

**MINNETONKA PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES**

**DECEMBER 8, 2005**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

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

**2. ROLL CALL**

Commissioners Allendorf, Brandt, Cheleen, Dahl, Frisque, and Hart were present. Britain was absent.

Staff members present: Planning Director Geoff Olson, Principal Planner Cary Teague, Planner Susan Thomas, Natural Resource Manager Jo Colleran, Planning Intern David Abel, Community Development Director Ron Rankin, and City Engineer Lee Gustafson. The city's traffic consultant, Tony Heppelmann, also attended the meeting.

- 3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:** The agenda was approved as submitted with additional comments provided in the change memo dated December 8, 2005.

- 4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** November 17, 2005

*Allendorf moved, second by Dahl, to approve the November 17, 2005, meeting minutes as submitted.*

*Allendorf, Cheleen, Dahl, and Frisque voted yes. Brandt and Hart abstained. Britain was absent. Motion carried.*

**5. REPORT FROM STAFF**

Olson briefed the commission on land use applications considered by the city council at its meeting of November 28, 2005:

- Adopted a resolution that approved items concerning the Fetterly View Plat at 11519 Fetterly Road West for Dick and Jill Heimerl (05057.05a).
- Adopted a resolution that approved a preliminary plat, with lot frontage variances, for a two-lot subdivision at 4232 Highview Place for Paul Vogstrom (05087.05a) in accordance with the planning commission's recommendation.
- Adopted a resolution that approved variances to tear down and rebuild a home at 2813 McKenzie Point Road for Lecy Bros.

Homes, on behalf of Larry and Betty Kochevar (05027.05a), with a one and a half decrease in one setback and in accordance with the planning commission's recommendation.

**6. REPORT FROM PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS: None**

**7. PUBLIC HEARINGS: CONSENT AGENDA**

No items were removed from the consent agenda for discussion or separate action.

***Cheleen moved, second by Dahl, to approve the items listed on the consent agenda as recommended in the respective staff reports as follows:***

**A. Aggregate side yard setback variance for an addition to the home at 11925 Hilloway Road West for Michael Charles & Associates (05092.05a)**

Adopt the resolution on pages A1–A3 of the staff report, which approves a side yard aggregate variance from 30 feet to 22 feet to construct an addition to the existing home at 11925 Hilloway Road West. This resolution is based on the following findings:

- 1) There is a unique hardship to the property caused by:
  - a. The location of the existing home and the angle of the side lot line.
  - b. The lot width is 98 feet.
- 2) The variance would meet the intent of the ordinance since:
  - a. The variance request is for a reasonable use of the property.
  - b. The addition would have a greater side yard setback than the existing home.
  - c. The proposed addition would not alter neighborhood character.

Staff approval is based on the following conditions

- 1) Submit proof of having recorded this resolution with Hennepin County before the city issues a building permit.

- 2) The installation and maintenance of erosion control and tree protection fencing, subject to review by the city's environmental resources coordinator.
  - 3) The building material and color of the addition must match the existing home.
  - 4) This variance will end on December 31, 2006, unless the city has issued a building permit for the project covered by this variance or approved a time extension.
- B. Wetland setback and wetland buffer variances for a performance area on the Civic Center Campus at 14600 Minnetonka Boulevard for the City of Minnetonka (86047.05a)**

***MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN***

- 1) *Recommend that the city council adopt the ordinance on pages A1–A3 of the staff report, which approves the proposed master development plan, and floodplain rezoning for boardwalk construction. This ordinance is based on the following findings:*
  - a. The proposal would meet the required standards and ordinances for a site and building plan approval.

Approval is subject to the following conditions:

- a. The April 21, 2005, plan is hereby adopted as the master development plan and as final site and building plans. The site must be developed in conformance with this plan. Modifications may be allowed, subject to staff review, as long as they are in general conformance with the approved plan.
- b. Prior to any site work, install tree protection/erosion control fencing. The fencing must be maintained throughout the course of excavation and construction.
- c. The city council may reasonably add or revise conditions to address any future unforeseen problems.

- d. Any change to the approved use that results in a significant increase in traffic or a significant change in character would require a revised conditional use permit.

### **CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT**

- 2) *Recommend the city council adopt the resolution on pages A4–A6 of the staff report. This resolution approves a conditional use permit for a trail in a wetland buffer area at the Civic Center Campus. Approval is based on the finding that the proposal meets the required conditional use permit standards and is subject to the following conditions.*
  - a. The site must be developed in conformance with the site plan dated April 21, 2005. Modifications may be allowed subject to staff review as long as they are in general conformance with the approved plan.
  - b. A seed mixture acceptable to the city's environmental resources coordinator must be used on all non-impervious areas within 16.5 feet of the wetland.
  - c. The following work must be completed before starting any site work:
    - (1) Install for staff approval erosion control and tree protection fencing. The fencing must be maintained throughout the construction process.
    - (2) If required, submit copies of Watershed District and Department of Natural Resources approval of the wetland buffers. The city may require revisions to the approved plans to meet the district's requirements.

***Allendorf, Brandt, Cheleen, Dahl, Frisque, and Hart voted yes. Britain was absent. Motion carried and the items on the consent agenda were approved as submitted.***

**8. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**A. A three-phase redevelopment project for the east part of Glen Lake for Thomas Wartman, consisting of condominiums and retail/service commercial and restaurants (05091.05a)**

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

Olson introduced staff and the city's traffic consultant, Tony Heppelmann. Olson reported. He recommended approval of the application based on the findings and subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.

Rankin clarified the areas Glen Lake included in a redevelopment project originally formed in 1977. He reviewed the evolution of change of businesses located in the Glen Lake area. He explained how tax increment financing helps redevelopment defer costs related to land acquisition, relocation of businesses, and demolition. It would help with the extraordinary costs related to street and traffic signal improvements. The relocation funds would help existing businesses relocate in the Glen Lake area. Rankin explained the city's conservative policy in the use of eminent domain. He did not expect eminent domain to be needed in the proposed project, but it is a provision of every redevelopment contract the city gets involved with.

Allendorf asked if burying ~~transmission~~ distribution lines on Stewart Lane had been considered. Olson stated that staff had considered that and financing options would need to be explored. It would be a separate issue. Allendorf was concerned with the timing. He was comfortable with variances for Sites A and B based on new urbanism principles. Allendorf did have concerns with Site C variances.

Dahl asked if there were plans to widen Excelsior Boulevard into four lanes. Olson stated that the current project would not change Excelsior Boulevard or Eden Prairie Road. Installing a traffic signal at Woodhill Road is a part of the proposal.

In response to Dahl's question, Olson explained that a neighborhood plan had been reviewed by residents of the Glen Lake area in 2002. It was not a city plan and was not adopted by the city. It was used by a developer to find out what residents preferred to happen. A consensus was reached that the Lake Side Estate town home area should remain town homes instead of condominiums and a mixed use area along the south side of Excelsior Boulevard was wanted. A

consensus was not reached regarding Site C. Some residents felt strongly toward single family homes and others favored condominiums.

Olson invited commissioners to address specific aspects of the project. The proposal does include all of the sites.

Tom Wartman, applicant, thanked Geoff for his thorough report. He explained his long term goals and vision for the Glen Lake area. It is a comprehensive plan that might encourage updating of the west side. He stated that:

- Change is difficult, but, without it, areas can become obsolete and outdated. He cited Matt's Auto and the television repair shop as examples.
- His dream is for a revitalized Glen Lake area.
- He reviewed the history of the businesses in the area.
- The south side is the second phase of development. The Excel substation is similar in appearance to a prison due to its fence. He hopes to remove that type of fencing and make the area green.
- The power poles on the north side would be removed. His goal would be to work with Excel to remove the poles on the south side also. Installing the three new poles would cost the developer \$50,000 each.
- Businesses on the south side of Excelsior Boulevard are being relocated in Minnetonka.
- The traffic patterns for the businesses would be coordinated.
- It is desired that the staff and ambience of the Gold Nugget be maintained. The current owners of the Gold Nugget would be grandfathered in the way it is, but a new owner would be required to make many updates.
- The shingles and architecture would replicate the old world charm and character of buildings that were on Lake Minnetonka at the turn of the century.
- Eleven of the condominium units would be affordable units. Out of 30 units to 32 units, two thirds would be priced between \$200,000 and \$250,000. Ten of the units would be priced between \$325,000 and \$350,000.
- The buildings would provide an architecture style not seen today. It would have a lot of character.
- Retail traffic would stay on the north end of the building.
- Stewart Lane would have a residential feel.

- The development would not be possible without tax increment financing.
- The second part of phase two is a condominium building that has a traditional feel, but fits into today's lifestyle.
- Variances are required to provide the best views. All parking would occur under the buildings. The site has the proper slope.
- A lot of natural landscaping and buffering would be done to tie in with the park. The project worked to keep the natural vegetation and trees. The existing vegetation buffer would not be disturbed.
- What is currently a sea of asphalt would be broken up. The four-story building would appear to be a three-story building. The top story would be "tucked under the roof."
- Instead of one larger building, it was broken down into two buildings to create a better space and composition. In between the two buildings would be a plaza area and green space to provide a community feel.
- Parking requirements would be met. Proof of parking has been provided to allow the spaces to remain as green space until it would be determined that they would be needed.
- Phase two would hopefully break ground in the fall of 2007.
- The current plans allow for 20 affordable units, 800 square feet in size. The affordable cost could go up in 2 or 3 years.
- The mixed use phase and Site C would begin this spring.
- Pedestrian friendly walkways and trails are part of the plan wanted by surrounding residents.
- He and the city are fighting for a stop light at Excelsior Boulevard and Woodhill Road. The developer would pay for it.
- The plan for the ball field would be a requirement.
- He read a recommendation from the city's market study for Glen Lake that supported mixed use concepts to provide high quality retail spaces in the Glen Lake area.
- Revitalization and beautification are necessary for the Glen Lake area.
- He can not downsize or eliminate aspects of the proposal and still succeed.
- The density is too important to support the tax increment financing and the livelihood of the area.
- The area has gone stagnant and stale.
- He asked for support of what was already completed and a vote to approve the current proposal. Time is crucial. Construction would

begin in April of 2006. He needed to make purchasing decisions now. He has been working on the proposal for 14 months.

John Hamilton, Urban Works, 901 North 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, Minneapolis, architect for the project, stated that the three buildings would offer three opportunities to provide for three different markets. Young kids starting out, empty nesters, and affordable families from the greater Minnetonka neighborhood would benefit from the proposal. The proposal would be surrounded by similar uses. The condominiums would fill the market demand and provide a buffer.

Chair Hart called for a brief recess and called the meeting back to order.

Chair Hart reviewed the proposal from a land use stand point. She reviewed the proposed guide plan changes, rezonings, conditional use permit with variances, conditional use permit to move the transmission poles, vacation of right-of-way, site and building plan with variances and conservation easement, plats, and the redevelopment plan modification included in the proposal. It would not be unusual to continue the public hearing to another meeting. She promoted a full review by all parties involved. Items not in the purview of the planning commission at this meeting included: eminent domain, financial aspects including tax increment financing, signs, lighting, and where and which tenants would move. That would be between the developer and the tenants.

The public hearing was opened.

Gara Strot, 14324 Brunsvold Road, stated that:

- There have been different grocery stores in the area for more than 50 years. All of them survived without a huge population spike as the proposal would create.
- Kowalski's closed because it priced its merchandise too high for the area. It is a working, blue-collar with seniors on a fixed income community.
- "Upscaling" does not have to equal three to five story buildings. Revitalization implies that the area is stagnant. Business for her family's business dropped off three to four years ago.
- Residents chose to live there because of the small community feel. The proposal would not fit and cause damage to the surrounding environments.
- Site C should remain zoned for private residential uses.

- She supported more middle-income projects with less density, such as a two-story building with a restaurant below and living space above.
- She is not opposed to all building projects. She wants the building to fit the community. The proposal would not benefit the community.

Ivan Fox, 6008 Pinewood Lane, stated that the project's philosophy consists of "build it and it will come." He stated:

- This project would be Excelsior Boulevard and Eden Prairie Road. It is not 50<sup>th</sup> and France Avenue. It could use a face lift and an update.
- He had no idea how traffic would work.
- He did not know about the infrastructure.
- Glen Lake is not a city, it is a little village.
- Out of 123 units, maybe 20 would be affordable. The affordable units are tiny, expensive things. He did not see it as affordable housing. He saw it as price gouging.
- What about the residents' rights to enjoy the ambience and the community that exists.
- He is scared of the project. It would disrupt the area.

Chair Hart stated that there would be 36 affordable units. Affordability is defined by the Metropolitan Council. She agreed that turning on Woodhill Road is a problem. It needs to have a solution.

Teresa Mahoney, 5412 Mayview Road, spoke on behalf of the Glen Lake residents who reside on Mayview Road, Kinsel Road, and North and South Streets on the east side of the lake. She stated that:

- The majority of residents are extremely concerned with the traffic and safety issues. The streets on the east side of Glen Lake are referred to as the "Glen Lake raceway." The volume and the speed of traffic are ridiculous. It is not safe to travel to the four parks in her area.
- Two vehicles can not pass on the roads without hitting a pedestrian in the walkway. She had to back into another road to allow enough room for a snowplow to pass. Six months ago, she witnessed two school buses collide.
- Her mailbox has been repeatedly knocked down by traffic.

- In 2003, a meeting took place in the Glen Lake Community Center to address the traffic issues. The streets were marked, but then the markings were blacked out because the streets were too narrow.
- The volume and speed of traffic have been issues since the Interstate 494 construction project began because people cut through the area.

Chair Hart stated that once the 494 construction project is completed, the traffic would return to normal. Ms. Mahoney and her consensus believed the traffic problem would not resolve itself once the Interstate 494 construction was completed. Ms. Mahoney stated that something needs to be done to the roads along Glen Lake. Chair Hart directed Ms. Mahoney to share her concerns with engineering staff.

Ms. Mahoney and her group were concerned that her area was not included in the traffic survey. Chair Hart explained that the traffic study addressed the major intersections in the area. It found that, besides turning on Woodhill Road, the traffic level would not change. Ms. Mahoney pointed out that the traffic study only addressed evening traffic. It did not address morning routes. The residents she met with are extremely concerned with the project adding to the traffic issue. Ms. Mahoney felt that her streets are now major through streets and the city needs to address the safety issues. She found it extremely alarming that the commission could continue with the project without a thorough review of the traffic issues on the east side of Glen Lake.

James Hiller, 5638 Glen Avenue, stated that the baseball fields now have lights and the times of the games have been changed so that the games will get done during rush hour. He wanted to be certain that if the stop light is installed, that Hennepin County would not take property away from or obstruct access to the Gloc baseball fields. He questioned why Hennepin County suggested that the city not proceed with vacation of the right-of-way until the site plan was completed. Olson explained that the city used the right-of-way for a parking lot. The city requires 80 feet of right-of-way. Legally, the city can not provide any more right-of-way than what currently exists. Mr. Hiller was satisfied.

Carol McConnell, 14325 Stewart Lane, was a member of the Glen Lake Task Force which met to develop ideas and suggestions of how the area might develop in the future. What the task force agreed upon was nothing like the proposal. The group opposed condominiums. Chair Hart pointed out that the task force's plan was not adopted by the city. Ms. McConnell agreed and stated that the group provided input to the developer. The plan was never proposed to the city. Ms. McConnell developed a concept of single-story and two-story

residences with walkways. They did not want a new urbanism look. The group wanted low key structures. The task force's input was included in the commission's agenda packet.

Mike Mullinowski, 14407 Excelsior Boulevard, of West Suburban Alano, purchased the property from the city and moved into its current residence in 1992. He stated:

- At this time in the organization, they do not want to move.
- Lots of time, money, and effort has been put into the current location.
- The organization has moved 3 times in 30 years.
- They are good residents.
- Parking has always been a problem, but that is a good thing in his organization.
- There is no where for the organization to move. They would need a building with 5,000 square feet and 50 to 60 parking spaces.
- The facility serves 200 people per week. The loss of the site could be the death knell for the organization.
- The building has beautiful wood working inside.
- He requested the commission deny the variance.

Grace Sheely, 14325 Grenier Road, stated that:

- She values neighborhood connections and the variety of opinions, but she was discouraged with the number of neighbors that did not know about the proposal.
- Olson has been wonderful by answering all of her questions. Rankin was unable to return her call today. She thought staff has done a wonderful job. She appreciated having her letter in the packet. Olson has done a professional job with addressing concerns and sharing the information.
- Her neighbors do not know the details of the proposal and do not understand the zoning and variance changes being proposed.
- She is overwhelmed with the details of the project and its timelines.
- In 1999, she enjoyed assisting the city develop its comprehensive plan. She believed that the comprehensive plan would be followed, but has learned that it is only a guide.
- She questioned how the requirements to change the comprehensive plan are being met.

- Neighborhood input supported R-1, single-family zoning, for the area.
- She was concerned that she would be the only remaining single-family home surrounded by the Hennepin County Home School and a church.
- She spent too much time and energy on the comprehensive plan for it not to be followed. She was distraught.
- Only 1.8 percent of Minnetonka's acreage, 327 acres, is currently zoned R-5, high density residential zoning. That includes density above 12 units per acre. The proposal would add 7 new acres to the R-5 zoning. It would be a big deal.
- Townhouses are not right for Glen Lake. It would contradict the comprehensive plan.
- She encouraged those present to speak with Councilmember Ellingson. He lives in the area.
- A face lift is needed, but high density housing is not reasonable.
- The October 25, 2005 *Minnetonka Memo* does not mention Site C.
- Developer presentations do not count as public meetings. No record was available for public review.
- She was not aware of the project until she received the city's letter dated November 21, 2005. She did not consider 2 days a reasonable response time.
- Planning staff has worked hard to include all of the public's comments.
- The project is a very aggressive development plan. It is being rushed by the public during the holiday season without time to discuss it.
- She does not feel comfortable with the development.

Olson explained the ten criteria that should be considered when considering a land use plan. The proposal would meet the strategic goal of affordable and modest cost housing. It would not cause an adverse impact on facilities or services. A traffic signal at Woodhill Road would mitigate the traffic problem. Olson has heard from residents concerned that the proposal would have an adverse effect on property values, but he has also received comments from residents concerned that the project would increase the property values. Clearly, the project would remove blight. The area has been deteriorating over the years and property values of several of the businesses on the south side of Excelsior Boulevard have been going down. Condominiums would be a more appropriate land use for Site C with townhouses on one side. Two condominium buildings on Site A would provide a nice transition between the grocery store and the Beacon

Hill condominiums. The proposal would not have an adverse impact on the natural environment. Site C would have a wetland buffer to protect the water quality.

Olson stated that change has been happening in the Glen Lake area since 1999 and will continue to happen. The economic development authority is looking for affordable housing sites. The grocery stores have closed. It is appropriate to address that with comprehensive guide plan changes to make a redevelopment project work. Some type of redevelopment project would benefit the Glen Lake area and satisfy the criteria. The proposal would help meet a regional need to provide life cycle and affordable housing goals. The project would not adversely impact historical landmarks or structures.

Olson explained that the ten criteria are a guide. The planning commission and city council have a great deal of discretion to determine if the project would be in the public's good. Chair Hart referenced pages 34 through 37 of the agenda packet that explained the criteria section.

Ms. Sheely asked if a public easement for the trail currently exists. Olson stated that a requirement of approval would require permanent trail easements for all of the trails. Chair Hart stated that there is also a conservation easement that would be established. Colleran confirmed the conservation easement would be a 25-foot buffer to the wetland.

Ms. Sheely observed that she moved to Glen Lake in 1997. She purchased 3 acres of lake front property for less than what the 800 foot condominium would cost. The developer has not changed the proposal since receiving residents' comments. She could live with Councilmember Ellingson's recommendations more than the current project.

Ms. Sheely asked why the market value in the tax increment finance report listed the cost at \$240,000. Chair Hart stated that the metropolitan council calculated the affordable cost to be \$197,500. Chair Hart referred Ms. Sheely to the meeting to be held by the economic development authority. Rankin explained that he had returned Ms. Sheely's telephone call that day and spoke to a young man who answered the phone. The metropolitan council's definition of affordable housing would be \$193,700. The affordable units are factored into the proposal's calculations at \$200,000 to anticipate some increase in the affordable ceiling over the next 2 years.

Jeff Schultenover, 13424 Maywood Curve, felt some of the environmental aspects of the project had not been addressed enough. He stated that:

- The high-density housing of Site C would have an adverse impact on Kinsel Park and the Glen Lake area.
- The drainage issue has not been adequately addressed. The increased parking areas and storm drains flow into Glen Lake.
- The Kinsel Park ponds overflow every time it rains.
- He was concerned with the Dixon Road pond as well.
- He did not see a plan that included the existing trees and an indication of which would be removed. The landscaping plan shows a few, but he wanted greater detail.
- He questioned why an environmental impact statement had not been done or at least an environmental assessment worksheet.
- Site C would need to be zoned R-4, instead of R-5, to be consistent with Glen Lake Shores.
- He wanted to know how much fill would be added to the flood plain down the slope of Site C. He opposed a variance to allow filling any part of a wetland or wetland buffer to affect the high water mark. Water is a great resource and we are obligated to protect it.
- He was committed to good land stewardship related to all decisions regarding the project.
- Change can be a good thing. He and others present want to be involved in the decision making process.

Gustafson explained that the Kinsel Park and Dixon Road ponds were sized for water quality purposes, to remove the dirt and pollutants from the street. It is expected that a heavy rain would flood the ponds. They are working as they were designed. Site A would have less hard surface and water runoff after the proposal would be completed than it currently has. Site B would have the same hard surface area that it currently has. The north half of Site B would drain to Excelsior Boulevard and the north Kinsel Park water quality pond. The water quality ponds would treat all of the hard surface areas of Site C. A wetland buffer would help ensure the water quality of Glen Lake.

Mr. Schultenover asked if the hard surface calculations include below level parking. Gustafson explained that any area that is not green, that does not infiltrate water, is included in the hard surface calculation. Rooftops and parking lots are included.

Colleran explained that the tree preservation ordinance allows tree removal within a twenty-foot perimeter of any building and a ten-foot perimeter around any driveway or parking area. There was an original site survey that listed the

trees on the site plan. Colleran explained the types and locations of trees on the site. Minimizing the impact to the critical root zones of the trees on the adjacent property would be a priority. The final landscape plan would be submitted for final review. Tree mitigation and final landscaping for the site would be approved by staff.

Colleran stated that the proposal does not meet the standard to require an environmental assessment worksheet. Relocating the transmission lines may trigger the need for an environmental assessment worksheet, but the plans have not been finalized enough for that to be determined yet.

Cheleen clarified that water inside underground parking would drain into the sanitary water system. Gustafson agreed and added that a drain located outside the doors would connect with the storm sewer.

Chair Hart stated that the flood zone fill would be addressed at a future meeting.

Chair Hart explained that if the zoning is a less intense use than the guide plan, it is considered to be in conformance with the comprehensive guide plan. Mr. Schultenover understood.

Lon Anderson, 5404 Mayview Road, stated that he has lived in Glen Lake over 10 years and Minnetonka more than 29 years. He has known the applicant for over 30 years. He was the architect for the Tower Hill development on Highway 7. He questioned what the architectural style of the Glen Lake project would be. He stated that:

- None of the buildings in Glen Lake are over two stories tall.
- Stone and stucco are being proposed rather than brick.
- He questioned the precedent being set by rezoning an R-1 district to an R-5 district.
- The design should reflect the existing zoning, comprehensive plan, and ordinances without variances.
- A four-story building would be too high.
- The infrastructure could not support an R-5 density.

Blair Bury, 5531 Eden Prairie Road, was born and raised in the area for 46 years. He supported the project, in its concept form, in its entirety. He stated that:

- He has confidence that the engineers would work out the drainage issues.

- He appreciated being notified of the project by the newspaper and notices from the city and the developer.
- Creating a comprehensive plan, rather than attempting it piece meal is wise.
- It would complement and support other businesses in Glen Lake.
- It has nice curb appeal.
- The buildings look nice.
- The lake is a nice natural resource that would be more easily enjoyed with the addition of the trails.
- He would appreciate more water in the lake. His property has lake access. In another 25 or 30 years, the area would be stagnant and non-vibrant.
- He felt the project would help the city and the Glen Lake area.

Laura Ronbeck, 13801 Kinsel Road, has lived in the Glen Lake area since 1977. She was a member of the Hennepin County Glen Lake Task Force. There were people opposed to the development of the golf course. She listed many projects that residents were opposed to, but accepted when completed. She stated that:

- People are naturally skeptical of change.
- It hit her when she walked into the new grocery store that Glen Lake is getting outdated. It needs a major face lift now.
- In order to maintain property values, Glen Lake must be attractive and functional.
- There is a huge silent majority supportive of the project.
- Traffic is currently a concern and is not pedestrian friendly. The project would hopefully correct the existing problems. A traffic light at Woodhill Road and Excelsior Boulevard and new trails and sidewalks would be beneficial.
- She supported the project.

Ann Malm-Hossfeld, 14616 Glendale Street, appreciated her letter being included in the agenda packet. She does not believe this change would be a good one for the neighborhood. She stated:

- She is not against gradual, slow change.
- Changing to the higher density would be radical.
- The plans do not sound like integration.
- The plan would wipe out structures, cultures, and community and drop in new pieces.

- She is very afraid of the loss of Glen Lake as it is now and the scale of the project.
- The proposal would set a precedent for change in density and height of buildings.
- She was concerned that the project would make it easier for the west side of Glen Lake to increase its density and height of buildings.
- It would promote two-lane and four-lane streets.
- The lake has loons. Loons do not want to nest near houses. The proposal may impact the wildlife and loons.
- The setback variances locate the buildings too close to the road. It would not be a comfortable environment. It would create the look of canyons.

Gene Maurice Ansoladehere, 14901 Glendale Street, supported the project. He heard about it 14 months ago. The developer has worked extremely hard to accommodate and create an extensive plan. He appreciated the grocery store and the shops. Initially he had some reservations, but there are more positives than negatives. He supported it.

Richard Urban, 5625 Eden Prairie Road, stated that he is concerned with maintaining the quality of the lake. Studies done in 1988 and 1989 showed the lake was sensitive because it is a run-off fed lake, not a spring fed lake. Foot traffic is not very well supported. He encouraged parameters being added to the project to enhance the safety of foot traffic.

Paul Pudlitzke, 5107 Woodhill Road, supported the project. He has lived in the area nine years and noticed the area becoming quieter from a retail stand point. He is concerned with traffic on Woodhill Road. The rate of speed is unbelievable. Sidewalks are needed for the safety of children. He hoped the proposal would address the traffic issues.

In response to Mr. Pudlitzke's question, Olson clarified that the property taxes of residences in the area had not decreased, but older retail businesses had experienced depreciation in value.

Mr. Pudlitzke supports the area businesses the best he can. The lack of holiday spirit of the business owners is evident. The redevelopment and revitalization is a good thing. He currently works in a building Mr. Wartman developed. He was confident Mr. Wartman would work diligently to be a good neighbor. The traffic issue is a much larger issue than adding one stop light.

Randall Neal, 14203 Glen Lake Drive, townhouse resident adjacent to Site C, stated that the artist's renditions of the project appear attractive. He was open and receptive to making things better, but he looked for reasonable change. The project was presented as an all or nothing deal. The building in Site C would be too large. It needs to be scaled down.

Chair Hart recessed and reconvened the meeting.

***Allendorf moved, second by Cheleen, to continue the planning commission meeting until 11:30 p.m.***

***Allendorf, Brandt, Cheleen, Dahl, Frisque, and Hart voted yes. Britain was absent. Motion carried.***

David Guffan, 15108 Excelsior Boulevard, supported the project. He agreed that it would be a change, but he saw it as a positive one. He attends meetings at the Alano society. He was hopeful that Alano would be able to find another place.

Robert Kinsman, 5230 Glenview Drive, has lived in Minnetonka for 57 years. He was very in favor of the project. He accepts the change and is in favor of it.

Joan Hiller, 5638 Glen Avenue, stated that her letter is included in the agenda packet. She would like to see reasonable change, but the proposal would be too much for the area. The density would be too high. She has lived in Glen Lake for five years. She would like to see some growth and updates, but the proposal's density would be too high. There are enough condominiums in the area. The area may become so dense that it would become a self-contained commercial unit. A majority of the neighbors support doing something, but if this is the only option, she could not support it.

Linda Barros, 14220 Brunsvold Road, asked if the property on the north and west sides of Glen Lake are on the city's green space preservation list. Olson explained that city staff designated areas of the city that were desired to be purchased and maintained as green space. Site C was designated as a medium priority to maintain as green space. The city did not have enough funds to purchase some properties ranked as high priority. When development occurs, the city tries to preserve as much green space as possible.

Ms. Barros was concerned what would provide a buffer between the park and the proposed condominiums. She was not opposed to change. The area does need a face lift. A two-story building would be appropriate, but not a four-story building that would appear to be six stories on Site C.

Mark Buller, 5524 Mayview Road, has resided there 20 years. He stated that:

- It is nice to have a grocery store back.
- He was glad the existing businesses would stay in Site B.
- He objected to the condominium building on Site C being so tall. He wished it would not be there at all. He sees condominiums from his house now. He does not want a precedent set to encourage more condominiums.
- Addressing the traffic issues should be part of the plan. The detours routed traffic through Glen Lake. The motorists will still cut through his neighborhood.

Keith Weigel, 14209 Glen Lake Drive, stated that:

- The building on Site C would be inappropriate in size. It does not seem right to put the tall condominium building next to two single family homes and a park.
- He appreciated the trail and sidewalk comments. He suggested buffers for the park. To him, the best buffer would be to deny the variance.
- It would make more sense to keep the open space next to the park rather than the conservation easement next to the condominium.
- He appreciated the opportunity to speak, the planning staff's willingness to answer his questions, and the commissioners volunteering their time.
- He hoped that commissioners would reconsider parts of Site C and Site A.
- He asked for the square footage of the proposed building on Site C. Olson was waiting to hear back from the architect in charge of the proposed building. Mr. Weigel did not think the proposal's number of units was an adequate decrease for a compromise. The entire city needs to be considered.
- A precedent needs to be considered for the R-5 zoning district. This would be the first time there would be R-5, high density, lake shore property. When the economic development authority uses tax increment financing and eminent domain, it is a scary proposition for all lake front neighborhoods in the city.
- He appreciated everyone's interest and hoped that discussions would continue.

Wendy Weigel, 14209 Glen Lake Drive, requested that the public hearing remain open for the January meeting since people who came to speak left because of the time.

No additional testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.

Allendorf requested a ~~scale drawing~~ computer generated insertion be completed to provide an accurate view of the proposed building as it would appear on Site C. He was unable to picture a five-story building as it related to the rest of the property. Allendorf suggested tabling action until the January meeting when the tax increment financing and food plain alteration rezoning could be reviewed.

Cheleen concurred with Allendorf. He felt that all options would be viable for the community. Site C's building would be large. He requested lowering the size of the building be considered and see if the tax increment financing would assist with that goal. The whole idea is a positive one. He supported it and favored spending more time on it.

Chair Hart agreed that a decrease in the number of Site C's units to 30 could be considered. Site A and Site B are pretty good. She favored a unified plan approach. The size of the structure on Site C is an issue.

Cheleen understood that each application is looked at separately. There would be no precedent set to allow high density housing on lake fronts.

Frisque was curious if the project would be economically feasible without the use of eminent domain on the Zachman property.

Dahl was concerned with pedestrian safety.

Allendorf asked if an overall pedestrian safety study was going to be completed. Olson confirmed that one would be done.

***Cheleen moved, second by Allendorf, to table action on the items for the three-phase redevelopment project for the easterly part of Glen Lake for Thomas Wartman, consisting of condominiums and retail/service commercial and restaurants until the January 12, 2005 meeting minutes.***

***Allendorf, Brandt, Cheleen, Dahl, Frisque, and Hart voted yes. Britain was absent. Motion carried.***

9. ADJOURNMENT

*Cheleen moved, second by Brandt, to adjourn the meeting at 11:35 p.m.  
Motion carried unanimously.*

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