

**MINUTES  
MINNETONKA CITY COUNCIL  
REGULAR MEETING, MONDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2011**

**1. CALL TO ORDER.**

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

**2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.**

All joined in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**3. ROLL CALL**

Council members Brad Wiersum, James Hiller, Tony Wagner, Bob Ellingson, Dick Allendorf, Amber Greves, and Terry Schneider were present.

**4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Wiersum moved, Greves seconded a motion to accept the agenda with addenda to items 12B and 14E. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

**5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: September 12, 2011 regular meeting**

Hiller moved, Greves seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the September 12, 2011 regular meeting. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

**6. SPECIAL MATTERS:**

**A. Recognition of 2011 photo contest winners**

Schneider presented the awards.

**7. REPORTS FROM CITY MANAGER & COUNCIL MEMBERS**

City Manager John Gunyou reported on the schedule for upcoming council meetings.

Greves announced her husband was transferring to a job in Colorado. She said she would be resigning her position at some point in December. She said her time on the council had been one of the best experiences of her life and serving the community had been very rewarding.

Schneider asked staff to provide information about the options for filling the vacant seat.

City Attorney Desyl Peterson said under the city charter, it was past the point where a special election was required but the council could call for a special election. The council had 30 days after the resignation to either appoint a replacement or schedule a special election. The special election then had to be held within 90 days. If the council failed to act within 30 days of the vacancy, the mayor had seven days to appoint a replacement. If the mayor did not act within those seven days, a special election was required.

Gunyou indicated the council chambers had been reserved for the following Wednesday to hold a special meeting to discuss the options after the scheduled joint study session with the park board. Schneider suggested the council make its decision at the special meeting. He said his one concern about holding a special election was that it would occur within 90 days of the city's general election and this could be confusing. He noted when the section in the charter about filling a vacancy in the council was amended, perhaps not enough thought was given regarding appointing someone within 30 days. He noted that was a short period of time and although that had to be followed in this instance, it may be something the council should revisit in the future.

**8. CITIZENS WISHING TO DISCUSS MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

James Householder Jr., 14501 Atrium Way, said he was a resident and the president of the Glen Condominium Owners Association. He said behind his condominium complex was a new development, The Glenn by St. Therese on Tree Street. He said residents of the condominium association were concerned about the parking situation on Tree Street and felt there should be no parking on that street. He suggested if the plan was that there would be no parking allowed on Tree Street then signage should be posted soon so people would become familiar with the restriction. Schneider said during the approval process traffic issues in the area were discussed. It was decided that if there was a problem it would make sense to have no parking on one side of the street. The decision was made not to implement parking restrictions right upfront but see first if a problem existed. He said once the Glenn by St. Therese opens, the city would monitor if there was a problem.

**9. BIDS AND PURCHASES:** None

**10. CONSENT AGENDA (Items Requiring a Majority Vote):**

**A. Ordinance amending Section 710 of the City Code regarding increases/changes certain fees, and resolution to publish a summary of the ordinance**

Allendorf moved, Wagner seconded a motion to:

1) Adopt Ordinance No. 2011-23 amending Section 710 of the City Code

2) Adopt Resolution No. 2011-097 authorizing publication of an ordinance summary

All voted "yes." Motion carried.

**B. Resolution supporting a grant application to Hennepin County for funding for Open to Business program**

Allendorf moved, Wiersum seconded a motion to adopt Resolution No. 2011-098 supporting a grant application to Hennepin County for funding for Open to Business program. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

**C. Resolution approving a conditional use permit for a veterinary clinic at 10015 Minnetonka Boulevard**

Allendorf moved, Wiersum seconded a motion to adopt Resolution No. 2011-099 approving the request. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

**D. Extension of previous final plat approval for BLACK OAKS ESTATES at 16611 Black Oaks Lane**

Allendorf moved, Wagner seconded a motion to approve the twelve-month time extension. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

**E. Resolution approving a conditional use permit for an accessory apartment at 2245 Platwood Road**

Allendorf moved, Wagner seconded a motion to adopt Resolution No. 2011-100 approving the request. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

**F. Resolution approving two joint powers agreements with the Minnesota Bureau of Criminal Apprehension**

Allendorf moved, Wagner seconded a motion to adopt Resolution No. 2011-101 approving the agreements. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

**11. Items requiring Five Votes: None**

**12. INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES:**

**A. Ordinance amending an existing master development plan and approving final site and building plans, with variances, for a hotel at 10600 Wayzata Boulevard**

City Planner Loren Gordon gave the staff report.

Allendorf asked if it was known what was going to happen with the Hampton Inn located a block to the east. Gordon said staff had been informed the lease would expire and the use would go away. There would be some reuse of the building but it was not known what that would be at this point. Allendorf noted there was a setback variance from I394. He asked if any of the other buildings in the same area had the same setback situation. Gordon indicated this property was the farthest forward of the buildings. There was a small portion of the front of the building within the setback.

Wagner said when the council reviewed the Eddie Merlots application a variance to the design standards was approved. He said he had regrets about voting for the variance afterward because of the high turnover rate with restaurants. He indicated he probably would not be supportive of any variance to the material mix in the ordinance unless a really good case could be made. He said he definitely wants the property reused but had concerns about the front facing I394.

Schneider said the narrow end of the building facing I394 didn't concern him as much as the long five story building close to the freeway. He agreed the city's standards had to be maintained.

Wiersum moved, Wagner seconded a motion to introduce the ordinance and refer it to the planning commission. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

**B. Ordinances amending various environmental sections of city code regarding floodplain, grading and erosion control, wetland protection, shoreland district, landscaping maintenance, and public nuisance**

Gordon gave the staff report.

Hiller said he appreciated the addendum deleting certain sections. He asked for the deletion of two additional provisions on pages A12 and A14. He had been concerned with the December deadline for the memorandum of understanding with the watershed but at the same time given the floodplain discussion at the last council meeting, more discussion was needed related to floodplain provisions.

Hiller moved, Allendorf seconded a motion to introduce the ordinance as revised and refer it to the planning commission. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

**13. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**A. On-sale wine and on-sale 3.2 percent malt beverage liquor licenses for American Pie Pizza of Minnetonka, 11056 Cedar Lake Road**

Gunyou gave the staff report.

Schneider opened the public hearing at 7:07 p.m. No one spoke.

Wagner moved, Greves seconded a motion to continue it to December 5, 2011. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

**B. On-sale wine and on-sale 3.2 percent malt beverage liquor licenses for Pairings Food and Wine Market, LLC, 6001 Shady Oak Road**

Schneider opened the public hearing at 7:08 p.m. No one spoke.

Wiersum moved, Allendorf seconded a motion to continue it to December 5, 2011. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

**14. OTHER BUSINESS:**

**A. Petition to permanently close Lloyds Lane at Highland Road**

City Engineer Lee Gustafson gave the staff report.

Schneider noted the sign pointing to Highway 7 should indicate it was only for eastbound traffic. Gustafson agreed adding the word eastbound or the initials "EB" could be done to make it clear. Wiersum said it would be just as easy for a driver to go east and then make a U-turn at the Highway 7 and Williston Road intersection. Gustafson agreed that drivers are used to doing U-turns on Highway 7. Schneider agreed U-turns are common but getting across two lanes of traffic in a short distance was a safety concern.

Greves indicated that the council had received an email earlier in the day about the cut through data count. She asked if the construction happening in the Highland Road area could have impacted the data. Gustafson said the sample was valid. The data was collected over a three day period and the counts were nearly identical. He said the construction would not have impacted the data to a significant degree.

Allendorf asked if a cul-de-sac were put in, would it require taking part of 15140 Lloyds Lane and 4617 Highland Road. Gustafson said two of the three properties on the corner would have impacts. Right-of-way would need to be acquired to construct a cul-de-sac. The city would look at what properties would be needed to have the least impact possible.

Hiller said the data indicated that Crown Drive and Highland Trail had nearly half the traffic as Lloyds Lane. He asked what else could be done to encourage people to drive further down the road. Gustafson said the analysis that was done looked at every neighborhood on the west side of Highland Road and made good estimates of where the traffic would likely go. Trying to make Highland Road one way in a short span would likely be the only way to force traffic down to another road.

Dan McGie, 14820 Lloyds Drive, said with hindsight his family might not have moved into their home eight years ago given the traffic. Over the years the neighborhood had reached a boiling point over traffic issues and that was the impetus for the petition. Earlier traffic studies showed an average of 630 cars a day on Lloyds Lane, 188 cars per day on Crown Drive and Highland Trail had an average of 387 cars per day. He said those numbers were significantly different than the numbers in the staff report. A 2010 study done by SRF Consulting during the Rabbit Hill construction showed the number at 738 cars per day. He said there were significant opportunities for more traffic because there were potential for more houses. Families don't allow their children to ride their bikes in the area because of the amount of traffic. He said the solutions proposed by the city were good but the neighbors decided to petition to close the street knowing it might not be realistic. He suggested looking at what other cities have done to come up with a better solution. Getting the traffic down to Crown Drive or Highland Bluff was not the right thing to do but rather getting traffic to Highland Road or Williston Road was the right thing to do because those streets were designed for the traffic.

Schneider said anytime a residential street was closed there were implications and was a major policy decision that required the council to address. Working out better realignments, geometrics or other alternatives could be done working with staff. He said one idea was having neighbor to neighbor discussions to encourage people to drive further south.

Wiersum said closing the street was not realistic but prohibiting a left turn on to Williston might be a solution. This would make it inconvenient for the residents that live on Lloyds Lane, but it could reduce the amount of traffic because it would create a disincentive to cut through the neighborhood. Another idea would be to prohibit a right turn on to Lloyds Lane from Williston Road. McGie said residents have looked at the Lake Harriet area where large planters are used and every other street is a one way and this was similar to what Wiersum was suggesting. Schneider noted that the city engineer has told the council several times that people ignore stop signs at places where they really don't make sense and this creates a safety issue. There could be unintended consequences and that was why the council relied on the city engineer's expertise. Wiersum agreed.

Allendorf agreed Wiersum's ideas were creative but he wouldn't want to punish the residents on Lloyds Drive and Lloyds Lane by making them drive further. He said there likely were other solutions. He suggested the residents listen to Schneider's suggestion of working with staff to find a solution. Wiersum said it would be a process to find the right solution and that the city engineer's suggestions should be tried to see how they work. If those suggestions do not work then more involved solutions could be looked at to reduce the traffic.

Wagner cautioned there would be downstream effects to the entire corridor. Whatever is done had to balance with the downstream effects. He said it was likely unrealistic to think the cut through traffic would go away entirely. He said there was no way he would be in favor of closing Lloyds Lane or restricting the ability to get through.

Schneider said one of the penalties residents pay were due to the way the city evolved. The city allowed all kinds of strange roads going different ways rather than roads going every two blocks from point A to point B. This allowed for a lot more wetlands, trees, and topography. The price for that though was because people use the shortest route possible, they use roads that go through neighborhoods. He said he didn't want to use the term "cut through" because the issue involved a road that went from point A, Highland Road, to point B, Williston Road.

Gustafson noted that all the ideas that had been discussed had already been reviewed. The police department indicated there would be an enforcement nightmare. If those changes were made to Lloyds corridor other corridors could request the same type signs.

Schneider said he has seen very positive impacts from the use of striping.

Allendorf thanked McGie and the neighbors for being realistic and knowing the city would continue to look at the issues.

Allendorf moved, Wiersum seconded a motion to receive petition and deny request. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

**B. Resolution ordering the abatement of nuisance conditions existing at 4408 Loretta Lane**

City Forester Emily Ball and Natural Resources Manager Jo Colleran gave the staff report.

Allendorf indicated the issue related to the way the easement was written and whose responsibility it was to remove the tree. Peterson said the easement document included a provision that stated the easement does

not include the right of the city, its contractors, or agents to cut, trim or remove trees. She noted this was not the typical easement and usually the language gives the city the right to cut trees.

Carrol Gatlin, 4408 Loretta Lane, said she only received a copy of the purchase agreement within the last few days after having requested it over a year ago. It was her recollection that the purchase agreement was written so that the city had the obligation of maintaining the property. She said the tree has been dead over a year. If the city had the right to tell her that someone had to come on to her property to remove the tree, then it had the right to be on her property. She noted a provision in the purchase agreement that the city had a right to maintain the property and that provision came before the provision about the city not having the right to remove vegetation. She said she would leave it up the council to decide if the right not to be on the property superseded the right to maintain the property. She indicated that if there was a point in time where vegetation was on the property and was disturbing the drainage, there would be an issue because the city would not have the right to come in and do anything about it.

Schneider said the city had easements all over the city and the standard utility drainage easements typically provided the right for the city to come on to the property for digging a pipe that could require removing trees. He said that was significantly different than an obligation to remove trees.

Wiersum asked for clarification about the city's rights. Peterson said Schneider's statement was well stated and the city did not have the obligation to remove the tree. The city has the right to go in to maintain the property for purposes of water storage and drainage. Wiersum said he agreed with that statement. He noted diseased trees are removed to eliminate the likely spread of further disease. Just because the city has an easement does not relieve the property owner of the responsibility to handle a diseased tree. Peterson noted that was correct. Wiersum said he did not agree with the property owner's statement that if the city removed the tree, it was accepting responsibility for future maintenance of her property. Peterson agreed with Wiersum's interpretation.

Wagner asked if a tree was impacting the drainage on the property, would the city would be prevented from doing anything. Peterson said it might because of the provision in the easement that indicated there was not the right to go in and cut down trees. Wagner said that was the point the property owner was making.

Wiersum moved, Greves seconded a motion to adopt Resolution No. 2011-102 ordering the abatement of the elm tree with Dutch elm disease. All voted "yes." Motion carried.

**C. Resolution authorizing the certification of delinquent water and sanitary sewer charges to the Hennepin County Auditor**

Finance Director Merrill King gave the staff report.

Wagner moved, Greves seconded a motion to adopt Resolution No. 2011-103 authorizing the certification of delinquent water and sanitary sewer charges to the Hennepin County Auditor. Wiersum, Hiller, Wagner, Allendorf, Greves, and Schneider voted "yes." Ellingson abstained. Motion carried.

**D. Items concerning a 2-lot subdivision of existing properties at 12910, 12918 Rutledge Circle and a parcel with an unassigned address on Rutledge Circle**

Gordon gave the staff report.

Wagner asked for more information about the orientation of the house. He asked staff to comment on if the access point would be off Rutledge Circle that would have an easement across the property or off Stanton Drive. Gordon said the documents that were submitted indicated the access would be off Rutledge Circle. The approved documents would include an easement over lot one otherwise Stanton Drive would be the access point. Wagner asked if the drive was off Rutledge Circle, could construction traffic be prevented on Stanton Drive. Gordon indicated a construction management plan could be included in the agreement. Wagner asked if that was included in the proposed ordinance. Peterson indicated it was. Wischnack noted sewer and water would come off Stanton Drive so there would be some intrusion in that area with the service hookup.

Anne Tremel, 12929 Stanton Drive, said the proposal was fundamentally flawed and didn't meet the city's criteria for approval. She said it was the council's role to enact and enforce legislation, to protect and enhance the quality of life for the residents of the city. Her role as a resident was to be a good steward of the city's resources, be a good neighbor, and to participate in city elections. She said the residents rely on the city government to make prudent and thoughtful decisions that are in the best interests of constituents. The reason the proposal had never been approved in any of its many other iterations was because the council had done its job in protecting the city's resources and constituents. The development would have a far reaching impact on the neighborhood. She asked what was now different that would make the current proposal acceptable. Previously, there were multiple reasons why the proposal did not move forward. She said approving the proposal would establish a dangerous precedent. Once the project was approved the council would

not be able to deny a similar type of proposal in the future. She noted there were countless similar properties in the city.

Cindy Devore, 12937 Stanton Drive, said she and her husband looked at different areas before deciding to buy their house in Minnetonka. They were told what a great city Minnetonka was with wildlife, wetlands, natural beauty, woods and the city even made sure there were natural buffers between properties. She always thought the city was a good steward of the land and praised the city's efforts to bring natural areas back. She said allowing the applicant to fill the wetland would take away from the land its job, to keep the quality of the water and the ground the way it should be. She indicated at the last council meeting a comment was made that changing the flow of the floodplain would not have much impact. She said in her backyard there was a raised flower bed, and digging down a little bit produces gravel. When water comes down the hill it flows into the flower bed and filters through. This helps with erosion and helps clean the water as it flows into wetland. Changing that flow would impact where the water ends up. She questioned how taking part of a nonconforming lot and adding it to another nonconforming lot would create a conforming lot. She also asked how the proposed changes to the floodplain ordinance discussed earlier in the meeting would impact this proposal.

Schneider said the council was taking a closer look at the floodplain mitigation fill replacement policy. Any changes to that policy would be done prospectively and would not affect this proposal.

Wagner said the two lots in the wetland were not owned by the city so the lot lines could be reconfigured.

Schneider noted that to a certain extent there could be precedents established but the council had been told many times by the city attorney that identical circumstances needed to be involved. He said all the lots were pretty unique so it would be difficult to see how allowing one would set precedent for the others.

Devore asked how the model for the floodplain would impact the proposal. Schneider said if the new model the watershed district was proposing was adopted the proposal wouldn't need council approval because the property would be out of the floodplain. Devore said there was no certainty of that happening.

Mark Tremel, 12929 Stanton Drive, said in 2004, the applicant came before the council as the developer with the property owners. The developer told the council that staff had told him the item would be approved. The council denied the proposal citing the unique lot line and the eight inch sanitary sewer line between the two parcels. Tremel asked if

that sanitary sewer easement had been addressed in the current plan. He agreed with the city attorney that the current flood plain elevation level had to be used and the making a decision on the proposal should wait until the model is complete. He cited section 300.26 of the city code that states a property owner was not entitled to an additional buildable lot when trying to combine a conforming lot with other nonconforming lots. He asked why the council was not requiring the applicant to go to the county to combine the lots. He noted the flood plain mitigation plan included the removal of trees as would the fill area, and city ordinance prohibited that. He also noted the compensatory storage area would come within a foot or two of the wetland delineation line. He questioned if that was too close. He said it wasn't the responsibility of the city to guarantee profits for developers.

Schneider indicated the sanitary sewer line would not change under the proposal. Gordon confirmed that was correct.

Curt Fretham, 12918 Rutledge Circle, said at the last meeting the question came up about the risk if the flood plain elevation ended up at a different elevation than 921 feet. He noted the proposal would not just fill the area to 921, but the low floor elevation of the house would be at 923 feet. The foundation of the house would be around 2,000 square feet and the building pad would be 3,500 square feet. This would allow room for additions. He clarified that the proposal would not fill wetland but rather flood plain. He noted one recommended condition was that the applicant needed to perform the mitigation before the property was allowed to transfer ownership. He said there were some practical issues with the condition. Doing the floodplain mitigation was a grading excavating activity. The same activities would be involved with constructing the house. He said it would be nice to be able to do the two in conjunction with each other to use the same surveyors. He said he was hoping that an arrangement could be agreed on to treat the proposal as a typical public improvement where money could be escrowed. He was agreeable to having the applicant perform the service but didn't want it associated with the transfer of the title. He said another condition was that the mitigation be completed before the recording of the final plat. Treating the proposal as a public improvement would help with that issue as well.

Peterson said she was concerned with changing the timing of the required mitigation and recording of the final plat. She said the mitigation needs to happen to make the lots conform with the platting requirements. She didn't see how the applicant could wait until after the plat was recorded to do the alteration because then the plat would be nonconforming.

Schneider said that because of the complexity of the site, the item that gave the council a comfort level was the mitigation that would result in additional flood plain capacity. Getting that done now would ensure that

the additional flood plain capacity existed whether the development occurred or not and that was part of the package the council approved.

Wagner said the study session to look at the flood plain ordinance was either well timed or was too late. He noted there were statements made that allowing fill had been done before but as he said, that had been done prior to his time on the council. The council may have allowed the expansion of buildable area because buildable area existed, but it never allowed the creation of a buildable lot. He said he remained opposed to allowing fill to create a buildable lot. He indicated if council members planned to support the proposed changes to flood plain ordinances, then it should be difficult to approve this development. He said during his time on the council, the city had tried to preserve open space and improve wetland quality. He asked the neighbors where they would prefer the driveway location. They indicated the location in the proposal was the preference.

Allendorf asked what the risks were to the city, the developer, and the owner of the home if the development was approved the flood plain elevation was later to be determined to be higher than 921 feet. Peterson said the city would bear no liability for any problems associated with the house being built in an area that was flood prone. The responsibility would be the homeowner's.

Schneider apologized for coming on strong at the last council meeting in saying it was fairly routine to allow the creation of a buildable lot. He said the council was not doing a disservice by taking action now before the floodplain ordinance discussion because that discussion would set the tone for years.

Wiersum said he had grappled with this proposal because it was not clear cut and was among the most unique situations he had seen on his time on the council. If it were simply a question of plain, pure land use, the decision for the council would be much clearer. He said the neighbors' comments were helpful. Because it was such a unique situation, he didn't see it as precedent setting. He said the debate on the flood plain level had been taken out of the discussion because the developer agreed to build to 921 feet. He noted it was a tough vote and he hoped it turned out well.

Greves said she agreed with many of Wiersum's comments. She came out of the last meeting feeling fairly confident that the new lot would comply with the flood plain elevation that would eventually be established and there would be some mitigation of risk by going to the current higher elevation level. That factor along with the number of unique circumstances that surrounded the proposal led her to vote the way she did at the last meeting. She said she did have difficulty with the applicant's request to treat the proposal like a typical public improvement proposal.

Hiller moved, Allendorf seconded a motion to:

- 1) Adopt Resolution No. 2011-104 approving floodplain alteration
- 2) Adopt Ordinance No. 2011-24 approving floodplain rezoning
- 3) Adopt Resolution No. 2011-105 approving preliminary plat

Wiersum, Hiller, Allendorf, Greves, and Schneider voted “yes.” Wagner and Ellingson voted “no.” Motion carried.

**E. Concept plan for Ecostation generally located at the corner of Shady Oak Road and Excelsior Blvd.**

Gordon and Wischnack gave the staff report.

Allendorf noted the city had put aside money for study of the area. He asked if that was included in the strategic area planning that was outlined in the staff report. Wischnack confirmed money had been set aside in the HRA levy for furthering the Shady Oak station study. Because it was unknown how much the county was going to do versus what the city was responsible for, the effort on the city’s behalf was not known. Allendorf suggested clarifying the planning efforts in the information. He said he was conflicted when he looked at a box that indicated affordable housing and a box that indicated fast food that made him question how that fit in within the context of the planning efforts.

Wischnack indicated the Met Council was in charge of the preliminary engineering that was moving ahead and would take about two years. The second effort underway was being done by the Hennepin County Community Works. She said this involved the planning, land use and economic development and all the things that would help support light rail and how the projects would proceed. Schneider noted the Met Council had a separate funding source that would be used to study areas in the Twin Cities with the focus being primarily on the Southwest Light Rail.

Wiersum asked if there was anything “eco” about the Ecostation. He said he could not see anything ecological included but rather it looked like a plan for a grocery store, apartments and a fast food restaurant that looked like anything that could be found in any suburban area and nothing tied it to the light rail station. Gordon said staff had a couple of meetings with the applicant and there were a number of things yet to come to get the plans in order. He said the level had not been reached where the finer details had been discussed.

Schneider said he would like the applicant to clarify what he wanted the council to give feedback on.

Richard Anderson, 11623 Lone Lake Ridge, said what was being presented was a 13 acre parcel of land. He said the Ecostation was meant to be a building that was “eco” wise with roofing and wall materials that were “eco” efficient. He showed aerial and ground photos of a project he did 30 years ago 20 blocks from the site. He said the same people who were involved in the construction design of that project were involved in this project. The previous project brought in \$2.2 million in annual taxes for the city of Eden Prairie. He said he expects this project would have an assessed value of \$75 million and bring in \$2.5 million annually in property taxes. The expectation is that 400 people would be employed by the project.

Schneider noted the concept plan in the council packet was different than what was being shown on the screen. Anderson noted the drawing on the screen was made two and a half years ago and had been revised to include more housing.

Wagner said there were significant efforts going on to plan light rail stations along the entire corridor. One of the tenets of the efforts is that each station area has to have some level of uniqueness. He said given that there were not an assembly of properties for this plan, he wasn't sure what he could comment on but would rather wait until the broader planning partnership was further along.

Wiersum agreed with Wagner. He said there was nothing wrong with any of the components of the plan but it did not speak to the issue of distinctiveness, a sense of community, or something that would make it really connect with the light rail station.

Allendorf said when the time comes later in the planning process then he would welcome an idea or a plan that would conform to the general concepts.

Schneider agreed that the plan was premature given the early stages of the planning process for the area. He said when the planning was complete he would like to see a single developer take over the entire area to ensure it was done right. A master plan for the area would be a plus.

**15. APPOINTMENTS and REAPPOINTMENTS: None**

**16. ADJOURNMENT**

Greves moved, Wiersum seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:17 p.m.  
All voted “yes.” Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

David E. Maeda  
City Clerk