

# REPORT / RECOMMENDATION



**To:** MAYOR AND COUNCIL

**Agenda Item #:**

VI.A.

**From:** Cary Teague, Community Development Director

**Action**



**Discussion**



**Date:** October 21, 2014

**Information**



**Subject:** PUBLIC HEARING – First Reading for Final Rezoning from POD-I, to PUD, Final Development Plan and Ordinance Amendment establishing the PUD District, Beacon Interfaith Housing Collaborative; 3330 66<sup>th</sup> Street. Res. No. 2014-115 and Ordinance No. 2014-17.

### **Action Requested:**

Approve first reading of the approvals. Second reading would happen after the Metropolitan Council has approved the Comprehensive Plan Amendments.

### **Staff and Planning Commission Recommendation:**

Final Rezoning to PUD, Planned Unit Development District & Final Development Plan

Adopt Resolution No. 2014-115, approving the Final Rezoning to PUD, Planned Unit Development, and approving the Final Development Plan.

Ordinance Amendment

Adopt Ordinance Not. 2014-17.

### **Information/Background:**

#### **(Deadline for a City Council Decision – October 22, 2014)**

The City Council is asked to consider final review for a redevelopment request of the existing TCF Bank building, located at 3330 66<sup>th</sup> Street by Beacon Interfaith Housing Collaborative (Beacon). The applicant proposes to remodel and expand the building into 39 units of small studio apartments for young adults (age 18-22) who have experienced homelessness. The size of the units would range from 322-451 square feet. Each unit would contain a full kitchen and bathroom. The building would contain offices for on-site service providers and property management. There would also be a community area for residents; a fitness area; a computer lab and a laundry room. (See applicant narrative and plans within the attached Planning Commission staff report.)

The site is 39,204 square feet in size. The existing bank is 18,179 square feet. The proposed addition would be 10,458 square feet. The building would remain two stories. The remodel of the building would retain the existing brick, and the addition would be brick with metal panels.

There would be 19 surface parking stalls. Proof of parking would total 37 total surface stalls. No enclosed parking is proposed. The applicants have indicated in their narrative that 18% of their residents have cars. Beacon anticipates that no more than 12 stalls would be required for residents. The maximum need for staff

parking is 6 stalls. Therefore, they believe they would have adequate parking. Residents are expected to utilize the Metro Transit bus service available across the street at Southdale.

All of the 39 units would be considered affordable housing, and would apply towards the City and Met Council's goal for affordable housing.

This development proposal is the second of the two-step review process. The first step in the process resulted in the following approvals by City Council:

1. A Comprehensive Guide Plan Amendment to allow affordable housing with supportive services, in addition to Senior Housing in the Regional Medical District.
2. Preliminary Rezoning from POD-1, Planned Office District-1, to PUD, Planned Unit Development and Preliminary Development Plan.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- Resolution No. 2014-115
- Ordinance No. 2014-17
- City Council minutes, September 2, 2014
- Planning Commission minutes, October 7, 2014
- Planning Commission staff report dated October 7, 2014



**RESOLUTION NO. 2014-115**  
**FINAL REZONING FROM POD-1, PLANNED OFFICE DISTRICT-1, to PUD, PLANNED**  
**UNIT DEVELOPMAND AND FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN**  
**FOR 3330 66<sup>TH</sup> STREET**

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

**Section 1. BACKGROUND.**

- 1.01 Beacon Interfaith Housing Collaborative proposes to remodel and expand an existing building into 39 units of small studio apartments for young adults (age 18-22) who have experienced homelessness.
- 1.02 The property is legally described as follows:
- Lot 2, Block 3, Southdale Acres, Hennepin County Minnesota
- 1.03 To accommodate the request, the following land use applications are requested:
1. Final Rezoning from POD-1, Planned Office District-1, to PUD, Planned Unit Development; and
  2. Final Development Plan.
- 1.04 On October 7, 2014, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the Final Rezoning and Final Development Plan. Vote: 5 Ayes and 0 Nays.

**Section 2. FINDINGS**

- 2.01 Approval is based on the following findings:
1. Affordable housing is identified as a need in the Comprehensive Plan; and the rezoning will assist the City in meeting its established affordable housing goal with the Metropolitan Council of providing 212 new affordable housing units by the year 2020. This project would include 39 new affordable housing units toward that goal.
  2. The proposed density of 43 units per acre is reasonable, and within the density range suggested in the Comprehensive Plan of between 12-80 units per acre.
  3. The proposed affordable housing project will generate less traffic than the existing bank facility.
  4. The uses allowed by the rezoning are compatible with present and future land uses in the area.
  5. The project will utilize sustainability principles. Most notable elements include: compliance with Minnesota Overlay and Guide to the 2011 Enterprise Green Communities Criteria; utilizing the existing building rather than a tear down; committing to a 15% energy savings; locating the building to make use of Metro Transit; impervious surface will be reduced by 6.9%; enhanced landscaping; making use of special construction material; installing a rain garden for storm water management; and pedestrian oriented design.
  6. The project will meet the following additional Comprehensive Plan goals and objectives:

- a) Promotion of a vision of community that is inclusive of a wide range of ages, incomes, and abilities and offers a wide range of housing options for Edina residents.
- b) Promotion of lifecycle housing to support a range of housing options that meet people's preferences and circumstance at all stages of life.
- c) Encourage an integrated mix of building type, heights and footprints within blocks, rather than single buildings or building groups.
- d) Incorporate principles of sustainability and energy conservation into all aspects of design, construction, renovation and long-term operation of new and existing development.

**Section 3. APPROVAL**

NOW THEREFORE, it is hereby resolved by the City Council of the City of Edina, approves the Final Rezoning to PUD, Planned Unit Development and Final Development Plan. The Final Development Plan is subject to the following conditions:

1. Subject to staff approval, the site must be developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the following plans, unless modified by the conditions below:
  - Site plan date stamped September 12, 2014.
  - Grading plan date stamped September 12, 2014.
  - Utility plan date stamped September 12, 2014.
  - Landscaping plan date stamped September 12, 2014.
  - Building elevations date stamped September 12, 2014
  - Building materials board as presented at the Planning Commission and City Council meeting.
2. Prior to issuance of a building permit, a final landscape plan must be submitted, subject to staff approval. The Final Landscape Plan must meet all minimum landscaping requirements per Section 36-1436 through 36-1462 of the City Code. Additionally, a performance bond, letter-of-credit, or cash deposit must be submitted for one and one-half times the cost amount for completing the required landscaping, screening, or erosion control measures.
3. The property owner is responsible for replacing any required landscaping that dies.
4. The Final Lighting Plan must meet all minimum requirements per Section 36-1260 of the City Code.
5. Submit a copy of the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District permit. The City may require revisions to the approved plans to meet the district's requirements.
6. Sustainable design. The design and construction of the entire project must be done with the Sustainable Initiatives as outlined in the applicant's narrative within the Planning Commission staff report. Attempts must be made meet an energy savings goal of 15% over state energy code guidelines. A plan of how standards are intended to be met must be submitted prior to issuance of a building permit.
7. All buildings must be built with sprinkler systems, subject to review and approval of the fire marshal.

- 8. Compliance with all of the conditions outlined in the director of engineering's memo dated July 15, 2014.
- 9. Approval of a Zoning Ordinance Amendment establishing the PUD-7, Planned Unit Development for this site.
- 10. Final Rezoning is subject to review and approval of the Metropolitan Council of a Comprehensive Plan Amendment.
- 11. For the first year of operation, the facility shall have 24-hour staffing, 7 days per week.

Adopted by the city council of the City of Edina, Minnesota, on \_\_\_\_\_, 2014.

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
Debra A. Mangen, City Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_  
James B. Hovland, Mayor

STATE OF MINNESOTA            )  
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN        )SS  
CITY OF EDINA                    )

CERTIFICATE OF CITY CLERK

I, the undersigned duly appointed and acting City Clerk for the City of Edina do hereby certify that the attached and foregoing Resolution was duly adopted by the Edina City Council at its Regular Meeting of \_\_\_\_\_, 2014, and as recorded in the Minutes of said Regular Meeting.

WITNESS my hand and seal of said City this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2014.

\_\_\_\_\_  
City Clerk

**ORDINANCE NO. 2014-17**

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE ZONING ORDINANCE  
TO ESTABLISH THE PUD-7, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT-7  
DISTRICT AT 3330 66<sup>th</sup> STREET**

The City Council Of Edina Ordains:

**Section 1.** Chapter 36, Article VIII, Division 4 is hereby amended to rezone the below described property to PUD, Planned Unit Development in accordance with the following:

**Sec. 36-494 Planned Unit Development District-7 (PUD-7) – 66<sup>TH</sup> West Apartments**

(a) *Legal description:*

The South 300 feet of Lot 2, as measured along the West line of said lot from the Southwest corner thereof in Block 3, Southdale Acres, Hennepin County, Minnesota. Torrens Property Certificate of Title No: 361393.

(b) **Approved Plans.** Incorporated herein by reference are the re-development plans received by the City on September 12, 2014 except as amended by City Council Resolution No. 2014-115, on file in the Office of the Planning Department.

(c) **Principal Uses:**

Affordable housing with supportive services to assist residents with maintaining stability in housing and employment, as proposed and described by Beacon Interfaith Housing collaborative in their project description on file in the Office of the Planning Department. Any change in use of the site will require an amendment to this PUD-7 Ordinance.

All uses allowed in the POD-1 District, as listed in Section 36-575.

(d) **Accessory Uses:**

Off-street parking facilities.

(e) **Conditional Uses:**

None

(f) **Development Standards.** Development standards per the POD-1 Zoning District, except the following:

Building Setbacks

<b><u>Building Setbacks</u></b> Front – 66 <sup>th</sup> Street Front – Barrie Road	43 feet 25 feet
Side – North Rear – South	50 feet 25 feet
Building Height	2 stories
Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR)	.77%
Building Coverage	30%
Parking Stalls (affordable housing with services)  <u>Parking stalls (Office uses per Section 36-575)</u>	19 surface Proof-of-parking for 37  <u>Per the Parking requirements of Sec. 36-1311</u>

(g) Signs for POD-1 use shall be allowed per the POD-1 standards in Sec. 36-1714.

Signs affordable housing with supportive services shall be allowed per Section 36-1712.

**Section 3.** This ordinance is effective immediately upon passage.

First Reading:

Second Reading:

Published:

ATTEST:

---

Debra A. Mangen, City Clerk

James B. Hovland, Mayor

Please publish in the Edina Sun Current on:

Send two affidavits of publication.

Bill to Edina City Clerk

CERTIFICATE OF CITY CLERK

I, the undersigned duly appointed and acting City Clerk for the City of Edina do hereby certify that the attached and foregoing Ordinance was duly adopted by the Edina City Council at its Regular Meeting of \_\_\_\_\_, 2014, and as recorded in the Minutes of said Regular Meeting.

WITNESS my hand and seal of said City this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2014.

---

City Clerk

**Minutes/Edina City Council/September 2, 2014**

**Member Brindle made a motion, seconded by Member Swenson, to close the public hearing.**

Ayes: Bennett, Brindle, Sprague, Swenson, Hovland

Motion carried.

**Member Bennett introduced and moved adoption of Resolution No. 2014-92, Approving a Conditional Use Permit at 4603 Annaway Drive for Nicole and Greg Jennings, subject to the following conditions:**

**1. The site must be developed and maintained in conformance with the following plans:**

- **Survey date stamped June 23, 2014**
- **Building plans and elevations date stamped June 23, 2014**

**2. Compliance with the conditions and comment listed in the Environmental Engineer's memo dated August 1, 2014.**

Member Sprague seconded the motion.

Rollcall:

Ayes: Bennett, Brindle, Sprague, Swenson, Hovland

Motion carried.

***VI.D. COMPREHENSIVE GUIDE PLAN AMENDMENT, PRELIMINARY REZONING FROM POD-I TO PUD, BEACON INTERFAITH HOUSING COLLABORATIVE, 3330 WEST 66TH STREET-- RESOLUTION NO. 2014-93 AND RESOLUTION 2014-94 – ADOPTED***

Community Development Director Presentation

Community Development Director Teague presented the request from Beacon Interfaith Housing Collaborative for a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to allow affordable housing in the Regional Medical District. The applicant also requested preliminary rezoning from Planned Office District-I to Planned Unit Development and approval of the Preliminary Development Plan. The proponent proposed to remodel and expand the existing TCF Bank building located at 3330 66<sup>th</sup> Street into 39 affordable housing units of small studio apartments for young adults who had experienced homelessness. There would be 19 surface parking stalls and proof-of-parking for 37 total surface stalls. Mr. Teague presented details of the proposal. The Planning Commission recommended denial of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, but recommended instead approval of a Comprehensive Plan Amendment that would incorporate language into the Comprehensive Plan that would allow this type of project. The Planning Commission also suggested approval of preliminary rezoning from Planned Office District-I to Planned Unit Development. Staff offered four Comprehensive Plan wording options for Council consideration, and recommended Option 3, correcting the density wording to reflect 'senior housing and affordable housing' rather than 'specialty housing.'

Mr. Teague answered questions of the Council relating to the definition of 'specialty housing,' ability to write specific housing type as well as potential appropriate future uses within the PUD, adequacy of parking, and rezoning if the site was used for another purpose.

Proponent Presentation

Lee Blons, Executive Director of Beacon Interfaith Housing Collaborative, presented the request to develop 66 West as affordable housing (apartments) for homeless youth. Ms. Blons described Beacon as an experienced developer of quality housing, shared its vision, and belief in the power of 'home.' The project involved many local churches including Edina Community Lutheran Church as the lead congregation. Ms. Blons shared the requirements for each tenant, supportive services that would be provided to tenants, development costs, site attributes, and availability of funding. Ms. Blons asked the Council to support the change necessary to the Comprehensive Plan and PUD to allow affordable housing for young people at 66 West to become a reality.

Mayor Hovland opened the public hearing at 8:24 p.m.

Public Testimony

Minutes/Edina City Council/September 2, 2014

Mark Chamberlain, 7004 Bristol Boulevard, addressed the Council.

Edward Schuck, 395 Lake Street West, Wayzata, addressed the Council.

Ruth Lordan, 6453 Barrie Road, addressed the Council.

Senator Melisa Franzen, 6216 Maloney Avenue, addressed the Council.

Rose Minor, Step by Step Montessori School, 6519 Barrie Road, addressed the Council.

Dr. William Davis, 6616 Cornelia Drive, addressed the Council.

Mike Nelson, 5329 61st Street West, addressed the Council.

Bishop Ann Svennungsen, 301 Clifton Avenue, Minneapolis, addressed the Council.

Dr. Elizabeth Briden, 6525 Barrie Road, addressed the Council.

Thomas Stone, 3710 Nicollet Avenue South, Apartment 204, addressed the Council.

Tom Nelson, Kenwood Lowry Hill Neighborhood, Minneapolis, addressed the Council.

Mikkel Beckmen, 5332 Freemont Avenue South, Minneapolis, addressed the Council.

Robert Long, 7900 Xerxes Avenue South, Minneapolis, addressed the Council.

Jeanette Auguston, 5000 Arden Avenue, addressed the Council.

John Crane, 5610 Woodcrest Drive, addressed the Council.

Lisa Thompson, 5500 Benton Avenue, addressed the Council.

Rita Babcock, 12500 Briarwood Terrace, Minnetonka, addressed the Council.

Floyd Grabel, 4817 Wilford Way, addressed the Council.

Lauren Morse Wendt, 1449 Frankson Avenue, St. Paul, addressed the Council.

Betsy Cussler, 5825 Vernon Lane, addressed the Council.

Daniel Tysver, 2104 53rd Street West, Minneapolis, addressed the Council.

Andrea Knoll, 4601 Arden Avenue, addressed the Council.

Maura Schnorbach, 6221 Balder Lane, addressed the Council.

Dr. Ward Godsall, 5601 Johnson Drive, addressed the Council.

Dr. Helen Wood, 6525 Drew Avenue South, addressed the Council.

Robert Hobbins, 4708 Upper Terrace, addressed the Council.

Pastor Erik Strand, 4113 54th Street West, addressed the Council.

Mark Swiggum, 7234 Ticonderoga Trail, Eden Prairie, addressed the Council.

**Minutes/Edina City Council/September 2, 2014**

David Vandongen, 5620 Kellogg Place, addressed the Council.

Eileen Supple, 7332 West Shore Drive, addressed the Council.

Father Tim Rudolphi, 6820 St. Patrick Lane, addressed the Council.

**Member Swenson made a motion, seconded by Member Sprague, to close the public hearing.**

Ayes: Bennett, Brindle, Sprague, Swenson, Hovland

Motion carried.

**Member Bennett introduced and moved adoption of Resolution No. 2014-93, Approving a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to Allow Additional Housing in the RMD, Regional Medical District and Resolution No. 2014-94, Preliminary Rezoning from POD-1, Planned Office District-1, to PUD, Planned Unit Development and Preliminary Development Plan for 3330 66th Street.** Motion died for lack of a second.

The Council asked Police Chief Nelson questions relating to safety and security. He reported the Police Department received an average of 19 to 20 calls for service per year from Nicollet Square, a similar Beacon establishment.

The Council asked Attorney Knutson questions relating to the application. Mr. Knutson answered that the deadline for Final Rezoning was October 7, 2014. With regard to the comment on spot zoning, he explained it was irrational zoning with no basis or foundation, such as zoning to favor a proponent.

Ms. Blons responded to the Council's questions relating to the psychological needs of the residents. The Council also asked Ms. Blons if 66 West would staff a 24-hour desk like Nicollet Square. Ms. Blons answered that staff would be present at night and on weekends, but Beacon had hoped to not be required to provide 24-hour care. However, Beacon would provide that service if the Council desired.

Sara Larson, Beacon Project Manager, explained that TCF Bank had approached realtors that had previously expressed interest and called Beacon's broker. Ms. Blons reviewed the search process to find this site, the cost effectiveness of this site, findings of the parking study, and adequacy of parking.

The Council and Ms. Blons discussed the issue of security and staffing hours. It was noted the building would have a security system, requiring a secured key card to enter. The Council expressed a desire to have 66 West staffed 24 hours per day for the first year and agreed to add it as a condition of approval. Following additional discussion, Attorney Knutson explained that in order to rezone the property back to POD-1, the Council would complete the same process and the City would be the applicant. **Member Bennett introduced and moved adoption of Resolution No. 2014-93, Approving a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to Allow Additional Housing in the RMD, Regional Medical District, utilizing proposed language Option 3.** Member Swenson seconded the motion.

The Council recognized the need to provide workforce housing, importance of addressing the needs of homeless youth, some of the most vulnerable among us, and appropriateness of this site for Beacon's worthwhile project.

Rollcall:

Ayes: Bennett, Brindle, Sprague, Swenson, Hovland

Motion carried.

**Member Bennett introduced and moved adoption of Resolution No. 2014-94, Preliminary Rezoning from POD-1, Planned Office District-1, to PUD, Planned Unit Development and Preliminary Development Plan for 3330 66th Street, subject to the following conditions:**

1. The Final Development Plan must be generally consistent with approved Preliminary Development Plans dated June 20, 2014.
2. Sustainable design. The design and construction of the entire project must be done with the Sustainable Initiatives as outlined in the applicant's narrative within the Planning Commission staff report.
3. All buildings must be built with sprinkler systems, subject to review and approval of the fire marshal.
4. Compliance with all of the conditions outlined in the director of engineering's memo dated July 15, 2014.
5. The Final Landscape Plan must meet all minimum landscaping requirements per Chapter 36 of the Zoning Ordinance.
6. The Final Lighting Plan must meet all minimum landscaping requirements per Chapter 36 of the Zoning Ordinance.
7. Final Rezoning is subject to a Zoning Ordinance Amendment creating the PUD, Planned Unit Development for this site.
8. Final Rezoning is subject to review and approval of the Metropolitan Council on the Comprehensive Plan Amendment.
9. For the first year of operation, the facility shall have 24-hour staffing, seven days a week. Staffing may be provided by adult volunteers.

Member Swenson seconded the motion.

Rollcall:

Ayes: Bennett, Brindle, Sprague, Swenson, Hovland

Motion carried.

#### **VII. COMMUNITY COMMENT**

This item was considered prior to Item VI. Public Hearings.

#### **VIII. REPORTS / RECOMMENDATIONS**

##### **VIII.A. RESOLUTION NO. 2014-87 ADOPTED – ACCEPTING VARIOUS GRANTS AND DONATIONS**

Mayor Hovland explained that in order to comply with State Statutes; all donations to the City must be adopted by Resolution and approved by four favorable votes of the Council accepting the donations.

**Member Bennett introduced and moved adoption of Resolution No. 2014-87 accepting various grants and donations.** Member Sprague seconded the motion.

Rollcall:

Ayes: Bennett, Brindle, Sprague, Swenson, Hovland

Motion carried.

#### **IX. CORRESPONDENCE AND PETITIONS**

##### **IX.A. CORRESPONDENCE**

Mayor Hovland acknowledged the Council's receipt of various correspondence.

##### **IX.B. HUMAN RIGHTS & RELATIONS COMMISSION ADVISORY COMMUNICATION –**

Received

##### **IX.C. MINUTES:**

1. **EDINA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, JULY 17, 2014**
2. **ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT COMMISSION, JULY 10, 2014**
3. **PLANNING COMMISSION, JULY 23, 2014**

Informational; no action required.

##### **X. AVIATION NOISE UPDATE – Received**

##### **XI. MAYOR AND COUNCIL COMMENTS – Received**

### Public Testimony

No public comment. Chair Staunton asked for a motion to close the public hearing. Commissioner Scherer moved to close the public hearing. Commissioner Lee seconded the motion. All voted aye; public hearing closed.

### Discussion

Commissioner Scherer said she agrees with Commissioner Lee's comments that the applicants did a good job on the building design and minimizing impact. Scherer further added the proposed basement height at 8-feet is reasonable.

Chair Staunton said he agrees with comments from Commissioners Lee and Scherer, adding the project is reasonable and he can support it as presented.

### Motion

**Commissioner Scherer moved Conditional Use Permit approval based on staff findings and subject to staff conditions. Commissioner Lee seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried 5-0.**

---

## **C. Final Rezoning and Final Development Plan. Beacon Interfaith Housing. 3330 West 66<sup>th</sup> Street, Edina, MN**

### Planner Presentation

Planner Teague told the Commission they are being asked to consider Final Rezoning and Final Development Plan for a redevelopment request of the existing TCF Bank building, located at 3330 66<sup>th</sup> Street by Beacon Interfaith Housing Collaborative (Beacon). Teague reported the proposed plans are the same as the plans that were approved in the first phase of this review, including the Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

Teague explained the applicant proposes to remodel and expand the building into 39 units of small studio apartments for young adults (age 18-22) who have experienced homelessness. The size of the units would range from 322-451 square feet. Each unit would contain a full kitchen and bathroom. The building would contain offices for on-site service providers and property management. There would also be a community area for residents; a fitness area; a computer lab and a laundry room. The site is 39,204 square feet in size. The existing bank is 18,179 square feet. The proposed addition would be 10,458 square feet. The building would remain two stories. The remodel of the building would retain the existing brick, and the addition would be brick with metal panels.

Teague added there would be 19 surface parking stalls. Proof of parking would total 37 total surface stalls. No enclosed parking is proposed. The applicants have indicated in their narrative that 18% of their residents have cars. Beacon anticipates that no more than 12 stalls would be required for residents. The maximum need for staff parking is 6 stalls. Therefore, they believe they would have adequate parking. Residents are expected to utilize the Metro Transit bus service available across the street at Southdale. All of the 39 units would be considered affordable housing, and would apply towards the City and Met Council's goal for affordable housing.

Planner Teague concluded that staff recommends that the City Council approve the Final Rezoning and approve the Final Development Plan.

Approval is based on the following findings:

1. Affordable housing is identified as a need in the Comprehensive Plan; and the proposed amendment would assist the City in meeting its established affordable housing goal with the Met Council of providing 212 new affordable housing units by the year 2020. This project would include 39 new affordable housing units toward that goal.
2. The proposed density of 43 units per acre is reasonable, and within the density range suggested in the Comprehensive Plan of between 12-80 units per acre.
3. The proposed affordable housing project would generate less traffic than the existing bank facility.
4. The project would utilize sustainability principles. Most notable elements include: compliance with Minnesota Overlay and Guide to the 2011 Enterprise Green Communities Criteria; utilizing the existing building rather than a tear down; committing to a 15% energy savings; locating the building to make use of Metro Transit; impervious surface would be reduced by 6.9%; enhanced landscaping; making use of special construction material; installing a rain garden for storm water management; and pedestrian oriented design.
5. Project would meet the following additional Comprehensive Plan goals and objectives:
  - a) Promotion of a vision of community that is inclusive of a wide range of ages, incomes, and abilities and offers a wide range of housing options for Edina residents.
  - b) Promotion of lifecycle housing to support a range of housing options that meet people's preferences and circumstance at all stages of life.
  - c) Encourage an integrated mix of building type, heights and footprints within blocks, rather than single buildings or building groups.
  - d) Incorporate principles of sustainability and energy conservation into all aspects of design, construction, renovation and long-term operation of new and existing development.

Final approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. Subject to staff approval, the site must be developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the following plans, unless modified by the conditions below:
  - Site plan date stamped September 12, 2014.
  - Grading plan date stamped September 12, 2014.
  - Utility plan date stamped September 12, 2014.
  - Landscaping plan date stamped September 12, 2014.
  - Building elevations date stamped September 12, 2014
  - Building materials board as presented at the Planning Commission and City Council meeting.
2. Prior to issuance of a building permit, a final landscape plan must be submitted, subject to staff approval. The Final Landscape Plan must meet all minimum landscaping requirements per Section 36-1436 through 36-1462 of the City Code. Additionally, a performance bond, letter-of-credit, or cash deposit must be submitted for one and one-half times the cost amount for completing the required landscaping, screening, or erosion control measures.
3. The property owner is responsible for replacing any required landscaping that dies.
4. The Final Lighting Plan must meet all minimum requirements per Section 36-1260 of the City Code.
5. Submit a copy of the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District permit. The City may require revisions to the approved plans to meet the district's requirements.
6. Sustainable design. The design and construction of the entire project must be done with the Sustainable Initiatives as outlined in the applicant's narrative within the Planning Commission staff report. Attempts must be made meet an energy savings goal of 15% over state energy code guidelines. A plan of how standards are intended to be met must be submitted prior to issuance of a building permit.
7. Compliance with all of the conditions outlined in the director of engineering's memo dated July 15, 2014.
8. Approval of a Zoning Ordinance Amendment establishing the PUD-7, Planned Unit Development for this site.
9. Final Rezoning is subject to review and approval of the Metropolitan Council on the Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

And recommend to the City Council adoption of the Ordinance Amendment establishing the PUD-Zoning District.

**Appearing for the Applicant**

Bart Nelson

## **Applicant Presentation**

Mr. Nelson delivered a power point presentation highlighting aspects of the building. Nelson further noted the plans presented are the same that were approved by the Commission and Council in the first phase.

Chair Staunton opened the public hearing.

## **Public Testimony**

Bob Long, Larkin Hoffman addressed the Commission and reported he represents Citizens to Preserve the RMD District and raised the following points:

- 1) The Comprehensive Plan hasn't been approved by the Met Council; therefore the final rezoning and final development plan legally can't be heard;
- 2) If the hearing were to proceed this evening he would object;
- 3) On October 8, 2014, Larkin Hoffman served the City with legal papers.

Concluding, Long asked the Commission to "table" this request until the City receives a response from Met Council.

Jackie Prince, 7200 York Avenue, #602 indicated her support for the project.

Chair Staunton asked if anyone else would like to speak to the project; being none Commissioner Platteter moved to close the public hearing. Commissioner Scherer seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried. Public hearing closed.

Chair Staunton asked Planner Teague if the request for final rezoning and final development plan can be heard. Teague responded he spoke with the City Attorney and the request can be heard. Staunton further acknowledged receipt of a law suit on behalf of Citizens to Preserve the RMD District/Larkin Hoffman.

## **Discussion**

Commissioner Lee asked if the windows proposed for the building are vinyl double hung. Mr. Nelson responded some windows are double hung; but not all. Operable windows will be located in the individual living units. Lee said she would like to see conformity with the windows. Continuing, Lee said she also has some concerns that the exterior materials aren't very durable. She added it's important to her after renovation and construction that the building looks like the renderings presented this evening. Nelson agreed, adding he would look into Commissioner Lee's comments.

A discussion ensued on the balancing of goals between ordinance and comprehensive plan. The proposal as presented complies with Met Council requirements of providing affordable housing; however, the sites RMD guide needed to be amended to allow this use. It was further noted if this property was one block to the north there would be no

issue, no hearing; the proposed use is allowed in residential zones. Teague agreed, adding the review this evening is to ensure that the plans presented are consistent with the plans approved at preliminary approval.

### **Motion**

**Commissioner Platteter moved to recommend final rezoning and final development plan approval based on staff findings and subject to staff conditions. Commissioner Lee seconded the motion. All vote aye; motion carried. 5-0**

**Commissioner Platteter moved to recommend approval of a zoning ordinance amendment establishing the PUD District based on staff findings to include the revised ordinance language and staff conditions. Commissioner Scherer seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried. 5-0**

Commissioner Platteter asked Planner Teague to clarify for the Commission the revision to the ordinance. Planner Teague explained that the revision would tie the parking stall requirements for the site to an office use.

---

### **D. Preliminary Rezoning & Preliminary Development Plan. Frauenshuh; 7700 France Avenue, Edina, MN.**

#### **Planner Presentation**

Planner Teague informed the Commission Frauenshuh Companies is proposing to develop the northeast corner of 7700 France with a free standing, 7,000 square foot seafood restaurant. The site is 17 acres in size and contains a six-story 275,000 square foot office building and a 7,623 square foot single-story office building (bank) in the southeast corner of the site.

Teague reported the restaurant would be designed for seating up to 242 people, and would provide 63 dedicated parking spaces in addition to the shared parking with the office building. The proposed building would be made of brick, EIFS, cedar, glass and metal panels. An area for outdoor dining is proposed along France Avenue.

Teague explained the primary issue with this request is that a free-standing restaurant is not a permitted use in the POD-2 zoning district. A restaurant is a permitted accessory use within an office building. The applicant went through the sketch plan process with this request in 2012. Both the Planning Commission and City Council suggested that PUD rezoning was the best way to approach the use on the site. Continuing, Teague stated to accommodate the request a Preliminary Rezoning from POD-2, Planned Office



## PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

Originator <b>Cary Teague</b> Community Development Director	Meeting Date <b>October 7, 2014</b>	Agenda # <b>VI.C.</b>
---	--	--------------------------

### INFORMATION/BACKGROUND

#### Project Description

The Planning Commission is asked to consider Final Rezoning and Final Development Plan for a redevelopment request of the existing TCF Bank building, located at 3330 66<sup>th</sup> Street by Beacon Interfaith Housing Collaborative (Beacon). (See property location on pages A1–A8.)

The proposed plans are the same as the plans that were approved in the first phase of this review, including the Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

The applicant proposes to remodel and expand the building into 39 units of small studio apartments for young adults (age 18-22) who have experienced homelessness. The size of the units would range from 322-451 square feet. Each unit would contain a full kitchen and bathroom. The building would contain offices for on-site service providers and property management. There would also be a community area for residents; a fitness area; a computer lab and a laundry room. (See applicant narrative and plans on pages A9–A47.)

The site is 39,204 square feet in size. The existing bank is 18,179 square feet. The proposed addition would be 10,458 square feet. The building would remain two stories. The remodel of the building would retain the existing brick, and the addition would be brick with metal panels. (See building renderings on pages A43–A46.)

There would be 19 surface parking stalls. Proof of parking would total 37 total surface stalls. No enclosed parking is proposed. The applicants have indicated in their narrative that 18% of their residents have cars. Beacon anticipates that no more than 12 stalls would be required for residents. The maximum need for staff parking is 6 stalls. Therefore, they believe they would have adequate parking. Residents are expected to utilize the Metro Transit bus service available across the street at Southdale.

All of the 39 units would be considered affordable housing, and would apply towards the City and Met Council's goal for affordable housing.

As part of the first phase of the review process, the applicant received the following approvals:

1. A Comprehensive Guide Plan Amendment to allow affordable housing with supportive services in addition to Senior Housing in the Regional Medical District.
2. Preliminary Rezoning from POD-1, Planned Office District-1, to PUD, Planned Unit Development and Preliminary Development Plan.

The following is now requested:

1. Final Development Plan and Final Rezoning to a PUD.
2. Zoning Ordinance Amendment establishing the PUD District.

### **Surrounding Land Uses**

- Northerly: Office buildings; zoned POD-1, Planned Office District and guided RM, Regional Medical District.
- Easterly: Multi-story office buildings; zoned POD-1, Planned Office District and guided RM, Regional Medical District.
- Southerly: Firestone Tire & Southdale; Zoned PCD-3, Planned Commercial District and guided CAC, Community Activity Center.
- Westerly: Multi-story office buildings; zoned POD-1, Planned Office District and guided RM, Regional Medical District.

### **Existing Site Features**

The subject property is 39,339 square feet in size, is relatively flat and contains a two-story TCF Bank. (See pages A2–A3.)

### **Planning**

- Guide Plan designation: RM, Regional Medical. (See page A5.)
- Zoning: POD-1, Planned Office District -1. (See page A6.)

## Density

Proposed Density of the project would be 43 units per acre; which would be within the density range currently allowed for senior housing and affordable housing with supportive services in the RM, Regional Medical District. The following table demonstrates existing density ranges for high density residential development in Edina. There are a variety of housing types here, from market rate housing to senior affordable housing development.

### High Density Development in Edina

Development	Address	Units	Units Per Acre
* Yorktown Continental	7151 York	264	45
The Durham	7201 York	264	46
York Plaza Condos	7200-20 York	260	34
York Plaza Apartments	7240-60 York	260	29
Edina Place Apartments	7300-50 York	139	15
* Walker Elder Suites	7400 York	72	40
* 7500 York Cooperative	7500 York	416	36
Edinburgh Condos	76xx York	392	36
* South Haven	3400 Parklawn	100	42
* The Waters	Colonial Drive	139	22
69 <sup>th</sup> & York Apartments	3121 69 <sup>th</sup> Street	114	30
* 6500 France – Senior Housing	6500 France	188	80
Lennar	6725 York	240	52

\* Senior Housing

## PUD Rezoning

The applicant is requesting a rezoning of this site to PUD, Planned Unit Development District to allow affordable housing on the site. (See attached draft PUD Ordinance.)

Within a PUD District, the setback regulation, building coverage and floor area ratio of the most closely related conventional zoning district shall be considered presumptively appropriate, but may be departed from to accomplish the purpose and intent of the PUD.

The following is compliance table that demonstrates how the proposed building would comply with the Regional Medical District standards and show residential densities in Edina. The use is currently not allowed in the existing POD-1 or RMD Zoning District.

**Compliance Table**

	<b>City Standard (POD-1 Planned Office District)</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Front – 66 <sup>th</sup> Street Front – Barrie Road	35 feet 35 feet	43 feet (existing) 25 feet (existing) 40 feet (new)
Side – North Side – east	20 feet 20 feet	50+ feet 25 feet
Building Height	12 stories or 144 feet, whichever is less	2 stories
Building Coverage	30%	30%
Density – Comp. Plan	12-80 units per acre	39 units 43 units per acre
Minimum Lot Size	10 acres (RMD Standard) No minimum in the POD District	.9 acres
Parking Stalls	1 enclosed space per unit + guest parking 39 units	<b>19 spaces exposed**</b> (proof-of-parking for 37)

**\*\* Variance Required under POD-1 Standards**

Per Chapter 36 of the City Code the following are the regulations for a PUD:

- 1. Purpose and Intent. The purpose of the PUD District is to provide comprehensive procedures and standards intended to allow more creativity and flexibility in site plan design than would be possible under a conventional zoning district. The decision to zone property to PUD is a public policy decision for**

**the City Council to make in its legislative capacity. The purpose and intent of a PUD is to include most or all of the following:**

- a. provide for the establishment of PUD (planned unit development) zoning districts in appropriate settings and situations to create or maintain a development pattern that is consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan;**
- b. promote a more creative and efficient approach to land use within the City, while at the same time protecting and promoting the health, safety, comfort, aesthetics, economic viability, and general welfare of the City;**
- c. provide for variations to the strict application of the land use regulations in order to improve site design and operation, while at the same time incorporate design elements that exceed the City's standards to offset the effect of any variations. Desired design elements may include: sustainable design, greater utilization of new technologies in building design, special construction materials, landscaping, lighting, stormwater management, pedestrian oriented design, and podium height at a street or transition to residential neighborhoods, parks or other sensitive uses;**
- d. ensure high quality of design and design compatible with surrounding land uses, including both existing and planned;**
- e. maintain or improve the efficiency of public streets and utilities;**
- f. preserve and enhance site characteristics including natural features, wetland protection, trees, open space, scenic views, and screening;**
- g. allow for mixing of land uses within a development;**
- h. encourage a variety of housing types including affordable housing; and**
- i. ensure the establishment of appropriate transitions between differing land uses.**

The project would meet some of the goals for a PUD as outline above. Those include:

- Providing a development that is 100% affordable to assist in the City affordable housing goals with the Met Council.
- Improve the efficiency of street by allowing a land use that would generate less traffic than the bank use; and it would eliminate the bank drive-through facility.
- Would utilize sustainable design as described in the applicant narrative on page A11. Most notable elements include: compliance with Minnesota Overlay and Guide to the 2011 Enterprise Green Communities Criteria; utilizing the existing building rather than a tear down; committing to a 15% energy savings; locating the building to make use of Metro Transit; impervious surface would be reduced by 6.9%; enhanced landscaping; making use of special construction material; installing a rain garden for stormwater management; and pedestrian oriented design.

The Comprehensive Plan allows senior housing as an allowed land use within the regional medical district. The proposed affordable housing with supportive services project is a form of housing that is desirable through a PUD, and would fit with this site, given its close proximity to the Metro Transit Facility across 66<sup>th</sup> Street and Southdale Shopping Center. This area would provide employment opportunities in close proximity for residents. The site is located on an edge of the Regional Medical District and on an arterial roadway.

## **2. Applicability/Criteria**

- a. Uses. All permitted uses, permitted accessory uses, conditional uses, and uses allowed by administrative permit contained in the various zoning districts defined in Section 850 of this Title shall be treated as potentially allowable uses within a PUD district, provided they would be allowable on the site under the Comprehensive Plan.***

With the recent Comprehensive Plan amendment to allow affordable housing in addition to senior housing, this project is consistent with the Regional Medical District.

The Zoning Ordinance amendment, which follows this staff report, lists the uses that would be allowed on this site. Spack Consulting did a parking analysis that determined that the proposed parking would support the uses proposed, and the traffic generated would actually be less than the previously approved medical office. (See pages A59-A81.)

The proposed residential development would generate 20 am peak hour trips and 24 pm peak hour trips. The existing bank generates 45 am peak hour trips and 89 pm peak hour trips.

**b. Eligibility Standards. To be eligible for a PUD district, all development should be in compliance with the following:**

**i. where the site of a proposed PUD is designated for more than one (1) land use in the Comprehensive Plan, the City may require that the PUD include all the land uses so designated or such combination of the designated uses as the City Council shall deem appropriate to achieve the purposes of this ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan;**

The proposal would not include a mixture of land uses. It would include affordable housing for young adults who have experienced homelessness. Within the overall RMD, Regional Medical District, this project would introduce the potential for another use in the district, and would help the City meet its affordable housing goals established with the Metropolitan Council of 212 new affordable housing units by the year 2020.

**ii. any PUD which involves a single land use type or housing type may be permitted provided that it is otherwise consistent with the objectives of this ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan;**

As mentioned above, the proposed uses would be for housing that is all affordable. Providing affordable housing and sustainable development are goals within the Comprehensive Plan that this project would accomplish. Comprehensive Plan goals and objectives include:

- Promotion of a vision of community that is inclusive of a wide range of ages, incomes, and abilities and offers a wide range of housing options for Edina residents.
- Promote lifecycle housing to support a range of housing options that meet people's preferences and circumstance at all stages of life.
- Variety of Buildings Forms. Encourage an integrated mix of building type, heights and footprints within blocks, rather than single buildings or building groups.
- Incorporate principles of sustainability and energy conservation into all aspects of design, construction, renovation and long-term operation of new and existing development.

***iii. permitted densities may be specifically stated in the appropriate planned development designation and shall be in general conformance with the Comprehensive Plan; and***

The proposed building density would be 43 units per acre and have an FAR of .77. The Floor Area Ratio contemplated in the Comprehensive Plan for Regional Medical is 1.0; however, the current POD-1 Zoning District allows an FAR of .50. The density range allowed for senior housing in the district is up to 80 units per acre.

Density in the Comprehensive Plan limits senior housing to 12-80 dwelling units per acre. Density for senior housing shall be based on proximity to hospitals, proximity to low density uses, utilities capacity, level of transit service available, and impact on adjacent roads. Other desired items to allow greater density would include: Below grade parking, provision of park or open space, affordable housing, sustainable design principles, and provision of public art.

The site has adequate utilities capacity; would generate less traffic than an office use; would provide affordable housing; would be a sustainable development; and would take advantage of Metro Transit Availability. Staff believes the density is appropriate for this site.

***iv. the setback regulation, building coverage and floor area ratio of the most closely related conventional zoning district shall be considered presumptively appropriate, but may be departed from to accomplish the purpose and intent described in #1 above.***

The proposed project does closely relate to the already established standards in the POD-1 District, as the existing building is being utilized. Flexibility is requested in regard to parking spaces. For the reasons stated above, staff believes the purpose and intent of the PUD Ordinance is met.

**Site Access**

The primary access to the site would remain off of Barrie Road. One drive entrance would be eliminated. (See page A35.)

**Parking**

Per Chapter 36, Article XII, Division 4, the requirement for multi-family residential parking in a commercial area, is one enclosed space per unit plus additional guest parking as required. Therefore, at minimum a requirement of 39 stalls plus guest parking should be provided. The

applicant is proposing 19 surface stalls, with a proof-of parking plan to 37 stalls.

Staff has some concern in regard to potential future lack of parking. While the proposed use may be able to get by with the proposed surface parking only, any future conversion of these units for market rate housing would surely be short of parking. A stipulation in a potential PUD Ordinance would be to only allow this type of housing on the site; therefore, any conversion of the units would require a PUD Amendment. Additional parking would be required as part of any PUD Amendment.

A parking study was done by Spack Consulting, which concludes that the proposed parking would support the use. (See page A67.) The total demand for parking is anticipated to be 12 spaces.

**Traffic**

A traffic study was also done by Spack, which concludes that the existing roadways support the proposed uses. The proposed use would generate less traffic than the existing bank on the site. The existing use generates 45 trips in the am peak hour and 889 trips in the pm peak hour. The proposed use would generate 20 trips in the am peak hour and 24 trips in the pm peak hour.

**Landscaping**

Based on the perimeter of the site, 21 overstory trees and a full complement of understory trees and shrubs are required. The applicant is proposing to plant 24 overstory trees around the perimeter of the site & understory trees and shrubs. (See landscape plan on pages A35-A37.)

**Grading & Utilities**

The city engineer has reviewed the plans and found them acceptable and offered comments. (See pages A57-A58.)

**Signage**

Signage for the residential use would be allowed per the requirements of the multiple family residential districts as follows:

Type	Maximum Number	Maximum Area	Maximum Height
Building identification	One per building	12 square	6 feet

		feet	
Area identification	One per development	24 square feet	6 feet
Building identification (convalescent, nursing or rest homes only)	One per building	24 square feet	6 feet

### **Bike Racks**

The applicant is proposing 26 bicycle parking spots and indoor bicycle storage. Outdoor racks would be located in front of the building near the main entrance off the parking lot. (See page A35.)

### **PRIMARY ISSUES/STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

#### **Primary Issue**

- **Is the proposed rezoning to PUD appropriate for the site?**

Yes. Staff believes the proposal to rezone the site to PUD is reasonable for the site for the following reasons:

1. The proposed Final Rezoning and Final Development Plan is consistent with the approved Preliminary Rezoning and Preliminary Development Plans.
2. The project would meet many of the goals of for a PUD as outline above. Those include:
  - Providing a development that is 100% affordable to assist in the city affordable housing goals with the Met Council.
  - Improve the efficiency of street by allowing a land use that would generate less traffic than the bank use; and it would eliminate the bank drive-through facility.
  - Would utilize sustainable design as described in the applicant narrative on page A13. Most notable elements include: compliance with Minnesota Overlay and Guide to the 2011 Enterprise Green Communities Criteria; utilizing the existing building rather than a tear down; committing to a 15% energy savings; locating the building to make

use of Metro Transit; impervious surface would be reduced by 6.9%; enhanced landscaping; making use of special construction material; installing a rain garden for stormwater management; and pedestrian oriented design.

3. The Comprehensive Plan allows senior housing and affordable housing with supportive services as allowed land uses within the regional medical district. The proposed affordable housing proposal is desirable through a PUD, and it would fit in well with this site, given its close proximity to the Metro Transit Facility across 66th Street and Southdale Shopping Center. This area could provide employment opportunity in close proximity for residents. The site is located on an edge of the Regional Medical District and on an arterial roadway.
4. The existing roadways and parking lot would support the project. Spack Consulting conducted a traffic impact study based on the proposed development, and concluded that the traffic generated from the project would not impact the adjacent driveways or intersections. In fact the proposed uses would actually generate less traffic than the previously approved medical building. No additional improvements other than those shown on the site plan would be required to accommodate the site redevelopment.
5. The PUD ensures that the residential building proposed would be required to be built unless an amendment to the PUD is approved by City Council.
6. The PUD ensures that this is the only residential use allowed on the site. Existing uses allowed in the POD-1 district would continue to be allowed as long as the parking requirements are met.

### **Staff Recommendation**

Final Rezoning from POD-1,  
Planned Office District to Planned Unit Development  
District & Final Development Plan

Recommend that the City Council approve the Preliminary Rezoning and approve the Preliminary Development Plan.

Approval is based on the following findings:

1. Affordable housing is identified as a need in the Comprehensive Plan; and the proposed amendment would assist the City in meeting its established affordable housing goal with the Met Council of providing 212 new

affordable housing units by the year 2020. This project would include 39 new affordable housing units toward that goal.

2. The proposed density of 43 units per acre is reasonable, and within the density range suggested in the Comprehensive Plan of between 12-80 units per acre.
3. The proposed affordable housing project would generate less traffic than the existing bank facility.
4. The project would utilize sustainability principles. Most notable elements include: compliance with Minnesota Overlay and Guide to the 2011 Enterprise Green Communities Criteria; utilizing the existing building rather than a tear down; committing to a 15% energy savings; locating the building to make use of Metro Transit; impervious surface would be reduced by 6.9%; enhanced landscaping; making use of special construction material; installing a rain garden for storm water management; and pedestrian oriented design.
5. Project would meet the following additional Comprehensive Plan goals and objectives:
  - a) Promotion of a vision of community that is inclusive of a wide range of ages, incomes, and abilities and offers a wide range of housing options for Edina residents.
  - b) Promotion of lifecycle housing to support a range of housing options that meet people's preferences and circumstance at all stages of life.
  - c) Encourage an integrated mix of building type, heights and footprints within blocks, rather than single buildings or building groups.
  - d) Incorporate principles of sustainability and energy conservation into all aspects of design, construction, renovation and long-term operation of new and existing development.

Preliminary approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. Subject to staff approval, the site must be developed and maintained in substantial conformance with the following plans, unless modified by the conditions below:
  - Site plan date stamped September 12, 2014.
  - Grading plan date stamped September 12, 2014.
  - Utility plan date stamped September 12, 2014.

- Landscaping plan date stamped September 12, 2014.
  - Building elevations date stamped September 12, 2014
  - Building materials board as presented at the Planning Commission and City Council meeting.
2. Prior to issuance of a building permit, a final landscape plan must be submitted, subject to staff approval. The Final Landscape Plan must meet all minimum landscaping requirements per Section 36-1436 through 36-1462 of the City Code. Additionally, a performance bond, letter-of-credit, or cash deposit must be submitted for one and one-half times the cost amount for completing the required landscaping, screening, or erosion control measures.
  3. The property owner is responsible for replacing any required landscaping that dies.
  4. The Final Lighting Plan must meet all minimum requirements per Section 36-1260 of the City Code.
  5. Submit a copy of the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District permit. The City may require revisions to the approved plans to meet the district's requirements.
  6. Sustainable design. The design and construction of the entire project must be done with the Sustainable Initiatives as outlined in the applicant's narrative within the Planning Commission staff report. Attempts must be made meet an energy savings goal of 15% over state energy code guidelines. A plan of how standards are intended to be met must be submitted prior to issuance of a building permit.
  7. Compliance with all of the conditions outlined in the director of engineering's memo dated July 15, 2014.
  8. Approval of a Zoning Ordinance Amendment establishing the PUD-7, Planned Unit Development for this site.
  9. Final Rezoning is subject to review and approval of the Metropolitan Council on the Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

PUD Ordinance

Recommend the City Council adopt the Ordinance Amendment establishing the PUD-7 Zoning District.

**Deadline for a city decision:** October 21, 2014

ORDINANCE NO. 2014-\_\_

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE ZONING ORDINANCE  
TO ESTABLISH THE PUD-7, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT-7  
DISTRICT AT 3330 66<sup>th</sup> STREET**

The City Of Edina Ordains:

**Section 1.** Chapter 36, Article VIII, Division 4 is hereby amended to rezone the below described property to PUD, Planned Unit Development in accordance with the following:

**Sec. 36-494 Planned Unit Development District-7 (PUD-7) – 66<sup>TH</sup> West Apartments**

(a) *Legal description:*

The South 300 feet of Lot 2, as measured along the West line of said lot from the Southwest corner thereof in Block 3, Southdale Acres, Hennepin County, Minnesota. Torrens Property Certificate of Title No: 361393.

(b) **Approved Plans.** Incorporated herein by reference are the re-development plans received by the City on June \_\_, 2014 except as amended by City Council Resolution No. 2014-\_\_, on file in the Office of the Planning Department.

(c) **Principal Uses:**

Affordable housing with supportive services to assist residents with maintaining stability in housing and employment, as proposed and described by Beacon Interfaith Housing collaborative in their project description on file in the Office of the Planning Department. Any change in use of the site will require an amendment to this PUD-7 Ordinance.

All uses allowed in the POD-1 District, as listed in Section 36-575.

(d) **Accessory Uses:**

Off-street parking facilities.

(e) **Conditional Uses:**

None

(f) **Development Standards.** Development standards per the POD-1 Zoning District, except the following:

Building Setbacks

<b><u>Building Setbacks</u></b> Front – 66 <sup>th</sup> Street Front – Barrie Road  Side – North Rear – South	43 feet 25 feet 50 feet 25 feet
Building Height	2 stories
Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR)	.77%
Building Coverage	30%
Parking Stalls	19 surface Proof-of-parking for 37

(g) Signs for POD-1 use shall be allowed per the POD-1 standards in Sec. 36-1714.

Signs affordable housing with supportive services shall be allowed per Section 36-1712.

**Section 3.** This ordinance is effective immediately upon Met Council review and decision on the Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

First Reading:

Second Reading:

Published:

ATTEST:

---

Debra A. Mangen, City Clerk

James B. Hovland, Mayor

Please publish in the Edina Sun Current on:

Send two affidavits of publication.

Bill to Edina City Clerk


CERTIFICATE OF CITY CLERK

I, the undersigned duly appointed and acting City Clerk for the City of Edina do hereby certify that the attached and foregoing Ordinance was duly adopted by the Edina City Council at its Regular Meeting of October 21, 2014, and as recorded in the Minutes of said Regular Meeting.

WITNESS my hand and seal of said City this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2014.

---

City Clerk



Parcel ID: 29-028-24-24-0030

A-T-B:

Owner Name: Twin City Fed Sav

Market Total:

Parcel Address: 3330 66Th St W Edina, MN 55435

Tax Total:

Property Type: Commercial-Preferred

Sale Price:

Home-stead: Non-Homestead

Sale Date:

Parcel Area: 0.9 acres 39,339 sq ft

Sale Code:

Map Scale: 1" ≈ 1600 ft.

Print Date: 4/17/2014




This map is a compilation of data from various sources and is furnished "AS IS" with no representation or warranty expressed or implied, including fitness of any particular purpose, merchantability, or the accuracy and completeness of the information shown.

COPYRIGHT © HENNEPIN COUNTY 2014



AI



Parcel ID:	29-028-24-24-0030	A-T-B:	
Owner Name:	Twin City Fed Sav	Market Total:	
Parcel Address:	3330 66Th St W Edina, MN 55435	Tax Total:	
Property Type:	Commercial-Preferred	Sale Price:	
Home-stead:	Non-Homestead	Sale Date:	
Parcel Area:	0.9 acres 39,339 sq ft	Sale Code:	


Map Scale: 1" ≈ 200 ft.  
 Print Date: 4/17/2014



This map is a compilation of data from various sources and is furnished "AS IS" with no representation or warranty expressed or implied, including fitness of any particular purpose, merchantability, or the accuracy and completeness of the information shown.

COPYRIGHT © HENNEPIN COUNTY 2014


A2



Google earth







URS Corporation N:\31810230\Projects\LU\_SE\_heights.mxd Date: 10/25/2007 2:13:59 PM

Height Limits	
2 Stories:	24'
3 Stories:	36'
4 Stories:	48'
5 Stories:	60'
8 Stories:	96'
9 Stories:	108'
10 Stories:	120'
12 Stories:	144'


Standard Height  
 Podium Height



**City of Edina**  
2008 Comprehensive Plan Update


Data Source: URS

**Future Land Use Plan with Building Heights**  
Southeast Quadrant  
Figure 4.6B



Site

A5



Site


Site

ZONING

50TH & FRANCE DETAIL



54TH & FRANCE DETAIL




Legend

-  HOD-2 Building height shall be determined by required setbacks, but shall not exceed 2 stories or 24 feet, whichever is less.
-  HOD-3 Building height shall be determined by required setbacks, but shall not exceed 3 stories or 36 feet, whichever is less.
-  HOD-4 Building height shall be determined by required setbacks, but shall not exceed 4 stories or 48 feet, whichever is less.
-  HOD-8 Building height shall be determined by required setbacks, but shall not exceed 8 stories or 96 feet, whichever is less.
-  HOD-9 Building height shall be determined by required setbacks, but shall not exceed 9 stories or 108 feet, whichever is less.
-  HOD-10 Building height shall be determined by required setbacks, but shall not exceed 10 stories or 120 feet, whichever is less.
-  HOD-12 Building height shall be determined by required setbacks, but shall not exceed 12 stories or 144 feet, whichever is less.
-  Church
-  City Buildings
-  Private School
-  Public School



Planning Dept  
December, 2013

VALLEY VIEW & WOODDALE DETAIL



site

HEIGHT

A7




City of Edina  
 2008 Comprehensive Plan Update

Roadway Functional Classification

Figure 7.5

LEGEND:

-  Principal Arterial
-  "A" Minor Arterial (Reliever)
-  "A" Minor Arterial (Augmenter)
-  "B" Minor Arterial
-  Collector



A6

514

**3330 66<sup>th</sup> Street, Edina**  
*Explanation of Request and Description of Project*

Beacon Interfaith Housing Collaborative (Beacon) is seeking final zoning approval to PUD and final development approval at 3330 66<sup>th</sup> Street.

Beacon builds high quality, affordable housing for families and individuals. We believe housing is the foundation for people to create the stability and security we all seek. We believe that well-designed, professionally managed buildings create a win-win for communities and tenants. We believe everyone deserves to have choices in housing. We believe in home. Our development projects are usually undertaken with partners and collaborators in the faith communities. When a congregation has identified a desire to create affordable housing and the capacity to embark on a development project, our staff, with their specialized expertise, collaborate with congregational leaders to make the vision a reality. This model, over our 15 year history, has resulted in the creation of nearly 500 homes.

In partnership with Edina Community Lutheran Church, Beacon has entered into a purchase agreement with the owners at 3330 66 Street West and intends to convert the existing building into a residential apartment building, "66 West Apartments," that will provide 39 units of permanent housing for young adults who have experienced homelessness. We plan to seek funding from Minnesota Housing, Hennepin County and several private funding sources to make the units affordable to homeless young adults between the ages of 18 and 22. 66 West Apartment's units meet the Met Council definition of affordable rental housing according to the Livable Communities Act. Construction of these units will apply towards the City's Met Council goal of creating 212 additional affordable housing units in Edina between 2011 and 2020. See the separate attachment detailing the project funding structure.

66 West is supportive, affordable housing for young adults who have experienced homelessness. The goal is to support the tenants as they learn to live independently and develop their skills to be financially independent – thereby ending the cycle of homelessness. The building will be staffed by specialists serving homeless young adults. Our supportive service approach is also designed to create a sense of belonging and place for residents and to foster healthy relationships between youth and caring adults with professional training and skills. The outcome is that that community creates an engaging, safe "home" environment with ample opportunities for youth to access on-site or in the broader community.

Site and Development Description

The project site is bounded by West 66<sup>th</sup> Street to the South, Barrie Road to the west, and office buildings to the east and north. The site is currently zoned POD and contains a two-story building with a basement. The first floor is being used as a bank with a drive through facility. The remaining floors are not being used.

The building will contain housing units, as well as office and resident amenities. The building will feature 39 studio units, ranging in size from a net (paint to paint) 322 square feet to 451 square feet. Each apartment will contain a full kitchen and bathroom. The building will contain offices for on-site service providers and property management. There will be a community area for residents, as well as a fitness area, computer lab and laundry room.

The site is .9 acres. The project incorporates the entire existing 18,145 square foot building and also includes a 10,458 square foot addition. The remodeled building, with the addition, will have an 11,283 square foot building footprint and a total floor area of 28,603 square feet. The building will remain two stories, plus the existing basement. The design retains the brick on the existing building. Expected

AC

exterior materials on the addition will be brick and metal panels. The updated exterior will complement the surrounding buildings.

The site features two outdoor courtyards and a basketball court as resident amenities. The project retains most of the mature trees on the site. Additional garden areas and ornamental trees, including a rain garden, further enhance the existing landscaping. Plantings and a tree for shade will improve the existing bus stop area, currently just a bench. Additional pedestrian walkways to the public sidewalk are planned.

**Sustainability.** Currently, the building use is limited to one of the three floors due to parking requirements. This project maximizes the potential of the .9 acres by repurposing the entire existing building and adding an addition. The development reduces the impervious paving of the site by 6.9%. Beacon delivers buildings that are environmentally sustainable in design and operation. 66 West will incorporate many sustainable building elements, outlined in the attachment.

**Parking, traffic and transit.** The primary entrance is accessed off Barrie Road. The parking lot, as designed, has 19 parking stalls. Landscaping along Barrie Road could be removed and the parking lot expanded to accommodate an additional 12 spots, should a future user require additional parking. In addition, there is a paved, unstriped area, currently designed as a basketball court, in which 6 additional spots could be added with minimal site disruption. Thus, the site could contain a total of 37 parking stalls for a future use.

Beacon has provided funding so that the City of Edina could conduct a parking study to verify the parking needs and determine the impact on traffic. Beacon believes 19 parking spots would be sufficient to serve the residents, guests and staff. The independent parking study found that in other Beacon buildings that serve a similar population, the rate of parked cars to apartments range between 18% and 30%. In the most similar building serving young adults, the rate of parked cars, at its peak, was 18%. Thus, conservatively, Beacon would expect no more than 12 parking stalls will be required for residents. In addition, the building has offices for a maximum of 6 staff. There will be no facility vehicles requiring a parking stall. In addition, the project site is located across the street from the Southdale transit hub served by nine bus routes. Also, two high frequency bus routes stop immediately adjacent to the property – route 6 to Downtown Minneapolis and the University of Minnesota and route 515 to Richfield and Bloomington. Thus, it is expected all residents can utilize public transportation, reducing the dependency on cars. We would also expect that future uses would also take advantage of the proximity to public transportation. Finally, the project includes 26 bicycle parking spots and indoor bicycle storage.

## **66 West** *Sustainable Elements*

In order to create homes that are durable, healthy and efficient, Minnesota Housing require all funded projects to comply with the Minnesota Overlay and Guide to the 2011 Enterprise Green Communities Criteria. This guide outlines mandatory and optional sustainable building criteria to include in the project. Beacon Interfaith Housing Collaborative (Beacon) has committed to implement certain criteria and incorporated the elements or strategies into the building design. The document providing the written commitment is attached. In addition, at the financial closing, Beacon will reaffirm the commitment and certify the building criteria that were included in the construction documents. Finally, upon construction completion, Beacon, the architect, and the general contractor will certify that the elements and strategies were incorporated into the final building. Energy modeling and performance test results are also required to verify energy standard criteria.

Below are significant strategies or elements that will be included in 66 West through the Green Communities program. See the attached certification for a complete list.

- 66 West is a compact development, with 43.33 units per acre.
- 66 West is within walking distance of many services and facilities.
- The project site is adjacent to public transit stop that totaling nearly 160 stops per day.
- 66 West is an adaptive reuse of an existing building.
- At least 50% of the planting will be native species.
- The building will have a HERS (home energy rating system) index of at least 85, which is at least 15% more energy efficient than a HERS reference home and consistent with Energy Star compliant homes.
- 66 West will install only Energy Star rated appliances and light fixtures.
- All of the project's interior paints, primers, and adhesives will meet low VOC standards.
- 66 West will install Energy Star, continuous running bathroom fans exhausted directly to the outdoors.

In addition, 66 West will feature the following Green Building strategies.

- 66 West will reduce the impervious paving of the existing site by 6.9%.
- The building will feature hard surface flooring in the units.
- The project site will include a rain garden.

Project Name 66 West Apartments  
 Project Address 3330 66th Street W  
 Project Status Application

Organization Name Beacon Interfaith Housing Collaborative  
 Organization Contact Sarah Larson  
 Date 5/13/2014

**INTENDED METHODS WORKSHEET:** This worksheet identifies how the project team intends to incorporate all the Mandatory and adequate number of Optional Criteria into the development.

This worksheet must be filled out and submitted before the construction start date. For additional information on how to submit go to [www.greencommunitiesonline.org/tools/certification/](http://www.greencommunitiesonline.org/tools/certification/)

**INSTRUCTIONS:**

- 1) Select an answer provided in the drop-down menu under Column D ("How Criterion will be implemented") for each criterion.
- 2) Explain special circumstances or request a waiver using Column E ("If necessary, describe deviations from intended approach"). This may include information on an approach proposed by the project team that does not appear as an option in the drop-down menu.
- 3) Indicate where the Criterion references can be found within the project documents in Column F and G ("Criteria Documentation"). This is required for Criterion 1.1b
- 4) Indicate the project team member who is responsible for documenting and ensuring the completion of the Criterion under Column 'H' (Champion).
- 5) Indicate the number of optional points being pursued by completing Column H ("Intended Points").

\*\*Gray text within the spreadsheet (under "Green Development Agreement" section at bottom) indicates the type of information that could occupy that cell. It is not intended to be left in your final submission documents.

Complete this document by signing the Green Development Agreement at the bottom of this worksheet. Without the mandatory signatures, this document remains incomplete and the project will not receive Step 1 Certification.

**1: INTEGRATIVE DESIGN**

Criteria Item	How Criterion will be implemented	If necessary, provide additional information or explanation of alternative approach to meeting this measure	Criteria Documentation		Champion	Intended Points
			Location of Measure in Project Documents	Spec page number / plan type for locating measure		
1.1a Green Development Plan: Integrative Design Meeting(s)	The project team has conducted one or more integrative design meeting(s) and submitted a Green Development Plan or equivalent documentation			N/A	Architect	M
1.1b Green Development Plan: Criteria Documentation	The project team will create design and construction documentation (i.e. plans, details, and specifications) to include information on implementation of appropriate Enterprise Green Communities Criteria		Project Plans and Specifications	TBD	Architect	M
1.2a Universal Design (New Construction only)						0
1.2b Universal Design (Substantial & Moderate Rehab only)						0
						0
						Intended Points

**2: LOCATION + NEIGHBORHOOD FABRIC**

Criteria Item	How Criterion will be implemented	If necessary, provide additional information or explanation of alternative approach to meeting this measure	Criteria Documentation		Champion	Intended Points
			Location of Measure in Project Documents	Spec page number / plan type for locating measure		
2.1 Site Sensitive Selection (New Construction Only)	Site is previously developed and will not be on prime soils, on public parkland, on critical habitat, on the 100 year floodplain, or on a slope greater than 15%			N/A	Project Manager	M
2.2 Connections to Existing Development and Infrastructure (New Construction only, except for projects located on rural tribal lands, in colonial communities, or in communities of population less than 10,000)	The project is located on a site with access to existing roads, water, sewers, and other infrastructure within or contiguous (having at least 25% of the perimeter bordering) to existing development, connected to the pedestrian grid, and meeting the septic tank requirements			N/A	Project Manager	M
2.3 Compact Development (New Construction Only)	43.33 units/acre			N/A	Project Manager	M
2.4 Compact Development	43.33 units/acre					6
2.5 Proximity to Services (New Construction only)	Suburban/Mid-Size Town location: Project is 0.5-mile walk distance of at least three, or a 1-mile walk distance of at least six facilities			N/A	Project Manager	M
2.6 Preservation of and Access to Open Space	The project is classified as an Urban/Small City or a Suburban/Mid-Size Town			N/A	Project Manager	M
2.7 Preservation of and Access to Open Space						0
2.8 Access to Public Transportation	Route 6 has over 90 transit rides per weekday and Route 515 has nearly 70 transit rides per weekday. Both have nearly as many rides on the weekend. A stop that serves both routes is directly in front of the building.					5
2.9 Walkable Neighborhoods: Connections to Surrounding Neighborhood	Provide summary of the project's sidewalk and pathway connections to public spaces, open spaces or adjacent development					0
2.10 Smart Site Location: Passive Solar Heating / Cooling	Provide a brief narrative that describe passive solar heating/cooling tactics					0
2.11 Brownfield or Adaptive Reuse Site	The project is located on an adaptive reuse site					2

A12

2.12	Access to Fresh, Local Foods					0
2.13	LEED for Neighborhood Development certification					0
						13 Intended Points

### 3: SITE IMPROVEMENTS

Criteria Item	How Criterion will be Implemented	If necessary, provide additional information or explanation of alternative approach to meeting this measure	Criteria Documentation		Champion	Intended Points
			Location of Measure in Project Documents	Spec page number / plan type for locating measure		
3.1	Environmental Remediation	Site has passed Phase I Environmental Site Assessment	Project Plans and Specifications	TBD	Project Manager	M
3.2	Erosion and Sedimentation Control (Except for Infill sites with buildable area smaller than one acre)	The project is an Infill site with a buildable area smaller than one acre		N/A	Project Manager	M
3.3	Low Impact Development (New Construction only)	The project is substantial or moderate rehab		N/A	Project Manager	M
3.4	Landscaping	The Architect or Landscape Architect will provide certified tree or plant list showing at least 50% of the site area available for landscaping is planted with native or adaptive species	Project Plans and Specifications	TBD	Architect	M
3.5	Efficient Irrigation and Water Reuse	The irrigation system will incorporate a drip system for at least 50% of the planting beds, separate zones for turf and beds, a timer that activates the valves for each zone timed to prevent water loss, and a rain delay sensor.	Project Plans and Specifications	TBD	Architect	M
3.6	Surface Stormwater Management	Provide a brief narrative of the design strategies and systems that will be implemented, and indicate the calculated volume of water being retained, infiltrated, or harvested on site				0
						0 Intended Points

### 4: WATER CONSERVATION

Criteria Item	How Criterion will be Implemented	If necessary, provide additional information or explanation of alternative approach to meeting this measure	Criteria Documentation		Champion	Intended Points
			Location of Measure in Project Documents	Spec page number / plan type for locating measure		
4.1	Water-Conserving Fixtures	Project will specify toilets at 1.28 gpf or less, urinals at .5 gpf or less, bathroom faucets at 1.5 gpm or less, and showerheads and kitchen faucets at 2.0 gpm or less	Project Plans and Specifications	TBD	Architect	M
4.2	Advanced Water-Conserving Appliances and Fixtures					0
4.3	Water Reuse					0
						0 Intended Points

### 5: ENERGY EFFICIENCY

Criteria Item	How Criterion will be Implemented	If necessary, provide additional information or explanation of alternative approach to meeting this measure	Criteria Documentation		Champion	Intended Points
			Location of Measure in Project Documents	Spec page number / plan type for locating measure		
5.1a	Building Performance Standard: Single family & Multifamily, 3 stories or fewer (New Construction only)	The project is not single-family or multi-family (three stories or fewer) new construction		N/A		M
5.1b	Building Performance Standard: Multifamily, 4 stories or more (New Construction Only)	The project is not multi-family (four stories or more) new construction		N/A		M
5.1c	Building Performance Standard: Single family & Multifamily, 3 stories or fewer (Substantial and Moderate Rehab)	The project will demonstrate energy performance of a HEETS index of 85 using an energy model and a Home Energy Rating certificate	Project Plans and Specifications	TBD	Mechanical Engineer	M
5.1d	Building Performance Standard: Multifamily, 4 stories or more (Substantial and Moderate Rehab)	The project is not a multifamily (four stories or more) rehabilitation		N/A		M
5.2	Additional Reductions in Energy Use					0
5.3	Sizing of Heating and Cooling Equipment and Ducts	Heating and cooling equipment will be sized in accordance with the ACCA manual, Parts J and S, or ASHRAE handbooks	Project Plans and Specifications	TBD	Mechanical Engineer	M
5.4	ENERGY STAR Appliances	The project will install Energy Star-rated clothes washers, dishwashers, and refrigerators	Project Plans and Specifications	TBD	Architect	M

A13

5.5a	Efficient Lighting: Interior Units	Project will install Energy Star Advanced Lighting Package		Project Plans and Specifications	TBD	Electrical Engineer	M
5.5b	Efficient Lighting: Common Areas and Emergency Lighting (all multifamily projects)	Project will use ENERGY STAR-labeled fixtures, LEDs, TB fixtures with electronic ballasts or better, or any equivalent high-performance lighting fixtures and bulbs in all common areas		Project Plans and Specifications	TBD	Electrical Engineer	M
5.5c	Efficient Lighting: Exterior	Project will install ENERGY STAR qualified fixtures or LEDs (with a minimum efficacy of 45 lumens/watt) equipped with daylight sensors on all outdoor lighting		Project Plans and Specifications	TBD	Electrical Engineer	M
5.6a	Electricity Meter (New Construction and Substantial Rehab only)	Individual or sub-meters will be installed in all dwelling units		Project Plans and Specifications	TBD	Electrical Engineer	M
5.6b	Electricity Meter (Moderate Rehab only)	The project is new construction or substantial rehab					0
5.7a	Renewable Energy	Provide brief narrative describing the types of renewable energy system installed and the estimated percentage of energy it will provide for the overall energy demand of the project					0
5.7b	Photovoltaic / Solar Hot Water Ready						0
5.8	Advanced Metering Infrastructure						0
							0
							Intended Points

#### 6: MATERIALS BENEFICIAL TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Criteria Item	How Criterion will be Implemented	If necessary, provide additional information or explanation of alternative approach to meeting this measure	Criteria Documentation		Champion	Intended Points	
			Location of Measure in Project Documents	Spec page number / plan type for locating measure			
6.1	Low / No VOC Paints and Primers	All interior paints and primers will meet the MPI and Green Seal standards for VOCs, based on the list provided in the Criteria		Project Plans and Specifications	TBD	Architect	M
6.2	Low / No VOC Adhesives and Sealants	All adhesives will comply with Rule 1168 of the South Coast Air Quality Management District. All caulks and sealants will comply with Regulation B, Rule 51 of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)		Project Plans and Specifications	TBD	Architect	M
6.3	Construction Waste Management	The project scope will include a provision to follow a construction waste management plan that reduces waste by at least 25% by bringing debris to a mixed debris recycling facility.		Project Plans and Specifications	TBD	General Contractor	M
6.4	Construction Waste Management: Optional	Provide a brief narrative that lists the materials in the Construction Waste Management Plan, the % recycled, salvaged, or diverted and the strategies to do so					0
6.5	Recycling Storage for Multifamily Project	The project will provide a dedicated, permanent, and accessible area for the collection and storage of materials for recycling					5
6.6	Recycled Content Material	Provide a brief narrative that summarizes the building materials made of recycled content material					0
6.7	Regional Material Selection						0
6.8	Certified, Salvaged and Engineered Wood Products						0
6.9a	Reducing Heat-Island Effect: Roofing						0
6.9b	Reducing Heat-Island Effect: Paving						0
							5
							Intended Points

#### 7: HEALTHY LIVING ENVIRONMENT

Criteria Item	How Criterion will be Implemented	If necessary, provide additional information or explanation of alternative approach to meeting this measure	Criteria Documentation		Champion	Intended Points	
			Location of Measure in Project Documents	Spec page number / plan type for locating measure			
7.1	Composite Wood Products that Emit Low / No Formaldehyde	All composite wood products will be compliant with California 93120		Project Plans and Specifications	TBD	Architect	M
7.2	Environmentally Preferable Flooring	Any carpet, pad and adhesive will not be installed in entryways, laundry rooms, bathrooms, kitchens/kitchenettes, utility rooms, or any rooms of ground-connected floors. Any carpet products will meet Green Label or Green Label Plus certification. Any hard surface flooring products will be either ceramic tile, unfinished hardwood floors, or in compliance with the FloorScore program criteria		Project Plans and Specifications	TBD	Architect	M
7.3	Environmentally Preferable Flooring: Alternative Sources						0
7.4a	Exhaust Fans: Bathroom (New Construction and Substantial Rehab only)	The project will install ENERGY STAR-labeled continuous bathroom fans that exhaust to outdoors operate continuously at 20 cfm		Project Plans and Specifications	TBD	Mechanical Engineer	M
7.4b	Exhaust Fans: Bathroom (Moderate Rehab only)						0
7.5a	Exhaust Fans: Kitchen (New Construction and Substantial Rehab only)	The project will install power-vented fans or range hoods that exhaust to the outdoors at an intermittent rate of 100 cfm, per ASHRAE 62.2-2010		Project Plans and Specifications	TBD	Mechanical Engineer	M
7.5b	Exhaust Fans: Kitchen (Moderate Rehab only)						0

A14

7.6a	Ventilation (New Construction and Substantial Rehab only)	The project will install a ventilation system that will satisfy the fresh air requirements of ASHRAE 62.2-2010		Project Plans and Specifications	TBD	Mechanical Engineer	M
7.6b	Ventilation (Moderate Rehab only)						0
7.7	Clothes Dryer Exhaust	All clothes dryers will exhaust directly to the outdoors using rigid-type duct work		Project Plans and Specifications	TBD	Mechanical Engineer	M
7.8	Combustion Equipment	All combustion equipment will be power vented or direct vented and hard-wired CO detectors will be installed in outside each sleeping area per criteria		Project Plans and Specifications	TBD	Mechanical Engineer	M
7.9a	Mold Prevention: Water Heaters	All water heaters will be installed with catch pans and drains piped to the exterior of the dwelling		Project Plans and Specifications	TBD	Mechanical Engineer	M
7.9b	Mold Prevention: Surfaces	All surfaces in bathrooms, kitchens, and laundry rooms will use materials that have durable and cleanable surfaces		Project Plans and Specifications	TBD	Architect	M
7.9c	Mold Prevention: Tub and Shower Enclosures	All bathrooms will have non-paper-faced backing materials such as cement board, fiber cement board, or equivalent		Project Plans and Specifications	TBD	Architect	M
7.10	Vapor Barrier Strategies (New Construction and Rehab projects with foundation work only)	The project will install a vapor barrier and capillary break under the slab	Provided at new slab on grade	Project Plans and Specifications	TBD	Architect	M
7.11	Radon Mitigation (New Construction and Substantial Rehab only)	The project is substantial or moderate rehab and will test for radon and install passive-radon features if necessary	Radon mitigation system will be installed in new slab-on-grade areas and added underneath basement units.	Project Plans and Specifications	TBD	Architect	M
7.12	Water Drainage (New Construction and Rehab projects replacing assemblies called out in Criterion only)	The project is moderate or substantial rehab that is not replacing assemblies called out in this criterion	Addition will be compliant		N/A		M
7.13	Garage Isolation	The project does not have an attached garage			N/A		M
7.14	Integrated Pest Management	The project scope will include requirements to seal all wall, floor, and joint penetrations. Rodent proof screens will be provided at all openings.		Project Plans and Specifications	TBD	Architect	M
7.15	Lead-Safe Work Practices (Substantial and Moderate Rehab only)	The project was built after 1978			N/A		M
7.16	Smoke-Free Building	The project will enforce a no-smoking policy					0
							9
							9
							Intended Points

**8. OPERATIONS + MAINTENANCE**

Criteria Item	How Criterion will be Implemented	If necessary, provide additional information or explanation of alternative approach to meeting this measure	Criteria Documentation		Champion	Intended Points
			Location of Measure in Project Documents	Spec page number / plan type for locating measure		
8.1	Building Maintenance Manual (all multifamily projects)	The project scope will include a provision requiring the contractor to provide a manual to the owner that will address the operation and maintenance of the appliances, HVAC systems, water-systems, lighting, paving and landscaping. The owner will provide a copy of the manual to the management company.	Project Plans and Specifications	TBD	Project Manager	M
8.2	Resident's Manual	The owner will provide a manual to the property management company to provide to all residents at move-in. The manual will address green cleaning products and schedules, pest control, location of water shut offs, proper use of systems, and operations of all appliances and special plumbing fixtures.		N/A	Project Manager	M
8.3	Resident and Property Manager Orientation	The project scope will include a provision requiring the contractor to provide an orientation to the property manager on the building features' operation and maintenance, including the green features. The orientation will be video taped for future reference. The property manager will provide information on nearby transit facilities to promote a healthy lifestyle.	Project Plans and Specifications	TBD	Project Manager	M
8.4	Project Data Collection and Monitoring System					0
						0
						Intended Points

ENTERPRISE GREEN COMMUNITIES CRITERIA  
TOTAL INTENDED POINTS

27

**Green Development Agreement:** The following signatures provides a written commitment demonstrating that all parties involved in the execution and delivery of this project agree to be accountable to measures and strategies as outlined in application documents.

**INSTRUCTIONS:**

This signature portion is most easily satisfied by either: a) printing the Intended Methods tab and having the various team members fill out and sign their portion or b) using digital signatures. Both forms of submission will be accepted.


To proceed with Enterprise Green Communities Certification, signatures must be provided by at the project manager, architect, and general contractor. If these 3 signatures are not present, your building will not proceed through Step 1 of Certification.

**MANDATORY SIGNATURES**


[Signature Line]

6/5/2014

A15

	6/5/2014
---	----------

Project Manager: Sarah Larson

	6/5/2014
---	----------

Architect: David Hazland, AIA

	<Insert Date>
--	---------------

General Contractor: General Contract 100

**OPTIONAL SIGNATURES**

<Provide Signature of Green Development Team Member>	<Insert Date>
--	---------------

Green Building Specialist: <PRUIT Green Development Team Member's Name>

<Provide Signature(s) of Green Development Team Member(s)>	<Insert Date>
--	---------------

Engineer (MEP): <PRUIT Green Development Team Member's Name(s)>

<Provide Signature(s) of Green Development Team Member(s)>	<Insert Date>
--	---------------

Energy and/or System Specialist: <PRUIT Green Development Team Member's Name(s)>

ACC


117



66 West Apartments  
EDINA MN | 06.10.2014 | 14-0016



VIEW FROM NORTHWEST





A



B



C



D



E



F

A21



G



H

A22




J



K

A23



L



M

A24

Adjacent Buildings Along West 66th Street



A25

Nearby Medical Office Buildings



Nearby Multifamily Housing



66 West Apartments

Edina, MN 06.13.2014

Site Photos

A26




UNIT COUNT

UNIT TYPE	UNITS	LEVEL 1	LEVEL 2	UNIT TYPE TOTAL
TYPE A (1,000 SF)	1	1	1	2
TYPE B (1,200 SF)	1	1	1	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>

SITE & BUILDING STATISTICS

- A. GROSS-GRADE FOOTING: 10,250 SF (4,520 ACRES)
- B. GROSS BUILDING FOOTPRINT: LEVEL TWO: 11,200 SF; LEVEL ONE: 11,200 SF; TOTAL LEVEL FLOOR AREA: 22,400 SF; ABOVE GRADE: 22,400 SF
- C. PERCENT OF LITE COVERAGE & FLOOR AREA: % LITE COVERAGE: 25.7%; FLOOR AREA: 5,750 SF
- D. DRIVING UNIT/FRACRE: 24 UNITS/FRACRE; 43 UNITS/FRACRE
- E. PERCENT PERMITTED SITE AREA: 45.0%
- F. ELEVATION ABOVE FINISHED GRADE: LEVEL 1: 480'-0"; LEVEL 2: 52'-0"
- G. HEIGHT OF ROOF ABOVE GRADE: 52'-0"
- H. TOTAL NET LEASABLE AREA: 10,125 SF

VICINITY MAP



GENERAL NOTES

1. DO NOT SCALE DIMENSIONS.
2. SUBMITTER SHALL VERIFY THE JOB SITE AND SHALL REVIEW THE CONTRACT SPECIFICATIONS TO INSURE THEY REFLECT THE FULL SCOPE AND INTENT OF THE TOTAL OF THE LOCAL HIGH COMMUNITARIAN OF WORK. EACH PARKING SHALL BE REFERRED TO LOCAL CONSTRUCTION FOR COMPLIANCE.
3. SUBJECT TO BE VERIFIED.

PARKING STALLS

STALL TYPE	CURRENT EXISTING PARKING	PROPOSED PARKING
NO. 1 PARKING STALL	0	0
STANDARD PARKING STALL	0	0


BICYCLE PARKING

TYPE	BIKE PARKING
TYPE	0

CONTACTS

DEVELOPER/CLIENT	CONTRACTOR - TRC	ARCHITECT	CIVIL ENGINEER
NAME: 66 WEST APARTMENTS DEVELOPMENT CONTACT: JEE BUDAL ADDRESS: 3330 66TH STREET WEST, EDINA, MN 55121 PHONE: 612-244-0000 FAX: 612-244-0000 EMAIL: JEE@66WESTAPARTMENTS.COM	NAME: TRC CONSTRUCTION CONTACT: MARK HERSH ADDRESS: 2000 W. WISCONSIN AVENUE, SUITE 100, EDINA, MN 55121 PHONE: 612-244-0000 FAX: 612-244-0000 EMAIL: MARK@TRC.COM	NAME: URS CORP CONTACT: JESSICA HALL ADDRESS: 1000 W. WISCONSIN AVENUE, SUITE 100, EDINA, MN 55121 PHONE: 612-244-0000 FAX: 612-244-0000 EMAIL: JESSICA.HALL@URS.COM	NAME: PERKINS+WILL CONTACT: JEFFREY PERKINS ADDRESS: 600 NORTH LAKE AVENUE, SUITE 200, EDINA, MN 55121 PHONE: 612-244-0000 FAX: 612-244-0000 EMAIL: JEFF@PERKINSWILL.COM
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT	STRUCTURAL ENGINEER	MEP ENGINEERS	INTERIOR DECORATOR
NAME: JILL BUDAL CONTACT: JILL BUDAL ADDRESS: 3330 66TH STREET WEST, EDINA, MN 55121 PHONE: 612-244-0000 FAX: 612-244-0000 EMAIL: JILL@66WESTAPARTMENTS.COM	NAME: BROWN CALDWELL INC CONTACT: JOHN TRM ADDRESS: 2000 W. WISCONSIN AVENUE, SUITE 100, EDINA, MN 55121 PHONE: 612-244-0000 FAX: 612-244-0000 EMAIL: JOHN@BROWN-CALDWELL.COM	NAME: JENSEN ENGINEERING INC CONTACT: MARK ERICSSON ADDRESS: 2000 W. WISCONSIN AVENUE, SUITE 100, EDINA, MN 55121 PHONE: 612-244-0000 FAX: 612-244-0000 EMAIL: MARK@JENSEN-ENGINEERING.COM	NAME: JILL BUDAL CONTACT: JILL BUDAL ADDRESS: 3330 66TH STREET WEST, EDINA, MN 55121 PHONE: 612-244-0000 FAX: 612-244-0000 EMAIL: JILL@66WESTAPARTMENTS.COM

SYMBOLS



Ad 7



104 NORTH THIRD STREET, SUITE 100  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55401

CONSULTANT

PRELIMINARY  
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

REVISIONS  
DATE: 10/15/14  
BY: JPH

DATE: 10/15/14  
PROJECT # 14-0018  
PHASE: SITE PLAN REVIEW  
DRAWN BY: JPH  
CHECKED BY: JPH


KEY PLAN

TITLE SHEET

G001

ISSUED: 10/15/14





- KEY NOTES**
1. REMOVE CONCRETE CURB AND GUTTER
  2. REMOVE BITUMINOUS PAVEMENT
  3. REMOVE CONCRETE PAVEMENT
  4. REMOVE SEGMENTAL RETAINING WALL
  5. REMOVE SIGN AND BASE
  6. REMOVE LIGHT POLE AND BASE
  7. REMOVE TREE AND STUMP
  8. REMOVE CANOPY, SUPPORT POSTS, AND FOOTINGS
  9. REMOVE TRASH ENCLOSURE AND FOOTINGS
  10. REMOVE BIKE RACK
  11. REMOVE PNEUMATIC TUBE INFRASTRUCTURE
  12. REMOVE HAND RAILING
  13. REMOVE TELLER MACHINES AND BOLLARDS
  14. REMOVE FLAG POLE AND BASE
  15. REMOVE BANK SIGN AND FOOTINGS
  16. SAWCUT PAVEMENT TO FULL DEPTH
  17. REMOVE BENCH AND CONCRETE PAD
  18. REMOVE AND SALVAGE BRICK WALK

ADD

**66 West Apartments**  
3330 66th St. West, Edina



301 NORTH THIRD STREET, SUITE 140  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55401  
612-855-2100

CONSULTANT  
**PIERCE PINI & ASSOCIATES**  
1000 W. WISCONSIN AVENUE, SUITE 200  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55401  
612-338-0000

**PRELIMINARY**  
**NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION**


REVISIONS  
# Date Description

DATE: 07.21.2016  
PROJECT #: 14-022  
PHASE: 300  
DRAWN BY: CLK  
CHECKED BY: STE


**SITE DEMOLITION PLAN**

**PRELIMINARY**  
**NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION**

**C200**  
Copyright © 2013 by UrbanArchitects, LLC



1 GRADING, DRAINAGE AND EROSION CONTROL PLAN



1"=20'

A30

66 West  
Apartments  
3330 66th St. West, Edina



801 NORTH THIRD STREET, SUITE 140  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55401  
612.85.3300

CONSULTANT  
PIERCE PINI &  
ASSOCIATES  
1000 WYOMING STREET, SUITE 300  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55401  
TEL: 612.338.1000 FAX: 612.338.1004

PRELIMINARY  
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

REVISIONS  
# Date Description


DATE: 07.21.2014  
PROJECT #: 14-021  
PHASE: 302

DRAWN BY: DSK  
CHECKED BY: CTC

GRADING,  
DRAINAGE AND  
EROSION  
CONTROL PLAN

**PRELIMINARY**  
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

C300



**PRELIMINARY**  
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

1. SET TOP EXISTING 12" ØP PIPE MAINLINE AND INSTALL NEW 8" ØP PRE SERVICE AND POST SERVICE 12" ØP PIPE AT 1.000'. SEE DETAIL 9/0600.
2. SET TOP EXISTING 12" ØP PIPE MAINLINE AND INSTALL NEW 8" ØP PRE SERVICE AND POST SERVICE 12" ØP PIPE AT 1.000'. SEE DETAIL 9/0600.
3. REMOVE EXISTING 4" SANITARY SERVICE AND INSTALL NEW 8" ØP SANITARY SERVICE.
4. EXISTING 8" ØP PVC INV = 872.71'. NEW 8" ØP PVC INV = 872.85.
5. INSTALL 30' ØP 8" ØP 500'-76' SANITARY SERVICE AT 1.000'.
6. NEW 8" ØP PVC SANITARY INV = 873.52'. CONDUIT DUCT LOCATION AND INVERT WITH MECHANICAL.
7. INSTALL METALLIC IRON IN WINDOW WELL. INV = 878.55'. INV = 877.00'. SEE DETAIL 9/0500.
8. INSTALL 30' ØP 8" ØP STORM SERVICE AT 1.000'.
9. INSTALL METALLIC IRON IN WINDOW WELL. INV = 878.55'. INV = 877.21'. SEE DETAIL 9/0600.
10. INSTALL 12' ØP 8" ØP STORM SERVICE AT 1.000'.
11. INSTALL 12' ØP 8" ØP STORM SERVICE AT 1.000'. INV = 884.21'. INV = 878.59'.
12. INSTALL 30' ØP 8" ØP STORM SERVICE AT 1.000'.
13. INSTALL 12" ØP 12" CONCRETE MANHOLE BURN WITH SOUP UP. INV = 883.33'. INV = 878.10'. SWAMP = 878.10'. SEE SHEET 0202.
14. INSTALL 30' ØP 8" ØP STORM SERVICE AT 1.000'. SPEC DR JACK PIPE UNDER BRICK SIDEWALK. EXISTING SIDEWALK TO REMAIN OPEN DURING CONSTRUCTION.
15. CONE BELL NEW NORTH INVERT AND EXISTING CATCH BASIN. INV = 878.83'.

ADJACENT COMMERCIAL BUILDING  
3316 WEST 66TH STREET

66 West  
Apartments  
3330 66th St. West, Edina  
MN 55425

URBAN  
ENGINEERS


PROJECT  
66 WEST APARTMENTS  
3330 66TH STREET  
EDINA, MN 55425

CONSULTANT  
PERCE PINKI &  
ASSOCIATES  
1000 W. WASHINGTON  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55408

DATE: 07/23/08  
DRAWN BY: JMM  
CHECKED BY: JMS

UTILITY PLAN

C400



1. SURMOUNTABLE CURB, MATCH EXISTING STYLE AND ELEVATION WITHIN RIGHT-OF-WAY
2. 6x12 CONCRETE CURB AND GUTTER, SEE DETAIL 3/C601
3. CONCRETE DRIVEWAY APRON, SEE DETAIL 3/C600
4. BITUMINOUS PAVEMENT, SEE DETAIL 1/C600
5. ED CONCRETE SIDEWALK, SEE DETAIL 4/C600
6. CONCRETE PAVEMENT, SEE DETAIL 2/C600
7. SEE LANDSCAPING PLANS FOR BIKE HACK SLEEVE LOCATIONS
8. PARKING LOT STRIPING, 4" YELLOW EPOXY PAINT, TYPICAL
9. BASKETBALL COURT STRIPING, 4" WHITE EPOXY PAINT
10. ADA PARKING SYMBOL, SEE DETAIL 7/C600
11. ADA PARKING SIGN, SEE DETAIL 8/P600
12. TAPER CURB FLUSH WITH DRIVEWAY APRON
13. EXTERIOR STAIRS, SEE LANDSCAPING
14. PEDESTRIAN RAMP, SEE DETAIL 6/C600
15. SEE STRUCTURAL FOR STAIR DETAILS
16. SEE LANDSCAPING FOR WINDOW WELL MATERIAL
17. INSTALL SALVAGED BRICK PAVERS

NORTH  
 1 PAVING PLAN  
 C500  
 0 20' 40' 60'  
 1"=20'

**PRELIMINARY**  
 NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

66 West  
 Apartments  
 3300 66th St. West, Edina

*ACD*



661 NORTH THIRD STREET SUITE 140  
 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55412  
 612.879.2100

CONSULTANT  
**PIERCE PINI &  
 ASSOCIATES**  
 1040 CHRYSLER PARKWAY SUITE 200  
 FORT WASHINGTON, PA 19073-0204


PRELIMINARY  
 NOT FOR  
 CONSTRUCTION

REVISIONS  
 # Description

DATE 07.21.2014  
 PROJECT # 19-021  
 PHASE 300  
 DRAWN BY DK  
 CHECKED BY KTG

PAVING PLAN

C500



66 West Apartments  
3000 66th St. West, Edina

A33



161 NORTH THIRD STREET SUITE 400  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55403  
(612) 452-1000

CONSULTANT

**PRELIMINARY**  
**NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION**

REVISIONS  
# Date Description

DATE: FEB 19, 2014  
PROJECT #: 14-0056  
PHASE: SITE PLAN REVIEW  
DRAWN BY: ME  
CHECKED BY: DH

AREA SITE PLAN

LA000

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA ARCHITECTURE

1 AREA SITE PLAN  
T-15200P

A34



161 NORTH THIRD STREET SUITE 400  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55401  
612.332.1100

CONSULTANT

**PRELIMINARY**  
**NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION**



REVISIONS  
• Date Description

DATE: 06.19.2014  
PROJECT #: 14025  
PHASE: SITE PLAN REVIEW  
DRAWN BY: ME  
CHECKED BY: GH

ARCHITECTURAL  
SITE PLAN

LA100

© 2013 URBANWORKSPACES LLC



A35



781 NORTH 154th STREET, SUITE 100  
LYNN, MINN. 55424

CONSULTANT

PRELIMINARY  
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

PROCESSED  
# Date Description

DATE: 06/19/2014  
PROJECT #: 14-0022  
PHASE: SITE PLAN REVIEW  
DRAWN BY: AC  
CHECKED BY: DH

COLORED SITE PLAN

LA200

Copyright © 2013 by URBANWOODWORKS, LLC




1 SITE PLAN  
1/2" = 10'

A36


L-300  
PLANTING SCHEDULE:

ITEM NO.	PLANT	QTY	REMARKS
1	PROSPERA 2' PLANTER POTS	2	2
2	PLANTER POTS	2	2
3	PLANTER POTS	2	2
4	PLANTER POTS	2	2
5	PLANTER POTS	2	2
6	PLANTER POTS	2	2
7	PLANTER POTS	2	2
8	PLANTER POTS	2	2
9	PLANTER POTS	2	2
10	PLANTER POTS	2	2
11	PLANTER POTS	2	2
12	PLANTER POTS	2	2
13	PLANTER POTS	2	2
14	PLANTER POTS	2	2
15	PLANTER POTS	2	2
16	PLANTER POTS	2	2
17	PLANTER POTS	2	2
18	PLANTER POTS	2	2
19	PLANTER POTS	2	2
20	PLANTER POTS	2	2
21	PLANTER POTS	2	2
22	PLANTER POTS	2	2
23	PLANTER POTS	2	2
24	PLANTER POTS	2	2
25	PLANTER POTS	2	2
26	PLANTER POTS	2	2
27	PLANTER POTS	2	2
28	PLANTER POTS	2	2
29	PLANTER POTS	2	2
30	PLANTER POTS	2	2
31	PLANTER POTS	2	2
32	PLANTER POTS	2	2
33	PLANTER POTS	2	2
34	PLANTER POTS	2	2
35	PLANTER POTS	2	2
36	PLANTER POTS	2	2
37	PLANTER POTS	2	2
38	PLANTER POTS	2	2
39	PLANTER POTS	2	2
40	PLANTER POTS	2	2
41	PLANTER POTS	2	2
42	PLANTER POTS	2	2
43	PLANTER POTS	2	2
44	PLANTER POTS	2	2
45	PLANTER POTS	2	2
46	PLANTER POTS	2	2
47	PLANTER POTS	2	2
48	PLANTER POTS	2	2
49	PLANTER POTS	2	2
50	PLANTER POTS	2	2
51	PLANTER POTS	2	2
52	PLANTER POTS	2	2
53	PLANTER POTS	2	2
54	PLANTER POTS	2	2
55	PLANTER POTS	2	2
56	PLANTER POTS	2	2
57	PLANTER POTS	2	2
58	PLANTER POTS	2	2
59	PLANTER POTS	2	2
60	PLANTER POTS	2	2
61	PLANTER POTS	2	2
62	PLANTER POTS	2	2
63	PLANTER POTS	2	2
64	PLANTER POTS	2	2
65	PLANTER POTS	2	2
66	PLANTER POTS	2	2
67	PLANTER POTS	2	2
68	PLANTER POTS	2	2
69	PLANTER POTS	2	2
70	PLANTER POTS	2	2
71	PLANTER POTS	2	2
72	PLANTER POTS	2	2
73	PLANTER POTS	2	2
74	PLANTER POTS	2	2
75	PLANTER POTS	2	2
76	PLANTER POTS	2	2
77	PLANTER POTS	2	2
78	PLANTER POTS	2	2
79	PLANTER POTS	2	2
80	PLANTER POTS	2	2
81	PLANTER POTS	2	2
82	PLANTER POTS	2	2
83	PLANTER POTS	2	2
84	PLANTER POTS	2	2
85	PLANTER POTS	2	2
86	PLANTER POTS	2	2
87	PLANTER POTS	2	2
88	PLANTER POTS	2	2
89	PLANTER POTS	2	2
90	PLANTER POTS	2	2
91	PLANTER POTS	2	2
92	PLANTER POTS	2	2
93	PLANTER POTS	2	2
94	PLANTER POTS	2	2
95	PLANTER POTS	2	2
96	PLANTER POTS	2	2
97	PLANTER POTS	2	2
98	PLANTER POTS	2	2
99	PLANTER POTS	2	2
100	PLANTER POTS	2	2

GENERAL NOTES:  
 1. STUDY ALL (OR SET NOTED) PLANS PRIOR TO PLANTING FOR REVIEW BY LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT.  
 2. ALL AREAS DETERMINED BY CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE 800 OR MORE PERCENT BLEND TO FINISHED OR UNFINISHED CONCRETE. WOOD SHOWN ALL PIECES IN GRASS TO BE 4" WOOD MATCH OUT TO EXPOSED FULL WOOD MATCH FROM TRIM TO WOOD WELD JOINTS. WOOD MATCH TO BE DOUBLE SANDING MINIMUM NATURAL COLOR.  
 3. PLANT SCHEDULE SUPERSEDES PLAN FOR ALL PLANT QUANTITIES.  
 4. ALL TREES NEAR EXISTING AREAS OR STRUCTURES TO HAVE CROWN LINKED UP TO 8'-12" ABOVE GROUND AND HAVE APPROPRIATELY SHAPED CROWN.  
 5. SEE SPECIFICATION FOR PLANTING AND TOP SOIL REQUIREMENTS.  
 6. DRAINAGE AND PERCOLATION TEST TO BE DONE PRIOR TO PLANTING.  
 7. PERFORM TEST ASAP AFTER BUILDING IS INSTALLED AND DRAIN IS ESTABLISHED.  
 8. CONTRACTOR TO REMOVE DRAIN RIDGES AT EACH WINDOW AND AT EACH DRIVE DOWNPOUT THAT DOES NOT OPEN ON TO PAVED SURFACE. SUPERSEDE WHAT IS TO BE REMOVED.  
 9. PRIOR TO PLANTING, OWNER AND CONTRACTOR TO OBTAIN ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND SCHEDULE OF EACH PLANTING TO MAINTAIN CONSISTENT CARE OF PLANTING AND SOIL DURING PLANT ESTABLISHMENT.  
 10. IRRIGATION SYSTEM TO BE REVEALED OR ALL KINDS OF WOOD SHOWN TO BE USED ON DRIVE TRAIL, DRIVE WALKS TO BE USED FOR DRIVE TRAIL, DRIVE WALKS INTO WOODLANDS SUPERSEDES ARE TO BE USED IMMEDIATELY SYSTEM.  
 11. WOOD MATCH IS MAINTENANCE FREE TO BE 1 1/2" WOOD MATCH & 3" WOOD OVER COMMERCIAL WOOD CONTROL, FACING, COMMERCIAL WOOD, EXPOSED TOP, FOLLOW PLANTING DETAILS FOR ALL FINISHES.  
 12. CONTRACTOR TO PROTECT EXISTING TREES FROM DAMAGE DURING CONSTRUCTION. CONTRACTOR TO EXIST SNOW FENCE AT DRIVE LINE, NO STORAGE OF MATERIALS IN EXISTING SNOW CONSTRUCTION.  
 13. IF THE LANDSCAPE CONTRACTOR IS CHARGED BY PERMITS AND ORDINANCES IN THE PLANTING SCHEDULE, CONTRACTOR OR ANY OTHER PERSON SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND ORDINANCES TO BE OBTAINED. THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ATTENTION OF THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT PRIOR TO PROCEEDING WITH INSTALLATION.




SECTION AT WEST WINDOW WELL




SECTION AT SOUTH PATIO TO CITY SIDEWALK

1 LANDSCAPE SECTIONS  
1" = 10'-0"

3 PLANTING NOTES AND SCHEDULE  
1" = 1'-0"




4 PLANTING DETAILS  
1" = 1'-0"




2 LANDSCAPE PLAN  
1" = 20'-0"

L-301  
RAIN GARDEN (SHADE) PLANTING SCHEDULE:

NO.	PLANT	DATE	NO.	PLANT
1	SPRING & SUMMER	2014	1	SPRING & SUMMER
2	SPRING & SUMMER	2014	2	SPRING & SUMMER
3	SPRING & SUMMER	2014	3	SPRING & SUMMER
4	SPRING & SUMMER	2014	4	SPRING & SUMMER
5	SPRING & SUMMER	2014	5	SPRING & SUMMER
6	SPRING & SUMMER	2014	6	SPRING & SUMMER



1 RAIN GARDEN PLANTING DETAIL  
1" = 10'-0"



2 REMOVALS/PRESERVATION PLAN  
1" = 20'-0"

66 West Apartments  
3330 66th St, West, Edin

A37



161 NORTH THIRD STREET, SUITE 140  
UNIVERSITY PARK, TEXAS  
912.422.3100

CONSULTANT  
**Studio Green**  
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS

REVISIONS:  
# Date Description


DATE 06/10/14  
PROJECT # 140316  
PHASE SITE PLAN REVIEW  
DRAWN BY BS  
CHECKED BY BS

PLANT REMOVAL/PRESERVATION PLAN

L301

© 2014 URBAN WORKS CONSULTANTS





**GENERAL NOTES:**

1. GRAB BARS AT OUTSIDE WALLS ARE TO OUTSIDE FACE OF FINISHING.
2. GRAB BARS AT INTERIOR WALLS ARE TO CENTERLINE OF WALL.
3. FINISHING AT ALL CORNERS SHALL BE TO CENTERLINE OF WALLS.
4. DETAIL ALL PARTS TO UNDERLIES OR HIDE FINISHING UNLESS TOP OF JOIST FINISHING IS AVAILABLE.
5. ALL EXTERIOR CORNER WALLS AND THRESHOLDS AND DOOR THRESHOLDS SHALL BE TO FINISHING.
6. ALL EXTERIOR CORNER WALLS AND THRESHOLDS AND DOOR THRESHOLDS SHALL BE TO FINISHING UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
7. ALL UNIFORMITY SHALL BE ACCORDANCE TO THE NOTES.
8. HANDRAILS SHALL BE INSTALLED AT ALL STAIRS AND ELEVATORS ON BOTH SIDES OF THE STAIRS AND ELEVATOR CARS UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
9. DIMENSIONS @ CORNER ARE TO FACE OF CORNER.

**66 West Apartments**  
3330 66th St, West, Edina

A39



314 NORTH THIRD STREET SUITE 500  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55401  
612.683.1500  
CONSULTANT

**PRELIMINARY**  
**NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION**

REVISIONS:  
# Date Description

DATE: 10/23/2014  
PROJECT #: 14-0233  
PHASE: SITE PLAN REVIEW  
DRAWN BY: AC  
CHECKED BY: SH

LEVEL 1 PLAN

A101

**1 LEVEL 1 PLAN**  
A101 10/23/2014

66 West  
Apartments  
3330 66th St. West, Edina

DF  
A/F



814 NORTH THIRD STREET, SUITE 100  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55412  
(612) 438-1100

CONSULTANT

PRELIMINARY  
NOT FOR  
CONSTRUCTION

REVISIONS  
\* Date Description

DATE 04/19/2014  
PROJECT # 04-0518  
PHASE SITE PLAN REVIEW  
DRAWN BY AG  
CHECKED BY DA

LEVEL 2 PLAN

A102

Copyright © 2014 UrbanWorldCo, Inc.

GENERAL NOTES:

1. DIMENSIONS AT OTHER WALLS ARE TO THE FACE OF AN INTERIOR WALL.
2. DIMENSIONS AT OTHER WALLS ARE TO THE CENTERLINE OF WALL.
3. DIMENSIONS AT LINT DIMENSIONS ARE TO CENTERLINE OF WALL.
4. OPENING DIMENSIONS TO LANDING OR HATCH ARE TO THE TOP OF SOLE PLATE UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
5. ALL EXISTING TYPING WALLS AND PARTIAL WALLS ARE TO REMAIN UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
6. ALL EXISTING COMMON WALLS ARE TO BE 14" THICK RATING WITH A MINIMUM 1/2" GROUT JOINTS.
7. ALL NEW PARTS TO BE ACCORDING TO THE NOTES.
8. DIMENSIONS ARE TO FACE UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED AT FINISH LINE OR FINISH POINT UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
9. DIMENSIONS TO FACE OF WALL.



7 LEVEL 2 PLAN  
1/8" = 1'-0"

A11



1/4 NORTH THIRD STREET, SUITE 101  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55414  
612.345.3399

CONSULTANT

PRELIMINARY  
NOT FOR  
CONSTRUCTION

REVISIONS  
# Date Description

DATE: 05/13/2014  
PROJECT #: 14-0016  
PHASE: SITE PLAN REVIEW


DRAWN BY: RB  
CHECKED BY: DS

ENLARGED  
UNIT PLANS

A151

**GENERAL NOTES:**

1. REFER TO THE OTHER TYPICALS FOR FINISHES, ELEVATIONS, HEIGHTS AND CLEARANCES. FREQUENTLY.
2. INSTALL GARD BARR FLOORING AS ALL FINISHES MUST BE SETTING FOR SETBACK.
3. WITHIN UNIT ALL WALLS ARE 5/8" TYPE X GIBBONS UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.
4. HATCHES ARE LOCATED IN WALL SECTION TO INDICATE WALL LOCATION.
5. ALL HATCHES ARE TO BE CONFORMED TO THE UNIT WALLS.
6. PROVIDE FLOORING AND BARR AT REFRIGERATOR AND RANGE LOCATION.
7. COUNTER TOPS LOCATED AT REFRIGERATOR AND RANGE.
8. PROVIDE KITCHEN COUNTER TOPS WITH SINK AND STOVE AT WALLS AND HATCHES.
9. REFER TO THE OTHER TYPICALS FOR ALL FINISHES, ELEVATIONS, HEIGHTS, SETBACKS, CLEARANCES, DIMENSIONS, MATERIALS, AND FINISHES. NOTE REQUIRED VARIATIONS FOR ACCESSIBILITY AND TYPE UNIT.
10. NOTE THAT THE ELEVATIONS MAY BE REVERSED UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.
11. PROVIDE INSULATION IN WALLS AT BATHROOM, LAMINATE, BEDROOM AND BARR. PROVIDE WALL FINISHES ADJACENT TO ALL FLOOR FINISHES UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.
12. DIMENSIONS AT FLOOR WALLS ARE TO CENTERLINE UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.




**2 TYPE 'A' UNIT**  
A151 VP = 1/2"

**TYPE 'A' UNIT NOTES:**

1. PROVIDE FLOORING FOR GARD BARR WALL TYPE FINISHES.
2. PROVIDE AND INSTALL FINISHES FOR SUBFLOOR JOINTS IN ALL TYPE FINISHES.
3. PROVIDE FLOOR FINISHES CONFORMED TO THE UNIT WALLS, FINISH.
4. AT WALL KITCHEN FINISHES MUST BE CONFORMED TO THE FINISHES OF THE OTHER WALLS UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.
5. PROVIDE FLOORING AND BARR AT REFRIGERATOR.
6. PROVIDE FLOORING AND BARR AT RANGE LOCATION.

**KEYNOTES:**



**1 TYPICAL UNIT**  
A151 VP = 1/2"

A201



66 WEST THIRD STREET SUITE 401  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55415  
612.432.3100

CONSULTANT

**PRELIMINARY**  
**NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION**


REVISIONS  
# Date Description

DATE 06.19.2014  
PROJECT # 144058  
PHASE SITE PLAN REVIEW  
DRAWN BY HS  
CHECKED BY DH

ROOF PLAN

A201

© 2014 URBANWORKS CONSULTANTS





ALUMINUM TRELLIS



VINYL DOUBLEHUNG WINDOW



EXISTING BRICK



DARK BRICK



METAL PANEL - VERTICAL



METAL PANEL - HORIZONTAL



66 West  
Apartments  
3330 66th St. West, Edina

A43



161 NORTH DENO STREET, SUITE 140  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55415  
612.677.1100

CONSULTANT

PRELIMINARY  
NOT FOR  
CONSTRUCTION

REVISIONS

• Date Description

DATE: 06.29.2014  
PROJECT #:  
PHASE: SITE PLAN REVIEW  
DRAWN BY: BN  
CHECKED BY: DN

EXTERIOR  
BUILDING  
MATERIALS

A300

Copyright © 2013 by UrbanWorks Consultants LLC



**2 SOUTH ELEVATION**  
A301 1/2" = 1'-0"



**1 WEST ELEVATION**  
A301 1/2" = 1'-0"

**66 West  
Apartments**  
3330 66th St, West, Eden

A44



90 NORTH THIRD STREET SUITE 400  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55414

612.497.1100

CONSULTANT

**PRELIMINARY**  
**NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION**

REVISIONS  
Date Description


DATE 06.11.2019  
PROJECT # 144016  
PHASE SITE PLAN REVIEW  
DRAWN BY BN  
CHECKED BY DM

**BUILDING ELEVATIONS**

**A301**  
© 2019 URBANWORKS ARCHITECTURE, LLC



**2** NORTH ELEVATION  
Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"



**1** EAST ELEVATION  
Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"

**66 West  
Apartments**  
3330 68th St. West, Edina

*Handwritten initials: AHS*



151 NORTH THIRD STREET, SUITE 140  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55401  
612.423.3800

CONSULTANT

**PRELIMINARY**  
**NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION**

REVISIONS  
# Date Description

DATE: FEB 19, 2014  
PROJECT #: 140056  
PHASE: SITE PLAN REVIEW  
DRAWN BY: DN  
CHECKED BY: DH

BUILDING ELEVATIONS

**A302**

© 2014 URBANWORKS ARCHITECTS

66 West  
Apartments  
3330 66th St. West, Edina

AW  
A



66 NORTH DUNDY STREET, 3RD FL, EDINA, MN 55425  
612.622.1200

CONSULTANT

PRELIMINARY  
NOT FOR  
CONSTRUCTION

REVISIONS  
# Date Description

DATE: 06.29.2011  
PROJECT #: 14-0215  
PHASE: SITE PLAN REVIEW  
DRAWN BY: SM  
CHECKED BY: DM

BUILDING  
PERSPECTIVE

A351

© 2011 URBANWORKS ARCHITECTURAL



1 BUILDING PERSPECTIVE FROM NORTH  
A351 12" = 1'-0"



P.C.  
8/13/2014

**D. Rezoning, Comprehensive Plan Amendment. Beacon Interfaith Housing. 3330 West 66<sup>th</sup> Street**

**Planner Presentation**

Planner Rothstein informed the Commission to consider a redevelopment request of the existing TCF Bank building, located at 3330 66<sup>th</sup> Street by Beacon Interfaith Housing Collaborative (Beacon). The applicant proposes to remodel and expand the building into 39 units of small studio apartments for young adults who have experienced homelessness. The size of the units would range from 322-451 square feet. Each unit would contain a full kitchen and bathroom. The building would contain offices for on-site service providers and property management. There would also be a community area for residents, a fitness area, a computer lab and a laundry room.

Continuing, Rothstein told the Commission the site is 39,204 square feet in size. The existing bank is 18,179 square feet. The proposed addition would be 10,458 square feet. The building would remain two stories. The remodel of the building would retain the existing brick, and the addition would be brick with metal panels.

There would be 19 surface parking stalls. Proof of parking would total 37 total surface stalls. No enclosed parking is proposed. The applicants have indicated in their narrative that 18% of their residents have cars. Beacon anticipates that no more than 12 stalls would be required for residents. The maximum need for staff parking is 6 stalls. Therefore, they believe they would have adequate parking. Residents are expected to utilize the Metro Transit bus service available across the street at Southdale.

All of the 39 units would be considered affordable housing, and would apply towards the City and Met Council's goal for affordable housing.

Rothstein further explained that the Comprehensive Plan defines the site and area as RM, Regional Medical. The RM allows for senior housing on a case by case basis, however, does not allow other housing. Therefore, a Comprehensive Plan Amendment is required. Rothstein added this development proposal is subject to a two-step review process. The first step in the process is to obtain the following approvals:

1. A Comprehensive Guide Plan Amendment to allow affordable housing in addition to Senior Housing in the Regional Medical District.
2. Preliminary Rezoning from POD-1 Planned Office District-1, to PUD, Planned Unit Development and Preliminary Development Plan. (3/5 Vote of the City Council required.)

If the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Preliminary Rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan are approved by the City Council, the following is then required for the second step:

1. Final Development Plan and Final Rezoning to a PUD.
2. Zoning Ordinance Amendment establishing the PUD District.

Rothstein further noted that the property is located within an area of the City that is designated as a "Potential Area of Change" within the 2008 Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan states that within the Potential Areas of Change, "A development proposal that involves a Comprehensive Plan Amendment or a rezoning will require a Small Area Plan study prior to planning application. However, the authority to initiate a Small Area Plan rests with the City Council." The City Council did not require a Small Area Plan during the Sketch Plan Review.

Planner Rothstein stated staff believes the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment is reasonable for the site for the following reasons:

1. Affordable housing is identified as a need in the Comprehensive Plan; and the proposed amendment would assist the City in meeting its established affordable housing goal with the Met Council of providing 212 new affordable housing units by the year 2020. This project would include 39 new affordable housing units toward that goal. That would make up 100% of the total units in the project.
2. The proposed density of 43 units per acre is reasonable, and within the density range suggested in the Comprehensive Plan of between 12-80 units per acre.
3. The RM District allows senior housing currently. The proposed affordable housing project would include units that are small in size generally similar to senior housing, and the residents within the proposed project typically do not drive, similar to senior housing. The proposed affordable housing project would generate less traffic than the existing bank facility.
4. The project would utilize sustainability principles. Most notable elements include: compliance with Minnesota Overlay and Guide to the 2011 Enterprise Green Communities Criteria; utilizing the existing building rather than a tear down; committing to a 15% energy savings; locating the building to make use of Metro Transit; impervious surface would be reduced by 6.9%; enhanced landscaping; making use of special construction material; installing a rain garden for storm water management; and pedestrian oriented design.
5. Project would meet the following additional Comprehensive Plan goals and objectives:
  - a) Promotion of a vision of community that is inclusive of a wide range of ages, incomes, and abilities and offers a wide range of housing options for Edina residents.
  - b) Promotion of lifecycle housing to support a range of housing options that meet people's preferences and circumstance at all stages of life.

- c) Encourage an integrated mix of building type, heights and footprints within blocks, rather than single buildings or building groups.
- d) Incorporate principles of sustainability and energy conservation into all aspects of design, construction, renovation and long-term operation of new and existing development.

Rothstein explained the housing proposed by Beacon would not have a direct connection to the RM, Regional Medical District. The structure would be located several blocks from the hospital. There would not be a direct tie in to any medical use in the area.

The Regional Medical Zoning District contemplates a 10 acre minimum lot size. It is intended for larger medical type uses along with senior housing which benefits from being in close proximity to medical uses.

Planner Rothstein concluded that staff recommends that the City Council approve the request for a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to allow affordable housing in the RMD District subject to the following findings:

1. Affordable housing is identified as a need in the Comprehensive Plan; and the proposed amendment would assist the City in meeting its established affordable housing goal with the Met Council of providing 212 new affordable housing units by the year 2020. This project would include 39 new affordable housing units (100% of the projects units) toward that goal.
2. The proposed density of 43 units per acre is reasonable, and within the density range suggested in the Comprehensive Plan of between 12-80 units per acre.
3. The RM District allows senior housing currently. The proposed affordable housing project would include units that are small in size generally similar to senior housing, and the residents within the proposed project typically do not drive, similar to senior housing.
4. The project would utilize sustainability principles. Most notable elements include: compliance with Minnesota Overlay and Guide to the 2011 Enterprise Green Communities Criteria; utilizing the existing building rather than a tear down; committing to a 15% energy savings; locating the building to make use of Metro Transit; impervious surface would be reduced by 6.9%; enhanced landscaping; making use of special construction material; installing a rain garden for storm water management; and pedestrian oriented design.
5. The project would meet the following additional Comprehensive Plan goals and objectives:
  - a) Promotion of a vision of community that is inclusive of a wide range of ages, incomes, and abilities and offers a wide range of housing options for Edina residents.
  - b) Promotion of lifecycle housing to support a range of housing options that meet people's preferences and circumstance at all stages of life.

- c) Encourage an integrated mix of building type, heights and footprints within blocks, rather than single buildings or building groups.
- d) Incorporate principles of sustainability and energy conservation into all aspects of design, construction, renovation and long-term operation of new and existing development.

Rothstein further recommended the City Council approve the Preliminary Rezoning and approve the Preliminary Development Plan, based on the following findings:

1. Affordable housing is identified as a need in the Comprehensive Plan; and the proposed amendment would assist the City in meeting its established affordable housing goal with the Met Council of providing 212 new affordable housing units by the year 2020. This project would include 39 new affordable housing units toward that goal.
2. The proposed density of 43 units per acre is reasonable, and within the density range suggested in the Comprehensive Plan of between 12-80 units per acre. The proposed affordable housing project would generate less traffic than the existing bank facility.
2. The project would utilize sustainability principles. Most notable elements include: compliance with Minnesota Overlay and Guide to the 2011 Enterprise Green Communities Criteria; utilizing the existing building rather than a tear down; committing to a 15% energy savings; locating the building to make use of Metro Transit; impervious surface would be reduced by 6.9%; enhanced landscaping; making use of special construction material; installing a rain garden for storm water management; and pedestrian oriented design.
3. Project would meet the following additional Comprehensive Plan goals and objectives:
  - a) Promotion of a vision of community that is inclusive of a wide range of ages, incomes, and abilities and offers a wide range of housing options for Edina residents.
  - b) Promotion of lifecycle housing to support a range of housing options that meet people's preferences and circumstance at all stages of life.
  - c) Encourage an integrated mix of building type, heights and footprints within blocks, rather than single buildings or building groups.
  - d) Incorporate principles of sustainability and energy conservation into all aspects of design, construction, renovation and long-term operation of new and existing development.

Preliminary approval is also subject to the following conditions:

1. The Final Development Plan must be generally consistent with approved Preliminary Development Plans dated June 20, 2014.
2. Sustainable design. The design and construction of the entire project must be done with the Sustainable Initiatives as outlined in the applicant's narrative within the Planning Commission staff report.
3. All buildings must be built with sprinkler systems, subject to review and approval of the fire marshal.

AST

4. Compliance with all of the conditions outlined in the director of engineering's memo dated July 15, 2014.
5. The Final Landscape Plan must meet all minimum landscaping requirements per Chapter 36 of the Zoning Ordinance.
6. The Final Lighting Plan must meet all minimum landscaping requirements per Chapter 36 of the Zoning Ordinance.
7. Final Rezoning is subject to a Zoning Ordinance Amendment creating the PUD, Planned Unit Development for this site.
8. Final Rezoning is subject to review and approval of the Metropolitan Council on the Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

### **Appearing for the Applicant**

Lee Blons, Beacon Interfaith Housing Collaborative

### **Applicant Presentation**

Ms. Blons addressed the Commission giving a brief history of Beacon Interfaith. Blons said this is their first in Edina and Beacon is collaborating with Edina Community Lutheran Church. Continuing, Blons reported that the 39 studio apartment unit project would serve suburban homeless young adults. Blons said they believe the location of 66 West is terrific. She pointed out it is located directly on a bus line and is within walking distance of retail and medical. Blons introduced Carol Lansing of Faegre and Benson and Bart Nelson of Urban Works.

Ms. Lansing reported that the term "affordable" housing isn't a vague term it's a recognized term.

Mr. Nelson with the aid of graphics gave a brief description of the units, parking stall count and the Proof of Parking agreement. Nelson also reported access to the site would be off Barrie Road. Continuing, Nelson said that per the request of the Commission the fence was removed to create a more welcoming site. Nelson said a rain garden would be incorporated and the vegetation planted would be at least 50% native plantings. Concluding, Nelson said the exterior of the building will have a contemporary look.

Continuing, Ms. Blons explained the concept for the project adding their intent is to build relationships between tenants and the neighborhood. The units are independent living with an on-site property manager. She further explained that multiple support services are provided, nutrition, independent living skills, etc., adding their intent is for all residents to have support. Blons reported there will be three full time staff to include overnight staffing. Blons thanked the Commission for their support.

### **Discussion**

Commissioner Forrest asked if the residents of the building are considered permanent. Ms. Blons responded in the affirmative, adding the "stay" rate is usually six months to three

years. Forrest asked how the project is funded. Blons responded that this type of project works backward. Approval is first; funding next. Continuing, Blons said a project like 66 West has diversified funding including private contributions. Forrest questioned age requirements. Blons responded the majority of the tenants are between 18 -21 years. Forrest further asked where the tenants come from. Blons explained that the majority of the tenants come through referrals. Forrest asked the turnover rate. Blons responded that 7-10 residents move in/out throughout the year. Forrest questioned if the tenant mix will be male, female or both. Blons responded that hadn't been decided yet; however their other buildings service both young men and women.

Continuing, Forrest explained she is struggling with amending the Comprehensive Plan to include "affordable" housing in the RM guided area. Ms. Lansing told Commissioner Forrest that the Commission has the discretion on policy

Commissioner Platteter asked if the tenants are required to sign a lease. Ms. Blons responded in the affirmative, adding the residents are expected to comply with all requirements in the lease. She said if a tenant doesn't comply with the requirements their lease would be terminated, adding staff would guide them to other housing if appropriate. Commissioner Platteter questioned security/safety. Ms. Blons explained the entrances are secured entrances with security cameras. Platteter asked about the daytime hours. Blons said during the day staff is present and access is secured visitors can be "buzzed in"

Commissioner Platteter said in viewing the landscaping plan he would like to see additional landscaping added to the west. Mr. Nelson responded he would be willing to look at that. He added their goal is to save as many existing trees as possible.

A discussion ensued with Commissioners discussing the makeup of the proposed housing. It was acknowledged that what is requested is different from a "regular" apartment building. It's a residence with support services that include everything from nutrition to transition coaches. Some Commissioners suggested that the services provided at the proposed residence could be considered compatible with the Comp Plan RM guided area.

### **Public Hearing**

Chair Staunton opened the public hearing.

The following spoke to the issue:

Sheila Rzepecki, 6617 Normandale Road, addressed the Commission.

Ms. Sims, 6433 Barrie Road, addressed the Commission.

Mrs. Prince, 7200 York Ave #602, addressed the Commission

Rev. Erik Strand, Edina Community Lutheran Church, 5732 Abbott Ave, addressed the Commission.

Marilyn Peters, 6429 Barrie Road, addressed the Commission.

Bill Davis, 6616 Cornelia Drive, addressed the Commission.

Ms. Wood, 6525 Drew Avenue, addressed the Commission.

Thomas Stone, Nicollet Square, #404, addressed the Commission.  
MJ Bauer, 7609 Gleason Road, Addressed the Commission.  
Pacy Erck, 6315 Colony Way, addressed the Commission.  
Mikkell Beckman, Hennepin County, 318 East 38<sup>th</sup> Street, addressed the Commission  
Tom Nelson, Kenwood/Lowry Hill neighborhood, addressed the Commission.  
Robert Hobbins, 4708 Upper Terrace, addressed the Commission  
Carol Truesdell, 9 Woodland Road, addressed the Commission.  
Pastor Mary Albing, Lutheran Church of Christ the Redeemer, addressed the Commission.  
Lynn Truesdell, 9 Woodland Road, addressed the Commission.  
Jenette Augustson, 5000 Arden Avenue, addressed the Commission.  
Floyd Grabel, 4817 Wilford Way, addressed the Commission  
Betsy Cruz, 8109 Dupont Ave., addressed the Commission  
Jon Good, 6816 Brittany Road, addressed the Commission  
Lisa Netzer, 6024 Timber Trail, addressed the Commission.  
Linda Schmitz, 6483 Barrie Road, addressed the Commission.  
Nate Schmeltzer, 132 West 62<sup>nd</sup> Street, addressed the Commission.  
Maura Schnonbach, 6221 Balder Lane, addressed the Commission.  
Marcia Kermeen, 232 Morgan Avenue, addressed the Commission.  
Jennifer Rolfes, 7675 Woodview Court, addressed the Commission.  
Lisa Thompson, 5500 Benton Avenue, addressed the Commission.  
Rose Minor, 6519 Barrie Road, Step by Step Montessori, addressed the Commission.  
Denise, Prior Lake addressed the Commission.  
Sandy Perzinski, 6519 Barrie Road, Step by Step Montessori, addressed the Commission.  
2007 West 61<sup>st</sup> Street, addressed the Commission.  
Elizabeth Briden, 6525 Barrie Road, addressed the Commission.  
David Coolaird, 7100 Metro Boulevard, addressed the Commission.  
Bob Long, Larkin Hoffman, addressed the Commission  
5100 Danens Drive, addressed the Commission  
Father Tim Rudolph, 6820 St. Patrick's Lane, addressed the Commission.  
Adam Estrem, St. Stephens Church, addressed the Commission.  
Rhonda Olson, 5109 Beard Avenue, addressed the Commission.  
Janet Sullivan, 6832 Gleason Road, addressed the Commission.  
Mark Swiggum, addressed the Commission.  
Mark Chamberlin, 7004 Bristol Blvd., addressed the Commission.  
Geoff Workinger, 5224 Kellogg Avenue, addressed the Commission.

Chair Staunton asked if anyone else would like to speak, being none Staunton thanked everyone for their input and asked for a motion to close the public hearing.

Commissioner Platteter moved to close the public hearing. Commissioner Carr seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

### **Discussion**

Commissioner Kilberg commented that he is struggling with the request to PUD as submitted. Kilberg stated he's not convinced this isn't residential creep into a

A54

office/commercial neighborhood. Continuing, Kilberg said in his opinion the businesses have valid concerns about the proposed rezoning to PUD to allow housing. Concluding, Commissioner Kilberg reiterated this could be considered reverse creep; commercial to residential, not residential to commercial.

Commissioner Carr asked for clarification on the zoning/rezoning. Planner Rothstein explained that currently the property is zoned POD-1, Planned Office District and is guided in the Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan) as Regional Medical and earmarked as an area for potential change. The request before the Commission this evening is a Comp Plan Amendment and rezoning to PUD to allow housing other than senior.

A brief discussion ensued on the recently approved rezoning for 6500 France allowing senior housing. It was pointed out that aspects of that project are strictly tied to medical (assisted living; aftercare; hospice) and that coincides with the Regional Medical guide. The Commission acknowledged the current request is difficult because while the City encourages "affordable housing" there isn't a specific zoning guide for that and to tie the "affordable" use to medical may be difficult.

Chair Staunton acknowledged this is a thriving medical area; however, the proposed housing does include support services and is a "cared" environment. Staunton said in his opinion this use "feels different" from market-rate housing. It's an environment that helps its residents on different levels. Commissioner Platteter agreed, adding this is just the other end of the spectrum. The elderly need support services and so do these young adults.

Commissioner Forrest said the request is creating interesting tension. She pointed out on one hand the City has a mandate to provide affordable housing opportunities; however, the means to provide it are limited. Forrest also pointed out the site isn't zoned RMD it's only guided RM in the Comp Plan. Zoned and guided are two different things. Continuing, Forrest said there must be a way to craft language that would allow this use in the Regional Medical similar to a senior housing use in RM guided areas. Concluding, Forrest also pointed out if the City stays strictly to how an area is guided there are a number of uses in the area "guided" Regional Medical that don't meet the definition.

Commissioner Carr said she can't support the proposal as presented. She stated it's not consistent with the Regional Medical District Comp Plan guide classification, adding the neighbors in her opinion have raised valid points, adding this could be considered spot zoning.

Chair Staunton said the Commission could eliminate the word affordable and say housing located in an area guided as Regional Medical must include support services. Commissioner Forrest said she agrees, adding her concern is with the word "affordable" adding it's a language thing.

Chair Staunton agreed "affordable" housing doesn't solve it; there needs to be a mention of housing linked with care/support services that maintains the values of the Comp Plan and its goal of affordable housing.

ASJ

Commissioner Carr said whatever the Commission decides, if the Comprehensive Plan is Amended, it's a significant change. She said a change like this may warrant more public input, adding it's clearly not medical related.

Chair Staunton pointed out if the sticking point is amending the Comprehensive Plan the Commission should note without an amendment to the Comp Plan the project as proposed can't move forward.

### Motions

**Commissioner Platteter moved to recommend amending the Comprehensive Guide Plan based on staff findings and subject to staff conditions.** Commenting further, Platteter stated he doesn't like the use of the word "affordable" suggesting that it be changed to "housing with support services". Motion failed for lack of second.

**Commissioner Carr moved to recommend denial of the request for an amendment to the Comprehensive Guide Plan to allow affordable housing in the Regional Medical District. Commissioner Forrest seconded the motion. Ayes; Forrest, Lee, Carr. Nays; Platteter, Staunton. Motion to deny carried 3-2 vote**

A discussion ensued with some Commissioners expressing the opinion that while they support the project their issue is with the word "affordable" as written in the proposed guide plan amendment. Commissioners said they are struggling to find an appropriate way to approve an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan; however, are at a loss in clarifying their intent.

Commissioner Forrest asked Attorney Knutson if a motion could be made that was more general in terms. Forrest said it's difficult to have the exact language "on the spot". Attorney Knutson responded the Commission is advisory, adding they can recommend anything to the Council for their consideration.

**Commissioner Forrest moved to recommend amending the Comprehensive Guide Plan/Regional Medical by incorporating guidelines/goals/requirements that would allow this type of project in the Regional Medical. Commissioner Lee seconded the motion. Ayes; Forrest, Lee, Platteter. Staunton. Nay; Carr. Motion carried 4-1.**

**Commissioner Platteter moved to recommend preliminary rezoning from POD-1, Planned Office District-1 to PUD, Planned Unit Development. Commissioner Lee seconded the motion. Ayes; Platteter, Forrest, Lee, Staunton. Nay; Carr. Motion carried 4-1.**

A56



**DATE:** July 15, 2014  
**TO:** Cary Teague – Planning Director  
**CC:** Chad Millner – City Engineer  
**FROM:** Ross Bintner P.E. - Environmental Engineer  
**RE:** **3330 66th Street West – Development Review**

The Engineering Department has reviewed the subject property for street and utility connections, grading, storm water, erosion and sediment control.

1. City Standard Plates available here: [http://edinamn.gov/index.php?section=construction\\_standards](http://edinamn.gov/index.php?section=construction_standards)
2. A separate permit is required from Nine Mile Creek Watershed District: [www.ninemilecreek.org](http://www.ninemilecreek.org)

#### *Survey*

3. No comments.

#### *Soils*

4. Submit soils, soil boring and geotechnical report.

#### *Details*

5. No comments

#### *Traffic and Street*

6. A traffic study has been reviewed and shows no undue burden on the transportation network.
7. Show replacement of brick sidewalk with salvaged or like for utility service crossing location.
8. Show replacement of concrete sidewalk with like for utility service crossing location.
9. Commercial entrance should follow standard plate 400 and 410.

#### *Sanitary and Water Utilities*

10. Verify location, and remove moribund water service on southwest property corner to main if it exists.

#### *Storm Water Utility*

11. Provide hydraulic and hydrology calculations that meet Nine Mile Creek Watershed District standards.  
Capacity is available in public stormwater system from NC\_III subwatershed, downstream of project.
12. Provide copies of maintenance agreement for private stormwater systems.
13. A revised SAC unit determination will be required at building permit application.
14. Provide drainage outlet from raingarden.

#### *Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control*

15. No comments.



---

*Other Agency Coordination*


16. Nine Mile Creek Watershed permit is required. MDH, MPCA and MCES permits may be required.

---

**ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT**

7450 Metro Boulevard • Edina, Minnesota 55439  
www.EdinaMN.gov • 952-826-0371 • Fax 952-826-0392

A526



## Traffic Impact Study

### 66 West Apartments Edina, MN

I hereby certify that this report was prepared by me or under my direct supervision, and that I am a duly Licensed Professional Engineer under the laws of the State of Minnesota.

By: *Michael P. Spack*  
Michael P. Spack, P.E., P.T.O.E.  
License No. 40936

Date: July 11, 2014

## Executive Summary

Background: Beacon Interfaith Housing Collaborative (Beacon) is proposing to develop a 39 unit apartment building at the site of an existing TCF Bank located northeast of the 66<sup>th</sup> Street/Barrie Road intersection in Edina, MN. The purpose of this study is to determine if transportation improvements are needed to accommodate the proposed building and to ensure there will be adequate parking available on site after the apartment building is fully occupied.

Results: The traffic impacts of the proposed apartment building on the study intersections were analyzed in the 2015 build-out conditions. The principal findings are:

- i. The forecast traffic from the proposed development will have little impact on the operations of the study intersections.
- ii. All study intersections will operate acceptably through the 2015 build-out scenarios.
- iii. The proposed 19 unit parking lot is forecast to be adequate for the 66 West Apartment building.

Recommendations: Other than the proposed changes of closing the east leg of the existing site southern driveway and converting the northern driveway to a full access intersection, no modifications are needed to be made by the developer to the study intersections.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction .....	1
2. Proposed Development .....	1
3. Analysis of Existing Traffic Conditions .....	2
4. Projected Traffic .....	3
5. Traffic and Improvement Analysis for 2034 Scenarios .....	5
6. Parking Analysis .....	5
7. Conclusions and Recommendations.....	6
8. Appendix.....	7

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 – Existing Peak Hour Level of Service (LOS) <sup>1</sup> .....	3
Table 2 – 2015 Build Level of Service (LOS) <sup>1</sup> .....	5
Table 3 – Existing Parking Lot Counts.....	6

## 1. Introduction

### **a. Purpose of Study**

Beacon Interfaith Housing Collaborative (Beacon) is proposing to develop a 39 unit apartment building at the site of an existing TCF Bank located northeast of the 66<sup>th</sup> Street/Barrie Road intersection in Edina, MN. The purpose of this study is to determine if transportation improvements are needed to accommodate the proposed building and to ensure there will be adequate parking available on site after the apartment building is fully occupied.

### **b. Study Objectives**

The objectives of this study are:

- i. Document how the study intersections currently operate.
- ii. Forecast the amount of traffic expected to be generated by the proposed development.
- iii. Determine how the study intersections will operate in the year 2015 with development traffic.
- iv. Determine if there will be adequate parking on site when the apartment is fully occupied.
- v. Recommend improvements, if needed.

The study intersections are:

- i. 66<sup>th</sup> Street/Barrie Road
- ii. Barrie Road/Existing Southern Site Access
- iii. Barrie Road/Existing Northern Site Access

## 2. Proposed Development

### **a. Site Location**

The site is located north of the Southdale Shopping Center on the northeast corner of the 66<sup>th</sup> Street/Barrie Road intersection in Edina, MN (see Figure 1 in the Appendix).

### **b. Land Use Intensity and Development Timing**

The proposed site will have 39 apartment units. The site is currently being used as a TCF Bank with a drive through. The existing bank building will be remodeled and an addition will be constructed to make up the apartment building. Site access will be via the Barrie Road/Existing Northern Site Access intersection. The Existing Southern Site Access east leg will be removed as part of the development.

The site is proposed to have a 19 stall parking lot. A conceptual site plan is shown in Figure 2 in the Appendix.

For the purposes of this study, the development is anticipated to be built and fully occupied by the year 2015.

### **3. Analysis of Existing Traffic Conditions**

#### ***a. Transportation Network Characteristics***

66<sup>th</sup> Street West is also Hennepin County State Aid Highway 53. It is a divided road with five lanes (three westbound and two eastbound) and a 35 mph speed limit near the site. According to MnDOT it has an average of 16,000 vehicles per day using it near the site.

Barrie Road is a local Edina road. It is a two lane, undivided road with a 30 mph speed limit near the site.

All of the study intersections are two-way stop controlled with stop signs on the minor approaches. The 66<sup>th</sup> Street/Barrie Road intersection is a  $\frac{3}{4}$  intersection restricting vehicles from making left turns or through movements from Barrie Road. Existing traffic control and travel lanes are shown in Figure 3 in the Appendix for each study intersection.

#### ***b. Traffic Volumes***

Intersection video was collected at each of the study intersections under normal weekday conditions in June 2014 when there was clear weather. Using these videos, turning movement counts were collected from 6:30 to 9:30 a.m. and from 3:30 to 6:30 p.m. at the three existing study intersections. The peak hours for each intersection were found to be:

- 66<sup>th</sup> Street/Barrie Road: 7:30 to 8:30 a.m. and 4:15 to 5:15 p.m.
- Barrie Road/Existing Southern Site Access: 8:30 to 9:30 a.m. and 4:30 to 5:30 p.m.
- Barrie Road/Existing Northern Site Access: 8:30 to 9:30 a.m. and 4:30 to 5:30 p.m.

The turning movement count data from the counts are contained in fifteen minute intervals in the Appendix.

### c. Level of Service



Source: City of San Jose, CA

An intersection capacity analysis was conducted for the existing intersections per the *Highway Capacity Manual, 2010*. Intersections are assigned a "Level of Service" letter grade for the peak hour of traffic based on the number of lanes at the intersection, traffic volumes, and traffic control. Level of Service A (LOS A) represents light traffic flow (free flow conditions) while Level of Service F (LOS F) represents heavy traffic flow (over capacity conditions). LOS D at intersections is typically considered acceptable in the Twin Cities region. Individual movements are also assigned LOS grades. One or more individual movements typically operate at LOS F when the overall intersection is operating acceptably at LOS D. The pictures on the left represent some of the LOS grades (from a signal controlled intersection in San Jose, CA). These LOS grades represent the overall intersection operation, not individual movements.

The LOS results for the existing study hours are shown in Table 1. These are based on the existing traffic control and lane configurations as shown in Figure 3 in the Appendix. The existing turning movement volumes from the Appendix were used in the LOS calculations. The LOS calculations were done in accordance with the *Highway Capacity Manual 2010* using VISTRO™ software. The complete LOS calculations, which include grades for individual movements, are included in the Appendix. The study intersections currently operate acceptably at LOS A or better with all movements operating at LOS C or better.

Table 1 – Existing Peak Hour Level of Service (LOS)<sup>1</sup>

Intersection	A.M. Peak	P.M. Peak
66 <sup>th</sup> St/Barrie Rd	A (c)	A (b)
Barrie Rd/Existing Southern Site Access	A (b)	A (b)
Barrie Rd/Existing Northern Site Access	A (a)	A (b)

<sup>1</sup>The first letter is the Level of Service for the intersection. The second letter (in parentheses) is the Level of Service for the worst operating movement.

## 4. Projected Traffic

### a. Site Traffic Forecasting

A trip generation analysis was performed for the development site based on the methods and rates published in the *ITE Trip Generation Manual, 9<sup>th</sup>*

*Edition.* Based on Land Use Code 220, the 39 unit apartment building will generate:

- 130 vehicles entering and 130 vehicles exiting the subdivision per day
- 4 vehicles entering and 16 vehicles exiting the subdivision in the a.m. peak hour
- 16 vehicles entering and 8 vehicles exiting the subdivision in the p.m. peak hour

A trip distribution pattern was developed for the generated traffic to and from the site. This pattern is based on existing traffic counts as well as taking into account site access and access to the regional transportation system. The trip distribution pattern is:

- 35% to the west on 66<sup>th</sup> Street
- 25% from the west on 66<sup>th</sup> Street
- 65% to the north on Barrie Road
- 35% from the north on Barrie Road
- 40% from the east on 66<sup>th</sup> Street

The traffic generated by the site development was assigned to the area roadways per this distribution pattern.

Since the 66 West Apartments will be taking over the site of the existing TCF Bank, the existing traffic to and from the bank was deleted from the network for the future Build scenarios.

### ***b. Non-site Traffic Forecasting***

Since the site is expected to be built and fully occupied in 2015, a background growth rate was applied to the existing traffic volumes to represent future traffic. The MnDOT State Aid office has a 20 year growth rate projection for Hennepin County of 10%. This means that 20 years from now, MnDOT projects traffic in the area will be 10% higher than current volumes. This leads to an annual growth rate of 0.5%. This growth rate of 0.5% was applied to existing traffic on the network.

### ***c. Total Traffic***

Traffic forecasts were developed for the year 2015 Build Scenarios by adding the traffic generated by the proposed development to the existing traffic with the 0.5% growth rate applied and subtracting out the existing TCF Bank traffic. The resultant 2015 Build peak hour forecasts are shown in the Appendix under the capacity analysis section for each scenario.

## 5. Traffic and Improvement Analysis for 2034 Scenarios

### a. Level of Service Analysis

The LOS results for the 2015 Scenario study hours are shown in Table 2. These are based on the existing traffic control and lane configurations at the study intersections with the deletion of the east leg of the Barrie Road/Existing Southern Site Access (named Barrie Road/Southern Driveway in Table 2) and the conversion of the northern site access to a full access intersection (named Barrie Road/66 West Site Access in Table 2). The lane configurations used can be seen in the capacity analysis section of the Appendix for the Build scenarios. The forecast turning movement volumes for the 2015 peak hour scenarios as shown in the Appendix were used in the LOS calculations. The LOS calculations were done in accordance with the 2010 *Highway Capacity Manual* using VISTRO™ software. The complete LOS calculations, which include queue lengths and grades for individual movements, are included in the Appendix.

Table 2 – 2015 Build Level of Service (LOS)<sup>1</sup>

Intersection	A.M. Peak Hour	P.M. Peak Hour
66 <sup>th</sup> St/Barrie Rd	A (c)	A (b)
Barrie Rd/Southern Driveway	A (b)	A (b)
Barrie Rd/66 West Site Access	A (a)	A (a)

<sup>1</sup>The first letter is the Level of Service for the intersection. The second letter (in parentheses) is the Level of Service for the worst operating movement.

Comparing the results from Table 2 to Table 1, the LOS results are forecast to not get any worse with the conversion of the existing bank site to the 66 West Apartments. The northern driveway intersection actually improves with the conversion to the 66 West Apartments because the existing bank is generating more traffic than the apartment is forecast to. No additional improvements or modifications are needed to accommodate traffic from the 66 West Apartments.

## 6. Parking Analysis

### a. Existing Parking Counts

The 66 West Apartment building is proposing a 19 stall parking lot for its 39 unit building. Typically this would be considered not enough parking for a building of its size, but the 66 West Apartments is housing for young adults who have experienced homelessness. Because of this, the parking demand is likely to be lower than most apartment buildings since vehicle ownership rates are expected to be lower at 66 West than a typical suburban apartment building.

In order to determine how much parking can be expected at the 66 West Apartments, parking lot counts were conducted at three similar sites in Minneapolis that are also managed by Beacon. The three sites were:

- Nicollet Square: 3700 Nicollet Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN
- Lydia Apartments: 1920 LaSalle Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN
- Cedar View: 3146 Cedar Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN

The number of vehicles in each of these parking lots was counted after 10:00 p.m. every day for a week in June of 2014. The highest number of parked vehicles at each lot can be seen in Table 3. Full parking counts can be seen in Figure 4 in the Appendix.

**Table 3 – Existing Parking Lot Counts**

Apartment Building	Number of Apartment Units	Highest Parking Lot Count	Rate of Maximum Parked Vehicles to Apartment Units
Nicollet Square	42	10	0.18
Lydia Apartments	40	7	0.24
Cedar View	10	3	0.30

***b. Projected 66 West Apartments Parking***

Looking at Table 3, it can be seen that the maximum parking space to apartment unit demand is 0.3. For the 39 units at the 66 West Apartments, that leads to 12 parking spaces needed. Since the proposed parking lot includes 19 parking spaces, there will be adequate parking on site.



**7. Conclusions and Recommendations**

The traffic and parking impacts of the proposed apartment building on the study intersections were analyzed in the 2015 build-out conditions. The principal findings are:

- i. The forecast traffic from the proposed development will have little impact on the operations of the study intersections.
- ii. All study intersections will operate acceptably through the 2015 build-out scenarios.
- iii. The proposed 19 unit parking lot is forecast to be adequate for the 66 West Apartment building.



Other than the proposed changes of closing the east leg of the existing site southern driveway and converting the northern driveway to a full access intersection, no modifications are needed to be made by the developer to the study intersections.

## **8. Appendix**

### ***A. Figures 1-4***


### ***B. Traffic Counts***

### ***C. Capacity Analysis Backup***


- AM Existing
- PM Existing
- AM 2015 Build
- PM 2015 Build

## Figure 1 Location Maps

North  
No Scale



Study Area




Site Location

AG9

Appendix A - Figures





Figure 2  
Concept Plan



A70

**Figure 3**  
**Existing Lanes & Traffic Control**



Appendix A - Figures



Figure 4  
Existing Parking Data

Occupied Vehicles (counted after 10pm)

Date		Beacon Counts			Spack Consulting Counts		
		Lydia Apartments	Nicollet Square	Cedar View	Lydia Apartments	Nicollet Square	Cedar View
Monday	6/9/2014	7	7	3	7	5	3
Tuesday	6/10/2014	6	7	3	--	--	--
Wednesday	6/11/2014	5	6	3	--	--	--
Thursday	6/12/2014	6	7	3	5*	9*	3*
Friday	6/13/2014	5	7	3	--	--	--
Saturday	6/14/2014	5	10	2	--	--	--
Sunday	6/15/2014	5	2	3	--	--	--
Maximum		7	10	3	*At 11 am		
Number of Units		40	42	10			
Max Parking Demand		0.18	0.24	0.30			

A72



# Traffic Data Inc Appendix B - Traffic Counts

PO Box 16296  
St. Louis Park, MN 55416

File Name : 1 - Barrie Rd & 66th St, 6-10-14, 630-930am, 330-630pm  
Site Code : 1  
Start Date : 6/10/2014  
Page No : 1

Barrie Rd & 66th St  
Edina, MN

Groups Printed: Cars + - Trucks

Start Time	Barrie Rd Southbound						66th St Westbound						Barrie Rd Northbound						66th St Eastbound						Int. Total	
	UTrn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	UTrn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	UTrn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	UTrn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total		
06:30 AM	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	0	96	13	1	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	36	0	0	40	153
06:45 AM	0	0	0	7	0	7	0	0	132	22	0	154	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	56	0	0	61	222
Total	0	0	0	9	1	10	0	0	228	35	1	264	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	92	0	0	101	375
07:00 AM	0	2	0	5	2	9	0	0	138	11	1	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	60	0	0	70	229	
07:15 AM	0	0	0	5	4	9	0	0	239	19	0	258	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	82	0	0	94	361	
07:30 AM	0	0	0	9	4	13	1	0	288	28	0	317	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	88	0	0	95	425	
07:45 AM	0	0	0	15	6	21	0	0	293	35	0	328	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	82	0	0	98	448	
Total	0	2	0	34	16	52	1	0	958	93	1	1053	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	44	312	0	0	357	1463	
08:00 AM	0	2	0	9	1	12	0	0	282	23	0	305	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	89	0	1	102	419	
08:15 AM	0	1	0	9	0	10	0	0	246	27	2	275	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	100	0	0	109	394	
08:30 AM	0	0	0	18	2	20	0	0	234	26	1	261	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	110	0	0	118	399	
08:45 AM	0	1	0	17	3	21	0	0	220	26	0	246	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	93	0	1	110	377	
Total	0	4	0	53	6	63	0	0	982	102	3	1087	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	38	397	0	2	439	1589	
09:00 AM	0	0	0	19	2	21	0	0	164	16	0	180	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	106	0	0	119	320	
09:15 AM	0	0	0	26	2	28	0	0	148	16	0	164	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	91	0	0	102	294	
Total	0	0	0	45	4	49	0	0	312	32	0	344	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	197	0	0	221	614	
03:30 PM	0	0	0	26	4	30	0	0	166	17	1	184	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	211	0	0	229	443	
03:45 PM	0	0	0	25	3	28	0	0	211	22	0	233	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	248	0	0	267	528	
Total	0	0	0	51	7	58	0	0	377	39	1	417	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	35	459	0	0	496	971	
04:00 PM	0	1	0	28	2	31	0	0	172	18	3	193	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	238	0	0	250	474	
04:15 PM	0	0	0	22	3	25	0	0	193	26	0	219	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	236	0	3	255	499	
04:30 PM	0	0	0	24	4	28	0	0	171	11	0	182	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	242	0	1	257	487	
04:45 PM	0	0	0	20	0	20	0	0	231	27	0	258	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	226	0	0	235	514	
Total	0	1	0	94	9	104	0	0	767	82	3	852	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	49	942	0	4	997	1954
05:00 PM	0	1	0	28	1	30	0	0	225	19	1	245	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	244	0	1	255	531	
05:15 PM	0	1	0	22	3	26	0	0	188	33	1	222	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	226	0	0	241	489	
05:30 PM	0	0	0	17	1	18	0	0	196	15	0	211	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	230	0	1	238	467	
05:45 PM	0	0	0	18	4	22	0	0	204	25	1	230	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	228	0	0	238	490	
Total	0	2	0	85	9	96	0	0	813	92	3	908	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	40	928	0	2	972	1977
06:00 PM	0	1	0	10	5	16	0	0	176	13	1	190	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	205	0	0	210	416	
06:15 PM	0	1	0	8	3	12	0	0	166	13	0	179	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	185	0	0	193	384	
Grand Total	0	11	0	389	60	460	1	0	4779	501	13	5294	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	10	251	3717	0	8	3986	9743
Approch %	0	2.4	0	84.6	13		0	0	90.3	9.5	0.2		0	0	0	0	0	100	0.3	6.3	93.3	0	0.2			
Total %	0	0.1	0	4	0.6	4.7	0	0	49.1	5.1	0.1	54.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1	2.6	38.2	0	0.1	40.9		
Cars +	0	11	0	383	46	440	1	0	4651	492	13	5157	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	247	3710	0	6	3973	9570	
% Cars +	0	100	0	98.5	76.7	95.7	100	0	97.3	98.2	100	97.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	98.4	99.8	0	75	99.7	98.2	
Trucks	0	0	0	6	14	20	0	0	128	9	0	137	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	4	7	0	2	13	173
% Trucks	0	0	0	1.5	23.3	4.3	0	0	2.7	1.8	0	2.6	0	0	0	0	0	100	100	0	1.6	0.2	0	25	0.3	1.8

Traffic Impact Study

B1

66 West Apartments

A73




# Traffic Data Inc Appendix B - Traffic Counts

P.O. Box 16296  
St. Louis Park, MN 55416

Barrie Rd & 66th St  
Edina, MN

File Name : 1 - Barrie Rd & 66th St, 6-10-14, 630-930am, 330-630pm  
Site Code : 1  
Start Date : 6/10/2014  
Page No : 2



A74



# Traffic Data Inc Appendix B - Traffic Counts

PO Box 16296  
St. Louis Park, MN 55416

Barrie Rd & 66th St  
Edina, MN

File Name : 1 - Barrie Rd & 66th St, 6-10-14, 630-930am, 330-630pm  
Site Code : 1  
Start Date : 6/10/2014  
Page No : 3

Start Time	Barrie Rd Southbound						66th St Westbound						Barrie Rd Northbound						66th St Eastbound						Int. Total
	UTrn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	UTrn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	UTrn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	UTrn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	
Peak Hour Analysis From 06:30 AM to 12:30 PM - Peak 1 of 1																									
Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 07:30 AM																									
07:30 AM	0	0	0	9	4	13	1	0	288	28	0	317	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	88	0	0	95	425
07:45 AM	0	0	0	15	6	21	0	0	293	35	0	328	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	15	82	0	0	98	448
08:00 AM	0	2	0	9	1	12	0	0	282	23	0	305	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	89	0	1	102	419
08:15 AM	0	1	0	9	0	10	0	0	246	27	2	275	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	100	0	0	109	394
Total Volume	0	3	0	42	11	56	1	0	1109	113	2	1225	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	43	359	0	1	404	1686
% App. Total	0	5.4	0	75	19.6		0.1	0	90.5	9.2	0.2		0	0	0	0	100		0.2	10.6	88.9	0	0.2		
PHF	.000	.375	.000	.700	.458	.667	.250	.000	.946	.807	.250	.934	.000	.000	.000	.000	.250	.250	.250	.717	.898	.000	.250	.927	.941
Peak Hour Analysis From 12:45 PM to 05:15 PM - Peak 1 of 1																									
Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 04:15 PM																									
04:15 PM	0	0	0	22	3	25	0	0	193	26	0	219	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	236	0	3	255	499
04:30 PM	0	0	0	24	4	28	0	0	171	11	0	182	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	242	0	1	257	467
04:45 PM	0	0	0	20	0	20	0	0	231	27	0	258	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	9	226	0	0	235	514
05:00 PM	0	1	0	28	1	30	0	0	225	19	1	245	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	9	244	0	1	255	531
Total Volume	0	1	0	94	8	103	0	0	820	83	1	904	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	47	948	0	5	1002	2011
% App. Total	0	1	0	81.3	7.8		0	0	90.7	9.2	0.1		0	0	0	0	100		0.2	4.7	94.6	0	0.5		
PHF	.000	.250	.000	.839	.500	.858	.000	.000	.887	.769	.250	.876	.000	.000	.000	.000	.500	.500	.500	.734	.971	.000	.417	.975	.947

A75



# Traffic Data Inc Appendix B - Traffic Counts

PO Box 16296  
St. Louis Park, MN 55416

File Name : 2 - Barrie Rd & Southern Driveways, 6-10-14, 630-930am, 330-630pm  
Site Code : 2  
Start Date : 6/10/2014  
Page No : 1

Barrie Rd & Southern Site Access  
Edina, MN

Groups Printed- Cars +/- Trucks

Start Time	Barrie Rd Southbound						Driveway Westbound					Barrie Rd Northbound					Driveway Eastbound					Int. Total					
	UTrn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	UTrn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	UTrn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	UTrn	Left	Thru		Right	Peds	App. Total		
06:30 AM	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	6	10	1	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
06:45 AM	0	1	7	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	18	1	0	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
<b>Total</b>	0	1	9	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	14	28	2	0	44	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
07:00 AM	0	0	7	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	9	11	1	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
07:15 AM	0	0	5	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	19	2	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
07:30 AM	0	0	9	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	8	25	2	0	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	47
07:45 AM	0	0	13	0	1	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	33	3	0	50	0	1	0	2	1	4	0	4	68
<b>Total</b>	0	0	34	1	2	37	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	41	88	8	0	137	0	1	0	2	2	5	0	5	182
08:00 AM	0	2	9	1	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	22	1	0	35	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	2	49
08:15 AM	0	2	9	0	2	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	12	22	2	1	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	52
08:30 AM	0	2	17	2	1	22	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	9	23	0	0	32	0	2	0	1	0	3	0	3	59
08:45 AM	0	0	18	3	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	21	3	0	37	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	3	61
<b>Total</b>	0	6	53	6	3	68	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	46	88	6	1	141	0	5	0	4	0	9	0	9	221
09:00 AM	0	1	15	1	0	17	0	2	0	0	1	3	0	7	14	7	0	28	0	1	0	2	0	3	0	3	51
09:15 AM	0	5	22	1	0	28	0	3	0	1	2	6	0	4	19	4	0	27	0	4	0	1	0	5	0	5	66
<b>Total</b>	0	6	37	2	0	45	0	5	0	1	3	9	0	11	33	11	0	55	0	5	0	3	0	8	0	8	117
03:30 PM	0	5	15	1	0	21	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	24	7	1	34	0	4	0	9	0	13	0	13	70
03:45 PM	0	4	19	1	0	24	0	3	0	2	2	7	0	8	27	6	1	42	0	1	0	3	0	4	0	4	77
<b>Total</b>	0	9	34	2	0	45	0	5	0	2	2	9	0	10	51	13	2	76	0	5	0	12	0	17	0	17	147
04:00 PM	0	3	21	0	0	24	0	2	0	6	1	9	0	4	17	8	0	29	0	5	0	6	0	11	0	11	73
04:15 PM	0	5	13	2	0	20	0	5	0	1	0	6	0	4	29	9	0	42	0	1	2	4	0	7	0	7	75
04:30 PM	0	4	14	0	0	18	0	2	1	3	2	8	0	4	16	4	1	25	0	5	0	8	2	15	0	15	66
04:45 PM	0	5	15	0	0	20	0	2	0	4	0	6	0	5	26	5	0	36	0	2	0	3	1	6	0	6	68
<b>Total</b>	0	17	63	2	0	82	0	11	1	14	3	29	0	17	88	26	1	132	0	13	2	21	3	39	0	39	282
05:00 PM	0	7	22	1	0	30	0	2	0	3	0	5	0	2	22	4	1	29	0	7	1	5	1	14	0	14	78
05:15 PM	0	4	17	0	0	21	0	4	0	5	3	12	0	12	30	6	1	49	0	4	0	2	1	7	0	7	89
05:30 PM	0	0	14	1	0	15	0	1	0	1	5	7	0	4	15	3	0	22	0	0	0	2	2	4	0	4	48
05:45 PM	0	2	15	0	0	17	0	2	0	1	2	5	0	1	28	5	1	35	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	3	60
<b>Total</b>	0	13	68	2	0	83	0	9	0	10	10	29	0	19	95	18	3	135	0	11	1	10	6	28	0	28	275
05:00 PM	0	2	7	0	0	9	0	1	0	0	4	5	0	1	15	2	0	18	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	3	35
05:15 PM	0	0	9	0	0	9	0	0	0	1	3	4	0	0	18	3	0	21	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	2	39
<b>Grand Total</b>	0	54	314	15	5	388	0	31	1	30	30	92	0	169	504	89	7	759	0	41	3	55	13	112	0	1351	
<b>Approach %</b>	0	13.9	80.9	3.9	1.3		0	33.7	1.1	32.6	32.6		0	20.9	66.4	11.7	0.9		0	38.6	2.7	49.1	11.6		0		
<b>Total %</b>	0	4	23.2	1.1	0.4	28.7	0	2.3	0.1	2.2	2.2	6.8	0	11.8	37.3	6.6	0.5	56.2	0	3	0.2	4.1	1	8.3	0	8.3	
<b>Cars +</b>	0	54	314	14	4	386	0	31	1	30	27	89	0	158	504	89	6	757	0	39	3	54	13	109	0	1341	
<b>% Cars +</b>	0	100	100	93.3	80	99.5	0	100	100	100	90	96.7	0	99.4	100	100	85.7	99.7	0	95.1	100	98.2	100	97.3	0	99.3	
<b>Trucks</b>	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	2	0	1	0	3	0	10	
<b>% Trucks</b>	0	0	0	6.7	20	0.5	0	0	0	0	10	3.3	0	0.6	0	0	14.3	0.3	0	4.9	0	1.8	0	2.7	0	0.7	

Traffic Impact Study

B4

65 West Apartments

A76





# Traffic Data Inc Appendix B - Traffic Counts

PO Box 16296  
St. Louis Park, MN 55416

Barrie Rd & Southern Site Access  
Edina, MN

File Name : 2 - Barrie Rd & Southern Driveways, 6-10-14, 630-930am, 330-630pm  
Site Code : 2  
Start Date : 6/10/2014  
Page No : 3

Start Time	Barrie Rd Southbound						Driveway Westbound						Barrie Rd Northbound						Driveway Eastbound						Int. Total
	UTrn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	UTrn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	UTrn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	UTrn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	
Peak Hour Analysis From 06:30 AM to 12:30 PM - Peak 1 of 1																									
Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 08:30 AM																									
08:30 AM	0	2	17	2	1	22	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	9	23	0	0	32	0	2	0	1	0	3	59
08:45 AM	0	0	18	3	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	21	3	0	37	0	3	0	0	0	3	61
09:00 AM	0	1	15	1	0	17	0	2	0	0	1	3	0	7	14	7	0	28	0	1	0	2	0	3	51
09:15 AM	0	5	22	1	0	28	0	3	0	1	2	6	0	4	19	4	0	27	0	4	0	1	0	5	66
Total Volume	0	8	72	7	1	88	0	5	0	2	4	11	0	33	77	14	0	124	0	10	0	4	0	14	237
% App. Total	0	9.1	81.8	8	1.1		0	45.5	0	18.2	39.4		0	26.6	62.1	11.3	0		0	71.4	0	28.6	0		
PHF	.000	.400	.818	.593	.250	.786	.000	.417	.000	.500	.500	.458	.000	.635	.637	.500	.000	.838	.000	.625	.000	.500	.000	.700	.698

Peak Hour Analysis From 12:45 PM to 06:15 PM - Peak 1 of 1																									
Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 04:30 PM																									
04:30 PM	0	4	14	0	0	18	0	2	1	3	2	8	0	4	16	4	1	25	0	5	0	8	2	15	66
04:45 PM	0	5	15	0	0	20	0	2	0	4	0	6	0	5	26	5	0	36	0	2	0	3	1	6	68
05:00 PM	0	7	22	1	0	30	0	2	0	3	0	5	0	2	22	4	1	29	0	7	1	5	1	14	78
05:15 PM	0	4	17	0	0	21	0	4	0	5	3	12	0	12	30	6	1	49	0	4	0	2	1	7	89
Total Volume	0	20	68	1	0	89	0	10	1	15	5	31	0	23	94	19	3	139	0	18	1	18	5	42	301
% App. Total	0	22.5	76.4	1.1	0		0	32.3	3.2	48.4	16.1		0	16.5	67.6	13.7	2.2		0	42.9	2.4	42.9	11.9		
PHF	.000	.714	.773	.250	.000	.742	.000	.625	.250	.750	.417	.646	.000	.479	.783	.792	.750	.709	.000	.643	.250	.563	.625	.700	.846

A74



# Traffic Data Inc Appendix B - Traffic Counts

PO Box 16296  
St. Louis Park, MN 55416

File Name : 3 - Barrie Rd & Northern Driveway, 6-10-14, 630-930am, 330-630pm  
Site Code : 3  
Start Date : 6/10/2014  
Page No : 1

Barrie Rd & Northern Site Access  
Edina, MN

Groups Printed- Cars + - Trucks

Start Time	Barrie Rd Southbound						Driveway Westbound						Barrie Rd Northbound						Eastbound						Int. Total						
	UTrn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	UTrn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	UTrn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	UTrn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total							
06:30 AM	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
06:45 AM	0	0	8	0	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	19	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Total	0	0	10	0	0	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	29	0	0	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
07:00 AM	0	0	6	0	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	11	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
07:15 AM	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	19	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
07:30 AM	0	0	8	0	0	8	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	25	0	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
07:45 AM	0	0	12	0	0	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	34	0	0	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Total	0	0	31	0	0	31	0	4	0	2	0	6	0	0	89	0	0	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
08:00 AM	0	0	12	0	0	12	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	0	22	0	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
08:15 AM	0	0	10	0	0	10	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	23	0	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
08:30 AM	0	0	21	0	0	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	26	0	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
08:45 AM	0	0	19	0	0	19	0	2	0	2	0	4	0	0	24	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Total	0	0	62	0	0	62	0	3	0	7	0	10	0	0	95	0	0	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167
09:00 AM	0	0	15	0	0	15	0	2	0	1	0	3	0	0	15	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
09:15 AM	0	0	24	0	0	24	0	4	0	4	0	8	0	0	24	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Total	0	0	39	0	0	39	0	6	0	5	0	11	0	0	39	0	0	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
03:30 PM	0	0	19	0	0	19	0	2	0	1	0	3	0	0	28	0	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
03:45 PM	0	0	22	0	0	22	0	2	0	5	0	7	0	0	30	0	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Total	0	0	41	0	0	41	0	4	0	6	0	10	0	0	58	0	0	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109
04:00 PM	0	0	19	0	0	19	0	5	0	0	0	5	0	0	28	0	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
04:15 PM	0	0	16	0	0	16	0	4	0	1	0	5	0	0	31	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
04:30 PM	0	0	13	0	0	13	0	5	0	2	0	7	0	0	24	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
04:45 PM	0	0	16	0	0	16	0	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	32	0	0	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Total	0	0	64	0	0	64	0	18	0	3	0	21	0	0	115	0	0	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200
05:00 PM	0	0	24	0	0	24	0	6	0	3	0	9	0	0	32	0	0	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
05:15 PM	0	0	19	0	0	19	0	2	0	1	0	3	0	0	39	0	0	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
05:30 PM	0	0	14	0	0	14	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	16	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
05:45 PM	0	0	15	0	0	15	0	2	0	3	0	5	0	0	29	0	0	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Total	0	0	72	0	0	72	0	11	0	7	0	16	0	0	116	0	0	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	206
06:00 PM	0	0	9	0	0	9	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	15	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
06:15 PM	0	0	9	0	0	9	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	19	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Grand Total	0	0	337	0	0	337	0	46	0	35	0	81	0	0	575	0	0	575	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	993
Approch %	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	56.8	0	43.2	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Total %	0	0	33.9	0	0	33.9	0	4.8	0	3.5	0	8.2	0	0	57.9	0	0	57.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Cars +	0	0	337	0	0	337	0	46	0	35	0	81	0	0	575	0	0	575	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	993
% Cars +	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	100	0	100	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Trucks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% Trucks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Traffic Impact Study

B7

66 West Apartments

A79




# Traffic Data Inc Appendix B - Traffic Counts

PO Box 16296  
St. Louis Park, MN 55416

Barrie Rd & Northern Site Access  
Edina, MN

File Name : 3 - Barrie Rd & Northern Driveway, 6-10-14, 630-930am, 330-630pm  
Site Code : 3  
Start Date : 6/10/2014  
Page No : 2



ASD



# Traffic Data Inc Appendix B - Traffic Counts

PO Box 16296  
St. Louis Park, MN 55416

File Name : 3 - Barrie Rd & Northern Driveway, 6-10-14, 630-930am, 330-630pm  
 Site Code : 3  
 Start Date : 6/10/2014  
 Page No : 3

Barrie Rd & Northern Site Access  
Edina, MN

Start Time	Barrie Rd Southbound						Driveway Westbound						Barrie Rd Northbound						Eastbound						Int. Total	
	UTrn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	UTrn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	UTrn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total	UTrn	Left	Thru	Right	Peds	App. Total		
Peak Hour Analysis From 08:30 AM to 12:30 PM - Peak 1 of 1																										
Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 08:30 AM																										
08:30 AM	0	0	21	0	0	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	26	0	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
08:45 AM	0	0	19	0	0	19	0	2	0	2	0	4	0	0	24	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
09:00 AM	0	0	15	0	0	15	0	2	0	1	0	3	0	0	15	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
09:15 AM	0	0	24	0	0	24	0	4	0	4	0	8	0	0	24	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Total Volume	0	0	79	0	0	79	0	8	0	8	0	16	0	0	89	0	0	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	184
% App. Total	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	50	0	50	0	50	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
PHF	.000	.000	.823	.000	.000	.823	.000	.500	.000	.500	.000	.500	.000	.000	.856	.000	.000	.856	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.821
Peak Hour Analysis From 12:45 PM to 06:15 PM - Peak 1 of 1																										
Peak Hour for Entire Intersection Begins at 04:30 PM																										
04:30 PM	0	0	13	0	0	13	0	5	0	2	0	7	0	0	24	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
04:45 PM	0	0	16	0	0	16	0	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	32	0	0	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
05:00 PM	0	0	24	0	0	24	0	6	0	3	0	9	0	0	32	0	0	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
05:15 PM	0	0	19	0	0	19	0	2	0	1	0	3	0	0	39	0	0	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Total Volume	0	0	72	0	0	72	0	17	0	6	0	23	0	0	127	0	0	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222
% App. Total	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	73.9	0	26.1	0	73.9	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
PHF	.000	.000	.750	.000	.000	.750	.000	.708	.000	.500	.000	.639	.000	.000	.814	.000	.000	.814	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.854

ASL

## Jackie Hoogenakker

---

**From:** Aase May <aasem@earthlink.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 30, 2014 12:22 PM  
**To:** Jackie Hoogenakker  
**Subject:** Beacon

I did email a few weeks ago in support if there was supervision.  
It sounds as if that is in place, so I am OK with the project.

Aase May  
6421 Colony Way 2B  
Edina 55435

## Jackie Hoogenakker

---

**From:** Kathy Pierson <kathyapierson@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 29, 2014 10:27 PM  
**To:** Jackie Hoogenakker  
**Subject:** Beacon Interfaith Housing Collaborative

I am a resident of Edina living within 1000 feet of the proposed remodel of the TCF building into apartments for homeless youth. I hope the people in Edina would never even consider complaining about our community supporting housing for homeless youth. We certainly should do our part to make this worthy project successful. This is a commercial area now, not a quiet little neighborhood so there should be no objection. Thank you.

Kathleen Pierson

## Jackie Hoogenakker

---

**From:** bktibaldo@aol.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 28, 2014 9:47 AM  
**To:** Jackie Hoogenakker  
**Subject:** Rezoning Proposal for 3330 W 66th St

Hello:

I've received a letter indicating the property at 3330 W 66th S is being considered for rezoning.

I am a nearby neighbor, living at "The Colony of Edina".

Although I support initiatives to help the homeless youth, I do not believe this is a suitable location for this property.

We have many elderly neighbors who are concerned with excess traffic, the thought of increased crime, and other events such a property may bring.

Again: I do NOT support this initiative.

Thank you  
Brian Tibaldo  
[bktibaldo@aol.com](mailto:bktibaldo@aol.com)  
612-227-2669

## Jackie Hoogenakker

---

**From:** Cassell\_40@comcast.net  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 27, 2014 1:23 PM  
**To:** Jackie Hoogenakker  
**Subject:** Beacon Interfaith

I am writing (once again and without any hope of being heard) to voice my strong objection to the proposed development of the project being proposed by Beacon Interfaith Housing Collaborative.

Those of us who live in the 55435 zip code are accustomed to being considered nothing more than the dumping ground for projects that "real" Edina does not want in their neighborhoods but make "real" Edina look welcoming & progressive. Examples:

- 1.) **Want Section 8 housing:** Dump it in the 55435 area. "Real" Edina won't be affected.
- 2.) **Want to increase the tax base:** Build too many multi-family dwellings by Southdale thus creating unbearable traffic and congestion and put it in the 55435 area. "Real" Edina won't be affected.
- 3.) **Want to look progressive:** House homeless teens thus making the area less safe than before and put the that housing in the 55435 area. Once again, "real" Edina won't be affected.

I hope when the planning commission meets more weight will be given the needs, safety, and wishes of your neighbors who will be affected by the project than will be given to the outsiders from Beacon Interfaith. This, however, has not happened in the past and I doubt it will happen at the meeting of October 8th.

Thank you.

M.K. Cassell  
Barrie Road  
55435



**Public Hearing Notices**  
**EDINA PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**Wednesday, October 8 2014**

**7:00 PM**

**Location: City Hall Council Chambers**  
**4801 West 50<sup>th</sup> Street**

**EDINA CITY COUNCIL**

**Tuesday, October 21, 2014**

**7:00 PM**

**Location: City Hall Council Chambers**  
**4801 West 50<sup>th</sup> Street**

*9-29-14 I support this project - we need more affordable housing.*

**CASE FILE:** 2014.008

**TO:** Property Owners Within 1000-Feet *Harold Christensen*

**APPLICANT:** Beacon Interfaith housing Collaborative *Unit 12  
60423 Colony Way  
Edina, MN.*

**PROPERTY ADDRESS:** 3330 West 66<sup>th</sup> Street, Edina, MN

**LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** Lot 2, Block 3, Southdale Acres

**REQUEST:** Final Rezoning and Ordinance Amendment establishing a PUD Zoning District.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** A rezoning and Ordinance Amendment from POD-1, Planned Office District-1, to PUD, Planned Unit Development to remodel and expand the existing building into 39-units of small studio apartments for young adults who have experienced homelessness.

**HOW TO PARTICIPATE:**

1. Submit a letter to the address below expressing your views, and or
2. Fax your views to the attention of the Planning Dept. @ 952/826-0389
3. E-mail your views to [jhoogenakker@edinamn.gov](mailto:jhoogenakker@edinamn.gov)
4. Attend the hearing and give testimony for or against the proposal.

**FURTHER INFORMATION:** City of Edina Planning Department  
4801 West 50th Street  
Edina, MN 55424  
(952) 826-0369

**DATE OF NOTICE:** September 26, 2014



## Jackie Hoogenakker

---

**From:** Georgia Kaiser <georgiakaiser@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 01, 2014 12:56 PM  
**To:** Jackie Hoogenakker  
**Subject:** Beacon interfaith housing/W. 66th St

To whom it may concern:

I am totally in favor of the Beacon interfaith housing for W. 66th St.  
I believe this is a wonderful opportunity for Edina to step up and show  
other cities that this is an important part of not only Edina, but all of  
the cities to do something positive for our youth.

Thanks,  
Georgia Kaiser

## Jackie Hoogenakker

---

**From:** Ruth <ruth@ruthlordan.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 02, 2014 7:23 AM  
**To:** Jackie Hoogenakker  
**Subject:** 2014.008 Beacon Initiative

Thank you for reading this and considering my views. I attended the last meeting, and after much thought, I am writing again to say that while Beacons intentions are good, and there is a need for housing for these souls, I concur with a developer who spoke at the last meeting ( I spoke too) that the TCF bank location is the wrong place for this. I spoke with many people I know who work with youth and they say that these young adults need a quiet place;the developers have found one on the other side of Southdale that fits better, is more cost effective etc. Second, this is somewhat of a money grab for Beacon-\$250,000 per unit when the cost of building nice 1200 square foot units is \$125,000. Third, the designation of a medical corridor is a more effective use of this property. 4. There is already a major parking problem(major for Edina lol) and while most of the residents may not own vehicles, the folks who abused them and do drugs, ie their so called parents will be visiting and are not to be trusted, as well as many of their friends and visitors I do not need these unsavory types simply walking out the back end of the proposed development, going thru a medical building parking lot and into my culdesac..After a year or so vehicles will be the first thing these young adults acquire so parking is an issue. At the last meeting a ton of non Edina residents preached on about their good works. Im all for that, but please pick a location that is not slated for better use. Inviting these kids past abusers, most of whom who have drug issues into the area where there is a plethora of establishments that stock prescription drugs, especially when they are just visiting is asking for trouble thank you again, Ruth Lordan