

**Minnetonka Planning Commission  
Minutes**

**July 11, 2019**

**1. Call to Order**

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

**2. Roll Call**

Commissioners Knight, Luke, Powers, Sewall, Hanson, and Kirk were present. Henry was absent.

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

**3. Approval of Agenda**

***Sewall moved, second by Luke, to approve the agenda as submitted with additions provided in the change memo dated July 11, 2019.***

***Knight, Luke, Powers, Sewall, Hanson, and Kirk voted yes. Henry was absent. Motion carried.***

**4. Approval of Minutes: June 27, 2019**

***Luke moved, second by Sewall, to approve the June 27, 2019 meeting minutes as submitted.***

***Knight, Luke, Powers, Sewall, Hanson, and Kirk voted yes. Henry was absent. Motion carried.***

**5. Report from Staff**

Gordon briefed the commission on land use applications considered by the city council at its meeting of July 8, 2019:

- Adopted a resolution approving items for Chase Bank.
- Adopted a resolution approving items for Chipotle on Red Circle Drive.
- Adopted a resolution approving a parking variance for a medical clinic located on Wayzata Boulevard.
- Introduced an ordinance for Shady Oak Crossings.
- Adopted a resolution approving a front-yard setback variance for an enclosed porch for a residence on South Lane.
- Adopted a resolution approving a master development plan and final site and building plan for the Doran, Marsh Run project.

- Adopted a resolution approving items for Highcroft Meadows on Orchard Road.
- Reaffirmed the affordable housing policy.

Training for planning commissioners will be held Monday, July 15, 2019. The dinner will begin at 5:30 p.m. and training at 6:30 p.m. Please RSVP to staff.

**6. Report from Planning Commission Members:** None

**7. Public Hearings: Consent Agenda:** None

**8. Public Hearings**

**A. Resolution denying a front yard setback variance for a new garage at 15301 Court Road.**

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

Cauley reported. She recommended denial of the application based on the findings listed in the staff report.

Powers confirmed with Cauley that staff identified other locations that the garage could be constructed on the property without variances. There is only one other property in the area that does not meet the front yard setback requirement.

Knight thought the site having two driveways looks odd. Cauley explained that the proposal would remove one of the driveways.

Sewall asked how far back the garage would need to be moved to meet ordinance requirements. Cauley answered four feet.

Luke confirmed with Cauley that the current front-yard setback extends into the ordinance requirement by two feet.

Chair Kirk confirmed with Cauley that, by planning commission policy, a residence converting garage space into living space does not justify a setback variance to construct a garage.

Matthew Titze, 15301 Court Road, applicant, stated that he has lived at the residence for three years and likes the area. The intent of the request is to increase the functionality of the house, provide an attached garage, and add living space upstairs. The architect was present for questions. The proposal would look good from the street and not extend into the backyard. A two-foot setback change would impact the roof line and configuration of the master suite. All of the neighbors signed off on the plan.

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

Powers did not think 24 inches would change the character of the neighborhood. He likes the proposal better than the one that would meet ordinance requirements. The design is smart. He favored approving the variance. He liked that the applicant met with all of the neighbors and all of them approved the proposal.

Hanson and Knight concurred with Powers. Knight noted that the house is angled from the street and suggested that the addition be turned and setback further if possible.

Sewall did not think the proposal would change the character of the neighborhood. He acknowledged that the application is a design difficulty, not a practical difficulty.

Chair Kirk thought it would be natural for the garage to be located on the side of the house. Bad rooflines do become problematic. He supports the proposal.

Powers stated that meeting the setback requirement would create practical difficulties with living in the house and aligning the roofline. The angle of the street decreases the front yard setback on the side of the house. The proposal would not change the character of the neighborhood.

Chair Kirk stated that the property is unique because its front yard setback currently does not meet ordinance requirements. There is a two-foot difference between an expansion permit and a variance. Only a small portion of the proposed garage would extend into the setback because of the angles of the street and house.

***Powers moved, second by Hanson, to adopt a resolution approving a variance request to construct a garage addition onto the west side of the existing house.***

***Knight, Luke, Powers, Sewall, Hanson, and Kirk voted yes. Henry was absent. 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. Resolution approving Conifer Heights, a six-lot subdivision at 5615 Conifer Trail and Mahoney Ave.**

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.

Sewall asked if the outlot would be incorporated into Lot Six. Cauley answered affirmatively. An easement would prevent the area from being filled or built on. A

stormwater maintenance agreement would outline the responsibilities of the property owner and the city.

Luke was concerned with Lot 3 being located so close to the wetland. Cauley explained that the building permit process would confirm that all separation requirements would be met.

Chair Kirk confirmed with staff that there would be sufficient buildable area.

Jack Ammerman, Wenck Associates, civil design engineer and project manager representing the applicant, stated that he appreciated their time and staff represented the project thoroughly and accurately. He was available for questions.

The public hearing was opened.

Joseph Socha, 5524 Conifer Trail, stated that:

- He would like some items addressed in the development contract including construction traffic. Conifer Trail should be repaved at the end of construction if it would be damaged.
- He asked how long construction would take.
- He stated that some magnificent trees would be removed and replaced with smaller trees. He would like to keep as many trees as possible.
- He wants to make sure that there would be a security deposit that would cover fixing the street.
- His house needs 24-hour, 7-days-a-week access for nurses to care for a family member. That is a very real concern.
- The cul-de-sac encroaches on both properties currently. He was concerned that the new street would be on his lot line or over his lot line. Most of the street has a buffer on both sides to the property lines. He would like the buffers continued into the proposed cul-de-sac.
- He would like an agreement to require trees removed from the outlot to be replaced.

David Biesboer, 5620 Mahoney Ave., stated that:

- The area is hilly and a lot of water runs through his property.
- The soil is sandy and moves easily. He was concerned with sheet runoff from Conifer Ave.
- He would like the holding pond located somewhere else, but understood if it would be necessary.
- He does not want one milliliter of runoff to travel down the hill onto his property.
- He would like to work with the developer and engineer to make sure there would not be a problem.

Fred Landin, 5640 Mahoney Ave., stated that:

- He was concerned with the wetland being protected during construction.
- The pond right now is full. It has overflowed twice. It flooded his neighbor's property at one point. He was concerned that it would overflow again.
- He wanted to make sure no additional water would flow into the pond.

Young Cho, 5520 Conifer Trail, stated that:

- He asked if a review of the builder would be performed.

Kurt Baum, 5529 Conifer Trail, stated that:

- He was concerned with construction traffic causing a safety hazard for children in the street.
- He would like the buckthorn removed.
- He did not know how Conifer Trail was created.

No additional testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.

Cauley explained that:

- She pointed out the paved portion of Conifer Trail, right-of-way and temporary bulb of the cul-de-sac which would be used for construction traffic. She explained that the bulb would be removed and the relative location of the proposed street.
- There would be green space between the paved portion of the street and the right-of-way. The green space would continue along the street. Restoration of the right-of-way would be required.
- The developer would be required to provide a financial guarantee that could be used to complete the project if the developer would not do so.

Loren explained that engineering staff would document the condition of the street to be compared with an inspection completed at the end of the construction project to hold the developer accountable to repair any damage.

Cauley stated that:

- Engineering staff would review proper runoff mitigation prevention for the proposed plan and during the building permit review process for each residence.
- Grading would be done in a way to protect as many trees as possible. Specific fencing may be required to protect a tree's root zone.

- The applicant's tree mitigation plan needs to add four trees.
- Once a property would be homesteaded for two years, then the property owner could remove trees like any other property.

In response to Chair Kirk's question, Yetka explained tree definitions and mitigation requirements.

Chair Kirk encouraged the developer to plant trees that would become high-priority trees that may not be as fast growing, but become quality trees in the future.

Cauley explained that city staff looks at each land use application. Builders and contractors are required to be licensed and meet state requirements.

Cauley explained that the developer would be required to notify adjacent property owners of a road closure. A road closure would not be allowed for an extended period of time that would prevent access to a residence. The city would work with the property owner and developer to make sure that there would be access to the residence. When County Road 101 was reconstructed, the site lines were found to be reasonable. If residents witness construction vehicles making traffic violations on Conifer Trail, then they should contact the police department and the developer.

Chair Kirk thought the access off of Conifer Trail made more sense than Mahoney Ave. because of the steeper grade on Mahoney Ave. Cauley agreed.

Sewall asked staff to discuss the holding ponds and runoff. Yetka explained some of the water mitigation requirements that would be required. No new drainage would be routed to the wetland. The pond would take the runoff from the impervious surface and purify it before it would travel down the storm sewer. Engineering staff would inspect the site to make sure it would function as intended.

In response to Power's question, Cauley explained that the construction management plan would include the contact information for the site supervisor. It would be provided on the city's website: [eminnetonka.com](http://eminnetonka.com).

Knight asked if the pond between the development and the school currently has a controlled overflow. Cauley explained that it does not now, but the possibility of adding an overflow control is being explored. Loren clarified that there is no engineered solution yet, but the possibility is being researched.

Hanson applauded the neighbors for understanding the proposal and voicing valid concerns. He encouraged residents to work with the developer. He likes where the proposal is headed. The proposal retains the lot size. The developer has been conservative with the number of lots and respectful of the neighborhood.

Chair Kirk was concerned with the amount of tree loss. He would like more trees saved. He hoped that the grading plan would be the worst-case scenario. It would make sense

to do most of the heavy lifting at one time to get the pad ready. He appreciated the half-acre lot sizes. There are not many areas this size left in the city.

Sewall thought significant trees may need more protection when a site is made up of 75 percent significant trees. He appreciated getting the heavy construction done as soon as possible. The proposal meets all ordinance requirements.

Powers agreed with commissioners. He noted that the neighbors would go through a period of disruption. He encouraged neighbors to pay attention and inform the developer of what is happening. He supports the proposal. It would fit Minnetonka in 2019.

***Hanson moved, second by Luke, to recommend that the city council adopt the resolution approving the preliminary plat of Conifer Heights with changes provided in the change memo dated July 11, 2019.***

***Knight, Luke, Powers, Sewall, Hanson, and Kirk voted yes. Henry was absent. Motion carried.***

Chair Kirk stated that this item is scheduled to be reviewed by the city council July 22, 2019.

**C. Items concerning The Kinsel at Glen Lake.**

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 Powers' question, Thomas explained that the traffic study determined that the intersection would not warrant sufficient conditions to require a traffic light for at least 10 years. There is a priority list that the county would place the intersection on once it would meet the conditions necessary to prompt installation of a traffic light.

Sewall asked about sidewalks. He saw lots of pedestrians in the area. Thomas explained that sidewalks would surround the entire site and be located along Stewart Lane for a distance and Excelsior Blvd.

Hanson supports planning for the anticipated traffic 10 years in the future. Thomas stated that city staff agrees, but that is not a possibility since Hennepin County has the authority for this intersection and has denied requests to make changes. Commissioners may find that the use would be too intense for the site, but should not focus on an Excelsior Blvd access.

Powers did not see a compelling need that the proposal would fill. Wischnack provided that the vacancy rates for apartments in Minnetonka is very low. A 5 percent vacancy rate is considered unhealthy. Minnetonka's apartment vacancy rate is 2.6 percent.

Luke asked if the vacancy rate in Glen Lake is also low. Wischnack recalled it being comparable with long waiting lists for senior apartments.

Knight asked if problems on Stewart Lane could be addressed before it gets worse. Thomas stated that the traffic study done in October of 2018, before Copper Cow opened, shows 325 trips a day. The count is relatively small. Staff has received concerns regarding pedestrian safety and plans providing sidewalk connection would help alleviate that problem.

Ron Clark, applicant, stated that:

- The traffic on Stewart Lane was the main concern expressed by residents.
- This use would have the lowest impact to the site compared to an office or retail use.
- There were concerns with lack of parking. The proposal would not create a parking problem.
- The residences would benefit the area's retail businesses.
- Glen Lake is healthy and thriving.
- This is the last piece of the Glen Lake puzzle.
- Neighbors were also concerned with mass and scale, garage access, and density.
- The applicant met with Lakeside Estates residents and president of the association. Their concerns were more about traffic and safety than the impact on them. They understood that development would happen and were o.k. with the three-story building, but they were concerned with traffic and pedestrian safety crossing the intersection.
- The building was moved to provide more room for landscaping and an entrance was removed in response to neighbors' concerns.
- He pointed out the location of guest parking.
- The units would be a little smaller. This is the same mass as a conventional 49-unit building.
- Surrounding buildings are three, four and five stories tall. The proposed three-story building would fit in.
- The amount of impervious surface would be at 66 percent. He compared it with surrounding properties.
- The streetscapes would be compatible with surrounding properties and blend in.
- He provided a rendering compared to surrounding buildings.
- He reviewed the design of the proposed building and landscaping.
- There would be 63 enclosed parking stalls.
- He reviewed the floor plans.

Mike Waldo, with Ron Clark Construction, stated that:



- Staff did a good job describing the proposal.
- This proposal fits in with the character of the neighborhood.
- There would very few trees saved no matter what use would be added.
- Staff did an incredible job making its argument to Hennepin County to have them authorize an access on Excelsior Blvd.
- The traffic from the parking lot would be minimal. A pedestrian crossing on Excelsior Blvd. is a concern. Stewart Lane is actually underutilized compared to a typical residential street.
- The residents would walk to the businesses in Glen Lake.
- Ron Clark Construction has a good, long history of quality projects in the city.
- There were similar concerns expressed when Zvago was proposed, but Zvago did not ruin the neighborhood and neither would this proposal.

Powers asked if there would be room for children to play or to walk dogs. Mr. Waldo pointed out a service door and back area with a dog walk area. He did not expect a lot of children. Most parents move out of an apartment by the time a child reaches five years of age. There is a park across the street.

Mr. Waldo:

- Pointed out garbage truck and moving truck accesses.
- Explained the financial assistance needed to provide affordable housing. It would be an inefficient use of resources.
- Stated that the area designated as proof of parking could be used for a stop light in the future.

The public hearing was opened.

Anne Hossfeld, 14616 Glendale Street, stated that:

- She requested that the application be denied.
- She was concerned with density, traffic, traffic studies, stormwater, and parking.
- The existing two-story and three-story buildings were unreasonable when they were approved.
- There is too much density, traffic, and parking problems.
- "The residents are screaming." There is extreme stress from the density and high level of traffic.
- Overflow parking from the businesses is occurring on residential streets. She heard there are moving vans parking on Stewart Lane.
- She requested another traffic study be done to study jaywalking on Eden Prairie Road and Stewart Lane because Copper Cow was not open in Oct. of 2018 and she has seen jaywalking occurring.

- She was concerned with where stormwater would go into the public storm sewer system and if the public stormwater sewer system is in good shape.
- Unmapped and Copper Cow do not have sufficient parking.

Richard Urban 5625 Eden Prairie Road, stated that:

- Stormwater currently runs into Glen Lake. The north end of the lake is now cattails. The stormwater cannot be allowed to run into the lake because it is killing the lake.

Diane Cook, 14471 Stewart Lane, stated that:

- She is not upset. She knew that the site is scheduled for high density. She can no longer walk down Stewart Lane because it is not safe. She walks on Excelsior Blvd. now.
- The proposal's access would be located on Stewart Lane which already has accesses to Zvago and Glen Lake Shores close to a curve in the road. She suggested moving the entrance to the short side of the street where the public parking is located. That would be the safe thing to do for traffic.
- Rush hours are a pass through for drivers on Stewart Lane.

Alan Winner, 14301 Stewart Lane, stated that:

- There are currently nine curb cuts on Stewart Lane without Kinsel. He is concerned with the safety of drivers being able to stay in the lane around the curve traveling at 30 miles per hour. There will be pedestrian and vehicle incidents due to the increased vehicle and pedestrian traffic.
- He suggested making the Kinsel accesses right-turn only to prevent bottle necks.
- It is difficult and dangerous to turn left on Stewart Lane from Eden Prairie Road. He requested a stop sign be added to the Excelsior Blvd. and Stewart Lane intersection.

Jim Stroebel, 14319 Stewart Lane, stated that:

- Glen Lake Shore residents are concerned with the building's size and mass of the footprint.
- The traffic would create more of a challenging driving situation.
- He represented someone else who requested commissioners listen to residents and respond to citizens' input.
- He supports the project. This site will be developed. It would be a quiet intrusion. A number of other uses would be considerably worse.
- Kinsel fits in with the small neighborhood.

- The compelling interest is that this would provide an opportunity for young professionals and a young demographic into the Glen Lake area which is currently skewed toward seniors (of which he is one).
- A multi-family use would fit in the neighborhood. It would not be out of place.
- The proposal can be improved. He supports closing the Excelsior Blvd. intersection with Stewart Lane and moving the footprint of the building closer to Glen Lake Townhomes to allow an extension of Woodhill Ave. through Excelsior Blvd. to Stewart Lane. Consolidating the traffic might increase enough flow so that the single warrant would be met.
- He suggested a traffic roundabout be considered.
- He favored getting rid of the 90-degree turn on Stewart Lane.
- A controlled intersection would create a safer entry and exit from Excelsior Blvd.
- He agreed that right-turns-only would make things easier.
- There needs to be a safer way to cross Excelsior Blvd. It is dangerous.
- He supports a traffic study that would focus on Stewart Lane. It is too narrow for its level of use. It is a service road. The topography and narrowness causes a safety issue for pedestrians and motorists.
- He applauded installing a sidewalk, but wants a sidewalk for all of Stewart Lane.
- There will be more development in the Stewart Lane area. There needs to be a long-term specific plan to deal with Stewart Lane. He asked that the current problems with Stewart Lane not be confused with the proposal.
- He thanked commissioners for their time.

Carol Seiler, 14301 Stewart Lane, stated that:

- It is difficult for fire trucks to travel on Stewart Lane. The snow plow knocked off a gas line by the building. The fire truck had difficulty turning the corner and making the sharp left to enter the lot.
- Two additional driveways with more traffic would cause an issue.
- The current configuration of the proposal is “not the right thing.”

Roger Harmon, 14301 Stewart Lane, stated that:

- The building would be too big.
- He would like the building moved forward.
- Do not plant pine trees at a 90-degree curve in the road.
- He questioned where snow would be stored. Zvigao has 27 above ground parking stalls. There needs to be more parking.
- Ron Clark is a good builder.
- A smaller building could be done.

Sally Gullock, 14301 Stewart Lane, stated that:

- There is no place for a moving van to park.
- A hook and ladder truck cannot get to the site.

Debbie Harmon, 14301 Stewart Lane, stated that:

- She questioned how it could be gambled to not have a plan to add more parking in place rather than considering to use nine proof-of-parking stalls and contacting the property owners on the west to see if an agreement could be worked out in the future if needed.
- She wanted commissioners to look at the width of Stewart Lane.

Ann Flanagan, 14301 Stewart Lane, stated that:

- The building would be too big for the site.
- She had concerns with the street. There is no right-turn lane to turn onto Stewart Lane from Excelsior Blvd.
- More traffic would be added.
- A smaller building would have more green space.
- She was concerned with children crossing the street to get to the park.
- She would like a swing set and sand box added.

Beth Bergan, 14301 Stewart Lane, stated that:

- She thanked commissioners for listening.
- She guaranteed people would be injured from drivers leaving the establishment that serves alcohol and not looking at other motorists trying to make a turn or pulling out.
- The driving conditions are not livable. She does not care what the traffic study says. The area is overcrowded.
- She appreciated natural resources staff being accessible and supportive.
- She takes seriously the conservation area and preventing invasive species.
- She wants the area to stay calm and peaceful.
- The building footprint would be too massive.

Shirley Vanden Hoek, 14301 Stewart Lane, stated that:

- She questioned where the green space would be on the same side of the street for dogs to relieve themselves. She supports allowing dogs as long as the dog owners clean up after the dogs.

No additional testimony was submitted and the hearing was closed.

Mr. Waldo stated that:

- There would be restrictions for dogs and cats, but he would check on specifics. He pointed out the green space to be used for dogs.
- There is a snow removal plan that would haul away snow if needed.
- Stormwater management guidelines would be met. Runoff would be at the same rate, volume, and quality as now.
- The building would have sprinklers. Fire department staff would have to approve the plans.
- The building manager would schedule move in and move out times.

Thomas stated that:

- A building permit would not be issued unless stormwater management requirements would be met. The Nine-Mile Creek Watershed District would also have to approve a proposal's stormwater management plan.

Chair Kirk noted that he has jaywalked in that area himself. He asked what could be done to encourage pedestrians to cross at controlled intersections. Wischnack said that it was difficult to get approval from Hennepin County for the mid-block crosswalk on Excelsior Blvd.

Chair Kirk suggested staff provide councilmembers with the volume of traffic on Stewart Lane and other streets to do a comparison. Wischnack noted that the traffic volume fluctuates with the day and time of day.

Chair Kirk asked if extending Woodhill Road to Stewart Lane had been considered. Thomas explained that extending Woodhill Road to Stewart Lane and making Stewart Lane into a cul de sac was included in the Glen Lake Study in the early 2000s. Gordon explained that the study was looked at again from 2008 to 2015. The consultant did not think the grades would work. There would be too much of a rise to get up to Excelsior Blvd. from Stewart Lane.

Sewall confirmed with staff that if a vehicle is parked illegally and causing a safety hazard, residents should contact the police.

Hanson is excited with what is happening in Glen Lake. He has friends looking to move to Minnetonka because there is vitality. He would prefer that affordable housing be incorporated into the project. He was comfortable with the look, aesthetics and height of the building. The proposal is not totally out of scale from a number-of-units perspective. He did not have a problem with the mass of the building for this site.

Luke said that she lives in Glen Lake and understands that there are times when traffic is busy. She hopes that the city continues to listen to the traffic issues. The building is big, but it is not oversized. She thought it would be in line with surrounding buildings. She was a little concerned that there would not be enough parking spaces. This type of

development would have an impact on the area, but she thinks the area can handle it. The area is not overcrowded. She agreed that the current traffic issues are separate from the proposal. The site will have a development with density. The proposal would impact the area, but not negatively enough for her to not support the proposal.

Powers struggled with the proposal. Just because it is expected that something is going to happen does not mean it needs to happen now. Being the last parcel in Glen Lake to develop puts a different perspective on the site than the first site that was redeveloped in the area. He struggled with adding to an unsafe condition. Stewart Lane is unsafe as it currently exists. The size of the building concerns him. He likes the developer who is conscientious and does a good job. He has not decided on a recommendation yet.

Knight stated that the area is vastly different than it was 34 years ago. He hated when Driscolls closed, and then Kawalski's closed, and then the next grocery store closed. He hopes Lunds and Byerlys will be there for the long haul. This proposal would help the businesses in the area survive. Not everyone in the building would leave and return to their residences at the same time. Making Stewart Lane a one-way street or prohibiting a right turn from Eden Prairie Road from 6 a.m. to 8 a.m. could be considered. He supports the proposal because it would be a good thing for the Glen Lake area.

Sewall said it felt like more of a public hearing regarding Stewart Lane. He agreed with the difficulty driving on Stewart Lane. The proposed use of the land would be appropriate. He was unsure if the proposed density would be reasonable. He did not know what number of units would feel right. He found pedestrian accidents to be unacceptable. He would be weighing the impact of the proposal on pedestrian accidents when deciding how to vote.

Chair Kirk supports integrating affordable housing units. He was disappointed how many mature trees would be cut down. He wants to make sure there would be enough room for new trees to be planted and grow to maturity. Hiding the building behind evergreens, especially near the curve in the road, did not make sense. He did not support the proposal because it is not everything that it could be. He would like more distance between the road and Stewart Lane on the south. The northwest corner of the building would be too close to the property line. The proposed building and the building on the west would be too close together. He agreed with the use. Housing makes sense. The building is a little too massive right now. He did not want it to go higher than three floors. The goal is to move the building away from the sidewalk so an oak could be planted and grow to maturity.

***Knight moved, second by Powers, to continue the meeting until 11:30 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.***

Powers would like to see affordable housing included in the development and more room is needed for landscaping. He leaned toward not supporting the proposal.

***Hanson moved, second by Luke, to recommend that the city council adopt the resolution approving a preliminary and final plat; an ordinance rezoning the property from R-1, low density residential, to PUD, planned unit development, and adopting a master development plan; and a resolution approving final site and building plans regarding The Kinsel at Glen Lake at 14317 Excelsior Blvd.***

***Knight, Luke, and Hanson voted yes. Powers, Sewall, and Kirk voted no. Henry was absent. Motion failed.***

Hanson reviewed commissioners' concerns including the building's proximity to the property lines, lack of green space for large trees, lack of affordable housing and pedestrian safety. Commissioners like the proposal's land use for the site.

**9. Adjournment**

***Knight moved, second by Powers, to adjourn the meeting at 11:07 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.***

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Lois T. Mason  
Planning Secretary