

**Unapproved  
Minnetonka Planning Commission  
Minutes**

**Aug. 16, 2018**

**1. Call to Order**

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

**2. Roll Call**

Commissioners Sewall, Henry, Knight, Powers, and Kirk were present.

Staff members present: Community Development Director Julie Wischnack, City Planner Loren Gordon, Assistant City Planner Susan Thomas, Senior Planner Ashley Cauley, and Natural Resource Manager Jo Colleran.

**3. Approval of Agenda:** The agenda was approved as submitted with additional comments provided in the change memo dated Aug. 16, 2018.

**4. Approval of Minutes:** Aug. 2, 2018

***Knight moved, second by Powers, to approve the Aug. 2, 2018 meeting minutes as submitted.***

***Sewall, Henry, Knight, Powers, and Kirk 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 Aug. 6, 2018:

- Adopted a resolution approving a conditional use permit with a wetland setback variance for an accessory apartment on Hillside Circle.
- Introduced an ordinance amendment to amend the master development plan for a two-level parking ramp at 12501 Whitewater Drive.

Gordon thanked commissioners who went on the bus tour for planning and economic development authority commissioners Aug. 9, 2018.

The next planning commission meeting is scheduled to be held Sept. 6, 2018.

A joint city council and commissions study session is scheduled to be held Sept. 4, 2018.

**6. Report from Planning Commission Members**

Powers said that the bus tour was informative and helped provide a sense of the direction the city is heading.

Gordon welcomed Matt Henry to the commission. Henry recommended residents participate in the citizen's academy. He learned a lot from the experience.

**7. Public Hearings: Consent Agenda**

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

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

**A. Conditional use permit for an adult daycare facility within an existing tenant space at 11581 K-Tel Drive.**

Recommend that the city council adopt the attached resolution approving a conditional use permit for Salaama Learning Center, an adult daycare facility, at 11581 K-tel Drive.

***Sewall, Henry, Knight, Powers, and Kirk voted yes. Motion carried and the item on the consent agenda was approved as submitted.***

**8. Public Hearings**

**A. Resolution approving an expansion permit for construction of a detached garage at 3500 Meadow Lane.**

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

Thomas 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.

***Powers moved, second by Henry, to adopt the resolution approving an expansion permit for construction of a detached garage at 3500 Meadow Lane.***

***Sewall, Henry, Knight, Powers, and Kirk voted yes. Motion carried.***

Chair Kirk stated that an appeal of the planning commission's decision must be made in writing to the planning division within 10 days.

**B. Front yard setback variance to construct a detached garage at 5509 Co. Rd. 101.**

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

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

Powers asked if other locations were considered. Cauley explained that the proposed garage would require a variance if located anywhere on the property. The proposed variance seems more reasonable than the alternatives.

Doryan Corona, 5509 County Road 101, applicant, asked that the proposal be approved. It would allow vehicles to be parked in the driveway in the winter.

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

Powers felt the request would be reasonable.

***Sewall moved, second by Powers, to adopt the resolution approving a front yard setback variance for the construction of a detached garage at 5509 County Road 101.***

***Sewall, Henry, Knight, Powers, and Kirk voted yes. Motion carried.***

Chair Kirk stated that an appeal of the planning commission's decision must be made in writing to the planning division within 10 days.

**C. Items concerning a two-phase parking ramp at 12501 Whitewater Drive.**

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

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

In response to Henry's question, Thomas stated that she spoke to the property owner on the north side of Whitewater Drive. He was concerned with the appearance of façade materials. Staff has concerns with the height of the light standards. Staff would work with the applicant to address those concerns. The proposed ramp would be relatively short for the area. Across the street, there will be a seven-story ramp.

Sean Moore with Ryan Companies, applicant, stated that he appreciated the commissioners' consideration. The ratio between office space and user is declining which is driving the need for additional parking.

Powers asked if the ramp would be built to accommodate additional stories in the future. Mr. Moore answered in the negative.

The public hearing was opened.

Jason Miller, part owner of 12500 Whitewater Drive, stated that it is pretty easy to build parking ramps to look good. He was curious to see what the finishes would be on the project. Making it look good will impact the value of his property. His building may have to do something similar in the future.

No testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.

Powers felt that it would be reasonable to require the proposal to be aesthetically consistent with the area in terms of berms and landscaping. He was confident that staff would insist on that.

Chair Kirk asked staff about the trees and landscaping plan. Colleran explained that there is a ring of trees between the road and existing parking area. There are approximately 25 trees located near the west entrance that circle around on the north side to the east entrance of the parking lot. The trees are primarily ash and different types of evergreen, spruce, and pine. Those would all remain. All of the construction would occur south or east or west within the parking area. There should be no impact to the existing vegetation. A condition of approval would require some screening of the first level.

***Powers moved, second by Knight, to recommend that the city council adopt the ordinance amending the existing master development plan on Minnetonka Corporate Center as it pertains to the property at to 12501 Whitewater Drive and a resolution approving final site and building plans for Phase One of a two-phase parking ramp for 12501 Whitewater Drive.***

***Sewall, Henry, Knight, Powers, and Kirk voted yes. Motion carried.***

The city council is tentatively scheduled to review this item at its meeting on Aug. 27, 2018.

## **9. Other Business**

### **A. Concept plan for redevelopment of the property at 14317 Excelsior Blvd. Items concerning a two-phase parking ramp at 12501 Whitewater Drive.**

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

Thomas reported. Staff recommends commissioners provide comments and feedback on the identified key issues and any other issues commissioners deem appropriate. The discussion is intended to assist the developer with future direction that may lead to the preparation of more detailed development plans.

Mike Waldo, representing Ron Clark Construction, applicant, stated that:

- The proposal would be three stories of residential housing.
- Rooftops are needed to continue to make the area vibrant.
- The area needs to be filled in.

- He is available for questions.

Tim Whitten, of Whitten and Associates, representing the applicant, stated that:

- The first goal is to make it work with three stories.
- Retail would generate more traffic and the need for more parking areas.
- The proposal would be a 60-unit, market-rate apartment building. It would not be as big of a building as a typical 60-unit apartment building.
- The Gold Nugget parking entrance is now awkward. Surface parking would be level with Excelsior Blvd. There would be 66-enclosed-parking spaces. The proposal would have more than one parking space per bedroom.
- The proposal would add a sidewalk along Stewart Lane.

Powers asked why the applicant opposed retail on the bottom floor with residential housing on the top floors. Mr. Waldo stated that 10 percent of locations with retail on the bottom floor and multi-family residential housing on the top floors work in the twin cities. The area already provides every service that makes sense. Mr. Waldo added that the proposal would create less traffic than a retail use.

Chair Kirk invited those present to provide comments.

Doris Pagelkopf, 14319 Stewart Lane, stated that:

- More of Glen Lake Shores abuts the property than Zvago.
- She is not opposed to an apartment building there. It would be a fine use of the property. Sixty units would be huge. Thirty units would be manageable. She is opposed to the size.
- Glen Lake Shores and Zvago already access Stewart Lane. Sixty more residents accessing Stewart Lane would make driving quite dangerous.
- She encouraged commissioners to drive around the area.
- She questioned the sewer and water studies.

Jim Stroebel, 14319 Stewart Lane, stated that:

- The distance between the curb cuts is about 50 feet. His major concern is safety and the ability of the site to handle additional traffic. Traffic is not a new issue. He suggested doing a formal traffic study now. He found it disturbing that a traffic study would not include public input.
- There are already difficulties with snow removal now.
- He is indifferent to how the property will be developed. His concern is with Stewart Lane. It is being used as a shortcut between Eden Prairie Road and Excelsior Blvd.

Pamela Malley, 14501 Atrium Way, stated that:

- She was concerned with the driveway accessing Woodhill Road. The lanes are being narrowed to allow a bike and walking path. There are two stoplights within a short distance of Woodhill Road and Excelsior Blvd. There would be backups between the stoplights. She questioned why there would have to be a stoplight for this proposal when it was not required before.
- Her condominium association has 84 units, but it has eight acres of land. The density seems to be an issue.

Ann Hossfeld, 14616 Glendale Street, stated that:

- She appreciated the process.
- She was concerned with density of the site and density creep in general.
- She was concerned with the traffic impact on Excelsior Blvd. and Stewart Lane.
- A building with three to four stories and 60 units was not discussed for the area previously. She was not aware of “some plan” that needed filling in. She feared the density creep. She objected to the idea that existing four-story buildings create a precedent. She provided photographs of what existed in 2006. The Oaks, Zvago, and St. Therese have been built since then and are all four stories. The field would be developed and trees removed. This is a commentary on the loss of topography and mature trees.
- Sixty units would be too big. The existing four-story buildings should not be used as a precedent for Glen Lake. She preferred the charming one-story style of development.
- Drivers on Excelsior Blvd. already slow down for traffic waiting for vehicles to turn into the parking lot of The Oaks. She opposed development that would increase density and traffic at the intersection.
- She was interested to hear what the engineers thought of the proposal.

Kathy Wolf, 14319 Stewart Lane, stated that:

- She used to work at The Gold Nugget. She questioned why another multi-unit building would be added to the area. The building would be huge.
- She wants the area to feel like a small-town community. That is what draws people to the area.
- The new restaurant will create more traffic and parking issues.
- She encouraged commissioners to drive Stewart Lane. Delivery trucks parked behind a building are hard to pass.
- She suggested a pharmacy instead.

Pam Bromme, 14319 Stewart Lane, stated that:

- There are a lot of vehicles emptying into one area. That is craziness.
- There would be hardly any green space anymore.

- She questioned if there would be variances.
- The proposed lot is smaller than The Oaks' site. The Oaks' has 54 units.
- She asked if commissioners want Glen Lake to have cement buildings or some green space.

Julie Friedman, 14319 Stewart Lane, stated that:

- She agreed with her neighbors.
- She questioned the impact on stormwater runoff. Her residence is lower than the proposed site.
- She was concerned with the high density, noise pollution, and character and charm of the neighborhood.

Beth Burgan, 14301 Stewart Lane, stated that:

- There are steps on the path that restrict access to Kinsel Park for strollers, bicyclists, and wheelchair users.
- The proposed building would be allowed to have dogs. Right now there are issues with dogs on the path who are not leashed attacking other dogs and a problem with dog owners not cleaning up after their dogs.

No one else chose to speak.

Thomas explained that visioning studies are utilized to picture what could happen on a site. The most recent vision-study plans for the site discuss a building with one to two stories of a commercial/office use and a mixed-use building with retail and multi-family residential units that would be three to four stories in height. The vision study is not a master plan for the site. Wischnack explained that having the study done prior to receiving an application for development shows some concept of change for the parcel.

Gordon explained that review of the concept plan allows communication between the developer and the community. The ideas are preliminary and do not require a large investment. Sometimes the projects do not go forward. A traffic light at Woodhill was previously acknowledged as a possibility. A traffic study would evaluate the past studies.

Chair Kirk explained the formal application process. There would be another public hearing with the planning commission if an application is submitted.

In response to Chair Kirk's question, Thomas stated that it is the decision of the property owner whether to allow pets or not. Colleran said that it is incumbent on each dog owner to pick up after his or her dog.

Sewall was comfortable with high-density residential, a mixed use, or an office use for the site. The market conditions do not allow for an office use. In terms of retail and housing, he guessed the economics would make the residential building taller and mass larger. He was comfortable with the current three-story building. It would be a change for

the neighborhood, but it would be shorter than other buildings in the area. It would provide some transition. Sixty units seems like it would create a lot of vehicles and traffic. He questioned if there is a number of units would please everyone. He suggested the developer see what could be done to reduce the density, but not the footprint or mass of the building. There is a distinction between inconvenience and safety. Safety is important to him. The proposal would make the area more walkable. He suggested considering adding traffic controls such as stop lights at the intersections of Woodhill Road and Excelsior Blvd. and Stewart Lane and Eden Prairie Road. Dog owners should be responsible and be a good neighbor.

Knight has lived in the Glen Lake area for 33 years. He liked being able to pull out of Glenview Drive in the morning. It was much easier when the temporary stoplight was operating at Woodhill Road and Excelsior Blvd. He questioned how noticeable additional vehicle trips would be during peak travel times. He has driven down Stewart Lane. Taking out the hills on Stewart Lane might cause traffic to travel faster. It would have been nice to see a sketch of the view of the proposed buildings from Woodhill Road.

Powers struggled to find how the proposal would add to the character of the Glen Lake area. He first thought that the proposal would be too much. There would not be enough green space or "Glen Lake" in the project.

Henry thought there was not enough green space in the front and other places. He loves the area and it is an asset to the city. The mass of the building would cover the vast majority of the property.

Chair Kirk noted how tired Glen Lake looked prior to redevelopment. Glen Lake is considered a city center. The proposal may create too much mass on the site. There would be a relatively tall building and small setback that would almost create an alley between the two buildings. He struggled with that and how close the building would be located to Stewart Lane. There is some green space, but he questioned if large trees would be able to survive there.

Chair Kirk stated that Stewart Lane is a problem. It is similar to a drive lane in a parking lot. The Woodhill intersection probably deserves a stop light. It is difficult for a pedestrian to cross. He would like the drive lane to continue south, past the two buildings and figure out how to get an access lane into the housing complex from the west. That would keep the traffic off of Stewart Lane and provide a controlled access off of Excelsior Blvd. and provide a greater separation between The Oaks and the proposal. He supports including some affordable units with the proposal for single-bedroom, market-rate apartments. The site should provide a transition from high density to low density residential uses. Putting mixed uses in the area would not provide a transition. The site would not accommodate all front-end parking that would be needed for a retail use. He preferred an all-residential use, lower density, greater separation between the buildings, and more of a buffer with mature trees.

The city council is scheduled to review this item at its meeting on Aug. 27, 2018.



Chair Kirk called for a five-minute recess and reconvened the meeting.

**B. Concept plan for Marsh Run redevelopment at 11650 and 11706 Wayzata Blvd.**

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

Cauley reported. Staff recommends commissioners provide comments and feedback on the identified key issues and any other issues commissioners deem appropriate. The discussion is intended to assist the developer with future direction that may lead to the preparation of more detailed development plans.

Anne Behrendt, chief operating officer at Doran Companies, applicant, introduced Ben Lindau, chief concept architect for the project, and Cody Dietrich, senior development associate. Ms. Behrendt stated that:

- Doran Companies has its development team in house. There are 30 architects on staff. Doran Companies constructs and manages all of its projects. In order to do high-quality projects, Doran Companies controls the whole process.
- Amenities are used to create a sense of community.
- Tony Kuechle was not able to attend the meeting, but he will be the main point of contact person in the future.
- The project is a high-density, residential, six-story apartment building. It would be built on a concrete podium with five stories of wood-frame construction.
- The proposal would very likely have an affordable housing component. The details are being worked out with staff. There would need to be 230 units in order to make the project work economically and have the amenities to make this type of project work.
- The amenity deck would be located on the podium level. She provided an example of a similar building on Interstate 394.
- There would be a number of direct-entry townhomes that would walk out to the street. She provided an example of a project done in Minneapolis, Mill and Main, that has the amenity podium and town homes that walk out to the street.
- The buildings would have important touches that make the buildings stand apart such as having all solid-wood doors, insulation in every wall of the building, ceiling fans in every bedroom, dimmer switches in the kitchens, and acoustical design. There would be a dog run on the property and DNA testing to enforce disposal rules if needed.
- There would be a pool deck, business center, and spa room.
- She provided an example of a building Doran built in Hopkins, The Moline, with similar massing. The applicant would like to host an open house at The Moline.
- The building would contain entertainment suites.

- There would be two entrances. One off of Fairfield Road and one off of Wayzata Blvd.

Mr. Lindau stated that:

- The applicant will work with staff and commissioners to make a vibrant place to live.
- The proposal would be a 230-unit, high-density residential building right on the Interstate 394 corridor. There would be walk-out townhomes to provide a transition and keep the street safe and active.
- Restaurants and other amenities would be within a walkable distance.
- The proposal would be five stories of apartments on top of one story of parking garage. The garage would be adjacent to the residents.
- There would be numerous plantings and landscaping.
- He provided a townhome street scape. Most of the tree buffer would be preserved and deciduous and coniferous trees would be added.

Ms. Behrendt stated that a neighborhood meeting was held the prior evening. A lot of comments related to the mass of the building and how it would relate to the neighboring buildings were provided. There would be 109 feet from building face to building face. The townhomes would be about 63 feet away from each other. The building would be 73 feet in height. The height of The Bay Hill condominiums building is 65 feet. The distance from The Bay Hill condominium building to the nearest townhome is about 65 feet. The applicant wants to make sure to provide an adequate buffer for the townhomes. One hundred and nine feet and mature trees is a good start. Right now the view is a parking lot of a commercial building. Neighbors suggested a fence which the applicant would do if that is what the neighbors want. The area needs definition and direction. The proposal is in line with what exists. She is available for questions.

Sewall asked if there would be parking and a sidewalk on the north side. Ms. Behrendt answered in the affirmative. There would be 30 surface parking spaces. The vast majority of the parking would be underground.

Knight asked how far the shadow of the proposed building would extend. Ms. Behrendt provided the results of a shadow study. The building would provide a buffer to noise and visibility to Interstate 394.

Laura Cohen, 798 Fairfield Circle, stated that:

- She saw a posted comment that said that the development in Minneapolis, Mill and Main, had staff change three times, amenity areas were crowded in the summer, and it has a fraternity feel.
- Another posted comment for The Bridges said that it is the “worst place” and loud 24/7.
- She was concerned that residents would bring additional people into the low-key, residential area and create noise.

- She was concerned that the 230 residents of the proposed building would go onto the neighboring properties and cause damage from vehicles and dogs. Her association fees would have to pay for the upkeep.
- She left the traffic aspect to the experts.
- Drivers now travel on the private roads which are maintained with association dues. Parking is limited for guests.
- The current office building is lovely and blends in with nature. The landscaping is beautiful. The office building hours are different than the peak driving times for residents and no one is there on the weekends.
- She opposed the zoning change.
- She invited commissioners to visit the site. She would provide a tour.
- She was concerned this would not be the right project.

Don Knox, 921 Fairfield Way, stated that:

- Surrounding buildings have similar exteriors that incorporate stone accents. He found the proposed building a fit for the uptown area, but not a suburban area. It would be a stark contrast to the surrounding townhomes.
- The buildings would be too large for the space.
- He provided a letter that is in the agenda packet.
- Cohen did a good job of covering the issues including noise.
- He was concerned what would happen to the property values.
- He requested that the size and architecture be looked at.

Carrie Martin, 1004 Fairfield Spur, stated that:

- She provided pictures of the office building. It is a quiet area. She does not want to see more people than the three she usually sees when she goes for a walk.
- The proposed building would be a monstrosity viewed from her bedroom window.
- She was concerned vehicles would use her driveway to turn around. There are only two guest parking stalls on her street.
- The pine trees block the view of a one-story structure, but a forest would be needed to block a six-story structure.
- She was concerned with snow removal.
- She did not want a shadow on her house in the winter.
- The proposal would have balconies and cause a privacy issue.

Andrew Jackson, 1012 Fairfield Spur, stated that:

- There would be 230 units, not just 230 people. This is a quiet, residential neighborhood.
- The six-story building would be too close.

- He was afraid for his property value.
- The proposed building would fit in uptown, not the proposed location.
- He likes the sunlight in the winter.
- There would be three accesses. Two for the underground parking and one for the ground-level parking on the north side.
- The residents of the proposed building would look into his townhouse.

Calla Beal, 1000 Fairfield Square, stated that:

- Her bedroom and deck would face the residents of the proposed building looking right at her. It would be devastating.
- She does not want to look at the apartment building.
- It is quiet on the weekends and in the evenings.
- She does not care about the amenities. She cares what it would do to the community. Everybody in the community loves it there.
- She has real concerns.

Daryl Ansel, resident of Bay Hill Condominiums, stated that:

- Fairfield Road is very narrow. He questioned how the overflow parking would be handled.
- The bridge completion caused an increase in traffic on Wayzata Blvd.
- The success of the Westridge parking center is terrific, but motorists block Hopkins Crossroad. The proposal would cause a traffic problem on the frontage road.

Bill Kottner, 11460 Fairfield Road, stated that:

- He was concerned with noise after 10 p.m., broken beer bottles, and people congregating at the pool.
- The traffic is already bad in the Hopkins Crossroad area.
- He questioned what would happen to the property values.

Pam Lewis, 980 Fairfield Court, stated that:

- She was concerned with the impact on the protected wetland.
- This feels like urban slam instead of urban creep.
- The neighborhood is lovely. The building would be monstrous. There are four-story condominium buildings. This would be six and look like a hotel.
- Traffic is already crowded.
- There are limited restaurants and amenities.
- There is a small park.
- There would be no restriction on the number of residents living in each unit.
- She is terrified. She values the quiet.

Enid Uhlhorn, 907 Fairfield Way, stated that:

- The concept does not fit the neighborhood. It would be too massive for the site. She described the wildlife in the suburban area.
- Traffic traveling on Fairfield Road goes too fast.
- There would be a lot more people using the walkway to the shopping area.

Karen Dahlman, Fairfield Way, stated that:

- She questioned if a study supports the traffic considerations.
- The six-story height would change the look of the neighborhood.
- She was concerned with the property values.
- She was concerned with construction noise and noise created by additional people and garbage haulers. She recommended adding a condition that would require the applicant to financially compensate the residents every time a delivery service or garbage hauler made noise prior to 7 a.m.
- She appreciated the opportunity to speak.

Wischnack explained that the noise ordinance allows garbage haulers and snow plowers to begin operating at 6 a.m. and noise is allowed starting at 7 a.m.

Lois Joseph, 11472 Fairfield Road, stated that:

- The proposal would dwarf everything in the area.
- The project would be “unnecessary” to be located on the corner of a quiet residential street.
- The project would be inappropriate. It would belong in the North Loop or Uptown.
- The area is now quiet and pristine. The building does not belong in the city.

Bob Uhlhorn, 907 Fairfield Way, stated that:

- He walks in the area. Residents of the proposal would walk through the surrounding property to reach Trader Joes and Dick’s Sporting Goods.
- He questioned how the applicant calculated the economic return.
- The site is too small for the proposed building.
- The surrounding property values would go down and there would be assessments to pay for the increase in traffic.

No one else chose to speak.

Chair Kirk asked staff about The Moline building in Hopkins. Gordon stated that it filled a housing need in Hopkins that was not previously filled.

Cauley clarified that Fairfield Road is a public street. Fairfield Circle and Fairfield Way are private streets. Staff will create a map illustrating the public amenities including trails in the area.

Wischnack will provide the results of the housing study to anyone who would like to see it. There are only so many locations for the city to utilize diversified housing types.

Sewall asked staff to address the correlation between new development and property values. Cauley explained that assessing staff conducted a study and found that there is no evidence of a decrease in value of surrounding properties of new apartment buildings. Property values have decreased when a commercial site redevelops into another commercial use due to an automatic devaluation assuming that the new commercial use would be more intense.

Knight noted that the residents of the Fairfield area love it as it is. He did not see a single swimming pool or exercise room. The area is packed. He suggested adding more townhomes. He has been in The Moline and it is a really nice place to live.

Henry noted that the location near Interstate 394 is an attractive site for high-density development. He saw a disconnect between the existing townhouses and proposed six-story building.

Chair Kirk felt that development is inevitable. The question is to what scale. It would be unrealistic to think that a new building would match 20-year old architecture. The existing architecture is pleasant and should be recognized. Even though the building would be located on Interstate 394, it would not have to have an urban vibe. The fact that a sun-angle study was completed tells him that the building would be too big for the neighboring uses. It would not be too big for the retail store to the east or Interstate 394, but it would be too big for the neighbors on the north. The complex would need to step from potentially high density on the south to low density on the north in order to keep the character of the neighborhood. It would be a mistake to locate parking on the north. The guest parking should be the easiest to find. There is an expectation that the view from the existing townhomes would change.

Powers concurred with Chair Kirk. The project would create confusion that does not exist now. The area will grow and change. No one would want to tolerate the shadowing. There is a limit to accepting change. The project would not create clarity. A zoning change needs to be done deliberately.

Sewall stated that Doran does a nice job constructing buildings. He has been in several and found the quality top notch. The building would have no transition or have any unity with the neighborhood. He agreed that locating a parking area on the north side would be a mistake. The parking area should be on the south side. Housing would be an appropriate land use. A pitched roof would be better. If he lived in the proposed building,

he would take Fairfield instead of Wayzata Blvd. because it would be faster. His biggest challenge is with the density and proximity. Six months of shadow would not be reasonable at all. A view is not guaranteed, but casting a shadow over a townhouse for six months would be unreasonable. Stepping the building back farther from the north to the south would be a way to improve the plan. He supports higher-density housing, but not this dense and not located so close to the neighbors on the north.

Chair Kirk noted that Doran is a great developer. The city council may have a different reaction to the concept plan. It is logical that the property be redeveloped. He supports housing, but it would be unreasonable to expect townhouses to extend all the way to Interstate 394. He appreciated everyone's patience.

Cauley explained how the project may be followed on the project page on **eminnetonka.com**. This item is scheduled to be reviewed by the city council at its meeting on Aug. 27, 2018.

**10. Adjournment**

***Sewall moved, second by Powers, to adjourn the meeting at 10:45 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.***

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