

**City Council Agenda Item #14\_  
Meeting of August 11, 2008**

**Brief Description**            Consideration of the 2030 Comprehensive Plan.

**Recommendation**        Approve the comprehensive plan.

**Background**                The city has undertaken a year and a half long process to create the future plan for the community. During this process, the 12 person comprehensive plan steering committee, has taken time to evaluate issues from many different groups, residents, commissions, and neighborhoods. Their process included:

- 18 regular meetings
- 4 joint meetings
- 2 Bus Tours
- Topical Focus Groups – housing; senior services; and families, schools and social services
- Geographic Focus Groups – Highway 7 and I-394
- 5 open houses

During this extensive review of future community issues and input, the following are the main considerations within the strategic vision of the long range plan document:

- Continue stability in established areas
- Preserve existing neighborhoods; but seek opportunities to broaden housing choice
- Diversity in household and housing types
- Support reinvestment/revitalization in neighborhoods to retain and attract families, young professionals, empty nesters and seniors
- Support for Regional Centers (Ridgedale & Opus) and Corridors (I-394 & Hwy. 62)
- Support for existing businesses and reasonable expansion
- Provide opportunities for mixed uses and pedestrian improvements
- Cohesive design standards, infrastructure management and sustainable design
- Connectivity to Improve Mobility
- Support programs/strategies to increase connectivity - transportation and recreational

- Resource Protection and Sustainable Practices
- Balance preservation efforts to protect water and woodland resources
- Apply sustainable principles in land planning, development and redevelopment
- Increased vitality in neighborhood, community and special purpose areas
- Use the “village concept” for development/redevelopment in commercial areas - mixed uses, pedestrian friendly and transit accessible

## 2030 Comprehensive Plan Document

Below is the table of contents for the comprehensive plan document. Each chapter is linked to the full version of the text as well as applicable maps to that section.

- **Chapter I: Strategic Framework**
  - A. Introduction *I-1*
  - B. Community Values *I-1*
  - C. 2030 Strategic Vision and Goals *I-3*
  - D. Public Involvement Framework *I-4*
- **Chapter II: Regional Settings and Demographics**
  - A. Regional Setting *II-1*
    - Role of City in the Metropolitan Region *II-1*
    - Metropolitan Council Policies for Developed Communities *II-2*
    - Minnetonka Changes since the 1979 and 1999 Comprehensive Guide Plans *II-3*
  - B. Demographics *II-5*
    - Who Are We Today *II-5*
    - How Have We Changed? *II-7*
    - How Do We Compare to Other Similar Communities? *II-11*
    - Who Do We Expect to be In the Future? *II-17*
- **Chapter III: Policies and Growth Strategy**
  - A. Policy Development Process *III-1*
  - B. Policy Use and Definitions *III-3*
  - C. Policies *III-4*
    - Overall City Growth Strategy and Services Policies *III-4*
    - Attract, Support and Retain Residents and Families *III-6*
    - Land Use, Development and Redevelopment *III-7*
    - The Natural Environment *III-13*
    - Parks, Open Space and Recreation *III-14*

- Transportation III-15
- Municipal Utilities and Facilities III-17
- Fire and Police Services III-18
- City Communication, Cooperation and Partnerships III-19

Map

- **Figure 1: Overall growth strategy**
- **Chapter IV: 2030 Land Use Plan**
  - . Summary and Analysis of Existing Land Use IV-2
  - A. 2030 Land Use and Growth Strategy Themes IV-6
  - B. Village Areas IV-9
  - C. Regional Areas IV-25
  - D. Transportation and Natural Resource Corridors IV-33
  - E. Land Use Plan Implementation IV-35
    - Existing Land Use Map (1 MB) Figure IV-1
    - Planned 2030 Land Use Map (11 MB) Figure IV-2

Appendices

- Appendix IV-A: Illustrative Examples of Land Uses
- Appendix IV-B:
  - Land Use Changes Sites from 2020 Comprehensive Plan
  - Land Use Changes Sites Table
- Appendix IV-C: Metropolitan Council Net Residential Density Worksheet
- Appendix IV-D:
  - Land Use Category Comparison to Zoning Ordinance Districts
  - Existing Zoning Map

Attachment

- Appendix A: [Land use definitions](#)

Attachment

- Appendix C: [Met Council Net Residential Density Worksheet](#)

Maps

- [Figure 1: Existing land use](#)
- [Figure 13: I-394 corridor](#)
- [Figure 15: 2030 land use plan](#)
- Appendix B: [Land use change sites](#)

- **Chapter V: Housing Plan**

- . Overview of Minnetonka Housing Trends V-1
- A. Current Housing Conditions V-4
- B. Analysis of Housing Needs V-14
- C. Affordable Housing Goals V-16
- D. Lifecycle Housing V-17
- E. Housing Goals and Actions V-17
- F. Tools for Providing Affordable Housing in Minnetonka V-22

- **Chapter VI: Resource Management Plan**

- . Upland Area Existing Conditions VI-2
- A. Existing Conditions—Water Resources VI-12
- B. Resource Management Goals VI-20
- C. Water Resources Management VI-22
- D. Implementation Practices and Strategies VI-26

Maps

- **Figure 1: Topography**
- **Figure 2: Steep slopes**
- **Figure 3: Natural communities**
- **Figure 4: Public waters inventory**
- **Figure 5: Wetland types and floodplain areas**
- **Figure 6: 100-year floodplain**
- **Figure 7: Wetland classification**

- **Chapter VII: Parks, Open Space and Trails**

- . Background VII-1
- A. Existing Systems VII-3
- B. Strategic Planning Efforts VII-9
- C. Future Park, Trail and Open Space Improvements and Needs VII-11
- D. Implementation Strategies VII-14

Attachments

- **Appendix VII-A: Capital Improvements Program**

Maps

- **Figure 1: Existing parks and open space**
- **Figure 2: Existing trail system**
- **Figure 3: Future trail links map**

- **Chapter VIII: Transportation Plan**

- . **Goals and Policies VIII-1**
- A. Major Trends and Influencing Factors VIII-3**
- B. Roadway System Plan VIII-5**
  - 1. **Jurisdictional Classification VIII-5**
  - 2. **Functional Classification VIII-8**
  - 3. **Functional Classification Changes VIII-11**
  - 4. **Programmed or Planned Improvements VIII-13**
  - 5. **Demographics and Land Use Background VII-15**
  - 6. **Existing Capacity Deficiencies VIII-16**
  - 7. **Existing Congestion on the Regional Highway System VIII-21**
  - 8. **Forecast Year 2030 Traffic Volumes VIII-21**
  - 9. **Future (Year 2030) Capacity Deficiencies VIII-22**
  - 10. **Safety Issues VIII-25**
  - 11. **Additional Roadway System Needs VIII-29**
  - 12. **Access Management VIII-30**
  - 13. **Right of Way VIII-31**
- C. Transit System Plan VIII-33**
  - 0. **Existing Transit Services and Facilities VIII-33**
  - 1. **Transit Strategies VIII-38**
  - 2. **Future Transit Development VIII-40**
  - 3. **Transit Advantages VIII-41**
- D. Freight System Plan VIII-43**
- E. Bicycle and Trail System Plan VIII-44**
  - 0. **Trail System Plan VIII-44**
  - 1. **Sidewalk System Plan VIII-46**
- F. Aviation Plan VIII-47**
- G. Implementation Plan VIII-48**

**Appendices**

- **Appendix IV-A: 2030 Traffic Forecats vs. ITE Trip Generation**
- **Appendix IV-B: Travel Demand Forecasting Methodology**

**Maps**

**Figure 1: Existing road system**

- **Figure 2: Municipal state aid roadways**
- **Figure 4: Functional classification of roadways**
- **Figure 5: Existing daily traffic volume (2005)**
- **Figure 6: Roadway capacity**
- **Figure 7: Existing congestion**
- **Figure 8: 2030 forecast traffic volumes**
- **Figure 9: Future congestion (2030)**

- **Figure 10: Crashes (2002–2006)**
- **Figure 11: Transit facilities**
- **Figure 12: Trail map**
- **Chapter IX: Economic Development Plan**
  - . **Recent Business Trends IX-1**
  - A. **Employment Trends IX-5**
  - B. **Redevelopment in Village Areas IX-7**
  - C. **The City's Role in Economic Development and Redevelopment IX-9**
  - D. **Economic Development and Redevelopment Tools IX-10**
- **Chapter X: Public Sanitary Sewer and Water System Plan (1 MB)**
  - . **Sanitary Sewer System X-1**
  - A. **Public Water Supply System X-14**

**Appendices**

- **Appendix X-A: Water Emergency and Conservation Plan**

**Maps**

- **Figure 1: Existing Trunk Sanitary Sewer System**
- **Figure 2: Existing System Capacity**
- **Figure 3: Future System Capacity**
- **Figure 4: Existing Water Distribution System**
- **Figure 5: Existing Average Day Pressure**

**Attachments**

- **Appendix A: Water Emergency and Conservation Plan**
- **Chapter XI: Strategic Services Time Capsule**
  - . **Public Safety Services XI-1**
  - A. **Public Works Services XI-7**
  - B. **Park and Recreation XI-9**
  - C. **Community Development XI-10**
  - D. **Engineering XI-12**
  - E. **Administrative Services and Finance Departments XI-14**
  - F. **Partnerships with Service Agencies XI-17**

**Appendices**

- **Appendix XI: List of Service Agencies**

**Attachments**

- **List of community services agencies available to Minnetonka residents**

### **Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee Recommendation**

The steering committee considered many public comments throughout their review. All public input was shared at their meetings and can be found on the city's website. After considering land use changes in the Manor Road area and Highwood Drive area, the committee decided not to recommend changing the land use plan designation, but did leave some text in the document regarding future consideration and the parameters by which a change would be considered. The steering committee recommended approval of the comprehensive plan document on June 25, 2008 (see pages A1-7)

### **Planning Commission Recommendation**

The planning commission considered the document at a separate planning commission meeting on July 22, 2008. The planning commission held a public hearing on the matter. The planning commission recommended approval of the document on a 5-1 vote (see pages A8–A19). An additional public comment was received after the planning commission review (see page A20).

### **Staff Recommendation**

- 1) Adopt the 2030 Comprehensive Plan with the following conditions:
  - a. Other agencies will be notified of the comprehensive plan and will be allowed 6 months to provide comments about the plan.
  - b. If additional changes are requested as a result of this review, the city council will consider the issues.

Through:       Geraldyn Barone, Assistant City Manager  
                  John Gunyou, City Manager

Originated by: Julie Wischnack, AICP, Community Development Director

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE  
MEETING SUMMARY  
June 25, 2008  
5:30 p.m.—8:00 p.m.  
Boards & Commission Room**

Steering Committee: Jan Callison Sue Sjeklocha  
Lee-Hoon Benson Jim Couling  
John Cheleen David Nichols  
Blaine Waters Janet Dupre  
Gauri Subramani

Project Manager: Ann Perry, Resource Strategies Corporation

City Staff: GERALYN BARONE Julie Wischnack Susan Thomas  
Elise Durbin Josh Metzger Jeff Thomson

Others: Approximately 35 residents

**1. Accept May 14, 2008 Meeting Summary**

Mayor Callison welcomed the group and introductions were done.

The committee accepted the May 14, 2008 meeting summary.

**2. Review Draft Chapter IV—Land Use Plan**

Callison said the comprehensive plan update process began for the steering committee back on April 12, 2007. She said the committee members were chosen because of their different backgrounds, areas of the city they represent, and their willingness to be a part of the city process. Callison said the committee members were charged with thinking about what the city is going to look like in 10 to 20 years and where change is likely to happen and then advise the Planning Commission and City Council on these items.

Wischnack briefly reviewed the next steps in the process, saying the Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on July 22 and the City Council is tentatively scheduled to adopt the plan at their August 11 meeting. Perry gave an overview of the areas to be reviewed tonight.

Wischnack began by reviewing the Highway 7/Williston Road/Highwood Drive area. She said there are nine properties on the north side of Highway 7, west of Williston Road, and south of Highwood Drive that have been proposed to be regraded from low density residential to commercial along with criteria to guide future development. Wischnack said additional criteria have been added based on the June 16 joint study session.

Robert Speeder spoke as a representative of the neighborhood. He said the Preserve Highwood Drive group was recently formed and already has 32 members. Speeder urged the committee not to reguide the nine properties, but to leave as is because the proposed solution of buffering and helping businesses will not work. He said lot size is not the problem for businesses as there are several other successful businesses further east on smaller lots. Speeder said the problem for the businesses is the access, and reguiding will not help. He said the proposed 50 foot setback is not much and there are already inadequate, unkempt buffers further east and it will only continue to this location. Speeder said the residential buffer, like what is there today, will be kept up. He stated that by gaining a half of a lot will not help solve access issues, will increase traffic, lose affordable housing and trees, and there will be less equity in the neighborhood's homes. Speeder referred to the recent commercial development proposal in the area, and said this is not appropriate and he is afraid what it will bring to the rest of the area. He said people purchased their homes with the expectation that the neighborhood will remain as is and he asked the committee to keep the properties guided as residential.

Couling asked if any of the affected property owners are a part of the Preserve Highwood Drive group. Speeder said yes, and no one disagrees that these properties should remain residential.

Speeder reaffirmed that a natural buffer already occurs and suggested that the commercial areas could be reguided to residential. Callison said that was discussed; however, there would be significant traffic impacts with a residential development.

Waters asked what makes the neighborhood think the commercial area will erode their property values. Speeder replied that while the first commercial owners may be okay, but it is unknown what happens when it is sold in the future. He also noted that these homes are some of the more affordable homes. Waters asked if it is appropriate to ask the current residential properties to continue being the buffer between the commercial area and the rest of the neighborhood. Speeder responded that they bought knowing they are the buffer.

Nichols confirmed that the neighborhood is asking for the properties to remain residential and that no reguiding occur.

Sjeklocha said if the issue for the businesses is access, where would they propose putting the frontage road to help the businesses do better. Speeder recommended doing something like what is further east.

Wischnack said the committee has three options for a recommendation:

1. Recommend approval of the change in land use for the nine low-density residential properties on Highwood Drive to commercial with the suggested land use criteria or other criteria desired by the steering committee.
2. Recommend that the nine residential properties on Highwood Drive remain guided for low-density residential uses.

3. Recommended that the nine residential properties on Highwood Drive remain guided for low-density residential uses and that the criteria be utilized as guidelines for future consideration of any potential future request to amend the 2030 land use plan for these properties.

Sjeklocha said the neighborhood made good points, but the committee is to look into the future. She said the city needs to look into the nuisance issues and unkempt areas further east. Sjeklocha said she is leaning towards recommendation #3, but wants to really look at the criteria.

Cheleen said he is considering recommendation #3 as well, and things will change in the 20 to 30 years. He said part of the issue is access and what can fit into the site. Cheleen said comprehensive plans can be changed and are not set in stone, and this may be an area that changes some years in the future. He said the criteria dealing with assembly and consolidation of properties and an overall master plan make the most sense. Perry said the assembly and consolidation of properties has some flexibility so that not all of the properties have to be assembled.

Couling asked that if recommendation #3 is chosen, then could a future change be to housing. Perry responded yes.

Benson asked if the city is responsible for constructing the frontage road. Wischnack said preliminary designs are being worked on and the city has to work with MnDOT on the project. Benson said recommendation #3 makes sense, but wants to make sure the criteria is fully flushed out.

Wischnack suggested that there be a change in the language of criteria #3 if recommendation #3 is chosen.

Callison suggested that the buffer area could be put into a conservation easement that way it is preserved permanently.

Nichols asked how long it will be before this area is reconsidered. Callison said the plan is formally updated every 10 years. Perry added that anyone, at anytime, can request a reguiding.

Dupre said the buffers and what they are expected to be like needs to be better articulated. Wischnack said this is a zoning performance standard, but more can be added in the implementation section.

Dupre said while she thinks the frontage road will help the businesses, she is not convinced that leaving this area the way it is now is the best use of the property. She said a really nice buffer could really separate the areas.

Nichols said the Highway 7 improvement done have hurt the businesses and what will they look like in another 10 years. He said he supports recommendation #3 because of its flexibility and standards.

Subramani asked if the traffic analysis done by the neighborhood yielded the same results as the city's. Wischnack said the neighborhood's traffic analysis is site specific, while the traffic analysis done for the comprehensive plan is more large-scale.

Sjeklocha asked if recommendation #3 moves forward and a proposal comes in in five years, then how would it get reviewed. Wischnack said the reguiding of the comprehensive plan will be looked at at the same time as the site and building plan review and any other reviews that need to be completed.

Waters said a developer will not invest that much into a proposal until they know that the property owners are willing sellers. He said he supports recommendation #3.

Couling said he also supports recommendation #3 because of the neighborhood's concern, but he also realizes that someone could come in and develop the area. He suggested certain criteria if commercial is developed and certain criteria if residential is developed.

Callison said the recommendation seems to be for #3 with specific language and criteria about buffering, residential and commercial uses and a conservation easement.

Wischnack reviewed the Minnetonka Boulevard/County Road 101 area. She said this area is proposed to be reguided from low density residential to medium density residential. Wischnack said one additional suggested criteria has been added about access the city's property.

Tom McMullin, 3509 Lilac Lane, spoke on behalf of the neighborhood. He said he has a signed petition with 40 signatures opposing the reguiding. McMullin said the concerns are the uncertainty of change and the unintended consequences. He said there seems to open-ended plans and it is unknown what a future development may look like. McMullin said by reguiding these properties medium density residential then the current owners will not be able to sell to anyone but a developer and it also affects all of the properties in the neighborhood. He said it is a shock to the neighborhood to see this area reguided as there is nothing wrong with the neighborhood.

Benson reiterated McMullin's comments that the neighborhood is concerned, but she said this is just a reguiding at this point and not a redevelopment. McMullin replied that it is an emotional response by the neighborhood and they are thinking the worst case scenario as they have no plans to react to.

Wischnack said the development of an apartment building in this location would be challenging.

Waters said the uncertainty about what a future redevelopment may look like is true, but he said the redevelopment could look very nice and add value to the neighborhood.

Couling asked how specific the criteria should get. Wischnack said the criteria should not get too specific in the comprehensive plan, but it does assist in informing about the city's expectations. If it is too specific she said it could be a barrier for a particular proposal.

Nichols asked what the price of new units may be based on the land values. Wischnack said new units would likely be priced higher than they are today. She said the cost of the land is the challenge in redevelopment.

Wischnack said the committee has three options for a recommendation:

1. Recommend approval of the change in land use for the five low density residential properties on Manor Road to medium density with the suggested land use criteria or other criteria desired by the steering committee.
2. Recommend that the five residential properties on Manor Road remain guided for low density residential uses.
3. Recommend that the five residential properties on Manor Road remain guided for low density residential uses and that the suggested criteria be utilized as guidelines for future consideration of any potential future request to amend the 2030 land use plan for these properties.

Dupre asked if the committee is to keep it guided as low density residential how does that affect the number of new housing units the city is expected to include. Wischnack responded the city is expected to have about 1,500 new units by 2030, and this area does not significantly impact that number. She said it was an attractive area to reguide because of the walkability of the neighborhood.

Couling said he is leaning towards recommendation #3; however, he feels like he is punting the decision and that it will need to be made at another point in time.

Waters said he is not concerned about the total units count because there are other areas where more housing units can go. He said he supports recommendation #3.

Nichols asked why there are prescribed criteria for this area. Callison replied that this is an area that developers are likely to look at and it warns developers of what the city's expectations are so that they do not overpay.

Benson said she supports recommendation #3, but suggested adding wording into the criteria that this area should be reguided for medium density residential.

Callison confirmed the recommendation of the steering committee is for recommendation #3 with the additional criteria wording that if the area is reguided it should be for medium density residential.

Wischnack reviewed the I-394 regional area and said the area west of I-494 and north of I-394, the proposed BMW site, is proposed to be office and is currently guided as commercial. She asked for the committee's recommendation on this area. The group agreed that the area have a dual guidance of office/commercial.

Wischnack reviewed a site north of I-394 on Parkers Lake Road that is currently guided medium density. She asked if the committee would like to recommend a change to this area. Callison suggested not making any changes because the public has not seen any proposed changes.

Wischnack asked if there were any other comments regarding the overall 2030 land use map changes. There were no additional comments.

Perry reviewed draft implementation text on affordable/mid-priced housing. The committee agreed this additional text should be included.

### **3. Review of Draft Chapter XI—Strategic Services Time Capsule Chapter**

Barone said this chapter is not required, but staff thought that it would be good to look at how the services may change in the future. She said a group of mid-level city staff managers comprised the group that met throughout the process to provide input. She said some of the issues identified in this chapter that will need attention in the future are the changing of the demographics, changing technology, increase in traffic, and an increase in medical calls. Barone asked if this chapter is appropriate or if there is anything missing.

Sjeklocha suggested incorporating some of the big ideas, like buffers, into this chapter.

The committee agreed this chapter should be included.

### **4. Prepare Recommendations on Draft 2030 Comprehensive Guide Plan**

Perry said there is still editing happening in order to make sure everything is consistent, but there will not be any policy changes.

Perry reviewed the highlights of each chapter

- Chapter I—Strategic Framework. There were no additional comments.
- Chapter II—Demographics. Perry said the city's role in the regional setting still needs to be included. Nichols asked if we are looking to balance our ages in the future and not purposefully try and be attractive to only younger or only older families. Perry said the plan looks at keeping a balance of ages.

- Chapter III—Policies and Growth Strategy. Sjeklocha suggested adding more action-oriented wording.
- Chapter IV—2030 Land Use Plan. Perry said the missing tables will be added.
- Chapter V—Housing Plan. Benson said to make sure there is consideration of smaller lots sizes in this chapter. Perry replied it is in Chapter 4 and also in this chapter.
- Chapter VI—Resource Management Plan. There were no comments.
- Chapter VII—Parks, Open Space and Trails. Sjeklocha suggested adding something about signage. Perry said this will be added to the implementation section.
- Chapter VIII—Transportation Plan. There were no comments.
- Chapter IX—Economic Development. There were no comments.
- Chapter X—Public Sanitary Sewer and Water System. There were no comments.
- Chapter XI—Strategic Services Time Capsule. There were no comments.

Callison suggested a one page sheet on what follow-up items can be developed based upon this plan, such as changes to ordinances.

Sjeklocha suggested an executive summary and a one page sheet on what the key messages of the comprehensive plan are.

#### **5. Next Steps.**

Wischnack reviewed the dates for the upcoming Planning Commission and City Council meetings to review the Comprehensive Plan.

#### **6. Adjournment.**

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

**UNAPPROVED  
MINNETONKA PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES**

**JULY 22, 2008**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Cheleen called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**2. ROLL CALL**

Commissioners Adams, Blatz, Lehman, Walker, and Cheleen were present. Schmitz and Sjeklocha were absent.

Staff members present: Community Development Director Julie Wischnack, City Planner Loren Gordon, Planner Josh Metzger, Planner Jeff Thomson, Assistant City Manager Geralyn Barone, and Planning Consultant Ann Perry.

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:** The agenda was approved as submitted with additional comments provided in the change memo dated July 22, 2008.

**4. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**A. 2030 Comprehensive Guide Plan**

Chair Cheleen introduced the proposal and called for the staff report.

Barone reviewed the steering committee's work. She invited commissioners to ask questions during the presentation. Barone introduced the steering committee members. She thanked the volunteers for attending 18 meetings.

Wischnack explained the land use planning law which requires the city to update its comprehensive guide plan every 10 years. She reported on the public involvement utilized while developing the comprehensive guide plan proposal. The *Minnetonka Memo* updated residents on the times for steering committee meetings. The number of housing units, protecting neighborhood character, and diversity of housing types were considered by the steering committee. Cohesive design, infrastructure management, and sustainability in design were reviewed. Increasing connectivity of the trail system was identified by residents as a priority. Preserving water and woodland areas is a high priority for Minnetonka residents.

Ms. Perry reported on demographic changes for specific areas in the future. Village areas were identified and different uses were considered. The proposal includes housekeeping changes that update the comprehensive guide plan to

match a property's current use. Proposed changes in the comprehensive guide plan also suggest changes for areas including adding higher density housing for the Ridgedale area because of the services offered and transit available. Ms. Perry reviewed areas that would not be changed.

Blatz questioned the benefit of listing criteria. Ms. Perry explained that the criteria would provide direction to a potential developer of parameters required for development or redevelopment to take place. It would not require the city to approve the comprehensive guide plan amendment. It would give the planning commission and city council information to base its decision on whether the application sufficiently met the criteria to justify a comprehensive guide plan amendment. Wischnack explained how providing parameters to measure an application requesting a comprehensive guide plan change would be beneficial.

Ms. Perry noted an area on the map that was mistakenly designated as commercial, but should be shown as light density residential. She continued explaining criteria used to determine the zoning for numerous areas.

Wischnack agreed with Blatz's calculation of the number of units to be located in a medium density area that is 1.7 acres in size.

Blatz asked Wischnack to comment on an effort to improve the buffer for the rear of residents on Manor Road. Wischnack explained that landscaping and garbage enclosures would be completed by the fall.

Adams asked if a buffer had been considered for the southwest quadrant between commercial and residential uses. Ms. Perry said that the proposal would define implementation regulations better, especially as it interacts with residential areas. The city needs to look at performance standards and determine what constitutes a buffer.

Ms. Perry explained that the major difference between the proposal and the existing comprehensive guide plan is the implementation. The proposal focuses more on how development and redevelopment impacts adjacent neighbors and infrastructure.

Chair Cheleen shared the reasons why the steering committee did not change the zoning for the Manor Road/Highwood Road area. Residents were opposed to changing the use for the area and rezoning before the area would be ready for medium density may be putting the cart before the horse. Chair Cheleen asked if performance standard changes need to be made now. Ms. Perry recommended that a sentence be added stating that the city establish review criteria for a

property before the comprehensive guide plan amendment is reviewed by staff, planning commission, and city council. Chair Cheleen felt that made sense.

Chair Cheleen asked how and when a comprehensive guide plan could be changed. Wischnack stated that comprehensive guide plan changes usually deal with housing type or edge property changes. A comprehensive guide plan amendment application is reviewed by the planning commission; the public within 400 feet of the site receives notification of a public hearing; the city council makes a final decision for the city; and the Metropolitan Council also needs to approve the application.

In response to Lehman's question, Wischnack explained that the steering commission spent a great deal of discussion regarding sustainability issues. The city should be supportive and serve as an example by its role in its activities rather than mandate sustainable requirements. The water resource chapter includes state mandates regarding maximum daily loading of phosphorus and other problems that cities control. Wischnack noted the types of uses that light rail would create. Transit-oriented design, "green" building, and water resources are big issues.

Ms. Perry continued her presentation of the land use chapter and housing plan for the future. Rental licensing and an inspection program were mentioned. The parks plan needs updating as well as an athletic fields needs study with surrounding cities and school districts. Ms. Perry reviewed the remaining chapters of the proposal.

Ms. Perry explained that the proposed 2030 comprehensive guide plan is tentatively scheduled to be reviewed by the city council at its August 11, 2008 meeting. The city council may authorize the plan's distribution to the surrounding cities, watershed districts, county, and school districts. Those entities are given six months to review the comprehensive guide plan. Staff will document concerns from those agencies and, make changes if necessary, and submit the plan to the Metropolitan Council.

Chair Cheleen noted that final adoption could take place March of 2009.

In response to Walker's question, Ms. Perry explained that the Metropolitan Council realizes that the best way to provide efficiency in the regional system is to increase density in areas served by public sewer and water. The Metropolitan Council allocates forecasts based on the designation. Minnetonka is a developed community. The expectation is that new development that would occur since the adoption of the comprehensive guide plan would occur at an overall density of 3

units per acre. The city may keep its half-acre-lot size, but compensation would be needed that would include high-density and medium-density housing. Minnetonka is currently close to 2.5 housing units per acre. New development would be in the range of 4.5 units per acre. She believed the expectation would be met. Walker asked what would happen if the expectation was not met. Ms. Perry responded that, theoretically, the Metropolitan Council could withhold federal funds from the city.

In response to Walker's question, Wischnack explained that a developer is responsible for funding improvements in infrastructure needed to support its development.

Chair Cheleen provided instructions for the public hearing.

The public hearing was opened.

Judy McClellan, 17408 Manor Road, lived in her residence over 27 years. She stated that:

- She has attended all of the meetings.
- She provided a slide show of five residences. Her residence sits on a berm above a shopping center. Two-story to three-story residences would overlook the shopping center. That would create an issue.
- Behind her lot is city property. She wanted to put a fence, but she was told it is an alley. There really is no alley.
- She wants a buffer between the residential and commercial property. The problems created by the commercial use are getting worse. She was told a buffer would not be created because sewer and utility lines are located in that area. She asked how a townhome could be built if that was already an issue.
- She provided a photograph of another residence that needs a buffer.
- Townhomes would cause traffic problems. The accesses would be too close to each other.
- She invited everyone to visit the site.
- The proposal would not be attractive to developers. She was worried that her property would not sell for many years if the comprehensive guide plan would be changed.
- Medium density still could be done in the future with a comprehensive guide plan amendment.

- Residences located that close in proximity to a commercial use is a difficult situation. She is frustrated with the lack of enforcement of ordinances that are in place to regulate the businesses' activities. Dumpsters are emptied at 5 a.m. on Saturdays. She accepts traffic and truck noise, but there are things going on that go beyond that.
- The proposed comprehensive guide plan gives her and her 4 neighbors no incentive to keep up their homes.
- Please consider the look of the land. A developer would not jump on the property if the guiding changed.

Mary Ann Hannah, 3535 Lilac Lane, stated that:

- She resided in her current residence 7 years.
- She was concerned that the proposed reguiding of Manor Road would drastically change the basic nature of the community.
- Expanding a structure to three stories of affordable housing would increase the noise complaints. There would be more voices to protest the noise.
- She was puzzled why a neighborhood that is already diverse in the value of its residences and ages of the residents would be chosen rather than undeveloped land.
- She preferred no hint of land use change for Manor Road to be included in the 2030 comprehensive guide plan.

Mike Stone, 4505 Timberwoods Lane, part of a neighborhood committee, stated that:

- His presentation given at a previous meeting was well received and understood.
- He thanked the steering committee for not recommending change of the comprehensive guide plan for the Highwood area.
- He appreciated the process to consider the neighborhood's feelings, specifically the current residential zoning and the feel of the neighborhood and traffic.
- He thanked the committee, Wischnack, and Gordon for their work and responses.

John Gonsiorek, 3514 Lilac Lane, stated that:

- He provided a memo outlining why the original proposal was a bad idea and he was pleased that the steering committee recommended that the guidance remain as it is.
- He was concerned that language in the new proposal includes wording that states that it is likely that a land use change may be requested in the long-term future and then proceeds to detail the land use change which is similar to the original comprehensive guide plan change. He felt that would be perceived as a target for developers. He requested that any mention of the property be dropped. It should be the same as any other low-density housing in the city.
- The area currently has three units per acre. The houses are small, sturdy, affordable houses.

Jennifer Jackson King, owner of the Big Buck Roadhouse property, stated that:

- She was concerned with changing the site's designation to mixed use.
- She understood the desire to make the area "less choppy" which was being caused by the appearance of the vacant buildings.
- Ace Hardware has a very long-term lease of 18 years that is being managed by the bankruptcy court. She did not see how a developer would be willing to take the existing piece-meal parcels and create a mixed-use development.
- She favors the area being improved. It would benefit her business.
- Mixed use is not the answer. The area is not pedestrian friendly. No one would cross Highway 7 to reach Super Target. It is not easy to navigate in a vehicle.
- She preferred remaining as an individual business for future sale potential.

Lowell Zitzloff, 12460 and 12500 Wayzata Boulevard, owner of Mattress Giant and Fireplace Center, stated that:

- A site with a major interstate for a front yard and a car dealership and office building as neighbors would be better left as commercial property rather than multiple dwelling or high-density housing.
- He appreciated staff's job, but he had difficulty with the proposed designation of that property.

Bill Claflin, 3410 Rainbow Drive, stated that:

- His neighborhood currently meets the proposed 2030 comprehensive guide plan guidelines.
- Medium density housing on Manor Road would destroy the character of the neighborhood and create traffic problems.
- Adding population is contrary to protecting water resources and infrastructure.
- A buffer could be created between the existing commercial and the neighborhood with a few pine trees, a fence, and a berm.
- The proposed comprehensive guide plan would alter the character of the neighborhood irrevocably. There are currently no sidewalks.
- The streets are not able to handle the current traffic. Vehicles travel at a high rate of speed.
- A rental neighborhood would be a disaster.
- Do not sacrifice a neighborhood for a plan that is not really needed. It could be accomplished in less populated areas.

David Vogel, 3537 Comet Lane, provided slides of the area and stated that:

- The neighborhood has a unique nature.
- Some 60 residences depend on Manor Road for access in and out of the neighborhood. Right now it is a quiet residential neighborhood.
- Mixed housing exists.
- Kids can literally play in the street.
- Any type of increased density on Manor Road would impact the entire neighborhood.
- The city received 30 letters in opposition to the proposed comprehensive guide plan in regard to the Manor Road area. It would be a poor choice of location to increase density.
- The goal to have mixed density in Minnetonka is admirable and he understood the benefits of planning for the future.
- Lowell Street has single family residences that border on commercial property.
- He provided photos of the area. The houses are maintained well. There is a natural berm behind the residences. The area has large trees.
- The "alley" near Ms. McClellan's residence is not attractive. The area is congested. A major intersection, Minnetonka Boulevard, and County Road 101, is located a few hundred feet north.

- Any type of development would make Manor Road much more of a commercial-kind of road in the middle of a residential neighborhood.
- Motorists park in the “alley” and cut through the area. Medium density housing would aggravate the problem.
- It would not be hard to berm the area and install a fence.
- He wanted every reference to the five properties in the Manor Road area removed from the proposed comprehensive guide plan.
- A change in density designation would be really inappropriate.
- A developer building townhomes on a thin strip of land adjacent to and overlooking dumpsters would be ludicrous. It would change the nature of the entire neighborhood.

Tom McMullen, 3509 Lilac Lane, reiterated that all language referring to the Manor Road properties should be removed from the proposed comprehensive guide plan. He thanked the steering committee for removing the language related to the land use change, but he still objected to the long-term plan language. It would act as a self-fulfilling prophecy. A better solution would be to come up with criteria that would apply to the entire city instead of targeting specific neighborhoods. Care should be taken when considering changing well-established neighborhoods at the expense of increasing housing density.

Bill Claflin, 3410 Rainbow Drive, stated that everyone in his neighborhood received a notice of a public hearing regarding a homeowner who lived a half a mile away adding a porch to his residence, but he did not receive any notice directly mailed to his residence regarding the proposed “rezoning”. That needs to be looked at very closely.

Doug Olson, 3600 Comet Lane, stated that:

- He wanted the neighborhood to maintain its integrity.
- The speed of motorists traveling on Manor Road and Rainbow Drive is a concern. A neighbor died at County Road 101 and Manor Road.
- Rebuilding the commercial businesses should occur prior to fitting a higher density building on the existing land.

John Powers, 3611 Rainbow Drive, stated that:

- He is a realtor. His neighbors are correct to request all of the language regarding the neighborhood be deleted from the

- proposed comprehensive guide plan. It would stigmatize the properties. Even the mere suggestion would open the door for developers. The homeowners have a right not to be stigmatized.
- The Sanctuary property was previously single-family residences. The developer applied for high-density residential. It was guided for single-family residential. It ultimately was developed for medium-density residential housing.

No additional testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.

Adams asked who residents should direct nuisance complaints to at city hall. Wischnack explained that Community Development handles nuisance complaints. She and John Weinand handle nuisance abatement. They have visited the area many times. Violations in progress should be reported to the police department.

Adams asked what the practical impact is on a property that is rezoned. He noted that Manor Road would not be rezoned. Wischnack explained land use guidance and implementation of zoning districts. Rezoning is a separate action from the comprehensive guide plan. The comprehensive guide plan is a guidance document. Zoning is a law. Talking about the property in the comprehensive guide plan is not harmful to the property, but, obviously there is concern. The planning commission may recommend that the city council leave the language, soften it, or not include it at all.

In response to Chair Cheleen's question, Ms. Perry directed him to Page 15 of Chapter 4. The language is in the planning portion of the document, not the implementation portion. Chair Cheleen noted that one performance standard could be that a developer would need either to own or have options on all 5 pieces of property before any development could happen. Ms. Perry responded affirmatively.

Lehman asked if the criteria could be left to apply to the entire city and language referring to the Manor Road neighborhood be removed. Ms. Perry stated that the Knollway neighborhood was included to provide language for a future deciding body to use as a guide. The steering committee was given the options of changing the comprehensive guide plan designation, taking out the language all together, or providing criteria to apply to a comprehensive guide plan modification requested in the future. The draft includes the steering committee's recommendation. The planning commission could recommend elimination of that language and replace it with language in the implementation section of the plan

to the effect that if a comprehensive guide plan change is requested, the city may allow sufficient time to review the criteria for the property.

Lehman asked if generic criteria could be included to apply to any property. Ms. Perry directed him to a list of general criteria that asks for sufficient information for specific properties. There needs to be sufficient flexibility to allow the city to consider specific circumstances.

Walker asked for the amount of vacant land in Minnetonka. Ms. Perry responded that Minnetonka has 205 acres of vacant, developable land, out of 18,023 acres.

Walker questioned if the neighborhood was properly informed of the public hearing. Wischnack stated that adjacent property and impacted property owners and tenants received notices mailed to the properties as well as notification provided in the *Minnetonka Memo* and *Lakeshore Weekly News*. That is beyond what the law requires. The state law requires no specific notification when the city is proposing modification of its comprehensive guide plan. If the city received an application for a comprehensive guide plan amendment, then state law requires the city to notify residents within 400 feet of the site with a written notice of the public hearing.

In response to Walker's question, Wischnack explained that the area has a unique quality that wants to be maintained. It is not intended to increase its density similar to Excelsior Boulevard and Grand Avenue.

Blatz understood that Highway 7 and County Road 101 would become more pedestrian friendly by adding walkways and trails. Wischnack agreed. Mixed use allows for a greater number of uses rather than boxing-in a certain type of land use.

Chair Cheleen served on the steering committee and noted that most things discussed referred to the long-term.

Wischnack explained that Mr. Zitzloff's property has dual designation. Certain things need to happen for certain types of uses to occur. High density is one of the considerations for his property. If a transportation improvement, like a west-bound ramp, was added, then it would make the site more appropriate for an office use. That is an example of the situations the 2030 comprehensive guide plan leaves flexibility to consider.

Adams asked how many of the designations have come to pass. Wischnack recognized a certain amount of guess work with comprehensive planning. Some of it may not be needed, but if it is, it is available.

Lehman asked if there are a number of locations in the city that are currently residential housing that are guided for a different use. Ms. Perry said that was true more so in the past. Minnetonka does not “pre-zone” land. There is a requirement now that the zoning ordinance needs to be consistent with the comprehensive guide plan. Lehman asked what percentage of the city’s uses are in conformance with their guiding. Ms. Perry estimated five percent of the city’s uses are inconsistent with its zoning. Over time, properties become in compliance with the zoning ordinance.

In response to Lehman’s question, Wischnack provided the example that County Road 73 and Interstate 394 were zoned R-1, but the comprehensive guide plan guided the area as office in its 20-year plan. When certain parameters listed in the comprehensive guide plan were met, the area was allowed to be zoned for office use.

Lehman noted that the proposed comprehensive guide plan discussed changing the guidance for certain properties, but the fear for the property owners was that a buyer would think the property would be rezoned. Wischnack explained that it is unusual that the steering committee has opted not to recommend changing the land use. It is not typical in terms of past practice. Transitional issues that include neighborhoods and buffering issues create a difficult decision. Each plan will be considered individually to determine its appropriateness. Housing issues will continue to arise. Staff is alerting the commission’s understanding of the issues.

Walker asked if the wording was dropped in regard to the five homes, then would a tool exist to change the zoning to a medium density development. Wischnack answered affirmatively.

Chair Cheleen asked for the advantage of leaving the wording in the proposed comprehensive guide plan regarding the 5-lot area. Ms. Perry responded that the wording provides direction to staff and decision making bodies on the parameters that would be expected to be met prior to changing the comprehensive guide plan. Wischnack added that the document will be read by a wide variety of people. It is much easier for an individual to determine if he or she wishes to purchase or develop property if guidelines are provided. Chair Cheleen noted that a comprehensive guide plan amendment would still be required and provide safeguards. If a developer looked at the area, then those residences would stand

out anyway because of where they are located and their proximity to commercial businesses.

Blatz asked if there is a risk to remove the language. She viewed requiring the applicant to own all of the properties in the site protection for the property owners.

Adams suggested including a condition requiring sufficient time for the city to review criteria for the property in which a comprehensive guide plan modification application is requested. Ms. Perry requested the specific language be determined by the city attorney. Adams agreed. He supported leaving the language to provide future planners and leaders with an understanding of how the guidance was determined. He did not think it stigmatized a neighborhood to leave it in.

***Lehman moved, second by Adams, to recommend that the city council adopt the 2030 Comprehensive Guide Plan with a condition that would allow the city time to review criteria in regard to approval of a comprehensive guide plan amendment application.***

***Adams, Blatz, Lehman, and Cheleen voted yes. Walker voted no. Schmitz and Sjekocha were absent. Motion carried.***

This item is tentatively scheduled to be reviewed by the city council at its August 11, 2008 meeting.

## 5. ADJOURNMENT

***Lehman moved, second by Adams, to adjourn the meeting at 9:00 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.***

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Lois T. Mason  
Planning Secretary

## **Additional Comment Received after July 22, 2008 Planning Commission Meeting**

Dear Mayor Callison;

Please thank the City Staff and Planning Commission Steering Committee for a monumental job well done preparing the 2030 Comprehensive Guide Plan for approval by the City Council. I am proud of the planning effort in the City.

The overall Comprehensive Guide Plan looks good. I am especially impressed that the City and residents have put so much effort into analyzing very detailed, small sized areas of the plan.

Having lived through planning cycles in suburbs before, I can sympathize with one planner's comment that less obvious judgements require a disproportionate effort.

I appreciate that the Steering Committee and the Planning Commission recommended the plan to the City Council with a revised analysis of two neighborhoods originally slated for Medium Density Residential Guidelines. I, of course, am particularly interested in the attention given the Manor Road Guideline.

This revision was more realistic than the original Medium Density Housing Guideline to us neighboring residents.

I request that you further eliminate any specific reference to the several areas (including the other potential properties) that were considered for revision to Medium Density Residential guideline.

Vague reference to the future of these locations does not improve the quality of an originally inadequate planning proposal.

Sincerely,

Jack Hanna  
3535 Lilac Lane  
Minnetonka

952-475-2841

[jhanna@usinternet.com](mailto:jhanna@usinternet.com)