public hearing.

Aanenson: Do you want to let the developer?

Aller: Oh the developer would have the chance. Okay. If the developer would come forward and tell us your name, your representational capacity and then tell us about your project.

Joe Jablonski: Good evening Mr. Chair, members of the commission. My name is Joe Jablonski representing Lennar this evening as the applicant. Appreciate staff's thorough introduction. I just wanted to fairly briefly go through a little bit more detail and let you know that I'm here to listen, learn and also to answer any questions that you have that I can respond to. Do you have the ability to put the overall?

Aanenson: Yes, absolutely.

Joe Jablonski: So this is the concept that we had submitted that we've talked probably the most about at this point and a few things that I wanted to add just to show that we have provided a couple of trail connections into the park area. There is one shown through here. To the north neighborhood. That was part of the park Comprehensive Plan to show a connection up through that trail system as well as a trail that kind of meanders through here. Again this is a fairly high level concept plan review. We haven't done a whole lot of engineering. We're really trying to get feedback on you know what the City's desires are for the property. We've met with staff several times but now kind of getting it into the process and learning what the feedback and the intentions. That's why we submitted two different plans. It shows and demonstrates two different ways that it can be developed but it's really up to you folks to help give us some feedback and support on which one you desire so that we can take that information and process it and feel how the best way for us to move forward is so with that a couple of the other things. There was housing types included in your packet. We did kind of break this up a little bit. We show larger home sites up here. These are 90 foot. These are conforming with the RS-1 standards that would match the existing neighborhoods to the north. The central area would be 65 foot wide lots. A little bit smaller maintaining a 2,200 to 3,400 square foot house plus the ability to finish basements so you're still talking about fairly large houses. We have done this particular product type successfully fairly recently in Boulder.

Aller: Cove.

Joe Jablonski: Boulder Cove, yes thank you. And Reflections at Lake Riley and we did some of those size home sites as well in Camden Ridge. In all 3 scenarios they were very well received and we hope to continue that. In the south portion here, this is where we concentrated our villa lifestyle type lots. In the packet you have some of the sample plans. That would be a single story maintenance free type of housing opportunity. I did see in the City's Comprehensive Plan 2030 that the housing portion of the plan does call out the need for a variety of housing types and a desire to provide housing for all types of life cycles so I think through some direction and guidance from staff we did want to make sure we included that type of housing. Not only for the City's benefit but it also is an under served market that we recognize is important to provide housing for as well. The other plan, you know we went through, the City did get feedback from a number of jurisdictions from the Board of Water Resources, Riley-Purgatory creek, engineering and it does seem that because of the preservation opportunity a lot of them are favorable to this plan. But again I'm here tonight to listen to the comments. Get the feedback and take that from what we can do moving forward from here so with that I'll keep my presentation short. I'm happy to answer any questions but I know there's a lot of people here interested in speaking this evening.

Aller: Anybody have any questions immediately? Okay, thank you.

Joe Jablonski: Thanks.

Aller: So the way I'd like to proceed is, I would love to ask you to listen to the comments of the community as they come forward. Maybe take some notes. To the extent that you can respond once the hearing is going to be closed, maybe we could have you come back and respond to some of them to the extent again that you can. The purpose of this hearing is to have the community, let you know how they feel about the project and the proposal and then move all those comments up to the City Council so both the public and you would have the opportunity to forward additional comments to the City for review at that time.

Joe Jablonski: Very good.

Aller: Thank you. Okay we'll open up the public hearing portion of the item.

Aanenson: If I may.

Aller: Yep.

Aanenson: Legally it's not a public hearing.

Aller: Oh I'm sorry it's a concept.

Aanenson: Public comment.

Aller: Comment. Thank you. So we'll open up the matter for comment. Any individual wishing to come forward, if you could please do so. State your name and address for the record and then let us know what your opinions of the project.

Jon Hebeisen: Can you hear me on this mic? Okay. Good evening. My name is Jon Hebeisen. I live at 2150 Majestic Way. It's on the south end of the proposed development. Just got a few points I want to throw out. I've got some notes here. I guess my threshold question is, I've read the materials and I'm wondering why or if two proposals are an either or. Lennar bought this property. They've got to make money. Here's your choices. Everybody likes a park. Who doesn't want a park? Everyone's going to want that. What's the cost of the park? Well we're going to jam 200 houses into the small part of this property because the underlying premise is Lennar bought this property and they have to make money and I'm rejecting that premise. They bought the property just as I bought mine. There were rules in place when I bought mine. There's rules in place when they bought their's. One that comes to mind very obviously is the square footage of the property lots. Obviously I saw them on the south and I don't know if it's possible to put the picture up there again. Look on the south left there, yeah. That's where they are. City ordinance that I buy, that I bought into requires 9,000 square feet. These are 6. That's not a very, that's a evisceration of any kind of an ordinance. But we're going to get a park. On the backs of the people that have the bigger lots that we've paid for and pay taxes on for decades. Second of all I question the wetlands. I've lived there 16 years. My children and I frankly have trespassed on Prince's land for almost all those years. Not anymore. There's a sign up. I don't anymore. It is wet. We've seen the flags that the engineering company or the surveyor came in and did. He actually came to our house to get permission to trespass on our land, which we gave him. They do not accurately reflect the wetlands. We took some pictures this spring. We've got ducks. Mallards, wood ducks. Their little orange flags, the wetlands go far beyond what is being depicted as the accurate wetlands and that concerns me because frankly in the spring myself and several neighbors we do get some water because we abut wetlands. If you allow development on this area, and if you call their wetlands what the flags say, where's that water going to go? You've got a pretty good idea. Next I guess I'll have a question that I'd like to address on through if possible. I haven't heard or read anything about what the intent is for the buffer. Is it going to be a fence? Is it going to be raised land buffer? A berm. Tree planting. I'd be interested in knowing what that is. And finally many of my neighbors are here but many are not and I'm just curious are there any requirements as to some kind of notice being mailed out to people who are affected by this? Because I didn't get anything. What's the requirements and what was done?

Aanenson: There's an affidavit of notice. Everyone within 500 feet. There's an affidavit that's a part of the staff report so.

Jon Hebeisen: Could I see that? Let me ask, does it list who they were sent to?

Aller: There should be a name and address list on there. In the report.

Jon Hebeisen: The whole south side, the people that are really getting the screws put to them here, our address is Majestic Way. How many Majestic Way people received that notice?

Aanenson: I don't see any.

Jon Hebeisen: How many?

Aanenson: I do not see any on the list.

Jon Hebeisen: None of us. Is that a problem? Is that a problem that you didn't give notice to the people really getting screws put to them here? I think it is. I appreciate your time.

Aller: Thank you. Anyone else wishing to come forward?

Dake Chatfield: Hello, my name is Dake Chatfield. I live at 2200 Majestic Way. Two houses down from Jon. My house is kind of at the crossroads of what I kind of call ground zero of this big construction project that's coming up and then the Galpin Boulevard improvements that are going to be made so we're going to have significant construction going on two sides of our property so it's quite an impact to my area. I mostly echo a lot of the comments that Jon said. I agree with what he was talking about. With the buffer zone, I don't quite understand how that's going to work. You can see that it looks like there's many 25 foot setback. That's not very large and where we butt up to the new construction area there's a significant forest area so it seems like most of that would have to be clear cut to accommodate these properties. So I guess my question or recommendation would be if we could get a bigger buffer. Maybe try to preserve some of that forest to the north of Majestic Way there. That would be ideal. And then I also question some of the wetlands as well that Jon mentioned. I know the one just north of my house is a pretty significant wetland. I've noticed you know there's geese and ducks and turtles and you know it's a big pond and when I look at the map here it looks like the road and two properties just go right over that pond so I don't know if we're okay to just fill in all these wetlands. That seems like an environmental impact that we want to consider as a community. That's primarily all I had to say.

Aller: Thank you sir. Our next individual coming forward from the.

Angelo Galioto: Hi Angelo Galioto at 1805 Emerald Lane and I'm in the Lucy Ridge neighborhood on the north part of the development.

Aller: Welcome.

Angelo Galioto: And I'll echo what these two men said about the overall density. It's a travesty. I mean this is going to be disaster but I want to add too, two more things that greatly concern me. We're trying to I heard here preserve Lake Lucy, Lake Ann and the ability for all of us residents to enjoy it and I have grave fear that if we move through with this based off of minimal 4 housing development that went on Lake Lucy Road and how it impacted Lake Lucy. If you put 200 homes in there or even 150 homes or whatever the number is you're going to destroy Lake Lucy and that's going to go right to Lake Ann and you're going to destroy Lake Ann and everything we're trying to do to preserve, and I know we have these perspective I guess water quality surveys et cetera. It's gone. It's a beautiful lake Lake Ann and we can't do that. The second thing, maybe it's specific to my neighborhood. I don't think it is but in the northern part

we have significant traffic concerns. Right now we have cars racing through our neighborhood that, you know with the few houses we have it's bad. If you add 40 houses in that neighborhood with what we have and what we see in the way cars race through there with you know people avoiding stop signs in general. I'm thinking of the kids. I'm thinking of the overall safety. I'm thinking of the nuisance. And I really think you should give hard thought before approving something like this. Thank you.

Kris Lenk: Hi my name is Kris Lenk and I live at 6895 Lucy Ridge Lane which is in the northern part and I oppose the current development concept because I have concerns also about making Lucy Ridge Lane a through street. The traffic flow on Lucy Ridge Lane would significantly increase due to the proposed number of houses to be built raising my concerns around traffic safety. We currently get a lot of traffic from our neighbors in Ashling Meadows and many don't even stop at the stop sign coming into Lucy Ridge Lane or cars come extremely fast down the hill approaching Lake Lucy Road. I can only imagine what will happen with the additional homes. I also worry about the years of construction traffic coming through our neighborhood as there are still young kids in the neighborhood. I'd like to see the entrance of this development come off of Galpin versus making Lucy Ridge Lane a through street. Thank you.

Aller: Thank you.

John Butcher: Hello, I'm John Butcher and I'm at 6915 Lucy Ridge Lane so I'm thinking the best way to frame up you know all the thoughts going through my head with this development. I have 3 concerns, 2 requests and one suggestion I think tonight. Concerns paramount is the impact to the environment. We mentioned the 4 homes up on Lucy Ridge Lane that are being built or have recently been built across the street at the crossroads of Yosemite and Lucy Ridge Lane. There's 12 acres that were razed about 2 years ago. Clear cut and that seems to be the way that we've been doing things recently. We come in and we completely destroy the forest. When that happened, we've been in Chanhassen for 14 years. When that happened Lake Lucy was materially changed and probably for decades. It looked pretty similar to Lake Ann. If you go back and look at watershed photos from the Lake Riley district, because I'm sure everyone knows Lake Lucy is the top of the watershed so what happens there starts to roll downhill. I'll show you a photo of, anyone that might be able to see it but this is the dock on the north side of Lake Lucy 2 years after all of those trees were cut. It's green right so there is no lake on the north side of Lake Lucy anymore. It's all vegetation. I'm sure that the builder did what they could to control runoff but the reality is, is when we cut forests down that have been there for hundreds of year that phosphorus finds a way into the lake and that's exactly what happened and no matter what we do around 200 acres. Around two lakes that are probably like we said today, you know Lake Ann is the prize. It is the gem of our community. Hundreds of thousands of people a year go there. There's no way to control this unless we had a different plan for this land. As a resident I understand the need for development and trust me I'm pro commerce. I think we just have to consider something that was said before which is we don't have to max this out. I love the idea of shared space in park but I can't imagine that what we can do here can be undone in our generation or maybe even our kid's unless we're careful. Second is safety and that was mentioned before but if we have 90 homes with two access points on that north part and Lucy Ridge Lane becomes a through street, I just, I can't imagine what that would do given all

the access already with Ashling Meadows. There'd be one entrance going west out to Galpin but anyone going north would come on Lake Lucy or Lucy Ridge Lane and that type of congestion is very concerning for me. And then third would be neighborhood continuity and when I think about the reason that we selected our home in that particular neighborhood, and it wasn't mentioned. I mean in any of the documents that I read online no one really mentioned the Lake Lucy Ridge neighborhood of 15 homes which is attached to Ashling Meadows or I should say Ashling Meadows became attached to us. The reason we selected it is because it was, there were 14 other executive custom homes in that neighborhood and the idea of 90 homes that don't match the way that Ashling Meadows and Lake Lucy Ridge were built doesn't appeal to me. It's not what I signed up for and it's not why we bought where we did. We bought because it was a quiet neighborhood that met certain requirements. The lot sizes that are being proposed are not anywhere close to what's in either of our neighborhoods. 15,000 square feet is, it's almost half of what our lot sizes are. So it is definitely concerning for a number of reasons. Two requests. I guess one would be do everything in your power to minimize environmental impact here. You know we can't undo it and make something and design something that our city and our residents can really be proud of. We don't have many spaces like this left and I applaud the effort around shared use and park space. It's important. We don't, we are blessed with these resources in our city and I understand that everyone does what they can to protect it but that's request number one. Second is there's a second, there's a tax ID parcel of 10 acres that abuts our neighborhood and I consider potentially some other uses for that. Either keeping it natural to create more of that buffer on the high side of the bluff. The runoff that comes, the steep bluffs if you look at the grading, and it was referenced in there too which I understand might be a very large retaining wall being proposed to be built, that's where the natural forestation on the north side comes and runs down into Lake Lucy. I would consider is there something different that we can do with that 10 acre parcel to both protect the environment and that kind of leads me to my one suggestion. As an alternative design there might be a way to connect the streets today that dead end in Ashling Meadows with the street that dead ends on Lucy Ridge Lane but potentially connect that and probably leave maybe 15 or 20 homes up there especially with potentially I hope some larger lot requirements for those homes. I think if we can set some different expectations for what goes on those where we have the ability to protect the lake and the runoff that we should take it and I think you're killing a lot of birds with one stone. I'd also love to see that whole north side just completely stripped. I mean if we're really doing what could be the best of both worlds for everybody, you know Lennar would get a buildable site near Galpin that has a large wetland to protect the lakes and then you'd have the forestation up on the top part where the water runoff goes in, down into the wetland space that could remain and minimize any of that impact so I'd encourage everyone to go read the 2013 wetland study that was done. It mentions the fact that this potential exists in the long range plan and the fact that there's risk to both lakes and you know Lake Ann is a gem. It's 40 feet deep. It's crystal clear and if we screw it up it's not coming back so I understand there's a lot of things that we're balancing here and I hope that you guys consider alternative designs. Thank you very much.

Aller: Thank you.

Callie Edwards: Hello, Callie Edwards ID 18740 Partridge Circle and I just note all the trees in the pictures back there and the leaf over the council members head and I'd like to really comment on what he said earlier about the clear cutting. When we've done a lot of developing



in all of our area and I just want everyone to note the effect on the big woods. And if you're not familiar with that term we have some of the only big woods in the world left here. I see some heads nodding and previously big woods have been saved such as in the Cenacle in Wayzata was saved by a conservation effort. Here it's clear that we can't save all 188 acres, although I know the nature conservancy had some efforts towards that. I'm really appreciative of what you all have done with the 2030 and the upcoming 2040 in the preservation of the trees and what you're attempting to do also with the development because we all know there'll be development. I'd just like us all to make note that there's a way to use forestation without reforestation by keeping the existing big woods, which has an overstory and a canopy that will interact underneath in the ground with the fungi. With the whole entire ecosystem that affects as he so effectively mentioned and showed us what happens in our lakes and how important it is, as Vanessa said we're really you know a water rich city and we need to be smart and be leaders in saving that and as we go forward just using the big woods concept I would suggest that perhaps an arborist might be included and involved and I know I believe you have Jill Seymour, is she an arborist for the City?

Aanenson: Yes, Jill Sinclair on our staff yep. She's walked the entire property as has the staff so.

Callie Edwards: Okay excellent so.

Strong: She's actually a forester.

Callie Edwards: Okay yeah, so wonderful and to have an arborist involved with the developer and in the wetlands. Thank you very much.

Betsy Randall: I'm Betsy Randall. I live at 1571 Lake Lucy Road. I agree with basically everybody here. I am currently, I currently live across from the new developments at Yosemite and I've been working with Vanessa because of all the runoff that I've been getting from them. I'm really concerned about runoff. I don't know that much about Prince's property other than it's gorgeous but again our lakes and our trees, our huge trees are very valuable. I'm concerned about clear cutting. It happened to the east of me when they put in the development oh 20 years ago. I've been here 22 years and I think part of that had a lot to do with Lake Lucy quality going down but is there any way, like I said I haven't been on the property but I know I've got white pines. I've got oaks that are over 100 years old and I'm guessing there's probably some of those on that property also and if they can be, I know it takes a lot to rope them off so that they don't get compacted roots and stuff but I really, really think that it needs to be something that's considered besides the small lots. Even a 15,000 square foot lot is only a third of an acre and the lots to the north I've gone through and looked online and most of them, there's one or two that's about the same size of the third but most of them are about a half acre. Maybe a little less. The 55, 65 foot lots I think are just way too small for that area. Chan's growing. We've got lots of room to grow and I don't think we need to have these teeny tiny lots. They can still build the same house on them but I just am really concerned of the quality of life of our water and our trees and the neighbors. Thank you.

Aller: Thank you.

Barry Dallavalle: Hi, I'm Barry Dallavalle and I live at 6960 Utica Lane. I'm going to try to expedite a little bit for our group. I represent the Lake Lucy Homeowners Association which has 14 members that own lots that border the east and north sides of Lake Lucy. A lot of our members are here tonight. Maybe I'll ask for a show of hands just so you know. I have got comments from some of the other members and I'll represent them tonight. We have a couple of concerns. One is obviously the water quality and handling of the runoff. We, our 14 members have actually taken it upon ourselves to treat the invasive species every year under the DNR permit that we can obtain so we know that this will probably impact that. Obviously because of that if we have to choose one of these plans we're for the density transfer plan which provides the maximum amount of land undeveloped. What we only can hope for is that you know the Riley-Purgatory watershed does it's job and make sure that the water's properly handled. The phosphorus is removed. I did see Terry Jeffery's input into the staff report and I'm sure that they'll be on top of that. We just want to make sure that that's, that due process is done. Also just to expand beyond that is, if there's anything that we can do, that the developer can do or the City can do or the watershed can do to educate the new home buyers on proper practices of irrigation, lawn maintenance. I think the watershed's been trying to do that but here's a pretty good opportunity I think for a new home buyer to be educated quickly and easily with what they need to do. The other thing is construction noise. I think we are all familiar with the noise of a construction site. Obviously being on a lake that noise is transfers across the lake quite easily and we would like to see that period as short as possible. I think looking at the two plans it appears that the density transfer plan would be the fastest development because it's developing on less land and maybe because of the lot mix that it would move those properties a little quicker and Lennar wouldn't have to subcontract the lots to construction companies with longer horizons. And I guess that's all I have so appreciate it. Thank you.

Aller: Thank you sir.

Brian Hugh: Hello, my name's Brian Hugh. I live on 7441 Windmill Drive. Kind of on the south end of the proposed development. Just had a question related to some of what my other neighbors had said about the area kind of just on the very south end. I've lived there for 20 years and for as far as I can remember that area has been, is flooded most of the springtime from the melt off and I've heard from a fairly well informed source that there's some discussion about bringing the hill down into there maybe to make that buildable because I can't see with it how it floods every spring how he could develop kind of on that end. If you kind of notice every spring how it gets pretty well wet until maybe just around June or so, so I just wanted to call out that because I know it's not marshland but we butt up right to the marshland but if you notice that area every spring it's pretty wet throughout most of the springtime so just wanted to call that out.

Aller: Thank you.

Greg Stewart: Hi. My name is Greg Stewart. I live at 1893 Topaz Drive which is the northern edge of the proposed development and if you don't mind I'd like to back the conversation up a little bit because it seems as though an awful lot of planning has gone on without a lot of public or community comment but the first request I have for the Lennar Corporation is that they deed the property over to the City of Chanhassen for permanent conservancy in the name of Prince

and this is what the City Council and what the City of Chanhassen should have done to begin with. Prince moved to Chanhassen because of the beauty of this place. In fact he bought this very property for that very reason. It's therefore incredibly disingenuous to the City then to turn around and allow the planning to go forward to completely destroy that forest. If the City benefits from the property that Prince owns and used to operate as his recording studio and home no doubt derives tremendous amount of benefit and Chanhassen definitely derives tremendous amount of tourist dollars because of that and will continue to do so. So that's my first request. However apparently Chanhassen likes to develop so all I can see is that there's going to be more noise. More traffic. Loss of privacy. More crime. More pollution. Lower property values and most importantly destruction of the beautiful pristine forest that bounds our properties and several others. And so I would ask the developer if he isn't going to deed the property over, as he should, that there be some statutes put in place that insures that the tree canopy is preserved during this building process and there are many simple ways that this could be done including increasing the buffer land between what backs up essentially on our property versus what would be built by Lennar from 10 feet, which will protect nothing given that mature trees have a 15 to 20 foot spacing, you could do the geometry there, to a 40 foot buffer. That would along preserve the main canopy of the forest. We haven't talked about the biological impact. There are you know 10-20 species of birds. Possum. Raccoon. Deer. I'm sure the neighbors here could shout out any number of species that will all be greatly impacted by this beyond the human species that are here tonight and I hope somebody takes that into consideration. There are also archeologically sensitive areas within this that I don't believe have been properly considered nor certainly have they been properly researched and I would hope that then they want to make sure that the City Council's aware of this. That they go through the proper and rigorous means to insure that those archeological sites are thoroughly investigated and preserved. There are Native American burial grounds within this property. Now I don't know if Lennar wants to be known as the builders not only for raping Prince's forest but also for building on Native American grounds ala poltergeist but the bottom line is.

Aller: Go ahead.

Greg Stewart: I'm sorry, humor's not allowed. So clearly most of the people here, maybe all of us here tonight are completely against this proposal for any number of very valid reasons that you've heard. All I can say is I hope going forward that there's a concerted and honest effort to make sure that the City Council and the developers work with the community that they're impacting to make sure if they do want to go forward with this proposal that it's done with all the proper means that will help preserve the canopy and the biological diversity therein and also you know us as the neighbors of this new community. We want to get along with our new neighbors and the best way to do that is to work with us. Thank you.

Aller: Thank you.

Joy Gorra: Well good evening fellow neighbors, city officials and Joe. My name is Joy Gorra and I'm the widow of Mike Gorra. I am the property south, right on Lake Ann. Everybody here in this room knows that area is truly a pristine jewel. We made that comment all through the night and what I'm asking is that we take our time on these projects. Change is inevitable but I'm going to steal a slogan from Great Plains Software. They use the term change without

change. I would love for that to happen in this area. Fast is not our friend. This has come up so quickly and I know tonight the City is talking about 2004. They've talked about the Gorra property as already being developed. That's very frightening. But tonight we have a wonderful opportunity here because we still have time on our hands I believe. I would love input from my neighbors on how they would like to see that land, the Gorra property developed. I've heard a number of different items to go there. A golf course. A boys ranch. An amusement park. Purple Pleasures something on that order. But I know in this room there's a lot of energy, a lot of smart people and we can do it right. So my request tonight is let's not be quick. Let's do it right. And I have to thank my neighbors on Lake Lucy. I have not been talking to my beaver friend and I think you guys may have something to do with that. Thank you.

Aller: Thank you.

Geri Stewart: Hi, I'm Geri Stewart. I live on 1893 Topaz Drive. We've only lived there a year and so we actually knew that this land could get developed because had already died. However we thought it would take longer. That woods behind our house is gorgeous and both plans we get the woods cut down and developed and we don't have a lot of buffer attached to our yard, although I know there's some. I might get a surveyor out to find exactly which trees are mine but I, they're talking about buffers but there is no buffer. There is a line like there's our yard and here's the other yard. I'm hoping that if it does get built out maybe they could leave a buffer of trees there because I mean the wildlife has to be able to get around somewhere and there is a lot of wildlife. Also I've been listening to all the traffic concerns and I'm looking there and I don't know if there's ordinances that you have to have more than one way into a neighborhood but I don't see why if there's an exit on Galpin and that road does go through, why it couldn't end in a cul-de-sac and not join up with the Ashling Meadows neighborhood and then into Lucy Ridge. That's all I have to say right now. Sorry.

Aller: Thank you.

Josh Kimber: Good evening. I'm Josh Kimber. I live at 2060 Majestic Way. You heard from the 2 gentlemen who are on the front part of the street. I'm at the very end. I'm the last house on that road. I echo pretty much everything everyone said here. I feel like the lot sizes are really small. I feel like we're putting a ton of houses in here. But I do have a pretty serious question about the trees on the south side of Majestic. Ms. Aanenson said twice, or a couple times during the presentation that the goal is to preserve those trees. There are some huge trees back there and I would like to learn more about what that buffer is. I would imagine this map isn't to scale but when I look at my lot compared to the house that would be behind me, it is a comparable sized lot. I don't know how you maintain that tree coverage knowing that our lots are the same size. I have a little bit of trees on mine but how you would maintain that buffer there with the same lot size. I don't know how that would be achieved so I would like to learn more about that buffer. But me also being at the end of Majestic Way we have had, like I'm in the low side of the street. We had two summers where me and my 3 neighbors were all flooded. My sump pump runs probably 10 or 11 months out of the year. I feel like there's like a water ground river that goes through there or something but my sump pump is constantly running. I've got a sump pump that will pump 50 to 60 gallons a minute and I can't keep up during rain storms. If they build up those lots behind me I'm going to have to do some major irrigation myself because as is my lot

goes up and then that lot does go down and if they build that up I'm going to get all that water from that back side and a majority of my neighbors on that north side of Majestic Way will be dealing with a large amount of water and flooding. But again I just can't echo enough, I agree with everyone here that I oppose the current plan. I would love to see multiple plans. Not just two. This is great land back there. Everyone, anyone who has been back there, there are some serious grave concerns because of the elevation and constant change so I do think we need to take our time and look seriously at this gem that we have. Thanks.

Aller: Thank you.

Deborah Medeiros: Hi, Deborah Medeiros, 6820 Lucy Ridge Lane and I more have a question. The road that goes along the north side of the development is, like have there been feasibility studies and do we know that that road can even go in because as I looked at a map there were some ponds and I was unsure of how they would get a road in there.

Aller: We're going to hold responses until later. We're getting comments so.

Deborah Medeiros: Okay. I guess I'd want to know that because if not then everything would go through Ashling Meadows and Lake Lucy which doesn't seem like a good reason for safety reasons and then just echoing all the environmental concerns of everyone in the room. Thank you.

Aller: Thank you.

Mehdi Ayouche: Good evening everybody. My name is Mehdi Ayouche. I live in 2102 Majestic Way. South side. I'm new to the neighborhood so I moved like a year ago but the reason I move is the same reason Jon and other neighbors on Majestic Way moved 20 years ago. 16 years ago is I fell in love with the trees and the quietness of the neighborhood and how clean it is and I think putting the many numbers of houses on the south side, that's going to be a big mistake because we're dealing with a lot of wetland. A lot underground water and I feel that is not a realistic plan especially if you look at the Galpin Boulevard is going to be very congested area so I feel that there is a need to review this plan. And also nobody talk about school zoning. So how is that going to affect the neighborhood. 200 houses. Almost 1,000 people. If we average 4 people per house. I mean that's a lot of kids so I think we should consider a better alternative or I mean I agree with the majority of the folks and I hear what their concerns. Thank you.

Aller: Thank you. Anyone else wishing to come forward? There we go.

Tamara Sather: Hi, thank you. My name is Tamara Sather and I live at 7090 Utica Lane and I just echo what most of these people say here too. I do appreciate the preservation model because I've lived in Chanhassen for 27 years and it's what drew me to this town also is the trails and the parks and I hope that we can continue that. I also, talking about the Lake Lucy Ridge property. We were here oh 14 years ago maybe and we had the same concern about the developer that was coming into that. I think it was Mr. Necker and we opposed that. My neighbors were here with me as we presented to the Planning Commission about reducing the amount of homes that were

going to go in there and it was successful and they reduced it and we all live in developments and we understand that, you know that that has to happen but again I echo the idea that does it have to be this many. We understand it's going to happen. Huge Prince fan and sadly when he died the first thing I thought was crap it's going to get developed and that just broke my heart and so you know my thoughts are going, I should have started a Go Fund Me page. I mean he's so famous. All this but I just wonder if there's another, a third proposal that still allows for the preservation but limits the amount of homes that go in. Thank you.

Charles Loeffler: Good evening. My name is Charles Loeffler. I live at 7327 Fawn Hill Road so I guess I'm on the other side of Galpin compared to everybody else today. My property doesn't quite end up on Galpin Road but there is a retention pond that's at the end of my property and it's an area there that's near Hunter Drive so as the road is proposed to go into this subdivision, as the ladies and gentlemen so far have mentioned from Majestic Way, that wetland area is definitely going to get impacted and as fill gets put in there or what not it does beg to question where that water will go. Will the retention pond on the other side of Galpin grow? Certainly the gentleman who commented about his sump pump, as he mentioned that water is going to go somewhere. We really need to understand what impact that is going to have. I'm fairly new to the area. I moved in about a year and a half ago but again I moved in taking a look at the neighborhood. I looked in a lot of different areas within the Twin Cities and chose Chanhassen because of the area and because of the neighborhood and just feel that even as I look at the development on Fawn Hill Road where the new houses are being built right now and that to me very high density just isn't part of that neighborhood and that area. And when I take a look at the vast amount of homes being planned in that lower portion, that just is not, it's not the neighborhood that I planned on moving into a year and a half ago and would hope that as other people have mentioned we take our time. We take a look at it and determine what the right plan is for this area because right now what I'm seeing concerns me. Thank you.

Aller: Thank you.

Danly Jones: Hi there. I'm Danly Jones. I live at 7026 Pima Lane so actually not in this neighborhood but I grew up going to Lake Ann and I have a 6 month old daughter and I want her to be able to swim in the same clean lake that I did and enjoy this land and I just don't want to see it ruined. So I'd like to ask the question is you know, is this final? Is it final that we have to develop this land? Is there something more the City can do? Is there something more that we can do to come together to preserve either some of this from being so dense or all of it? Thank you.

Aller: Thank you. Anyone else wishing to come forward?

Julie Butcher: Hi, my name is Julie Butcher. I live at 6915 Lucy Ridge Lane and I just wanted to talk about the fact that I was, I really hope that our city can be good stewards of this land. We have 200 acres of forest and wetlands and bluff that is really some of if not the last within the city limits of Chanhassen. Sad enough that we have to have it developed and I same, I would love for this to not be developed at all but if it is going to be developed and we do have to have homes then I really think that this is not a responsible plan for our city. Why we have to have so many homes in such a small area. The density. One builder. A cookie cutter neighborhood

effect. All the reasons that the people here have spoken already. Chanhassen is a quaint, was a quaint small town kind of community feeling and the more that we clear cut land like this and throw up a whole bunch of houses practically zero lot lines that all pretty much look the same then we lose our identity that I've held so dearly to over the last 20 years that we've lived here. So I would just ask this committee to be good stewards of this land. What is left of it. I love it here and I want to keep being proud of the town that I live in. Thank you.

Aller: Thank you.

Dale Carlson: Hi everyone. Ditto. Dale Carlson, 6900 Utica Lane, Chanhassen. Been there 46 years or something like that. I just have a question for you guys. I hear all this stuff about destroying wetlands and water quality. Who's responsible, who's going to be held accountable if that happens? Is anyone going to be held accountable if the geese go away? I hope they do maybe but I'm saying if the deer go away and all these birds. I mean there's, I can't tell you how many different, who will be held accountable? Thank you.

Aller: Thank you sir.

Audience: Is it too soon to ask questions about construction itself and practices and everything?

Aller: What we're doing here is a concept plan. You're welcomed to come on up real quick if you have a specific question about the construction so that we're aware of it but the information, the whole purpose of this communication and this discourse that we're having is to get information to the developer or the owner or whoever's going to be building on a piece of property and the City Council and let them get that information so that it can be responded to properly at City Council so if you have a specific question we'll have you come up again.

Audience: Or will there be meetings later once plans are, so that we can bring up those concerns?

Aller: Yes and even though the concept may be approved eventually and it becomes a plan, they'll come forward with an actual plan. One of the reasons why we go through this process is to allow for a less expensive and intrusive situation so they get the feedback before they invest in the property and start moving on things that they can't turn away from and they can't back down. They can't really listen to the concerns of the community so this is really the best way to do it so the community can voice it's opinion. They can hear it and then if they decide to do so and it works for them then they can take those matters into account and move forward with the project with that information.

Audience: I do have one quick question.

Aller: Sure.

Audience: I sure would have liked to have a hearing like this before the land even got sold. Was there one and I just missed it?

Aller: Well you know I wouldn't want to have a hearing if I wanted to sell my house so that's the kind of situation.

Audience: But the City wasn't given first options on do you want to buy this and conserve this land?

Aller: I wouldn't know but I don't think so. Any last individuals wishing to come forward, come on up forward. State your name and address for the record and, you're back.

Angelo Galioto: I just had one question. Angelo Galioto, 1805 Emerald Lane again.

Aller: Thank you.

Angelo Galioto: As we speak here today does Lennar own the property? That's a question I have.

Aller: I believe they have the right to build on the property so.

Angelo Galioto: They have the right to build. Do they own it?

Aller: We can ask them what their legal position is. Is that the last question? So we'll ask, now before, it will be. So before I close the comment portion of this process we did receive several emails from individuals that are part of the record. Meredith and Greg McGuirk, David Cohn and Julie Witt and they have been read and they will be made part of the record and forwarded on along with all the other comments.

Steve Wallace: I apologize I just showed up late but I'd like to make a comment. I'm Steve Wallace. I live at 6900 Lucy Ridge Lane.

Aller: Welcome.

Steve Wallace: Strongly oppose the plan for a lot of the reasons that I just heard towards the end of the discussion here. Obviously land conservation is critical. This is beautiful land. We've seen a significant impact to Lake Lucy as some of the development and runoff that has created sediment and actually really that lake is turning into a bunch of weeds because of a lot of the sediment runoff so number one oppose. If we need to do a development I would strongly recommend taking the time to evaluate other options. I would look at having a main entrance and an only entrance off of Galpin as opposed to running through some of the other subdivisions. I would cul-de-sac those off and you know buffer zone as well. I think that's the other component. If there is going to be development a 10 foot buffer zone is not nearly enough in order to maintain the trees that are already there and make sure there's a significant buffer between subdivisions so I would recommend those things but appreciate the time.

Aller: Thank you. Okay I'm going to close the public comment section and ask the developer to come forward again and to the extent possible, with all the information that you're gathering



which of course you'll have a record of, if you could make some comments at this point in time that would be great.

Joe Jablonski: I can that. Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you for everyone who provided comments. I took a lot of notes. I'm not going to necessarily go through all of them but I'll try to address a few of the broader details or concerns that were brought up. The first one, does Lennar own the property? At this point we have a contract to purchase the property. An option agreement to purchase the property. We do not own it at this time. Let's see, let's talk quick about connectivity and some of this will be broad connectivity discussion but what we've done here, which is at the direction of staff and is in general good planning, at least as far as the initial concept plan stage is we've attempted to line up the road connections into the property at the existing roads so there'd be one at, I can't remember the name but there's one on the south end that lines up there. There's one at the north that lines there and I think there's a road that comes across that's called Winslow Path or.

Aanenson: Wynsong.

Joe Jablonski: Wynsong Path and we also have made the connections to the existing neighborhoods knowing that when those neighborhoods were built there's a road connection at them. Probably also, I haven't verified this but there's probably also a sign that says future road connection possible so we've been given direction by staff, at least at this point to make those connections because it connects the neighborhoods. It's connectivity. It's for the long run it's typical in planning so that you have the ability to get through for public safety, fire, those kind of things. We did eliminate one connection that was right here. There's a road stub. You can kind of see it. It's a little tough on the plan but we were not going to make that connection or we weren't showing it in this plan. We have had other plans that did show that connection but we did eliminate one. So that's kind of that north quadrant. There is also rules and regulations that the City has imposed that only allow you a certain distance for cul-de-sacs. Part of that I don't know off the top of my head, I'm sure one of the staff members know what the cul-de-sac length requirements are but that's kind of where the connectivity also comes from. If you, staff has anything to add to that.

Bender: The length of the cul-de-sacs is a maximum of 800 feet.

Joe Jablonski: Okay. So that's the connecting points up in that north neighborhood. You know that obviously traffic connection concerns that was something that we've heard, or I heard quite a bit about. That's something that we're going to have to rely a little bit on the Planning Commission and council to help give us direction on how important that is to them to have those connecting points and certainly also take the input of staff on that as well. So there are a couple things that also came up. Let's see related to wetlands and drainage. I'm going to talk real broadly about this because again we haven't gotten into a whole lot of engineering on this. As the Chairman was explaining part of this process is, we start with a concept plan which helps establish how the lots could be laid out and then as we get into the next level, a preliminary plat and we go through that process we get into a lot more engineering details and we start figuring out some of the details of drainage, grading, some of those things that we haven't had an opportunity to study a whole lot at this point but some of the things I will point out is, there is

earlier the wetland delineation plan, there is a wetland shown in this location that we would be impacting. We have attempted to wherever possible limit or eliminate the need to impact wetlands but this is one that is an impact. That road really cannot be moved in one form or fashion getting into that property at that location where there's a road connection is important which is why we've maintained that. We would be required per state and regulator laws to mitigate in some form or fashion that wetland impact. There's a number of different ways to do that. Drainage off of some of these back yards and buffering, both on the north and the south were also things that I had down that came up several times. Again we haven't spent a lot of time on that but that's something that based on the feedback and the comments that I've heard tonight that we'll go back and work on between now and for sure the preliminary plat stage that I would envision us having a landscape plan and working closely with staff as well on establishing some kind of buffer at both the south and the north neighborhoods. There will be land alteration that obviously has to take place. Topography on the site is fairly dramatic so there will be a fair amount of dirt of moving that occurs but also as part of that we also have to follow the watershed and water quality rules knowing that some of that's going to be directed to ponds that will be built that aren't there today. A storm sewer that's put in or will be put in that's not there today. And just a number of things on the site through the improvement process that isn't there to help treat that water today as natural runoff but will be with development. And we have to follow very closely the rules and the guidance of the watersheds and the city code and all that thing to help achieve because the last thing that we want is to damage or in any way cause any problems with either one of the lakes as well which is part of the reason why we've worked closely with staff to help try to preserve such a large area. So that, let's see buffers. Cul-de-sacs. Lot sizes. I guess you know some of the questions and obviously I heard that quite a few times. Lot sizes are a concern. Again the reason why we're doing it is two fold. One in order to allow the property the ability to develop it either all has to be developed or some of it has to be concentrated and you have a willing seller that wants to sell the property. You have a willing buyer who wants to buy the property and we have to do it in a manner that follows the rules and the guidelines laid out by the city code and by the zoning ordinances and doing that which is why we've shown two plans. One that impacts a lot of the area down in here and the other that falls within the PUD guidelines. Still maintaining the same setbacks. The same lot coverage areas are a little bit flexible but the setbacks are the same on the sides and the front usually. There may be some instances where front setbacks are relaxed or asked to be relaxed but we maintain the same side setbacks that are required in the RS-1 standards so while they are smaller and they are a little bit different it is a way to develop in a manner that allows us and gives the city the opportunity to preserve a large area of open space. Let's see. I heard a comment about donating the land to the City. If that were to occur that probably would have occurred by the estate of the property owner and they elected to sell it and you know I don't know if the City was prepared to pay or had any opportunity to review the use or the price of the property but they, it was shopped or put out for sale to the open market and at that time the City could have also put in the opportunity to buy it so. That, and I know it's difficult to see these types of properties develop. It's a very pristine piece of property. We understand that. We know that. We've done a lot of development not just in Chanhassen but around the Twin Cities and we really see these as partnerships with the cities and we want to see it not only develop in a way that works for us but works for the people of Chanhassen. Not just in the immediate neighborhoods but the whole neighborhood and we recognize that there's some unique things here and we want to help the City see them so I know that's difficult to hear or can be difficult to see and, but it is a

developable property. It is in your zoning districts. It is provided city sewer and water which gives it the ability to be developed so.

Aller: Great thank you.

Audience: I have a question. On your other plan all your lot sizes were 90 feet.

Joe Jablonski: Correct.

Audience: Why don't you carry that over to this plan? That's what everybody's been talking about.

Joe Jablonski: Well there's economics involved that don't allow the, there's not enough lots on that plan shown in the upland areas or up in these areas only to support the ability to have it developed.

Aller: Okay. Are we done?

Joe Jablonski: I think I covered as many broad questions as I had written down. I know there's some specifics but if you folks have anything more I'd be happy to address them.

Aller: Anything for staff or the applicant at this point in time? Thank you. Okay I'll open it up for comments from the commissioners.

Weick: I'll start.

Aller: Commissioner Weick.

Weick: If that's okay. As I often do, I'm fairly consistent with my views. I'll go ahead and share some of those as it relates to this. Development, before I do that I would say thank you to everyone that came out this evening. It is critically important that everyone voices their opinions and I applaud in return your respectful input that you provided tonight and appreciate that. I'm also impressed that the comments were mostly focused on our natural resources which I have a serious concern about and so I appreciate the facts that were brought forward about various lakes and things like that that got into the record tonight as well. I would say also that I'm not sure it's fair to say that planning without public input is happening because I think that's what tonight is the first step in representing and there'll be more opportunities to do that as well so I hope everyone is able to feel comfortable that at least their opinions are being heard throughout this process. That said I would say that I am always and will always be opposed to large houses on small lots. I never will be convinced that if, you know if you have the land you should necessarily build on it and I understand there's a lot of, there's a lot of realities about developing that that doesn't take into account but it's still my opinion and I'm opposed to 35 percent lot coverage. I'm always opposed to increasing the lot coverage over 25 percent. I'll continue to be opposed to that. And so I hope that the City Council is sincere in listening to the comments and the feedback from this evening as well as my own as we move forward. Thank you.

Tietz: Chairman Aller?

Aller: Commissioner Tietz.

Tietz: Yeah I'd just like to echo all the sentiment tonight for the speaking on behalf of the resource. You know it's a spectacular resource that we can't duplicate. The woods. The big, the remnant big woods. The mature high quality oaks that exist on that north slope. The severity of the slope on that north side. I think the plan, the concepts really lack a respect for the landscape basically or fundamentally. And then if you took these plans, either one of them, they're basically the same except for the shoreline development. If you walk that site with these plans it's going to be totally mass graded and totally clear cut. There's no, in my opinion there's no way you can build that road on the north side. The north end of the property without virtually clear cutting that hillside. Those are severe cross slopes and to put the city grade, the city standard road in there and then to develop lots that you would put what, 15,000 square foot lots and those are going to be the largest homes. It's going to be, you will not recognize that hillside so I think we do want a quality development and the old adage of less is more I think really applies in this situation. That we do not have to maximize the density of this property to meet a code to get a quality development and that's all I have to say.

Aller: Additional comments? Okay well I will again thank everybody present and it is not an easy conversation to have when nobody wants to hear someone tell them what they would like done with your potential property and at the same time nobody wants to have somebody come in and build something that they feel is not to their, either their standards or is something that is detrimental to an area that we all love. We're all passionate about our safety. The safety of our kids and our roads. We're all passionate about the trees and the lakes that we have here and so again I appreciate the civility with which you've handled yourself tonight and I would thank the representative of Lennar as well for coming in and actually participating in the process. Listening and attempting to answer to the best of his ability those things that are put out there on short notice. Again this matter will be moving forward to the City Council. Your comments are in the record. The information that we've received in emails is also in the record. Before we close I will just state that I join in my fellow commissioners in their belief that it may not be Option A or Option B but I feel that there's an Option C out there that is going to be acceptable to all. We're not going to please all but at least it will be a combined effort that was started here tonight with your comments and Lennar's listening so with that I'll request that the motion, appreciate motion be made to move this forward.

Tietz: It's just a review.

Aller: It's a review then I'll just ask that the review be forwarded to the City Council and that will be on August 13<sup>th</sup> as well?

Aanenson: Correct and we do the verbatim Minutes so the comments will be.

Aller: So the verbatim Minutes will be for the City Council to hear and to read and reflect on before they take action on the concept as is presented to them on the 13<sup>th</sup> so again if you're at

home or you're here follow the website. Come on in and see the City Council on the 13<sup>th</sup> or follow them at home. Moving forward to, let's take a 2 minute recess.

**The Planning Commission took a short recess at this point in the meeting.**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Commissioner Randall noted the verbatim and summary Minutes of the Planning Commission meeting on June 19, 2018 as presented.**

**COMMISSION PRESENTATIONS.** None.

**ADMINISTRATIVE PRESENTATIONS.**

Aanenson: I will give you, we do have an item on the August 7<sup>th</sup> meeting. I know it's National Night Out but it didn't get on the city schedule so we actually have a subdivision on that night so, and then the next night back to back, because we love being together, joint commission tour. So we do have a bus this time so we can all be together and hear the same thing which will be nice so we are going to go by some of those projects on Lake Lucy. We'll just talk about those infill development and ask for good conversation and then we're hoping to revisit the water treatment plant. We're hoping it's pretty close but the architecture in there.

Weick: It's beautiful.

Aanenson: It's beautiful. I will give a compliment to Sharmeen Al-Jaff on our staff who worked with the Public Works Director to get that looking so spiffy so.

Weick: If I may I drove by with my family and I said, I said hey what do you think that looks like because they didn't know what it was and they said it looks like a mansion.

Aanenson: Good job. I'll tell her that. Yes. So you know we really don't have anything else. We were talking about Foxwood. A couple ideas but if somebody wants to shoot me an email of something they would like to look at for that night on Wednesday. We'll have snacks. Again the Senior Commission, Environmental Commission, and Park Commission will all be there so let me know if you can make it and I'll have Jenny send out to email to everybody so we can get a head count.

Randall: What day again?

Aanenson: It'd be Wednesday.

Aller: The 8<sup>th</sup> of August.

Aanenson: Throw out back to back unfortunately.

Randall: No that's fine.

Aanenson: We always try to find, well because our meetings are prescriptive we can't just bump our meeting and so, so that's where we're at so that is all I had for you. Thank you for the long meeting.

Aller: Thank you. That was a good meeting. Everybody got their voices heard and I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

**Commissioner Madsen moved to adjourn the meeting. All voted in favor and the motion carried unanimously with a vote of 6 to 0. The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.**

Submitted by Kate Aanenson  
Community Development Director

Prepared by Nann Opheim