

**MINNETONKA PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES**

JANUARY 6, 2011

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

Commissioners A. Thomas, Adams, Daeges, Lehman, Magney, Sjeklocha, and Cheleen were present.

Staff members present: Community Development Director Julie Wischnack, City Planner Loren Gordon, Principal Planner Susan Thomas, Planner Jeff Thomson, Planning Technician Stephanie Scott-Sims, Natural Resources Manager Jo Colleran, Project Engineer Nate Stanley, and SRF Traffic Consultant Craig Vaughn.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA: The agenda was approved as submitted with additions provided in the change memo dated January 6, 2011.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: December 16, 2010

Lehman moved, second by A. Thomas, to approve the December 16, 2010, meeting minutes as submitted.

A. Thomas, Adams, Daeges, Lehman, Magney, Sjeklocha, and Cheleen voted yes. Motion carried.

5. REPORT FROM STAFF

Gordon briefed the commission on land use applications considered by the city council at its meeting of December 20, 2010:

- Adopted the ordinance concerning amendments to the city code regarding subdivision requirements.
- Adopted the resolution approving the conditional use permit concerning the International Spanish Language Academy at 5959 Shady Oak Road.
- Tabled action on a resolution approving an amendment of an original condition of approval regarding the location and order of grave sites that can be sold by the Groveland Cemetery Association.

Gordon announced that the third village center public workshop will be held next Tuesday, January 11, 2011, at the Minnetonka High School reading room at 6 p.m. Public comment on the preferred draft concept for the Highway 7 village center will be taken.

The next planning commission meeting will be January 20, 2011 at 6:30 p.m.

6. REPORT FROM PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS: None

7. PUBLIC HEARINGS: CONSENT AGENDA

No item was removed from the consent agenda for discussion or separate action.

Adams moved, second by Sjeklocha, to approve the item listed on the consent agenda as recommended in the staff report as follows:

A. Time extension of floodplain setback variances for the construction of a home at 4124 Skyview Road. (08011.10a)

Approve the twelve-month time extension.

A. Thomas, Adams, Daeges, Lehman, Magney, Sjeklocha, and Cheleen voted yes. Motion carried and the item on the consent agenda was approved as submitted.

Adams noted that the project has already had one extension. He asked what the policy is regarding time extensions. S. Thomas explained that there is no written policy. Staff has traditionally requested review of an application after three years from the initial approval.

8. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Conditional use permit to operate a retail store in an existing office building at 11320 Minnetonka Mills Road. (10039.10a)

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

Scott-Sims reported. She recommended approval of the application based on the findings and subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.

The public hearing was opened. No testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.

Sjeklocha moved, second by Adams, to recommend that the city council adopt the resolution on pages A13—A15 of the staff report. This resolution approves a conditional use permit for a retail shop of not more than 1,450 square feet at 11320 Minnetonka Mills Road. Approval is based on the finding that the proposal meets the required conditional use permit standards and is subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Prior to issuance of a building permit, record this resolution with the county. A copy of the recorded resolution must be returned to the city.
- 2) Any retail use of the space must be limited in scope and must compliment the office tenants located in the building.
- 3) The retail use must comply with the city's sign regulations.
- 4) The retail use may not result in any exterior building modifications, including truck docks, separate entrances, freestanding signs or overnight truck parking; and
- 5) The retail use may not exceed more than 1,450 square feet.
- 6) The city council may reasonably add or revise conditions to address any future unforeseen problems.
- 7) 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.
- 8) The applicant must agree to the above conditions in writing.

A. Thomas, Adams, Daeges, Lehman, Magney, Sjeklocha, and Cheleen voted yes. Motion carried.

B. Items concerning a 6-lot subdivision of the existing property at 4625 Highland Road. (10034.10a)

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

Thomson reported. He recommended approval of the application based on the findings and subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.

Stanley explained how engineering staff looks for ways to improve safety and traffic. When development occurs, the site and area around the site are looked at. The intersection of Highland Road and Highland Lane has been identified as a potential problem for many years. It has been the city's long-standing position that when the property at 4625 Highland Road is developed that it would be the city's opportunity to improve the intersection. Part of the problem is the poor layout of the connection of Highland Lane and Highland Road. Stanley described the connection and the difficulty a driver has navigating the area safely. Another issue is the non-standard traffic control. The stop sign on Highland Road is routinely disobeyed and creates a false sense of security.

Stanley provided photos of previous intersection skews and what was done to mitigate each problem.

Stanley explained that city staff and Vaughn considered a road reconfiguration that the neighbors supported to make a T-shaped intersection. It was determined that the environmental impact would be too extreme for the situation. It would require additional storm water management, tree loss, grading, and large retaining wall.

Vaughn stated that he performed the traffic operations study and field observations for the site. His slides went over the traffic operations analysis and comments regarding the geometric conditions at the two key intersections, Highland Road and Highland Lane and Highland Road and Lloyds Drive. He provided current traffic data and trip generations for the area. The two key intersections work well during peak hours with minimal side-street delay. The proposed development would generate approximately four morning peak-hour trips and six evening peak-hour trips. Access to the site would be by a new cul-de-sac roadway from Highland Road.

Vaughn noted that Highland Lane intersects Highland Road at a severely skewed angle which impacts motorists' sightlines. Vegetation southwest of the intersection obstructs driver sightlines from the side street. The current traffic control is not typical and creates a false sense of security. The current stopping-sight distance is on the edge of being acceptable. The side-street stop lines are inadequate. There is a north-bound stop condition which should help that situation, but people north bound tend to roll through the intersection.

Vaughn and staff reviewed multiple concept plan alternatives to mitigate the deficiencies. Two concept alternatives were put forward in the project documentation: realigned Highland Lane traffic-circle alternative and realigned

Highland Lane T-intersection alternative. He described each concept and the impacts and cost for each.

Vaughn explained that an all-way stop condition could be implemented if the approaching roadways leading into an intersection average 300 vehicles per hour over an 8-hour period. Another reason would be if all of the roadways leading into an intersection were of equal volume. Neither of those situations exists for this site.

Thomson explained that a street improvement for the area would be a separate, city project. Comments would be taken tonight. The developer would be responsible for dedication of the right of way and providing storm water improvements for the intersection. Staff is recommending approval of the proposed development.

Lehman asked for thoughts regarding speed control for Highland Road. Stanley responded that the city commonly receives requests for speed humps. It has been found that drivers slow for a hump, but accelerate once over it to make up for slowing down. Speed humps have been used in one area and property owners tell staff that drivers will slow when approaching the hump, but can hear vehicles accelerate once over the hump. Engineering may perform a speed study for an area to verify that speed is an issue and consider options including geometric improvements that include narrowing or widening of roadways or defining the edge of a roadway.

Lehman asked what would happen if the development would not proceed. Stanley responded that staff strives to make safety improvements whenever an opportunity arises. The intersection had one accident in ten years. Unless the area took a turn for the worst, staff would wait to act until the site is developed.

A. Thomas asked what would happen if the project would be approved, but not the street improvement. Stanley answered that development of the site allows the city to negotiate dedication of right of way for the city to complete improvements at this time. It would be a disservice to the community and opportunity lost to improve safety if a street improvement would not be done at the time the site would be developed.

A. Thomas asked for the width of Highland Road. Stanley explained that it changed in different parts of the road.

A. Thomas asked if the entirety of Highland Road would be striped. Vaughn responded that striping would be recommended only along the curve.

Sjeklocha questioned if the traffic study took into account other developable areas. Thomson indicated that it is very rare to do a traffic study for a residential subdivision; however, this study did take other developable lots into account.

Sjeklocha asked how a traffic study determines the number of trips a proposal would generate. Vaughn explained the national, standard guidelines used.

In response to Sjeklocha's request, Vaughn explained the traffic pattern and pointed out the intersection where vehicles roll through. The south-bound direction does not have to stop. The Highland Lane residents were not rolling through the stop, although they do have the expectation that drivers on Highland Road are stopping.

Sjeklocha asked if the cul-de-sac located 125 feet from the intersection would be normal road development. Thomson answered affirmatively. There would be a stop sign where the cul-de-sac accesses Highland Road.

Adams noted that the intersection issue is not part of the resolution or something that the planning commission needs to act on. Thomson agreed.

Adams asked why access to the subdivision would be located on Highland Road rather than Highland Bluff. Thomson explained the two options. Access to Highland Bluff would create an 800-foot cul-de-sac. Adams thought access from the south would save a few trees.

Adams asked Thomson to clarify if economic viability is part of the commission's purview. Thomson responded that it is not. Commissioners review the land-use application and proposed development of the site in accordance with city ordinances. Property values, marketability, and economic climate are not part of the planning commission's decision. The developer could address neighbors' concerns.

Chair Cheleen asked if the sight line and street would be improved, then could the city install a three-way stop. Vaughn stated that an all-way stop condition could be done at the intersection. It would technically go against guidance provided by the Minnesota Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Conditions. That would open up liability considerations. All-way stops can impact travel times, enforcement costs, and fuel consumption.

Chair Cheleen asked if the McMansion policy would have jurisdiction on the proposed houses. Thomson responded that it would not apply since the proposal

would be a new subdivision with its own public street and there would be no variances needed.

Chair Cheleen asked for the definition of a “NURP” pond. Thomson provided that it stands for “National Urban Runoff Program” pond.

Chair Cheleen welcomed comments regarding the roads that would be passed on to the city council and clarified that the planning commission acts only on whether to recommend the subdivision to the city council.

Corey Lepper, representing Vinehill Partners, applicant, was present with Jim Lane, the property owner. Mr. Lepper stated that his goal is to minimize the impact to natural resources, storm water retention or detention, traffic, and neighborhood character. He chose the least-intrusive option. He was present to answer questions.

Jim Lane, co-owner of the property, stated that the property has been in his family since 1938. The Highland Bluffs property to the south was originally part of the 12 acres owned by his parents. The proposal consists of 3.7 acres. He and his brother have worked closely with Mr. Lepper to preserve the character of the property. The natural features include many trees he and his brother planted.

The public hearing was opened.

Steve Arnold, 15017 Highland Lane, met with engineering staff last week and was disappointed in the close-mindedness to different intersection ideas. He stated that:

- No one in his group of neighbors approved a diagram.
- The present situation is okay because drivers crawl through the intersection.
- A “T” intersection would make it easier to see vehicles traveling from the south on Highland Road. Stanley told him the state would object to his suggestion. It would involve complications with a state right of way.
- Mr. Arnold asked if the developer is contributing to the improvement.
- He found it interesting that everything is called an “improvement” when he does not think it is an improvement at all.
- An ideal solution would be for the city to acquire right of way from the property across Highland Road and take a corner off so a driver could see before turning.

Jan Gauger, 15108 Highland Lane, was mainly concerned with the intersection. She stated that:

- She brought the issue of a stop sign to the city council 30 years ago.
- She is a little disappointed that the road and the development are not interlaced. She understood that two decisions would be made. That was pretty clear in her mind. She asked the chair if she needed to go directly to the city council with the street concerns.

Chair Cheleen clarified that one of the reasons that the street improvement is being considered at this time is because it could be done at the same time as the grading and construction for the proposed development. The developer and property owner are willing to give a portion of Lot 1 to the city to make the improvement to the road. The street improvement is contingent on the approval of the development. The planning commission is not approving the street improvement, but comments will help guide the city council's decision.

Ms. Gauger continued:

- The neighborhood has had one meeting with the developer in April of last year. There were no details. It did not give enough indication of where the proposal was headed. She has not seen specific lot designs before this meeting. Numerous neighborhood meetings were held for the Braeburn Development.

Tom Becker, 14909 Highland Lane, asked if the Highland Lane residents would be assessed for the street improvement. Thomson responded that there would be no special assessments.

Mr. Becker stated that he is very familiar with how traffic ignores the stop sign on Highland Road. Drivers creep up to the stop sign and constantly go through it. The biggest issue is traveling south on Highland Road and turning onto Highland Lane. It is a blind corner. The problem is not getting off of Highland Lane; it is trying to get on. He suggested clearing the foliage near the stop sign to make it more visible. In the amount of time his son waited for the school bus, a police officer pulled over two vehicles for running the stop sign. It happens every day, all day long. It has more to do with drivers ignoring the stop sign than the configuration of the road.

Gary Gauger, 15108 Highland Lane, stated that he has lived there since 1975. His wife submitted a petition to get a stop sign installed. Unless the sight line can be fixed so vehicles would be visible when southbound on Highland Road, it would still be a dangerous intersection. The first version to straighten Highland Lane was pretty extreme. He favored straightening the road and keeping the stop sign. The south-bound traffic making a left onto Highland Lane is the worst. He usually has 3 to 4 close calls each summer. The land was formerly horse pasture so the trees were not as large as they are today. The sight lines became much worse over the last 10 years to 15 years.

Scott Stillman, 14916 Highland Lane, stated that his main concern is the speed at which vehicles travel on Highland Road near the bus stop. The children wait for the bus at a very busy intersection. The stop sign is relied on to at least slow down the traffic if not stop it. A three-way stop would provide a greater sense of security for the children living on Highland Lane. He requested a three-way-stop-controlled intersection.

Randy Grunow, 4617 Highland Road, stated that the stop sign is critical. Motorists travel on the road very fast. Some do stop sometimes. When the weather conditions are bad, numerous vehicles end up in his driveway and yard. His mailbox has been taken down several times. Speed would increase even more without the stop sign. He has four children who wait at the bus stop. He supported an all-way stop to help solve the speed issue.

Jeff Forsythe, 4701 Highland Road, asked how comfortable the developer is that he would be able to sell the houses after clearing the land. He wanted to see the property used as well, but not be cleared and stay vacant. Mr. Lepper agreed the environment is challenging. He reviewed the building climate for each year since 2008. Mr. Lepper said that 2010 was a good year for building and selling houses. He has 3 homes under construction right now in Braeburn Woods. All of the lots have sold. He is optimistic.

Catherine Callahan, 15118 Williston Lane, was curious whether a fewer number of lots had been considered. It seemed like it would be pretty tight to cram six homes in the space. She raised kids in the neighborhood. She questioned if the site would be clear cut or developed as sold. The proposal has been rushed without a lot of chance for public input. Chair Cheleen responded that the minimum lot size is 22,000 square feet. Every proposed lot is larger than that standard. Mr. Lepper noted that only the road and right of way would be cleared initially. Trees would be taken down when a house design has been finalized.

Lou Forsythe, 4701 Highland Road, stated that she can see when driving, but when her daughter turns right onto Highland Road she is unable to see because the snow is stacked too high. It is very concerning. The residents who live in the proposed houses would have the same issue.

No additional testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.

Chair Cheleen asked Thomson to explain what the planning commission is voting on and what the process is moving forward. Thomson obliged. The planning commission's recommendation regarding the plat application will be reviewed by the city council to make the final decision. The city council is tentatively scheduled to review the plat at its January 31, 2011 meeting. Neighbors may submit additional comments by Friday, January 28, 2011, to be included in the city council packet.

Chair Cheleen asked for clarification regarding when the decision to do the street improvement or not would be determined. Stanley explained that there is no set schedule for street improvements. The traffic study furnished the recommendation to move forward with the cul-de-sac when development would be done in an effort to minimize construction impact to the area. If the proposal does not move forward, then whether to move forward with the street improvement would be discussed at that time. A schedule has not been determined at this time.

Chair Cheleen asked if staff would have a better idea after the city council meeting's decision on January 31, 2011. Wischnack explained that the street improvement would not require separate city council action. Street improvement projects are approved as a large group one time each year. The city council will read the comments and concerns and discuss the potential street improvement.

Chair Cheleen asked if there would be notification provided for a street improvement. Wischnack answered affirmatively. She invited those present to visit the city's website which is updated regularly. New information is posted within a day of staff receiving the information.

Sjeklocha commented that there is one connection between the proposed plat and the road right of way of Lot 1. Thomson confirmed that the right of way may or may not be used. The proposed subdivision would anticipate the intersection improvement in terms of its layout and the land needed to do it.

Lehman noted that city councilmembers watch the planning commission meetings. He appreciated all of the comments. He was concerned about

comments that stated that the process was not adequate. Thomson explained that staff performed the required notification process with the addition of the neighborhood meeting. Notices were sent to neighbors with information and directions to visit the website. After a couple revisions, the meeting was rescheduled a couple times. The neighbors were notified again of the public hearing which is the primary mechanism for the city to receive public feedback.

Wischnack added that neighborhood meetings were not conducted prior to a couple years ago. This particular application had multiple notifications. A typical application would have one notification sent to surrounding properties. The city is not required to have a neighborhood meeting. More than the normal amount of notifications and meetings has been done for this project. Lehman favored going above and beyond minimum requirements. He encouraged staff to continue to do so. Wischnack noted that individuals may meet with staff and experts individually.

Lehman requested that staff keep in mind comments regarding the stop sign not being effective. Speed bumps or rumble strips before a stop sign may be considered. Stanley responded that all safety options would be considered.

Sjeklocha asked what the sightlines would look like from a driver's point of view. Vaughn explained that he would be able to provide that image by using Google Earth, but images for the area are not available. He did take photographs that he did not have with him. Sjeklocha clarified that she wants to compare the views now with what the proposal would provide. She directed that information be considered and provided to the city council.

Chair Cheleen asked if the old easement would have to be vacated. Thomson answered in the negative. The neighbors at any time could request a vacation of the easement.

Chair Cheleen said that traveling south on Highland Road is difficult. He asked if there would be enough of a sightline for drivers to see vehicles making the left-hand turn. He requested that be looked at before the city council meeting. Stanley confirmed that part of the goal of moving the intersection down would be to bring the street around the corner so the approaching driver would see the vehicle traveling around the corner with enough time to safely make a left-hand turn.

Adams moved, second by Lehman, to recommend that the city council adopt the resolution provided in the change memo dated January 6, 2011 which grants preliminary approval to the Rabbit Hill subdivision, date stamped December 3, 2010. Approval is based on the following findings:

- 1) The proposal meets the required standards and ordinances for a preliminary plat.

Approval is subject to the following conditions:

- 1) The subdivision must be developed in substantial conformance with the following plans, unless modified by the conditions below:
 - Preliminary Plat and Site Plan date stamped December 3, 2010
 - Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan date stamped December 20, 2010
 - Grading, Drainage and Erosion Control Plan date stamped December 20, 2010
 - Utility Plan date stamped December 3, 2010
- 2) Prior to final plat approval, complete the following:
 - a. Show the following on the final plat:
 - (1) A minimum 10-foot wide drainage and utility easements adjacent to the public right-of-way(s) and minimum 7-foot wide drainage and utility easements along all other lot lines.
 - (2) Utility easements over existing or proposed public utilities, as determined by the city engineer. Additionally, a drainage and utility easement must be provided over a water main connection to the existing stub in the Highland Bluff subdivision.
 - (3) Drainage and utility easements over wetlands, floodplains, and stormwater ponds, as determined by the city engineer.
 - (4) Right-of-way dedication on the north east corner of the lot for the Highland Road and Highland Lane intersection as outlined in the traffic study.
 - b. If the developer is petitioning the city to construct the public improvements, the city council must order the improvements.
- 3) The following items must be submitted to the city before the city releases the final plat:

- a. An electronic CAD file of the final plat in microstation or DXF.
- b. The following documents must be prepared by an attorney knowledgeable in the area of real estate and must be submitted for the city attorney's approval:
 - (1) Title evidence that is current within thirty days before release of the final plat.
 - (2) Stormwater pond maintenance agreement establishing the responsibility for maintaining required drainage ponding and any other required drainage improvements approved by the City. Maintenance will include, but not be limited to, the periodic removal of sedimentation at the base of the pond and any adjacent drainage ditches, keeping a vegetative cover within the basins, ditches and pond, and removing any blockage of the swale or culvert that may impede the drainage of the site, as approved with the grading and building permits.
 - (3) Restrictive covenants to be recorded against the individual lots with the plat. The covenants must include the conditions that have not been met as of the release of the plat.

These documents must be recorded with the final plat, and a drawing of any easement must be attached to the easement deed.
- c. Pay a park dedication fee of \$30,000.
- d. Any other requirements included with final plat approval.
- 4) A grading permit is required. Unless authorized by appropriate staff, no site work may begin until a complete grading permit applicant has been submitted, reviewed by staff, and approved.
 - a. The following must be submitted for the grading permit to be considered complete.
 - (1) Final grading, stormwater, utility, drainage and erosion control plans must be submitted for staff approval.

- The new street must meet minimum city engineering standards.
 - Maximum grade of the new street at the intersection with Highland Road must not exceed 3% for 30 feet.
 - The water main pipe must be extended to connect to the existing stub in the Highland Bluff subdivision to the south.
 - A fire hydrant is required at the connection to the existing water main in the Highland Bluff subdivision.
- (2) Individual letters of credit or cash escrow for 125% of a bid cost or 150% of an estimated cost to comply with grading permit, landscaping requirements, and to restore the site. The developer may submit one itemized letter of credit, if approved by staff. The city will not release or reduce the letters of credit or cash escrow until work has been completed according to the plans approved by the city.
- (3) If the developer is constructing any public improvements, the following must be submitted for staff review and approval:
- (a) Final street and utility plans.
 - (b) A signed agreement with the city. This agreement must guarantee that the developer will complete all public improvements and meet all city requirements.
 - (c) A letter of credit or cash escrow in the amount of 125% of a bid cost or 150% of an estimated cost of the improvements.
 - (d) The city will only reduce or release the letter of credit or cash escrow upon receipt of as-built drawings and a letter certifying that the streets and utilities have been completed according to the plans approved by the city.
- (4) An engineering/utility inspection fee.

- (5) Payment for traffic signs and installation, as required by the city engineer.
 - (6) A construction management plan. The plan must be in a city approved format and must outline minimum site management practices and penalties for non-compliance.
- b. Prior to issuance of a grading permit:
- (1) Install a temporary rock driveway, erosion control, tree and wetland protection fencing for staff inspection. These items must be maintained throughout the course of construction.
 - (2) The final plat must be released by the city and filed with Hennepin County for recording.
- 5) Prior to issuance of a building permit for any of the lots within the development:
- a. Submit the following for items staff review and approval:
- (1) A construction management plan. This plan must be in a city approved format and outline minimum site management practices and penalties for non-compliance.
 - (2) Final grading and tree preservation plan for the lot. The grading for each lot must be located within the grading limit indicated on the preliminary grading plan. City staff may approve adjustments to the grading limits only if the revised grading does not have any additional impact to the critical root zone of adjacent trees and does not remove any high priority trees indicated for preservation. The plan must also:
 - (a) comply with the preliminary grading plan as depicted on the preliminary plat;
 - (b) must preserve trees designated for preservation at the time of preliminary plat approval;
 - (c) show sewer and water services to minimize impact to any significant trees. No trees may be removed for

installation of services. One set of new services must be installed.

- (3) A tree mitigation plan. The plan must meet minimum mitigation requirements as outlined in the ordinance.
 - (4) Submit cash escrow in the amount to be determined by city staff. This escrow must be accompanied by a document prepared by the city attorney and signed by the builder and property owner. Through this document the builder and property owner will acknowledge: (1) the property will be brought into compliance within 48 hours of notification of a violation of the construction management plan, other conditions of approval, or city code standards; and (2) if compliance is not achieved, the city will use any or all of the escrow dollars to correct any erosion and/or grading problems.
- b. Submit the following documents:
- (1) A recorded copy of the preliminary plat, all required easements, stormwater maintenance agreement, and restrictive covenants.
 - (2) A letter from the surveyor stating that boundary and lot stakes have been installed as required by ordinance.
 - (3) A letter of credit or cash escrow in the amount of 150% of an estimated cost or 125% of a bid cost to complete required tree mitigation. Individual letters of credit are required for each lot.
- c. Schedule and hold a preconstruction meeting with engineering, planning, and natural resources staff.
- d. Install a temporary rock driveway, erosion control, tree protection and wetland protection fencing for each lot. These items must be maintained throughout the course of construction.
- e. Pay a hookup fee for sanitary sewer and water.
- f. Driveway grades must not exceed 10%.

- g. Water services must be 1-1/2" and sanitary sewer services must be 6".
- 6) Notwithstanding the requirements outlined above, all lots and structures within the development are subject to the all R-1 zoning standards. In addition:
- a. Lowest floor elevation must be a minimum of 2 feet above the designated floodplain elevation.
 - b. Houses within the development must be protected with 13D automatic fire sprinkler systems if:
 - (1) Access to the property on which the house is being constructed is via a private roadway;
 - (2) Any portion of the first-story walls, as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the house, is more than 150 feet from a public street; or
 - (3) The property on which the house is being constructed is located more than 499 feet from a public, looped water line.
- 7) During construction, the streets must be kept free of debris and sediment.
- 8) The city must approve the final plat within one year of preliminary approval or receive a written application for a time extension or the preliminary approval will be void.

A. Thomas, Adams, Daeges, Lehman, Magney, Sjeklocha, and Cheleen voted yes. Motion carried.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Sjeklocha moved, second by Adams, to adjourn the meeting at 8:30 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

By: _____

Lois T. Mason
Planning Secretary