

**MINUTES
CITY OF EDINA, MINNESOTA
PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
October 24, 2012
7:00 P.M.**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Grabiell called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM

II. ROLL CALL

Answering the roll call were Scherer, Forrest, Schroeder, Kilberg, Potts, Platteter, Cherkassy, Carpenter, Staunton Fischer and Grabiell.

III. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

The agenda was filed as submitted.

IV. COMMUNITY COMMENT

Kathleen Wasescha, 5348 Hollywood Road requested that she be kept informed on all development plans for the properties at 5109-5125 West 49th Street.

V. REPORTS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Planner Presentation

Planner Teague told the Commission they are being asked to consider a sketch plan to redevelop three lots 5109-5125 West 49th Street to build an 18-unit attached housing development. The subject properties are 1.28 acres in size, therefore the proposed density of the project would be 14-units per acre.

Continuing, Teague reminded the Commission they heard two previous sketch plan reviews for the subject properties; one on March 28, 2012 for a six-story, sixty-foot tall, 98-unit senior housing building and the last one on June 27, 2012 for a four-story, forty-foot tall, 60-unit senior housing building. Teague noted at both meetings the consensus of the Planning Commission was that the proposed development was too much for the site.

Discussion

Commissioners asked how many units are permitted by Code and the Comprehensive Plan. Teague responded that Code would allow roughly 10 -11 units. The Comprehensive Plan between 8-10 units, adding the request exceeds those standards.

Applicant Presentation

David Motzenbecker delivered a power point presentation highlighting the following:

- Site reconfigured to accommodate an 18-unit housing development; roughly 14 units/acre.
- Units are proposed at three levels and 30' high.
- Each unit would have a two stall garage.
- Development is envisioned to meet the demands of empty-nesters and would be considered life-cycle housing.
- High level of amenities
- Connecting the development to greater Edina by adding to the public walkway that would help connect 49th Street directly to Vernon Avenue.
- Rezone site from PRD-2 to PRD-4
- Comprehensive Plan Amendment
- Setback Variances; and
- Site Plan review

Motzenbecker added there also is the possibility of rezoning the site to a PUD; not PRD-4 as mentioned; however they would follow staff and Commission lead on this matter. Concluding, Motzenbecker said they will retain as much of the mature vegetation and trees as possible. Landscaping provides a good buffer from the surrounding traffic.

Discussion

Commissioner Forrest inquired on the width of the driveway into the project and internally; noting that trash hauling would need to be accommodated in this area. Mr. Motzenbecker responded that at this time the proposed driveway aisle width is standard. Continuing, Motzenbecker said with regard to trash each individual unit would have its own trash and recycling bins.

Commissioner Platter asked if this project would be guided by bylaws establishing specific rules. Motzenbecker said their intent is for the building to have an association directing rules for trash enclosures and other standard multi-tenant issues.

Chair Grabiell asked for clarification on the internal workings of the site; especially at the east end. Motzenbecker responded at the east end of the site there will be a hammer head turn around.

Commissioner Staunton asked for clarification on unit construction noting the changing topography of the site. With graphics Mr. Worman explained the step down approach of some of the units as they take advantage of the topography, adding at 49th Street there would be a 2 ½ - story exposure.

Commissioner Schroeder asked how guest parking would be accommodated. Mr. Worman responded that guest parking would be accommodated in front of each garage (2 spaces). He said their goal is to achieve parking for 36 guests.

Commissioner Fischer asked if any thought was put into exterior materials. Mr. Worman said at this time their goal is to achieve high quality housing that has character. Worman said there has been some discussion on roof gables, dormers and brick but not much else.

Chair Grabiell said he salutes the fact that the number of units went down from 71 to 18, adding that's a large drop. Grabiell said he still has concerns about traffic moving into and out of the area. Mr. Motzenbecker responded that at this time a traffic study is being done on the project.

Commissioner Schroeder asked the applicant if any thought was given to storm water management. Mr. Motzenbecker said they have discussed some options including water gardens, cisterns and rain barrels to collect water off the roof.

Public Comment

Kathleen Wasescha, 5348 Hollywood Road, stated she would like the Commission to consider when reviewing development proposals what the benefit would be for the neighborhood.

Discussion

Commissioner Fischer told the applicant that he likes what he sees. He said the project utilizes the grade pretty well. Fischer said the Commission will ultimately answer the questions about variances; however, the concept is good.

Commissioners asked Planner Teague if the roadway addressing the single family home is included in the land; pointing out it is important to know if the street was vacated and is included as part of this development. Teague responded that at this time he is not sure if that roadway was vacated and recorded with Hennepin County.

Commissioner Scherer commented that she agrees with Fischer; she likes the concept. Scherer said at this time she doesn't want to comment on the proposed units at three stories, reiterating she likes the concept; it's a step in the right direction.

Commissioner Carpenter said he agrees with Commissioners comments; however, he still thinks the site may be a little tight. Carpenter suggested they reconsider the number of units to allow some "breathing" room.

Commissioner Forrest said she has a concern with the east setback; however, she would like a "clearer" picture before she makes any decision. Forrest also said it would be important to know if this project proceeds if the street (Pukuana) was vacated and is part of the site.

Commissioner Staunton said that this definitely is an area of transition although he's not sure R-1 is appropriate here, adding the townhouse project feels right. Continuing, Staunton acknowledged the applicants desire to embrace the Grandview area, but in his opinion how the project addresses 49th Street will be the most important. Concluding, Staunton said low density is desirable in this location.

Commissioner Potts commented that the proposed townhouse project appears to be a good fit, adding he could support a low density project in this location.

Commissioner Schroeder said with regard to the Grandview Small Area Plan and its surrounding roadway systems that reconfiguration of the Highway 100 ramps was discussed as a future possibility. Schroeder added if there was a reconfiguration of these ramps the excess land could serve a useful purpose. Schroeder said it may be important to anticipate "what could happen" in the future. Commissioners agreed.

Chair Grabiell thanked the applicant for their presentation and said the following should be addressed if the project proceeds:

- Find out if the road that serves the single family home was vacated;
 - Consider reducing the number of units;
 - Conduct a traffic study; and
 - Consider what this development would look like from the people that live directly across the street from it.
-

B. Zoning Ordinance Amendments

- **Grading**
- **Subdivisions**

Planner Presentation

Planner Teague said what he would like from the Commission at this time is how to move forward getting public input on ordinance amendments.

Teague added he sees a couple ways the Commission can proceed; 1) Hold a public hearing at a regular meeting of the Planning Commission; or 2) Hold a public hearing at another venue; such as the Senior Center; not at a regular Planning Commission meeting.

Teague also said he would like further thought by the Commission on how to “reach out” to residents on specific issues.

Discussion

Chair Grabiell commented that the Commission would need to decide if the public speaks more freely at an informal venue vs. a formal venue such as a televised Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Platteter added in his opinion there are benefits from a less formal setting such as the Senior Center. Commissioner Potts agreed, adding he believes the language developed thus far on retaining walls and grading is good; however it would be good to have an informal discussion with residents on these topics. Continuing, Potts asked Planner Teague if the suggested language changes to the code with regard to retaining walls and grading add additional survey costs to residents. Teague responded in the affirmative. He noted that the Engineering Department in some instances has requested information on a survey for retaining walls less than 4-feet.

Commissioner Staunton said from his experience with the “Grandview” project that beginning with a less formal setting worked well. He noted that getting other people’s opinions and knowledge is a good thing. Staunton pointed out that the Council has proposed the use of “small working “groups ” adding, these small groups can discuss the best way to gather public input and also tackle ordinance topics. Continuing, Staunton said the goal is to reach out to everyone in a thoughtful manner and gather as much information as possible before the formal public hearing process begins.

Commissioner Carpenter agreed and pointed out some of the issues that need to be tackled may not be considered very exciting and finding the correct way to gather input shouldn't be limited. Carpenter suggested having a larger "drawing card", retaining walls and grading issues may not attract enough participation, open it up more.

Commissioner Forrest agreed. She said in her opinion the suggested language on retaining walls and grading may sufficiently address past issues; however, developing on 50-foot wide lots with or without subdivision continues to create issues throughout the City. Concluding, Forrest wondered if creating working groups with members of the Commission would be the correct way to proceed.

Commissioner Staunton agreed adding the Commission should take the time to do this correctly. He said a few Commissioners could form a small sub group that sub group would form a "working or steering" group/committee that would include residents, property owners, developers, engineers etc. He added it will take energy to find the correct people that care about specific topics. Concluding, Staunton said the Commission should deliberately reach out.

Commissioner Fischer agreed adding a Commission sub group with a "working groups" to deal with specific topics has merit. This group could then have a "public session" on these specific topics and present their findings to the full Commission.

Commissioner Potts said another issue that is important for him to resolve is the definition of "neighborhood"; is it the 500-foot neighborhood as per subdivision ordinance and if it is what about those "lots" that fall between a change in neighborhoods as previously happened with the last subdivision.

Commissioner Staunton suggested that Commissioners Platteter, Potts and Forrest lead the first sub group of the Commission. He said he envisions the sub group to field a working group that would be comprised of residents, developers, contractors or others they feel would help. Topics for this subgroup could include building on 50-foot lots, grading and retaining walls, neighborhood definition etc. Commissioners Platteter, Forrest and Potts agreed to form a sub group of the Commission that would include a "working or steering group/committee" to gather input on specific issues (as mentioned previously) and report back to the Commission their findings.

The discussion concluded noting this is the "Holiday" season, adding it is reasonable to discuss this further after the 1st of the year; however the sub group could begin meeting at any time to discuss their topics and consider members for their "working or steering" group/committee and report back to the Commission on their efforts.

VIII. CORRESPONDENCE AND PETITIONS

Chair Grabiell acknowledged back of packet materials.

VIII. CHAIR AND COMMISSION COMMENTS

None.

IX. STAFF COMMENTS

None.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Platteter moved meeting adjournment at 9:25 PM. Commissioner Potts seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

Jackie Hoogenakker

Respectfully submitted