



MINUTES
Regular Meeting of the Edina Planning Commission
Wednesday, August 30, 2006, 7:00 PM
Edina City Hall Council Chambers
4801 West 50th Street

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chair John Lonsbury, Kevin Stauton, Michael Schroeder, Mike Fischer, Geof Workinger, Stephen Brown, Floyd Grabel and Scott Thiss

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Nancy Scherer and Basima Tewfik

STAFF PRESENT:

Interim Planner-Dan Cornejo and Jackie Hoogenakker

I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

The minutes of the July 26, 2006, meeting were filed as submitted.

II. NEW BUSINESS:

P-06-6	Final Development Plan and
S-06-6	Preliminary Plat
	REC, Inc.
	Hills of Braemar
	7651 Woodview Court

Mr. Cornejo presented his staff report and concluded the proposed three-unit addition to the existing Hills of Braemar townhome development is a complementary final "build-out" of the development and staff recommends approval of the Preliminary Plat and Final Development Plan.

Mr. Tim Bohlman was present representing REC, Inc.

Commissioner Grabel asked if previous approval was granted for six buildings, but only five were built. Mr. Cornejo responded this "lot" was left unplatted, leaving the option for a sixth building in the future. Continuing, Mr. Cornejo explained in 1974 the entire area was proposed to be platted and

developed at a higher density; however at that time the market shifted to lower density housing (R-1 and R-2) so the site was developed to reflect the current market trend.

Mr. Bohlman addressed the Commission and explained the subject site is owned by the individual property owners of the Hills of Braemar townhouses. The homeowners of this townhouse development support the project with the proceeds of the sale of this parcel going to the homeowners association. Continuing, Mr. Bohlman explained the proposal is to construct a three-unit townhouse rambler complex. Concluding, Mr. Bohlman explained the site will also be re-landscaped to include transplanting a number of the large trees that already exist on the site.

Commissioner Brown moved to recommend Preliminary Plat approval and that the proposed Final Development Plan meets the required findings for Final Development Plan approval for the following reasons:

- is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan;
- is consistent with the (Final) Development Plan as approved and modified by the Council;
- will not be detrimental to properties surrounding the tract;
- will not result in an overly-intensive land use;
- will not result in undue traffic congestion or traffic hazards;
- conforms to the provisions of this Section and applicable provisions of this Code; and
- provides a proper relationship between the proposed improvements, existing structures, open space and natural features.

Approval is also subject to Final Plat Approval.

Commissioner Grabiell seconded the motion. All voted aye; motion carried.

P-06-7 **Final Development Plan**
 TCF
 3330 66th Street West

Mr. Cornejo presented his staff report noting this application is fundamentally an operational adjustment to a banking operation that has existed on this site for approximately 30 years. The applicant has indicated that the

current facility has outlived its usefulness, and desires to reuse and transform the property to better meet the current and future banking needs of TCF Bank customers. The site is “constrained” somewhat by large existing trees, most of which will be saved in the new site plan. The new smaller building, and the two small parking lots, and the drive-through located on the rear of the building, will provide a positive impact on surrounding property and on the pedestrian amenity of West 66th Street and Barrie Road. Mr. Cornejo concluded, staff recommends:

- a. Approval of the Final Development Plan, subject to the new signs conforming to the sign regulations for the Planned Office District
- b. Approval of the sideyard variance of 12.3 ft. on the west property line of 3330 West 66th Street.
- c. Approval of the rear yard variance of 18 ft. on the north property line of 3400 West 66th Street, subject to the temporary bank facility on 3400 West 66th Street being in compliance with the Building Code; this variance lapses upon discontinuance of the operation of the temporary bank facility, or 180 days from the start date of the operation of the temporary bank facility, whichever occurs first.

Commissioner Grabiell commented it appears the proponents are requesting that a temporary building be constructed on property they don't own, and asked if the proponents have submitted a letter of approval from the property owner(s) of 3400. Chair Lonsbury commented he also shares that concern and questioned if the Commission could even approve a variance for the temporary structure if the property owner(s) didn't specifically request it.

Mr. Cornejo noted it appears the proponents are not present this evening to answer that question; however, on the application for Final Development Plan the proponents requested approval for a temporary structure. Continuing, Mr. Cornejo explained from a building code standpoint the temporary structure is allowed because it will be removed from the site on or before the 6-month allowed time period for temporary structures. Variances are also required to allow the temporary structure and to locate the temporary structure closer to the property line than Code permits.

Commissioner Grabiell questioned if parking would remain in compliance on both sites as a result of this request. Mr. Cornejo responded both sites would continue to comply with parking requirements.

Commissioner Fischer noted on the plans a “fire-wall” is depicted in the trailer and questioned why a fire-wall is required especially since the trailer would be located next to a parking lot, not a building, and is temporary in nature. Continuing, Commissioner Fischer said if there are safety concerns regarding the trailer it should be with the use of the “trailer” as a temporary bank and not its

Planning Commission Minutes

August 30, 2006

Page 4

relationship to the parking lot. Commissioner Fischer told the Commission he also observed on the plans a low decorative wall with signage, adding he doesn't

mind the wall, but questioned if the signage requirements were reviewed. Mr. Cornejo responded the proponents were made aware of the Sign Code.

A discussion ensued between Commission Members on the circulation pattern within the bank site, including customer and employee parking with Commission Members in agreement they need to see more detailed circulation and parking plans (including curb cuts) before they make their decision.

Commissioner Staunton pointed out Commission over the past few months the Commission has worked to bring buildings in the greater Southdale area up to the street, and more pedestrian friendly. Commissioner Staunton noted the proposed bank building is actually setback farther from the street than the original building. Commissioner Staunton questioned why the proposed building isn't constructed closer to the street or at the very least at the same setback. Mr. Cornejo responded he believes the proponents felt this proposal better accommodates their customers.

Commissioner Brown stated he is uncomfortable with this request. He said in his opinion there is no hardship to support the setback variances on the 3330 site and the "use" of this site appears to drive the need for variances. Commissioner Brown said there are too many holes in the request that need to be addressed before he feels comfortable enough to vote on this proposal.

A discussion ensued with Commissioners expressing their concern that the applicant was not present and that it is not fair to Mr. Cornejo to respond to questions that should be fielded by the applicant. Commissioners felt it was prudent to table the hearing for the following reasons:

- technically this site is a redevelopment and the Commission felt the applicant should explain their reasons for constructing the building, drive-through and parking areas as depicted, and;
- since this would be considered new construction could the bank site be designed to accommodate all their banking needs without requiring variances
- the proposed internal circulation, customer and employee parking and curb cut placement need to be further addressed and explained;
- the nature of the temporary bank trailer is an issue especially as it relates to both private and public safety;
- the drive-through situation needs to be re-reviewed;
- a letter is needed (or at least a signature) from the property owner at 3400 66th St W

- signage should meet Code. Signage on the proposed low decorative building wall along with building signage may not be in compliance with Code – this should be addressed.

Commissioner Staunton moved to continue the request by TCF for Final Development Plan including variances to the next meeting of the Planning Commission on September 27, 2006. Commissioner Grabel seconded the motion.

Chair Lonsbury asked Commissioners for their reasons to table this request. They are as follows:

1. Explain the reason(s) the proposed building can't be constructed closer to the street or at the same front yard setback.
2. Explain the reason(s) the proposed building and drive through can't meet Code. (it will be new construction)
3. Edina Police Department approval (in writing) that the proposed temporary bank structure is safe, not only for bank employees but customers to the bank.
4. Legal assurance that a variance can be granted for the temporary structure on a site that isn't owned by the applicant.
5. Review and comments from the City Engineer.
6. The proponent is to submit a more detailed parking and circulation plan.
7. Address employee and customer parking during construction
8. Submit a more detailed plan of the rear of the property as it relates to parking and other Code requirements.
9. Submit a signage packet that meets Code.
10. The proponent needs to explain their hardship.

Chair Lonsbury called for the vote. All voted aye; motion to table the Final Development Plan proposal for TCF Bank until September 27, 2006 was approved.

III. ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting adjourned at 8:10 PM

Submitted by

