

Planning Commission Date: 9/8/14 Agenda Item: 4a – Public Hearing Item Case # 2014-43

ITEM:	Village Park Preserve Residential Subdivision – Preliminary Plat
SUBMITTED BY:	Nick Johnson, City Planner
REVIEWED BY:	Kyle Klatt, Community Development Director Jack Griffin, City Engineer Brett Emmons, Emmons & Olivier Resources, Inc. Greg Malmquist, Fire Chief Stephen Mastey, Landscape Architecture, Inc. Ann Pung-Terwedo, Washington County John Hanson, Valley Branch Watershed District Neil Ralston, Metropolitan Airports Commission

#### SUMMARY AND ACTION REQUESTED:

The Planning Commission is being asked to hold a public hearing to consider a Preliminary Plat request from GWSA Land Development, LLC for a 104-unit single family residential subdivision to be located on approximately 64 acres immediately west of Manning Avenue (CSAH 15) and immediately north of 30<sup>th</sup> Street within the southern portion of the Village Planning Area. Staff is recommending approval of the request subject to compliance with 13 conditions as noted in this report.

#### **GENERAL INFORMATION**

Applicant:	GWSA Land Development, LLC (Craig Allen); 10850 Old County Road 15, Suite 200, Plymouth, MN 55441			
Property Owners:	U	Schiltgen Farms, Inc.; 10880 Stillwater Blvd. N., Lake Elmo, MN 55042 and Mark Holliday; PO Box 243, Lake Elmo, MN 55042		
Location:	30 <sup>th</sup> Str	Part of Sections 13, Township 29 North, Range 21 West in Lake Elmo, north of 30 <sup>th</sup> Street and immediately west of Manning Avenue (CSAH 15). PID Numbers: 13.029.21.43.0004 and 13.029.21.44.0002.		
Request:		ation for preliminary plat approval of a 104-unit single family residential sion to be named Village Park Preserve.		
Existing Land Use		Agriculture		
Existing Zoning:		RT – Rural Transitional Zoning		
Surrounding Land Use:		North – vacant/agricultural land, planned for Easton Village single family residential subdivision; west – Reid Park and Rural Single Family		

		parcels; south – Heritage Farm open space preservation (OP) subdivision; east – Lake Elmo Airport.			
Surrounding Zoning:		RT – Rural Development Transitional; OP – Open Space Preservation; PF – Public Facilities			
Comprehensive Plan:		Village Urban Low Density Residential $(1.5 - 2.49 \text{ units per acre})$ and Rural Area Development – City has submitted a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to the Metropolitan Council to change the land use guidance of the Holliday parcel from Rural Area Development to Village Urban Low Density Residential.			
Proposed Zon	ing:	LDR – Urban Low Density Residential			
History:	sewer servi been used f Sketch Plar Comprehen Planning C	t properties are included in Village Planning Area boundary and municipal ce area as defined in the 2013 Village Land Use Plan. Site has historically for faming activities, including the growing of agricultural crops. The awas reviewed by the Planning Commission on 6/30/14. The asive Plan Amendment for the Holliday parcel was reviewed by the ommission on 6/30/14. Both Land Use Applications were reviewed by the il on 7/15/14, where the CPA was approved (Resolution 2014-60)			
Deadline for Action:		Application Complete – 8/14/2014 60 Day Deadline – 10/12/2014 Extension Letter Mailed – No 120 Day Deadline – 12/11/14			
Applicable Regulations:		Chapter 153 – Subdivision Regulations Article 10 – Urban Residential Districts (LDR) §150.270 Storm Water, Erosion, and Sediment			

## **REQUEST DETAILS**

The City of Lake Elmo has received a request from GWSA Land Development, LLC for a preliminary plat to subdivide approximately 64 acres of land located within the Village Planning Area into 104 single family lots. The proposed plat would be located on property currently owned by Schiltgen Farms, Inc. and Mark Holliday, and would be located immediately west of Manning Avenue North (CSAH 15) and immediately north of 30<sup>th</sup> Street North. The two subject parcels have historically been used for agricultural purposes.

The preliminary plat has been developed in response to the City's Comprehensive Plan, which guides the property owned by Schiltgen Farms, Inc. for Village Urban Low Density Residential (V-LDR) development. It should be noted that the Holliday parcel is currently guided Rural Area Development (RAD). However, the City approved a Comprehensive Plan Amendment request to change the Holliday parcel from RAD to V-LDR on July 15, 2014 (Resolution 2014-60). The Comprehensive Plan Amendment request has progressed through adjacent jurisdiction review period, and the CPA application has been submitted to the Metropolitan Council. If approved, the proposed plat would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The plat is designed to incorporate 104 single family lots, all of which are designed with minimum widths of 65 feet.

In terms of access, the preliminary plat shows a connection to 30<sup>th</sup> Street via the Village Parkway minor collector road in the southern portion of the plat. As shown on the proposed plat, the Village

Parkway minor collector road will serve as the primary access and circulation route for the development, extending from 30<sup>th</sup> Street in the south to the Easton Village residential subdivision in the north. In addition to the 30<sup>th</sup> Street connection, the proposed neighborhood would also benefit from temporary access to Manning Avenue (CSAH 15) through the southeast portion of Easton Village. However, this access will be closed off at some point the future. Therefore, Village Parkway, with connection to 30<sup>th</sup> Street and eventually Trunk Highway 5 (TH 5) to the north will serve as the primary access.

The proposed Village Park Preserve subdivision is the third subdivision in the Village Planning Area to submit Preliminary Plans. In terms of utilities, the subject parcels have access to City watermain within the 30<sup>th</sup> Street right-of-way north of Heritage Farms, as well as at the sanitary sewer lift station site immediately east of Reid Park. Existing sanitary sewer facilities are also located at the lift station site and will need to be extended to the subdivision to serve the residential development. As proposed, both the sewer and water services enter the subdivision in the southwestern portion of the development. Watermain is also extended to the existing watermain in 30<sup>th</sup> Street, providing a hydrological loop.

The proposed subdivision also includes a series of outlots that will provide for storm water management, open space, trails and a significant expansion of Reid Park. It should be noted that all of the outlots that are planned for parkland or storm water use will be deeded to the City.

According to the project narrative, the applicant is proposing to construct homes within the subdivision in two phases, with each phase consisting of 50+ residential lots. In addition, the narrative notes that the site will be mass graded during the first phase of construction. The mass grading would include preparation of the streets and storm water facilities. As the site is relatively flat, it is the goal of the applicant to balance the site with as much on-site material as possible.

#### PLANNING AND ZONING ISSUES

According to the City's Comprehensive Plan, the Village Park Preserve site is guided for Village Urban Low Density (Schiltgen Farms parcel) and Rural Area Development (Holliday parcel). While presenting a Sketch Plan for the proposed development, the applicant applied for a Comprehensive Plan Amendment for the Holliday parcel to change the land use guidance from Rural Area Development (RAD) to Village Urban Low Density (V-LDR). The Comprehensive Plan Amendment was unanimously recommended for approval by the Planning Commission on 6/30/14 and unanimously approved by the City Council on 7/15/14. The Comprehensive Plan Amendment has since been submitted to the Metropolitan Council for consideration after undergoing adjacent jurisdictional review. In order for the applicant to apply for a Final Plat, the Comprehensive Plan Amendment must be approved by the Metropolitan Council in advance of any Final approvals by the City. In addition, the site will be required to be zoned LDR – Low Density Residential prior to Final Plat approval. The overall subdivision plan has therefore been prepared in order to comply with the standards for the LDR zoning district in terms of lot size, lot widths, building setbacks, and other design criteria. The applicant notes in the project narrative that no variances are being sought for the proposed subdivision.

The arrangement of lots and blocks generally follow a grid-like pattern with the Village Parkway minor collector road running north-south through the center of the subdivision. The eastern half of the subdivision has three east-west streets, while the western half has two east-west streets. The proposed spacing of the local roads that intersect with the minor collector road generally meet the recommended spacing of 330 feet for neighborhood collector roads. It should also be noted that the

proposed subdivision includes three "eyebrow" or mini cul-de-sacs, two of which are located in the northeast and northwest corners of the subdivision, while the third is located in the southern portion of the development with direct access to the minor collector road. All local streets have been designed to comply with the City's current street standard with a 60-foot right-of-way and 28-foot wide street.

Sidewalks are planned on one side of all residential streets within the subdivision per the City standard. In addition, the Village Parkway minor collector road includes a 6-foot walk on the west side and an 8-foot bituminous trail on east side, which is consistent with the City's typical section for the collector. Finally, a trail connection to the proposed expansion of Reid Park is planned in the southwest corner of the subdivision, providing direct access to recreational facilities.

A typical lot building plan (detail) is included as part of the attached subdivision packet, and each lot as depicted in the plans includes a description of the lot size, dimensions, and all required setbacks. All of the lots proposed meet the City's minimum area requirement of 8,000 for single family lots in a LDR district, with the smallest lot (Lot 4, Block 3) proposed at 8,342 square feet. The largest lot in the development (Lot 7, Block 2) is proposed at 27,055 sq. ft. in size. The Project Narrative notes that the lots will average 11,421 square feet in size, which exceeds the minimum requirements by a fairly wide margin. As an overview of the proposed lots, 60 lots are designed at 65 feet in width with the rest designed at widths of 75 or 81 feet. Generally speaking, the smaller lots of the subdivision are located on the eastern side of the development, and the larger lots are located west of the collector within closer proximity to the proposed park area adjacent to Reid Park.

The following is a general summary of the subdivision design elements that have been proposed as part of the Village Park Preserve preliminary plat and plans:

Zoning and Site Information:

шış	g and she information.	
•	Existing Zoning:	RT – Rural Development Transitional District
•	Proposed Zoning:	LDR - Urban Low Density Residential
•	Total Site Area:	63.6 acres
•	Total Residential Units:	104
		0.00

• Proposed Density (Net): 2.20 units/acre

Proposed Lot Dimensional Standards:

•	Min. Lot Width:	65 ft.
•	Lot Depth:	130 ft. typical
•	Lot Area:	8,000 sq. ft. (8,342 min. proposed)
•	Front Yard Setback:	25 ft.
•	Side Yard Setback:	5 ft.to garage, 10 ft. to living space
•	Rear Yard Setback:	20 ft.

Proposed Street Standards:

ROW Width – Local	60 ft. (per Subdivision Ordinance)

• Street Widths – Local: 28 ft.(per City standard)

The standards listed above are all in compliance with the applicable requirements from the City's zoning and subdivision regulations. Based on Staff's review of the preliminary plat, the applicant

has demonstrated compliance with all applicable code requirements at the level of detail that is required for a preliminary plat.

As with any new subdivision, the City Code requires that a portion of the plat be set aside for public park use. In this case, the applicant has indicated that the western portion of the subdivision adjacent to Reid Park will be dedicated to the City for this purpose. Dedication of the proposed parkland is supported by the Village Land Use Plan, as the land offers a significant expansion of Reid Park and is identified as ecologically sensitive land in the Village Alternative Urban Area-wide Review (AUAR), the adopted environmental review document for the Village Planning Area. As proposed, access to the park area will be provided via a trail connection in the southwestern portion of the development. As the internal trail connections to Reid Park have not yet been determined, additional work with the Park Commission to determine trail routing will be necessary once plans for the expansion area are further developed.

The Subdivision Ordinance requires 10% of the land in urban residential districts to be set aside as parkland, which in this case amount to 6.36 acres (10% of 63.6 acres of total land). The Preliminary Plat (PP-6) indicates that Outlot 2, the proposed park area adjacent to Reid Park, is 686,961 square feet, or 15.77 acres, which is 9.41 acres above the required amount. However, it should be noted that two wetland areas exist in the proposed parkland, the area of which would not be eligible to count toward dedication. Removing the wetland areas from the calculation results in a dedication amount of 15.37 acres. Based on the level of proposed dedication, it is clear that the amount of land provided would far exceed the required amount of dedication required under the Subdivision Ordinance. When the amount of parkland provided exceeds the amount required under the ordinance, it is not uncommon for the applicant to receive a credit for the amount above what is required. It should be noted that the applicant is working on two other residential subdivision in the Village Area. The first, Village Preserve, is a 97-unit single family residential subdivision on approximately 40 acres of land in the northern portion of the Village Planning Area that has received Preliminary Plat approval. The second planned residential subdivision is on land owned by Schiltgen Farms, Inc. across Lake Elmo Ave. (CSAH 17) from the Village Preserve residential subdivision. If provided with a credit for land dedication above and beyond the required amount, it stands to reason that the credit could be utilized for the other two residential projects in which the applicant is engaged. Staff has contacted the City Attorney to confirm that this type of credit can be utilized off-site and can be granted via an approved developers agreement with the City, and the City Attorney confirmed that it is possible and legal under state statutes. In this case, the parkland credit amount would result in 9.01 acres (15.37 acres provided -6.36 acres required =9.01 acres of credit).

#### **REVIEW AND ANALYSIS**

City Staff has reviewed the Village Park Preserve Preliminary Plat. In general, the proposed plat will meet all applicable City requirements for conditional approval, and any deficiencies or additional modifications that are needed are noted as part of the review record. In addition, the City has received a detailed list of comments from the City Engineer, the Fire Chief, the City's Landscape Consultant, Washington County and the Metropolitan Airports Commission, all of which are attached for consideration by the Commission.

In addition to the general comments that have been provided in the preceding sections of this report, Staff would like the Planning Commission to consider the following review comments as well:

• *Comprehensive Plan*. Based upon the City's approval of the requested Comprehensive Plan Amendment for the Holliday parcel, the proposed subdivision is consistent with the

Lake Elmo Comprehensive Plan for this area. The net density proposed for the development fall within the range allowed for the Village Urban Low Density (V-LDR) land use category (1.5-2.49 units/acre). However, before proceeding to Final Plat, the applicant must receive formal approval of the Comp Plan Amendment from the Metropolitan Council (Condition #1). Other aspects of the Comprehensive Plan relate to the Village Park Preserve subdivision as follows:

- Density Calculation. The subject property is guided Village Urban Low Density Residential (V-LDR) in the Comprehensive Plan, which allows for a density range of 1.5-2.49 units/acre (net). The applicants have completed the density calculation using the methodology consistent with the City's adopted practice. The resulting net density calculation resulted in a net density of 2.20 units/acre (104 units/47.38 net developable acres). Therefore, the proposed subdivision is consistent with the density requirements of the Village Urban Low Density Residential land use category.
- **Parks.** The City's Park Plan identifies proposed location for neighborhood parks 0 based on the anticipated population that should be served by each park, the location of existing City parks and areas that are currently underserved. Given the proximity of the subject parcels to Reid Park, the Park Plan does not call for a neighborhood park in this portion of the Village Planning Area. However, it should be noted that the Village Land Use Plan encourages the dedication of the land east of Reid Park as a park expansion. In March of 2014, Gonyea Development presented plans for the Village Preserve subdivision in the northern portion of the Village Planning Area to the Park Commission. As part of the broader review of the area, Gonyea presented their plan to expand Reid Park as part of the Village Park Preserve subdivision. The Park Commission was supportive of this approach, as it would allow for the creation of a destination park in the Village. As part of the Village Park Preserve subdivision, the applicants are proposing to dedicate 15.77 acres of land for the expansion of Reid Park. Therefore, the Reid Park expansion would be consistent with the Village Land Use Plan and has been supported by the City's Park Commission.
- *Water*. Water will be provided to this area via existing watermain along 30<sup>th</sup> Street. In addition, the applicant proposes to pull watermain from the lift station, creating a hydrological loop of the system. It should be noted that the City has more than adequate capacity to serve the future subdivision on the subject property as a result of the construction of Well #4. Well #4 was recently connected to the broader water system as a result of a recent watermain extension north of the Village Planning Area.
- *Sanitary Sewer*. The Village Preserve subdivision will be served by the sanitary sewer extension from the existing facilities located at the Village lift station site to the west of the proposed development. All wastewater for the proposed development would be directed via forcemain to the Cottage Grove Ravine Interceptor located to the east of Lake Elmo Ave near Interstate-94, which is part of the regional wastewater treatment system administered by the Metropolitan

Council. It should be noted that there is adequate capacity of the wastewater system to serve the proposed residential development.

- *Phasing/Staging Plan.* According to the City's Wastewater Plan, the Village Planning Area is in Stage 1 of the City's planned service areas. Therefore, the proposed subdivision is consistent with the City's Staging Plan.
- **Zoning**. The proposed zoning for the Village Preserve site will be LDR Low Density Residential. The submitted development plans demonstrate compliance with the City's urban residential zoning requirements. Single family detached housing is a permitted use within the LDR zoning district.
- *Subdivision Requirements*. The City's Subdivision Ordinance includes a fairly lengthy list of standards that must be met by all new subdivisions, and include requirements for blocks, lots, easements, erosion and sediment control, drainage systems, monuments, sanitary sewer and water facilities, streets, and other aspects of the plans. Staff, as well as the City Engineer, have not identified any existing conflicts with the City's Subdivision Ordinance.
- *Infrastructure*. The developer will be required to construct all streets, sewer, water, storm water facilities, and other infrastructure necessary to serve the development.
- *Phasing Grading and Construction*. The applicant noted in the submitted Project Narrative (Attachment #2) that the subdivision will be split into two phases of construction with regards to residential. However, the applicant intends to mass grade the site as part of the first phase of construction. As part of Final Plat and final construction documents, more detailed plans with regards to phasing of all improvements will be required. The City Engineer has also requested additional detail related to the phasing of improvement for the next stage of City approval.
- *Wetlands.* The submitted narrative indicates that there are three wetland on the site. Two of the identified wetland are located within the proposed park area and will not be impacted by development activity. The third wetland, 782 square feet in size, is located on the Holliday parcel. The applicant has noted that this wetland is eligible for a de minimis exemption. The applicant is proposing to mitigate this smaller wetland through the Valley Branch Watershed District permitting process. Typical for any preliminary plat approval, the applicant will be required to meet all the rules and regulations of the Wetland Conservation Act and Valley Branch Watershed District (Condition #5).
- *Trails.* The applicants are proposing two segments of trails within the development. The first trail is contained within the Village Parkway minor collector road and is consistent with the City's approved typical section. The north-south trail segment will eventually provide direct pedestrian connection through Easton Village to the downtown area to the north and west. The second trail segment proposed is in the southwest portion of the development to provide connection to the proposed park expansion area next to Reid Park. Ultimately, staff would recommend that the Park Commission engage in a broader planning effort for the future use and design of Reid Park. Once a broader plan is

established, effective trail connections can be made to the existing park area to the west of the proposed development. In addition to the sidewalks proposed for the residential subdivision, there should be ample facilities and for walking, biking, and other recreational activities, offering effective connections to Reid Park and the broader Village Area.

- Landscaping and Tree Preservation. The landscape and tree preservation plans have been reviewed by the City's consulting landscape architect, Stephen Mastey. Mr. Mastey's review memorandum related to the landscape and tree preservation plans is found in Attachment #9. Mastey has requested additional calculations pertaining to street trees. In addition, he makes several recommendations related to native ground cover and other plant selections. Staff is recommending that the Final Landscape Plan be updated per the recommendations of the landscape consultant (Condition #9). In addition, it should be noted that the Tree Preservation information is located on the provided Tree Survey (TS1). As noted in the tree survey, the proposed removal amount of significant trees is 22.6%, which is under the 30% removal threshold permitted under the City's Tree Preservation Ordinance. Finally, with regards to tree preservation, the submitted landscape plans do not include tree protective fencing or other measures around the trees to be saved on the site. As part of the Final Landscape Plan, staff would recommend that tree protection measures be included.
- *Buffering*. Buffering for the proposed subdivision is applicable in two areas:
  - Village Greenbelt. As part of the Village Land Use Plan, the southern and eastern portions of the development are guided for a greenbelt to create separation of residential lots from 30<sup>th</sup> Street and Manning Avenue. As proposed in the Village Park Preserve Preliminary Plat, this area is currently being utilized for stormwater management purposes, which is allowed under the City's Land Use Plan. In addition, the Village Land Use Plan does not specify a set distance for the greenbelt. As shown in the plans, the separation between residential lots and 30<sup>th</sup> Street right-of-way ranges from 40 feet up to 130 feet. The separation between residential lots and 30<sup>th</sup> Manning Avenue is greater. In addition, the Landscape Plan includes a more robust planting schedule along the greenbelt area for both Manning Avenue and 30<sup>th</sup> Street, including coniferous and evergreen trees for year-round screening. A cross section of the proposed plantings is also provided.
  - Mcleod Property. In addition to the recommended buffering along 30<sup>th</sup> Street and Manning Avenue, buffering and screening around the Mcleod property in the southwest portion of the development, particularly the east boundary, is required as a condition of approval for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment (Resolution 2014-60 – Attachment #4). Once again, a more aggressive planting schedule has been provided around the east and north boundary of the Mcleod property, providing year round screening. In addition, the lots on the east side of the Mcleod parcel are of greater size and depth than most of the lots in the development. Nevertheless, staff would recommend that the applicant install an additional row of trees in the rear of 1-3, Block 1 to provide additional screening.

Staff is recommending that this requirement be included as a condition of approval (Condition #11).

- *Streets*. The proposed street system has been designed to comply with all applicable subdivision requirements and City engineering standards. All of the proposed cul-de-sacs meeting the minimum turning radii specified under the Subdivision Ordinance. It should be noted that the City Engineer has recommended some modest changes related to the southernmost intersection of Street 2 and the minor collector road. This recommendation is included in as a requested modification in his report, to which staff is recommending be included as a condition of approval (Condition #3).
- *Secondary Access.* The primary access to the site will be provided from 30<sup>th</sup> Street via the Village Parkway minor collector road. Temporary secondary access may be achieved through the temporary connection to Manning Avenue (CSAH 15) through Easton Village. However, as this access is planned to be temporary, the permanent secondary access will be the connection of the Village Parkway minor collector road to Trunk Highway 5. The City must consider the timing of the closure of the temporary access on Manning Avenue with the broader interest of secondary access in mind. Coordination with both property owners/developers will continue in this regard.
- *Street Names*. Staff is recommending that the street names for the proposed subdivision follow the Washington County street naming system. Staff has provided the applicant with proposed street names that are consistent with the Washington County system. In conversation with the applicant, they are amenable to the provided street names. Staff will work with the applicant to incorporate the correct street names in advance of Final Plat.
- *City Engineer Review*. The City Engineer has provided the Planning Department with a detailed comment letter (Attachment #5) as a summary of his review of the Village Park Preserve Preliminary Plat. In addition, the City Engineer obtained additional review of the proposed storm water system through Brett Emmons of Emmons & Olivier Resources, Inc. In the memorandum, the Engineer highlights several of the critical path issues or modifications that must be resolved for the proposed design to move forward. One of these issues remains the discharge of storm water to a new location within a new culvert to the south of 30<sup>th</sup> Street. As a condition of approval (Condition #6), staff is recommending that the necessary permissions related to this stormwater discharge be provided in advance of Final Plat application. In addition, the other necessary revisions and modifications identified in the City Engineer's memorandum must also be made in advance of Final Plat (Condition #3).
- *Washington County Review*. County Staff has reviewed the Village Park Preserve plat and provided specific comments to the City in a letter dated September 3, 2014 (Attachment #7). The most significant of the County's comments relate to the need for additional right-of-way for both Manning Avenue (CSAH 15) and the Manning-30<sup>th</sup> Street intersection. As a condition of approval (Condition #8), staff is recommending that the applicants observe all requirements in the review memorandum submitted by Washington County.

- *Watershed Districts*. The project area lies within the Valley Branch Watershed District (VBWD). The Valley Branch Watershed District has not provided any formal comments for the proposed plat at this time. It should be noted that the developer must meet all the rules of the Wetland Conservation Act and VBWD and will need to secure permits from the VBWD in order to proceed with the development as planned (Condition #5).
- *Fire Department Review*. The Fire Chief has reviewed the plat (Attachment #6) and found the hydrant locations to be sufficient in terms of spacing and operation effectiveness. In addition, the Fire Chief is requesting that the street names follow the Washington County street naming system. Staff will work with the applicant to update the street names per the input of the Fire Chief in advance of Final Plat.
- *Metropolitan Airports Commission Review*. Neil Ralston of the Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) has submitted a review memorandum documenting the concerns and requests for additional work related to the subdivision's location adjacent to the Lake Elmo Airport. The memorandum is found in Attachment #8. The most critical issues relate to the design of the stormwater management facilities on the site. In addition, MAC is recommending that an aeronautical study be filed with the FAA for any structures over 35 feet in height utilized in the construction of the subdivision. Staff is recommending that the applicant address all review comments in the memorandum submitted by MAC as part of any final plat submittal (Condition #13).

Based on the above Staff report and analysis, Staff is recommending approval of the preliminary plat with 13 conditions intended to address the outstanding issues noted above and to further clarify the City's expectations in order for the developer to move forward with a final plat. The recommended conditions are as follows:

## **Recommended Conditions of Approval:**

- 1) The Metropolitan Council must approve the Comprehensive Plan Amendment for the Holliday parcel in advance of the City's consideration of an application for Final Plat for the Village Park Preserve Subdivision.
- 2) In advance of Final Plat application, the applicant shall provide adequate title evidence satisfactory to the City Attorney.
- 3) All required modifications to the plans as requested by the City Engineer in a review memorandum dated September 4, 2014 shall be incorporated into the plans prior to consideration of a Final Plat.
- 4) The Preliminary Plat approval is conditioned upon the applicant meeting all minimum City standards and design requirements.
- 5) The developer shall follow all of the rules and regulations spelled out in the Wetland Conservation Act, and shall acquire the needed permits from Valley Branch Watershed District prior to the commencement of any grading or development activity on the site.

- 6) Related to the proposed storm water discharge to the south, the applicant must provide written permission from all property owners of the affected parcels located south of the proposed 30<sup>th</sup> Street culvert consenting to the discharge location, volume and rate(s) in advance of submitting Final Plat.
- 7) The applicant shall be responsible for the submission of final plans and the construction of all improvements within the 30<sup>th</sup> Street right-of-way as required by the City and further described in the review memorandum from the City Engineer dated September 4, 2014.
- 8) The applicant shall observe all right-of-way and other requirements included in a review memorandum from Washington County dated September 3, 2014.
- 9) The Landscape Plan shall be updated per the recommendations of the City's Landscape Consultant, describe in a memo dated September 4, 2014. Tree protection measures for trees intended to be saved according to the submitted Tree Survey must be included in the Final Landscape Plan.
- 10) The applicant must enter into a separate grading agreement with the City prior to the commencement of any grading activity in advance of final plat and plan approval. The City Engineer shall review any grading plan that is submitted in advance of a final plat, and said plan shall document extent of any proposed grading on the site.
- 11) The applicant shall install an additional row of trees in the rear of Lots 1-3, Block 1 to provide additional screening for the eastern boundary of the Mcleod property to satisfy the condition of approval related to the requested Comprehensive Plan Amendment.
- 12) The developer shall obtain all required permits from Northern Natural Gas to perform construction work over the gas line that runs from north to south across this site.
- 13) The developer shall address any comments from Metropolitan Airport Commission documented in a review memorandum dated September 3, 2014 as part of a final plat submission for any portion of Village Park Preserve.

## **DRAFT FINDINGS**

Staff is recommending that the Planning Commission consider the following findings with regards to the proposed Village Park Preserve Preliminary Plat:

- That the Village Park Preserve Preliminary Plat is consistent with the Lake Elmo Comprehensive Plan and the Future Land Use Map for this area conditioned upon receiving final approval for the Metropolitan Council for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment for the Holliday parcel.
- That the Village Park Preserve Preliminary Plat complies with the City's LDR- Urban Low Density Residential zoning district.
- That the Village Park Preserve Preliminary Plat complies with the City's Subdivision Ordinance.

- That the Village Park Preserve Preliminary Plat meets other City zoning ordinances, such as landscaping, tree preservation, erosion and sediment control, and other ordinances, except where noted in the conditions of approval or the attachments to this report.
- That the Village Park Preserve Preliminary Plat is consistent with the City's engineering standards provided the plans are updated to address the City Engineer's comments documented in a letter dated September 4, 2014.
- That the Village Park Preserve Preliminary Plat provides effective and safe pedestrian facilities, providing access to Reid Park and a future connection to downtown Lake Elmo, contributing to a walkable community as guided by the Village Land Use Plan.
- That the Village Park Preserve Preliminary Plat provides a significant expansion of Reid Park, as recommended by the Village Land Use Plan.
- That the Village Park Preserve residential subdivision will allow for the completion of the Village Parkway minor collector road from 30<sup>th</sup> Street to Easton Village, providing a critical transportation improvement needed for the Village Planning Area.

## **RECCOMENDATION:**

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Village Park Preserve Preliminary Plat with the 13 conditions of approval as listed in the Staff report. Suggested motion:

"Move to recommend approval of the Village Park Preserve preliminary plat with the 13 conditions of approval as drafted by Staff based on the findings of fact listed in the Staff Report."

## **ATTACHMENTS:**

- 1. Location Map
- 2. Application Form and Project Narrative
- 3. Village Park Preserve Preliminary Plat and Plans (34 Sheets)
- 4. Resolution 2014-60
- 5. City Engineer Review Memorandum, dated 9/4/14
- 6. Fire Chief Review Memorandum, dated 8/27/14
- 7. Washington County Review Letter, dated 9/3/14
- 8. Metropolitan Airports Commission Review Letter, dated 9/3/14
- 9. City's Landscape Consultant Review Memo, dated 9/4/14.

#### **ORDER OF BUSINESS:**

- Introduction.....Community Development Director
- Report by Staff..... City Planner
- Questions from the Commission...... Chair & Commission Members

-	Open the Public Hearing	Chair
-	Close the Public Hearing	Chair
-	Discussion by the Commission	Chair & Commission Members
-	Action by the Commission	Chair & Commission Members

Date Received: Received By: LU File #:	LAKE ELMO	651-747-3900 3800 Laverne Avenue North Lake Elmo, MN 55042
PRELIMINARY PLAT APPLI	CATION PARK	PRESERVE
	11 Ilance	
Applicant: GWSA Land Develo Address: 10850 011 Compy 120	purent, LLL	
Address: 10850 011 County TZa	ind 15. Suste Zuo, Plymenth,	MN 55441
Phone #: 952-2.70-4473	· · · · ·	
Email Address: Craig & junyer Co.	mpiny lon	
Street and all a		
Fee Owner: Mark Itelliday Address: PO Boy 243, Lake Eli		
Address: PU Buy 243, LLK. ET.	MU, MUN 55042	
Phone #: 651-270-1318		
Email Address: Markh 850 and	. Com	
		a
Property Location (Address and Comple	ete (long) Legal Description:	Attacked
General information of proposed subdiv	vision: Preliminary Phr to me	- funite +/-14 sicres
General information of proposed subdiv with The Schillson Property of	rision: Preliminary Phit to inc -s part of a 104 lot Single	monte +/-14 acres
		No
Conducted pre-application meeting with	I Staff? Ves I N	No
Conducted pre-application meeting with In signing this application, I hereby acknowledge Ordinance and current administrative procedure	Staff?	No icable provisions of the Zoning s outlined in the application
General information of proposed subdiv <u>b. Th. Th. Schillson Property</u> Conducted pre-application meeting with In signing this application, I hereby acknowledge Ordinance and current administrative procedure procedures and hereby agree to pay all stateme	Staff?	No icable provisions of the Zoning s outlined in the application
Conducted pre-application meeting with n signing this application, I hereby acknowledge Ordinance and current administrative procedure procedures and hereby agree to pay all stateme	Staff?	No icable provisions of the Zoning s outlined in the application
Conducted pre-application meeting with In signing this application, I hereby acknowledge Ordinance and current administrative procedure procedures and hereby agree to pay all stateme	Staff?	No icable provisions of the Zoning s outlined in the application
Conducted pre-application meeting with n signing this application, I hereby acknowledge Ordinance and current administrative procedure procedures and hereby agree to pay all stateme Signature of applicant:	Staff?	No icable provisions of the Zoning s outlined in the application
Conducted pre-application meeting with n signing this application, I hereby acknowledge Ordinance and current administrative procedure procedures and hereby agree to pay all stateme Signature of applicant:	Staff?	No icable provisions of the Zoning s outlined in the application
Conducted pre-application meeting with n signing this application, I hereby acknowledge Ordinance and current administrative procedure procedures and hereby agree to pay all stateme Signature of applicant:	Staff?	No icable provisions of the Zoning s outlined in the application
Conducted pre-application meeting with n signing this application, I hereby acknowledge Ordinance and current administrative procedure procedures and hereby agree to pay all stateme Signature of applicant:	Staff? Ves IN e that I have read and fully understand the appl es. I further acknowledge the fee explanation as ents received from the City pertaining to addition Date: 0/6/14	No icable provisions of the Zoning s outlined in the application
Conducted pre-application meeting with In signing this application, I hereby acknowledge Ordinance and current administrative procedure procedures and hereby agree to pay all strateme Signature of applicant:	e that I have read and fully understand the apples. I further acknowledge the fee explanation as ents received from the City pertaining to addition	No icable provisions of the Zoning s outlined in the application
Conducted pre-application meeting with n signing this application, I hereby acknowledge Ordinance and current administrative procedure procedures and hereby agree to pay all stateme Signature of applicant: City Use Only Planning: Zoning District: Reviewed by:	Staff? Ves IN e that I have read and fully understand the appl es. I further acknowledge the fee explanation as ents received from the City pertaining to addition Date: 0/6/14	No icable provisions of the Zoning s outlined in the application

S:\Planning-Building Department\Forms\Permit Applications\Preliminary Plat Application 9.11.13.docx Revised 9/11/2013 3.14 PM



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY

This is to certify that I am making application for the described action by the City and that I am responsible for complying with all City requirements with regard to this request. This application should be processed in my name and I am the party whom the City should contact regarding any matter pertaining to this application.

I have read and understand the instructions supplied for processing this application. The documents and/or information I have submitted are true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I will keep myself informed of the deadlines for submission of material and of the progress of this application.

I understand that this application may be reviewed by City staff and consultants. I further understand that additional information, including, but not limited to, traffic analysis and expert testimony may be required for review of this application. I agree to pay to the City upon demand, expenses, determined by the City, that the City incurs in reviewing this application and shall provide an escrow deposit to the City in an amount to be determined by the City. Said expenses shall include, but are not limited to, staff time, engineering, legal expenses and other consultant expenses.

Date

Phone

I agree to allow access by City personnel to the property for purposes of review of my application.

Signature of applicant

Name of applicant\_

(Please Print)

Name and address of Contact (if other than applicant)\_



# AFFIRMATION OF SUFFICIENT INTEREST

I hereby affirm that I am the fee title owner of the below described property or that I have written authorization from the owner to pursue the described action.

(P	lease Print) roperty See Attached	
eet address/legal description of subject p	roperty See Attached	-
		_
A GA.	AL La	
1 yVAU	8/6/14	
Signature	Date	

If you are not the fee owner, attach another copy of this form which has been completed by the fee owner or a copy of your authorization to pursue this action.

If a corporation is fee title holder, attach a copy of the resolution of the Board of Directors authorizing this action.

If a joint venture or partnership is the fee owner, attach a copy of agreement authorizing this action on behalf of the joint venture or partnership.



# AFFIRMATION OF SUFFICIENT INTEREST

I hereby affirm that I am the fee title owner of the below described property or that I have written authorization from the owner to pursue the described action.

ame of applicant	Perer (Please F		NTGON	
ame of applicant <u>(Please Print)</u> reet address/legal description of subject property				
5				
tota/2	hiltser	8	-19-14	
Signature	0		Date	

If you are not the fee owner, attach another copy of this form which has been completed by the fee owner or a copy of your authorization to pursue this action.

If a corporation is fee title holder, attach a copy of the resolution of the Board of Directors authorizing this action.

If a joint venture or partnership is the fee owner, attach a copy of agreement authorizing this action on behalf of the joint venture or partnership.

#### Schiltgen Farms Property Description - Manning:

The land referred to in this Commitment is situated in the County of Washington, State of Minnesota, and is described as follows:

The North 50 acres of the South Half of the Southeast Quarter of Section 13, Township 29 North, Range 21 West, Washington County, Minnesota, except that part which lies easterly of the following described line: Commencing at the southeast corner of said Southeast Quarter; thence South 88 degrees 45 minutes 30 seconds West along the South line of said Southeast Quarter, 159.73 feet (bearings are based on the Washington County Coordinate System); thence North 1 degree 14 minutes 30 seconds West, 33 feet, thence North 43 degrees 59 minutes 50 seconds East. 142.10 feet to the point of beginning of the line to be described, thence North 0 degrees 45 minutes 51 seconds West, 1188.14 feet to said North line of said South Half of the Southeast Quarter and said line there terminating.

Abstract Property.



# AFFIRMATION OF SUFFICIENT INTEREST

I hereby affirm that I am the fee title owner of the below described property or that I have written authorization from the owner to pursue the described action.

Name of applicant <u>MARK HOLLIDAY</u> (Please Pri	nt)
Street address/legal description of subject property_	See Attached
Mark Halling Signature	8-12-14
Signature	Date

If you are not the fee owner, attach another copy of this form which has been completed by the fee owner or a copy of your authorization to pursue this action.

If a corporation is fee title holder, attach a copy of the resolution of the Board of Directors authorizing this action.

If a joint venture or partnership is the fee owner, attach a copy of agreement authorizing this action on behalf of the joint venture or partnership.

Mark Holliday Property Description:

The land referred to in the Commitment is situated in Washington County, State of Minnesota and is described as follows:

The South 498.6 feet of the South Half of the Southeast Quarter (S1/2 of SE1/4); Section Thirteen (13), Township Twenty Nine North (29N.), Range Twenty-one West (21W.); except the West 1273.0 feet of the South Half of the Southeast Quarter of said Section Thirteen (13). And excepting therefrom that portion of the above tract conveyed to the County of Washington by that certain Quit Claim Deed dated March 30, 1987, and filed of record in the Office of the Washington County Recorder on April 2, 1987 as Document No. 535377.

Abstract Property.

#### VILLAGE PARK PRESERVE Development Narrative September 2, 2014

#### **Developer Introduction**:

GWSA LAND DEVELOPMENT, LLC. Craig Allen 10850 Old County Road 15 Suite 200 Lake Elmo, Minnesota 55441 Telephone: 952-270-4473 Email: craig@gonyeacompany.com

The developer is proposing a community of 104 single family homes on +/- 63.6 acres of land located on the west side of Manning Avenue North (CASH15), north of 30<sup>th</sup> Street North. The Schiltgen parcel and the Holliday parcel comprise the 63.6 acres of land. This proposed residential development will consist of higher end single family homes. It is anticipated that these homes will range in price from \$400,000 to \$650,000. The development is located in an area of Lake Elmo with easy access to the transportation system. This will provide the future home owners a secluded place to live that is located within minutes of all the amenities Lake Elmo has to offer with the regional facilities of the larger metropolitan area.



#### "VILLAGE PARK PRESERVE"

The project is anticipated to be constructed in two phases, of 50-60 lots per phase. The primary access is the proposed Village Parkway from 30<sup>th</sup> Street North. Over 15.7 acres of land is proposed to be dedicated as parkland to add to the existing Reid Park. A trail connection to the park area is proposed in the southwest corner. Over seventy five percent of the homes in the community will have a walkout basement. The project is located within the Stillwater School District #834.

#### Development Team:

<u>Civil Engineering, Surveying & Land Planning</u> Sathre-Bergquist, Inc. Robert S. Molstad, P.E. David B. Pemberton, P.L.S. 150 South Broadway Wayzata, Minnesota 55391 Telephone: 952-476-6000 Facsimile: 952-476-0104 Email: <u>molstad@sathre.com</u> Email: <u>pemberton@sathre.com</u>

Wetland & Biological Sciences **Kjolhaug Environmental Services** Melissa Barrett 26105 Wild Rose Lane Shorewood, MN 55331 Telephone: 952-401-8757 Email: <u>Melissa@kjolhaugenv.com</u>

Soil Sciences Haugo GeoTechnical Services Paul Haugo 13570 Grove Drive #278 Maple Grove, MN 55311 Telephone: (612) 554-4829 Email: p.haugo@gmail.com

#### **Property Ownership**:

Per Schedule A of Title Commitment No. HB-26627A (northerly property)

The North 50 acres of the South Half of the Southeast Quarter of Section 13, Township 29 North, Range 21 West, Washington County, Minnesota, except that part which lies easterly of the following described line:

Commencing at the southeast corner of said Southeast Quarter; thence South 88 degrees 45 minutes 30 seconds West along the South line of said Southeast Quarter, 159.73 feet (bearings are based on the Washington County Coordinate System); thence North 01 degree 14 minutes 30

- 2 -

seconds West, 33 feet, thence North 43 degrees 59 minutes 50 seconds East, 142.10 feet to the point of beginning of the line to be described; thence North 00 degrees 45 minutes 51 seconds West, 1188.14 feet to said North line of said South Half of the Southeast Quarter and said line there terminating.

Abstract Property.

Per Schedule A of Title Commitment No. HB-26880 (southerly property)

The South 498.6 feet of the South Half of the Southeast Quarter (S1/2 of SE1/4); Section Thirteen (13), Township Twenty Nine North (29N.), Range Twenty-one West (21W.); except the West 1273.0 feet of the South Half of the Southeast Quarter of said Section Thirteen (13). And excepting therefrom that portion of the above tract conveyed to the County of Washington by that certain Quit Claim Deed dated March 30,1987, and filed of record in the Office of the Washington County Recorder on April 2, 1987 as Document No. 535377. Abstract Property.

#### Comprehensive Plan, Zoning, Density, & Variances:

The site consists of the Schiltgen parcel +/- 49 acres and the Holliday parcel +/- 14.8 acres. The Existing Land Use is classified as Rural Area Development. On the Village Land Use Plan, the planned Land Use for the Schiltgen parcel is Village Urban Low Density (V-LDR) and Rural Area Development (RAD) for the Holliday parcel.

The attached preliminary plat shows 104 single family lots that are a minimum width of 65 feet. There are 60 lots that are in the 65' lot width, 4 lots in the 75' lot width, and 40 lots that are 81' in width. The smallest lot area is L4B3 (65') – 8,342 sf and the largest lot area is L7B2 (81') at 27,055 sf, with an average lot area of 11,421 for the entire project.

#### Lake Elmo Zoning:

Both parcels are currently zoned RT. The Schiltgen parcel is currently planned as Village Urban Low Density (V-LDR) and the Holliday parcel is currently planned as Rural Area Development (RAD). A Comprehensive Plan Amendment to change the Holliday parcel from RAD to V-LDR was approved by City Council and is currently being reviewed by the MET Council. The V-LDR district has the following requirements:

V-LDR District

1.5 - 2.5 units per acre

Minimum Lot Area – 8,000 square feet Minimum Width – 60 feet Front Yard Setback – 25 feet Side Yard Setback – 5 feet to garage and 10 feet to living space Corner Yard Setback – 15 feet Rear Yard Setback – 20 feet

- 3 -

#### **Density:**

Gross Site Area: 63.55 acres Gross Density = 104/63.55 = 1.64 units per acre

Wetland Area: 0.40 acres Proposed Park Area: 15.77 acres Net Area: 63.55-0.40-15.77 = 47.38 acres Net Density = 104/47.38 = 2.2 units per acre

Variances – No variances are proposed.

A preliminary plat lot area tabulation sheet is in Appendix A of this narrative.

#### Site Analysis:

The site is currently being used for agricultural purposes. Please refer to the ALTA Survey and the aerial photos. Utility service, sanitary sewer will be provided to the site as part of the proposed Trunk Sanitary Sewer project that will extend sewer service from the new lift station at Reid Park, north to the Site, the current plan is to provide sanitary sewer from the stub in the proposed Village Parkway, from the Easton Village project. A 12" trunk watermain will be installed with the proposed trunk sanitary sewer system, that will provide a watermain connection for the proposed development. Storm water will be managed and outlet from the site in accordance with the City and Watershed requirements. The proposed stormwater plan would outlet with a new storm sewer pipe down the west side of Manning Avenue North to the culvert about 850 feet south of 30<sup>th</sup> Street North. The site is within the Valley Branch Watershed District. Minor utilities (gas, electric, phone, and TV) will need to be extended to service the site.

The topography of the site is relatively flat on most of the site, 914 to 926 for the proposed development area. The proposed park area drops in elevation from 926 to +/- 892.

There are three existing wetlands on the site, two wetlands are within the proposed park area and no impacts are proposed by the residential development. The third wetland qualifies for a de minimis exemption and an application has been filed with Valley Branch Watershed District. Once approved the de minimis classification would allow us to fill without replacing.

The USDA Soil Survey of the project site indicates Antigo Silt Loams, Campia Silt Loams, and Mahtomedi Loamy Sand. The soils that are present consist of mostly moderately well drained loams and sandy loams with a moderate permeability.

#### Street Design:

"Village Park Preserve" proposes a north south parkway (Village Parkway), the parkway will be 32' B-B within an 80' ROW. The other public streets within the project would be 28' B-B, with a sidewalk along one side of the street, within a 60' ROW. The cul-de-sacs will have a 44' Radius to the back of curb. All streets will be constructed to the City of Lake Elmo standard street section.

- 4 -

#### **Utility Services:**

City sanitary sewer and watermain will need to be extended to the site, please see the notes above.

#### Site Grading:

The site grading is planned to begin in the fall of 2014. The project will be graded in one phase. The overall graded area is +/- 45.5 acres. We are proposing to grade all streets to the proposed hold downs and prepare corrected building pads for all home sites. We are creating five stormwater ponding areas and one infiltration area to meet the stormwater treatment requirements of the City and the Watershed. The excavation of on-site material is estimated at +/- 180,000 cy. It is our design objective to balance the site with on-site material, some import of suitable structural fill material may be necessary for building pad, street, and retaining wall construction. As the final design analysis is completed we will provide detailed construction plans for the project to the City of Lake Elmo.

#### <u>Stormwater:</u>

The stormwater facilities proposed in "Village Park Preserve" are illustrated on the enclosed preliminary plans. Runoff from the site will be directed to storm sewer inlet locations, collected and conveyed to the proposed treatment pond(s) and filtration area(s). The ponds and filtration areas will provide temporary storage of stormwater runoff, treatment of stormwater and sediment removal. The stormwater plan will provide adequate treatment and storage to meet the City of Lake Elmo and the Valley Branch Watershed District requirements.

## Traffic:

"Village Park Preserve" proposes one primary access point (Village Parkway) off of 30<sup>th</sup> Street North.

Traffic Generation – (anticipate 10 trips per day per home site) 104 Lots = 1,040 trips per day

#### Trail System:

Six-foot concrete sidewalks are proposed along residential streets within the site. In addition, there are 8.5 foot trails proposed to promote neighborhood connectivity.

#### Woodland Areas & Protection:

#### I. Introduction

A current tree survey in accordance with City of Lake Elmo requirements has been completed for this site and is included in the submittal. The tree inventory plan is shown on the Erosion Control Plan. 25 trees were identified, per the City requirements.

#### II. Tree Species, Distribution and Size:

The site has 467.5 caliper inches of significant trees, with 100.0 caliper inches of exempt trees for a net total of 367.5 caliper inches. The trees located throughout the site. The species include Cherry, Box Elder, Hackberry, Ash, and a few others. A table containing data on the trees, as well as a map which shows tree location, species, size and condition, are shown in the preliminary plans, please see the Erosion Control Plan.

#### Tree Removal & Restitution:

The "Village Park Preserve" development will impact approximately 22.6% of the significant trees on the site. The development is under the 30% threshold.

#### Landscape Plan, Monuments, & Entrance:

This development will have a parkway access from 30<sup>th</sup> Street North. Many of the lots will have pond views or overlook views, due to the site topography. The stormwater ponds and treatment areas will have landscaping to create unique water treatment facilities for the proposed project. A custom entry monument may be designed and constructed at the proposed entrance. This will create a sense of luxury and livability for the new single family residents, while providing safer access to the site. Landscaping, monuments and other furnishings will be designed to conform to the Lake Elmo Branding and Theming Study.

#### Homeowner's Association and Restrictive Covenants:

The developer will prepare restrictive covenants and standards that will apply to this 104 lot project. The restrictive covenants will be tailored to the developer's vision of the project. Each home will be required to meet the specifics of building types, landscaping, and overall goals of the development.

A master HOA will be created for the "Village Park Preserve" project. This association will be in charge of the monumentation, entrance, landscaping, and infiltration basins. The HOA will also be responsible for maintenance issues within the subdivision. These may include special landscaping, mailboxes, signage, and other common elements.

#### APPENDIX A:

Village Park Preserve– Preliminary Plat Lot Area Summary

BLOCK 1	GROSS AREA				W	ETLAND AREA		NET	AREA	
Lot 1	22,997	s.f.	0.53	acres	0	s.f.	22,997	s.f.	0.53	acres
Lot 2	15,466	s.f.	0.36	acres	0	s.f.	15,466	s.f.	0.36	acres
Lot 3	16,238	s.f.	0.37	acres	0	s.f.	16,238	s.f.	0.37	acres
Lot 4	21,309	s.f.	0.49	acres	0	s.f.	21,309	s.f.	0.49	acres

Lot 5	15,634	s.f.	0.36	acres	0	s.f.	15,634	s.f.	0.36	acres	
Lot 6	14,347	s.f.	0.33	acres	0	s.f.	14,347	s.f.	0.33	acres	
Lot 7	12,999	s.f.	0.30	acres	0	s.f.	12,999	s.f.	0.30	acres	
Lot 8	12,034	s.f.	0.28	acres	0	s.f.	12,034	s.f.	0.28	acres	
Lot 9	11,518	s.f.	0.26	acres	0	s.f.	11,518	s.f.	0.26	acres	
Lot 10	10,677	s.f.	0.25	acres	0	s.f.	10,677	s.f.	0.25	acres	
Lot 11	13,329	s.f.	0.31	acres	0	s.f.	13,329	s.f.	0.31	acres	
Lot 12	14,784	s.f.	0.34	acres	0	s.f.	14,784	s.f.	0.34	acres	
Total	362,664	s.f.	8.33	acres	0	s.f.	362,664	s.f.	8.33	acres	

BLOCK 2		GROS	SS AREA			ETLAND AREA		NET	AREA	
Lot 1	18,200	s.f.	0.42	acres	0	s.f.	18,200	s.f.	0.42	acres
Lot 2	21,102	s.f.	0.48	acres	0	s.f.	21,102	s.f.	0.48	acres
Lot 3	16,406	s.f.	0.38	acres	0	s.f.	16,406	s.f.	0.38	acres
Lot 4	16,691	s.f.	0.38	acres	0	s.f.	16,691	s.f.	0.38	acres
Lot 5	18,012	s.f.	0.41	acres	0	s.f.	18,012	s.f.	0.41	acres
Lot 6	26,509	s.f.	0.61	acres	0	s.f.	26,509	s.f.	0.61	acres
Lot 7	27,055	s.f.	0.62	acres	0	s.f.	27,055	s.f.	0.62	acres
Lot 8	12,112	s.f.	0.28	acres	0	s.f.	12,112	s.f.	0.28	acres
Lot 9	12,164	s.f.	0.28	acres	0	s.f.	12,164	s.f.	0.28	acres
Lot 10	11,894	s.f.	0.27	acres	0	s.f.	11,894	s.f.	0.27	acres
Lot 11	10,988	s.f.	0.25	acres	0	s.f.	10,988	s.f.	0.25	acres
Lot 12	10,988	s.f.	0.25	acres	0	s.f.	10,988	s.f.	0.25	acres
Lot 13	10,988	s.f.	0.25	acres	0	s.f.	10,988	s.f.	0.25	acres
Lot 14	10,988	s.f.	0.25	acres	0	s.f.	10,988	s.f.	0.25	acres
Lot 15	13,012	s.f.	0.30	acres	0	s.f.	13,012	s.f.	0.30	acres
Total	474,218	s.f.	10.89	acres	0	s.f.	474,218	s.f.	10.89	acres

BLOCK 3		GROS	S AREA		W	ETLAND AREA		NET	AREA	
Lot 1	10,852	s.f.	0.25	acres	0	s.f.	10,852	s.f.	0.25	acres
Lot 2	8,813	s.f.	0.20	acres	0	s.f.	8,813	s.f.	0.20	acres
Lot 3	8,680	s.f.	0.20	acres	0	s.f.	8,680	s.f.	0.20	acres
Lot 4	8,342	s.f.	0.19	acres	0	s.f.	8,342	s.f.	0.19	acres
	- 7	_								

Lot 5	10,457	s.f.	0.24	acres	0	s.f.	10,457	s.f.	0.24	acres	
Lot 6	10,407	s.f.	0.24	acres	0	s.f.	10,407	s.f.	0.24	acres	
Lot 7	11,345	s.f.	0.26	acres	0	s.f.	11,345	s.f.	0.26	acres	
Lot 8	13,467	s.f.	0.31	acres	0	s.f.	13,467	s.f.	0.31	acres	
Lot 9	11,462	s.f.	0.26	acres	0	s.f.	11,462	s.f.	0.26	acres	
Lot 10	10,266	s.f.	0.24	acres	0	s.f.	10,266	s.f.	0.24	acres	
Lot 11	10,042	s.f.	0.23	acres	0	s.f.	10,042	s.f.	0.23	acres	
Lot 12	8,862	s.f.	0.20	acres	0	s.f.	8,862	s.f.	0.20	acres	
Lot 13	8,630	s.f.	0.20	acres	0	s.f.	8,630	s.f.	0.20	acres	
Lot 14	8,450	s.f.	0.19	acres	0	s.f.	8,450	s.f.	0.19	acres	
Lot 15	8,450	s.f.	0.19	acres	0	s.f.	8,450	s.f.	0.19	acres	
Lot 16	8,450	s.f.	0.19	acres	0	s.f.	8,450	s.f.	0.19	acres	
Total	313,950	s.f.	7.21	acres	0	s.f.	313,950	s.f.	7.21	acres	

BLOCK 4		GRO	SS AREA			ETLAND AREA		NET	AREA	
Lot 1	8,450	s.f.	0.19	acres	0	s.f.	8,450	s.f.	0.19	acres
Lot 2	8,827	s.f.	0.20	acres	0	s.f.	8,827	s.f.	0.20	acres
Lot 3	9,883	s.f.	0.23	acres	0	s.f.	9,883	s.f.	0.23	acres
Lot 4	11,251	s.f.	0.26	acres	0	s.f.	11,251	s.f.	0.26	acres
Lot 5	9,903	s.f.	0.23	acres	0	s.f.	9,903	s.f.	0.23	acres
Lot 6	10,166	s.f.	0.23	acres	0	s.f.	10,166	s.f.	0.23	acres
Lot 7	10,196	s.f.	0.23	acres	0	s.f.	10,196	s.f.	0.23	acres
Lot 8	9,903	s.f.	0.23	acres	0	s.f.	9,903	s.f.	0.23	acres
Lot 9	9,577	s.f.	0.22	acres	0	s.f.	9,577	s.f.	0.22	acres
Lot 10	8,915	s.f.	0.20	acres	0	s.f.	8,915	s.f.	0.20	acres
Lot 11	8,547	s.f.	0.20	acres	0	s.f.	8,547	s.f.	0.20	acres
Lot 12	8,999	s.f.	0.21	acres	0	s.f.	8,999	s.f.	0.21	acres
Lot 13	9,135	s.f.	0.21	acres	0	s.f.	9,135	s.f.	0.21	acres
Lot 14	9,135	s.f.	0.21	acres	0	s.f.	9,135	s.f.	0.21	acres
Lot 15	9,135	s.f.	0.21	acres	0	s.f.	9,135	s.f.	0.21	acres
Lot 16	9,135	s.f.	0.21	acres	0	s.f.	9,135	s.f.	0.21	acres
Total	302,314	s.f.	6.94	acres	0	s.f.	302,314	s.f.	6.94	acres

BLOCK

**GROSS AREA** 

WETLAND

NET AREA

- 8 -


5						AREA				
Lot 1	9,240	s.f.	0.21	acres	0	s.f.	9,240	s.f.	0.21	acres
Lot 2	9,108	s.f.	0.21	acres	0	s.f.	9,108	s.f.	0.21	acres
Lot 3	9,020	s.f.	0.21	acres	0	s.f.	9,020	s.f.	0.21	acres
Lot 4	9,020	s.f.	0.21	acres	0	s.f.	9,020	s.f.	0.21	acres
Lot 5	9,262	s.f.	0.21	acres	0	s.f.	9,262	s.f.	0.21	acres
Lot 6	9,262	s.f.	0.21	acres	0	s.f.	9,262	s.f.	0.21	acres
Lot 7	8,675	s.f.	0.20	acres	0	s.f.	8,675	s.f.	0.20	acres
Lot 8	11,717	s.f.	0.27	acres	0	s.f.	11,717	s.f.	0.27	acres
Total	150,608	s.f.	3.46	acres	0	s.f.	150,608	s.f.	3.46	acres

BLOCK 6		GRO	OSS AREA			'ETLAND AREA		NET	AREA	
Lot 1	11,333	s.f.	0.26	acres	0	s.f.	11,333	s.f.	0.26	acres
Lot 2	8,509	s.f.	0.20	acres	0	s.f.	8,509	s.f.	0.20	acres
Lot 3	9,388	s.f.	0.22	acres	0	s.f.	9,388	s.f.	0.22	acres
Lot 4	10,729	s.f.	0.25	acres	0	s.f.	10,729	s.f.	0.25	acres
Lot 5	9,749	s.f.	0.22	acres	0	s.f.	9,749	s.f.	0.22	acres
Lot 6	11,229	s.f.	0.26	acres	0	s.f.	11,229	s.f.	0.26	acres
Total	121,874	s.f.	2.80	acres	0	s.f.	121,874	s.f.	2.80	acres

BLOCK 7		GRO	SS AREA			ETLAND AREA		NET	AREA	
Lot 1	11,671	s.f.	0.27	acres	0	s.f.	11,671	s.f.	0.27	acres
Lot 2	9,380	s.f.	0.22	acres	0	s.f.	9,380	s.f.	0.22	acres
Lot 3	9,270	s.f.	0.21	acres	0	s.f.	9,270	s.f.	0.21	acres
Lot 4	9,925	s.f.	0.23	acres	0	s.f.	9,925	s.f.	0.23	acres
Lot 5	9,342	s.f.	0.21	acres	0	s.f.	9,342	s.f.	0.21	acres
Lot 6	10,430	s.f.	0.24	acres	0	s.f.	10,430	s.f.	0.24	acres
Lot 7	9,667	s.f.	0.22	acres	0	s.f.	9,667	s.f.	0.22	acres
Lot 8	10,140	s.f.	0.23	acres	0	s.f.	10,140	s.f.	0.23	acres
Lot 9	11,087	s.f.	0.25	acres	0	s.f.	11,087	s.f.	0.25	acres
Lot 10	11,343	s.f.	0.26	acres	0	s.f.	11,343	s.f.	0.26	acres
Lot 11	9,609	s.f.	0.22	acres	0	s.f.	9,609	s.f.	0.22	acres
Lot 12	8,579	s.f.	0.20	acres	0	s.f.	8,579	s.f.	0.20	acres
Lot 13	8,454	s.f.	0.19	acres	0	s.f.	8,454	s.f.	0.19	acres
Lot 14	10,400	s.f.	0.24	acres	0	s.f.	10,400	s.f.	0.24	acres
Total	278,594	s.f.	6.40	acres	0	s.f.	278,594	s.f.	6.40	acres
	- 9	_								

BLOCK 8		GRO	SS AREA			ETLAND AREA		NET	AREA	
Lot 1	12,831	s.f.	0.29	acres	0	s.f.	12,831	s.f.	0.29	acres
Lot 2	11,279	s.f.	0.26	acres	0	s.f.	11,279	s.f.	0.26	acres
Lot 3	11,279	s.f.	0.26	acres	0	s.f.	11,279	s.f.	0.26	acres
Lot 4	11,189	s.f.	0.26	acres	0	s.f.	11,189	s.f.	0.26	acres
Lot 5	10,164	s.f.	0.23	acres	0	s.f.	10,164	s.f.	0.23	acres
Lot 6	9,736	s.f.	0.22	acres	0	s.f.	9,736	s.f.	0.22	acres
Lot 7	11,407	s.f.	0.26	acres	0	s.f.	11,407	s.f.	0.26	acres
Lot 8	11,408	s.f.	0.26	acres	0	s.f.	11,408	s.f.	0.26	acres
Lot 9	10,606	s.f.	0.24	acres	0	s.f.	10,606	s.f.	0.24	acres
Lot 10	10,632	s.f.	0.24	acres	0	s.f.	10,632	s.f.	0.24	acres
Lot 11	10,546	s.f.	0.24	acres	0	s.f.	10,546	s.f.	0.24	acres
Lot 12	9,965	s.f.	0.23	acres	0	s.f.	9,965	s.f.	0.23	acres
Lot 13	10,530	s.f.	0.24	acres	0	s.f.	10,530	s.f.	0.24	acres
Lot 14	10,530	s.f.	0.24	acres	0	s.f.	10,530	s.f.	0.24	acres
Lot 15	10,530	s.f.	0.24	acres	0	s.f.	10,530	s.f.	0.24	acres
Lot 16	10,530	s.f.	0.24	acres	0	s.f.	10,530	s.f.	0.24	acres
Lot 17	12,481	s.f.	0.29	acres	0	s.f.	12,481	s.f.	0.29	acres
Total	371,286	s.f.	8.52	acres	0	s.f.	371,286	s.f.	8.52	acres
OUTLOT		GRO	SS AREA			ETLAND AREA		NET	AREA	
1	14,417	s.f.	0.33	acres	0	s.f.	14,417	s.f.	0.33	acres
2	686,961	s.f.	15.77	acres	0	s.f.	686,961	s.f.	15.77	acres
3	50,900	s.f.	1.17	acres	0	s.f.	50,900	s.f.	1.17	acres
4	32,677	s.f.	0.75	acres	0	s.f.	32,677	s.f.	0.75	acres
5	45,019	s.f.	1.03	acres	0	s.f.	45,019	s.f.	1.03	acres
6	262,419	s.f.	6.02	acres	0	s.f.	262,419	s.f.	6.02	acres
Total	2,184,786	s.f.	50.16	acres	0	s.f.	2,184,786	s.f.	50.16	acres
R/W		GRO	SS AREA			ETLAND AREA		NET	AREA	
	473,313	s.f.	10.87	acres	0	s.f.	473,313	s.f.	10.87	acres
TOTAL		GRO	SS AREA			ETLAND AREA		NET	AREA	
	4,730,142	s.f.	108.59	acres	0	s.f.	4,730,142	s.f.		acres
	- 10	)								


# - 11 -






SH	EET INDEX TABLE
SHEET	Description
SP	Site Plan
ALTA	ALTA/Existing Conditions
PP	Preliminary Plat
ST	Street Plan
UP	Utility Plan
GP	Grading Plan
EC	Erosion Control Plan
TS	Tree Survey
LP	Landscape Plan

VELOPER YA MORE DE VALUE DEMELET, AND HELVER AND HELVER OME: ONE DEMENTION ME: CRAINING COMPETING COMPANY COM







# VILLAGE PARK PRESERVE LAKE ELMO, MINNESOTA

믝

NOT TO SCALE

Being 5 fort its wolfs and adjusting for time, submainteenvie extension, and 10 fort in width and adjusting right of vice lines submainteend, as down on the plat

#### DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY SURVEYED Schedule A of the herein referenced Title Commit (Per Sch

#### Per Schedule A of Title Commitment No. HB-25627A (northerly property)

The North 50 acres of the South Half of the Southeast Quarter of Section 13, Township 29 North, Range 21 Winl, Washington County, Minnesota, except that part which lies easterly of the following described line:

ing at the southeast comer of said Southeast Quarter; literce South 88 degrees 45 minutes 30 seconds West along the South line of said Southeast Quarter, 159.73 feet (bearings are based on the Washington County Coordinate System); thence North 0.1 degree 14 minutes 30 seconds Wast, 33 feet, thence North 43 degree 58 minutes 50 seconds East, 142.10 feet to the point of beginning of the line to be described; themce North 00 degrees 45 minutes 51 seconds Wast, 1188.14 feet to said North line of said South Half of the Southeast Quarter and said line them terminating.

Abstract Property

N

0

s

C

A

L

E

#### Per Schedule A of Title Commitment No. HB-26880 (southerly property)

The South 498.6 freet of the South Hall of the Southeast Quarter (S1/2 of SE1/4); Section Thirteen (13), Township Twenty Nine North (2014), Range Twenty-one West (21W.); except the West 1273.0 freet of the South Half of the Southeast Quarter of sald Section Thirteen (13). And excepting therefrom that portion of the above tradi scoweyed to the County of Washington by that certain Quark Claim Deed dated March 30, 1887, and filed of model in the Office of the Washington County Recorder on Anil 2, 1967 as Documentities, 535377. Abstract Property


#### GENERAL NOTES

- 1) Sile Address: Unausigned, Lake Elmo, MN 55042/FID NO. 13.029.21.43.0004 (HB-26627A) and No. 13.029.21.44.0002 (HB-25880)
- Flood Zone: Pacols are contained. In Zone X (area of minimal flooding) per Flood Insurance Rate Map, Community Panel No. 27163C0355E, effective date of February 3, 2010.
- 3) Parcel Area: Gross- 2,768,244 Sq. FL 63.55 Acres Welland- 17,488 Sq. FL - 0.40 Acres ROW- 39,804 Sq. FL - 0.91 Acons Net- 2,710,952 Sq. FL + 62,24 Acres
- 4) Benchmark: Elevations are based on MNOOT Geodedic Marker (C349) located on the west skie of Matrining Ave North approximately 2350 feet north of the subject property, 17 feel northwest of a metal shed and 4 feet east of a power pole having an elevation of 924.32 feet NAVD 1988. The contours where obtained from LIDAR mapping that was downloaded from the ment of Natural Resources on September 20, 2013.
- 5) Zoning: The current Zoning for the subject property is RT (Rural Transitional) per the City of Litke Elmois zoning map dated May 2013. The planning department, informed us per a phone call that the property is in the process of changing to Wilage Low Density. Per this phone call, the setback, height, and density restrictions for this zoning designation are going to be as follows: SETBACKS Final 25 feet, Side 10 feet Wing and 5 feet gampa. Rear 20 left (HEIGHT 35 feet, DENSITY + 1.5 2 unit per

3

A"DOP'S

- 6) Location of UEDEx: We have shown the location of utilities on the surveyed property by observed evidence only.
- 7) Wettand: Kjoltaug Environmental Services were at the property on October 1, 2013.



#### SURVEY LEGEND

C

T

M

A

D HON FIFE SET	GRAVEL-EXISTING
WINN WINE FOUND	BITLMINOUS-EXISTING
OUY WRE-EXISTING	EASEMENT-EXISTING
POWER POLE-EXPITING	BOUNDARY LINE-EXISTING
TELEPHONE PEDESTAL-EXISTING	ADJACENT PROPERTY LINE-EXSTING
OVERHEAD UTULTY-EXISTING	SECTION 'LINE-EXISTING
W0005-EX5100	CENTERLAS - PROPOSED
EASEMENT LINE-PROPOSED	- WORLD OF WAY- PRONVED
SETBACK LINE-PROPOSED	
LOT WOTH TING-PROPOSED	CURVE RADIAL LINE-PROPOSED




REAR BUILDING PAD LINE-PROPOSED CURVE RADAUL LINE-PROPOSED BLOCK LINE-PROPOSED					
FIELD CREW	NO.	67	DATE	REVISIONS	USE (INCLUDING COPYING, DISTRIBUTION, AND/OR CONVEYANCE OF INFORMATION) OF THIS PRODUCT IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED WITHOUT SATHRE-BERGQUIST, INC.: EXPRESS WRITTEN AUTHORIZATION. USE WITHOUT
DRAWN BY				-	
JML					SAID AUTHORIZATION CONSTITUTES AN ILLEGITIMATE USE AND SHALL THEREBY
CHECKED BY					INDEMNIFY SATHRE-BERGOUIST, INC. OF ALL RESPONSIBILITY. SATHRE-BERGOUIST, INC. RESERVES THE RIGHT TO HOLD ANY ILLEGITIMATE
RL/S					USER OR PARTY LEGALLY RESPONSIBLE FOR DAMAGES OR LOSSES RESULTING
DATE					FROM BLEGITMATE USE.
08-04-14	1 14	10			a strand and a second strand second sec


I hereby certify that this survey, plan or report was prepared by me or under my direct supervision and that I am a duly Licensed Land Surveyor under the laws of the State of Minnesota. Dated this Theday of August, 2014




















LOT TAB SHEET


SLOCK	CROSS AREA	WETLAND AREA		BLOCK		WETLAND AREA.	NETAREA	WIDTH # SETBACK		
Lot 2	22.997 n.f. 0.50 sores 15.466 n.f. 0.36 sores	1.1 0	22,007 af 0.33 arms 56,9 af- 13,466 af 0.30 arms 74,8 af-	Cot 1	8450 s.f. 0.19 son 8357 s.f. 0.20 son		5.450 s.f. 0.19 acres 5.827 a.f. 0.70 acres	65 all 12 72.7 all 12	FLOCK	GROSS AREA
Lot 3	16.236 L.C. 0.37 acres	0 15	16,216 af 11.37 acres 74.9 min	Lot 2 Lot 3	9,883 sf. 0.23 som		9,845 a.f. 0.23 acm	77 46 15	Lat	12.431 4.1 0.79
144.4	77 48P8			Lor-4	11.251 s.f. 8.26 and		(1.25) s.6 0.26 acres	74.8 al. 15	Lol	11.279 u.t. 0.26
Los 5 Los 6	15.634 s.f. 0.36 score 14.547 s.f. 0.33 score	0 st 0 st	15.634 a.f. 0.36 series 120.1 +4- 14.347 a.f. 0.33 series 95.1 e4-	Let 5	9,903 af. 0.13 ann		9,903 a.f. 0.23 ares	64.9 at 11,	Loc 3	11,279 all 6.26
Las 7	12,999 s.f. 0.30 acert	0 at	12,999 af 0.30 sens 82.) +/	Lot 6	10.166 a.f. 0.23 see		10,166 s.f. 0.23 ports	54.9 eA HC	Lot 4	11,189 1.4. 0.26
Los B	12,037 1. 0.28 2009	0 46	17,034 4.6 0.28 some 10.9 +/-	Log 7	10,196 a.f. 0.23 abr		10,196 s.f. 0.23 acres	54.9 al- 1C	Lot 5	10,161 #£ 0.23
Ease 9	11,518 s.I. 0.28 some	0 4E	\$1,518 of 0.25 with \$7.8 ef.	Lot #	9.903 af: 0.23 and 9.527 af: 0.22 and		9.903 s.f. 5.23 sons 9.577 s.f. 5.22 sons	88.0 al LL 76.1 al LL	kot6 kot7	9,736 s.f. 0.22 11,407 s.f. 0.25
Kot 20	10,677 s.f. 0.25 scena	34 65	10,637 e.C 0.25 acres. #1 e4.	Los 10	3,915 sf. 0.20 wor		\$915 LE 020 x0m	77 #6 12	Lot B	11,404 A.C 0.26
Lot 11 Lot 12	1.029 s.f. 0.31 arrest 14.784 s.f. 0.34 arrest	9 s.L.	43,329 s.f. 0.31 porer #1 #/- 18,354 s.f. 0.34 pores #1 #6-	Los 84	8.547 s.f. 0.20 som		\$347 ef. 0.20 more-	67.3 A/- 1.E	Lot 9	10,605 + E 0.74
Total	14384 ed. 0.34 acres 362664 ed. 2.13 acres	A		Log 12	\$,999 a.f. 0.21 som		6.999 6.F. 0.21 acres		Los #0	19,637 +1 (9,24
100	the state of the state	- E 197	annes to also ante	Lot 13	9,115 s.f. 0.21 ant		9,135 s.f. 0.21 scms 9,135 s.f. 0.21 scms	65,4 wh LE 53,4 wh L5	Lot U	10,545 e.f. 0.24 9,955 e.f. 0.23
				Lot 14 Lot 15	9,335 s.f 0.21 som 9,135 s.f. 0.21 som		9,135 s.f. 0.21 acms	63.4 w/ 1,5 63.4 w/ 1,1	Lot 13	9,963 +.5 0.23 10,530 +.f 0.24
				Lot IA	9,233 11. 0.21 2000		3,135 s.f. 0.21 Kms		Locia	10,510 41 0.24
				Fota)	302,354 a.J. 6.64 mm		302,314 1/. 6.94 mms		Eur 15	10,530 A.E. 0,24
BLOCK 2	GROSS AREA	WETLAND AREA	NET AREA WIDTH & SETRA						Lot 16	10,530 4.1 0.24
Larl	18,300 al. 0.42 anes	9 M.	15,200 1f 0.42 som 81.5 W						Loc 17 Total	12,441 ef. 0.29
Los Z	21,802 al 0.49 acres	0 sf.	21,000 s.f. 0.48 acres 82.1 s/	ROCK	GROSS AREA	WETLAND AREA	NET AREA	WIDTH @ SETRACK	1001	374,286 a.f. 8.52
Los 3	16,406 cf 6.38 arm	9 s.L	16,406 s.f. 0.38 aber 84 H	Lost	9,240 s.f. 0.21 ion		9,240 s.f. 0,21 sores	71.7 + 16	OUTLOT	GROSS AREA
Los 4 Los 5	16.091 s.f. 0.38 seres 18.012 s.J. 0.41 ares	0 s.f.	16.091 af 0.38 arts 81 4/ 15.012 af 0.41 arm 81 4/	Los 2	9,109 a.t. 0.21 sort	t 0 af.	8,108 s.f. 0.21 acres	7%.T AN 11	-1	14,417 1 0.33
Lor 6	26,509 1.7. 2.61 1011	U M	36,509 a.f. 9,61 som 81 e/-	643	9,000 s.t. 0.21 sort		0.020 s.f. 0.21 hors	26.7 +6 LE	3	646,961 LL 15.77
Los T	27.055 a.f. 0.62 scree	0 41	27,055 a.f. 0.62 some 80.7 +/-	Lot 4	9,020 at 0.21 acm 9,252 a.f. 0.21 acm		9,020 of 0.21 some 9,262 of 0.21 some	65 14 LE 61.9 44 LE		50,900 at 1.17 32,677 at 0.75
Los B	12,112 of 0.78 seres	3.4 0	12.112 s.f. 0.28 seres 80.7 e/-	Less	9,362 #.6 0.21 600		9.362 af. 0.21 arm	54.9 44 LE	3	45.019 LT 1.03
Lot W	12.164 s.f. 0.24 arms	0 e.f.	\$2,164 a.f. 0.28 sees \$1. +4	Los 7	8,675 e.f. 0.20 scre		8.675 all 0.20 arms	68 +A LC		362,419 s.E. 6.02
Lot 10 Lot 11	11.894 s.f. 0.27 acous 10,968 s.f. 0.25 acres	0 41	11,894 s.C. 0.27 acres 81.2 +/- 10,985 s.C. 0.25 acres 81 +/-	Log 8	11,717 ef. 0.27 site		11,317 s.f. 0.27 scew.	77.1 44-11	Text	2,184,786 s.f. 50.16
Lot 12	10,958 +1, 0.25 scree	0	00,968 a.f. 0.25 apro XI ++-	Total	150,508 ef. 3,46 south	A 4 4	150,608 a.f. 3.46 acres			
Log 13	10,984 6.E. 0.25 acres	0	10,988 s.f. 0.25 acess 81 ++-						RW	<b>GROSS AREA</b>
Lot 14	10,988 s.f. (1.25 acres	h 0	10,988 s.f. 0.25 soles Al +4							473.313 1.1 10.07
Total	13,012 x.f. 0.30 arms 474,218 x.f. 10,89 arms	0 sL. 0 sL.	11012 sf 0.30 scm 96 st 174,219 sf, 10.89 scms	BLOCK.		WETLAND AREA	NET AREA	WIDTH & SETIACK	1000000	DESIGNATION OF COMMISSION
- 177 F	Total No. 1965 Bio.	10 Case	(1998) (1991 - 1998) (1992)	Lor 1	11,510 3.C 0.26 atre		0.333 s.C 0.26 acres 8.509 s.C 0.20 acres	967 H- UL 664 H- UL	TOTAL	GROSS AREA
				5m2 6m3	\$,509 s.f. 0.20 acre 9,388 s.f. 0.22 acre		8,509 s.C. 0.20 scies 9,358 s.f. 0.23 acres	66.4 +5 4.C 43 +5 1.C		1,740.142 af 108.19
				Lan	16,725 s.f. 0.25 sere		10,729 s.f. 0.25 Apres	24.4 at 1.C		
BLOCK 3	GROSS AREA	WETLAND AREA	NET AREA WIDTH & SETINA	Lot 5	9,749 s.f. 0.22 sere	a: 0 af	9,749 s.f. 0.22 acres	75 46 1.0		
Lot	10,852 +1 0.25 acres	0 11	10.852 af. 0.25 acres 80 ef-	Loc 6	11.229 s.f. 0.26 acro		11.229 s.f. 0.36 som	8 4 11		
Los 2	8,813 ef. 0.20 abres	D 47.	8.813 t.f. 0.20 acms 65 er	Tetal	122.874 ef. 2.80 scm	3. 0 st	131,874 s.f. 2.80 antes			
Loc 3	2,680 e.f. 0.20 acres	0 a.t.	6.648 s.f. 0.20 soms 65 ef-							
Lot 3	6,343 ef. 0.19 acres (0,457 ef. 0.24 acres	0 11	8,342 af 0,19 ages 65 e/ 10,657 af 0,29 ages 66.9 e/	A share and		Sector of the Association		Inter Concession and and		
Lot	10,407 ef. 0.24 some	0 a.C	10,407 6,7 0,24 some 72.9 ef	BLOCK		WETLAND AREA	NET AREA	WIDTH & SETBACK		
Let 7.	11,345 e.f. 0.26 pores	0 45	11.345 s.f. 0.26 scres 77.8 av	Lat	11,575 e.C 0,27 scm		11.672 LE 0.27 som	SQ1 4/ 16		
Lot	13,467 ef. 0.31 spes	0	13,167 s.f 0.31 some 68.9 als	Let 1 Let 3	9.390 s.£ 0.22 seve 9.270 s.f. 0.21 seve		9,380 s.f. 0.22 scius 9,270 s.f. 0.31 acres	64.9 +/- 1/C 74.1 +/- 1/C		
Lot 9	11,162 cf. 0.26 autors	0 a.L	11.467 of 0.26 acres 71 ef	Logi	9,925 af. 0.23 and		9,925 Lf 0.23 game.	54.9 4Å 1E		
Lot 10	10,266 af 0.24 annu 10,042 af 0.23 annu	0 af.	10,366 s.f. 0.24 acres 72.9 el 10,042 s.f. 0.23 acres 69.5 el	Las	9,342 af. 0.21 scree	3. 0	9.342 st. 0.31 acres	74.9 47 1.1		
Lantz	8.862 al. 0.20 actra	0 11	K352 cf 0.20 serv 59 at	Lord	10,436 a.f. 0.24 ane		19,430 s.f. 9,24 apres	10 1/ IL		
Los 13	\$,630 s.f. 0.20 some	0 aL	\$650 af. 0:20 sens 65.1 ++	LogT	9,667 a.f. 0.22 som 10,146 a.f. 0.73 som		9,657 kf. 0,22 ares 10,149 kf. 0,23 ares	20 46 1.C 86.9 46 1.C		
Lot 1+	5,450 4.1 0,19 acres	0 #L	8,450 LE 10.19 acres 65 all	Las	10.146 s.f. 0.23 som 11/087 s.f. 0.23 som		10,140 s.f. 0,23 aires 11,087 s.f. 0,25 aires	96.9 M LE		
Lot 15	8,450 a.f. 0,19 aoma	D AL	5.650 s.f. 0.19 acres 03 all	Lot 10	11.343 a.f 0.26 scm		11.343 Lf. 9.26 x0m	97.7 ++ 14		
Total	6.450 al. 0.19 anta M3.950 al. 7.21 apres	0 1/ 0 d	8,450 +4 0.19 acres 65 +4- 313,550 s.f. 7,24 scies	Locit	9,609 a.f. 0.22 scree		9.609 LL 0.12 AVES	80.7 +/+ 1 <i>t</i>		
. teat	AND AD DEL ADD		Contraction and the pass	Lor 12	8,579 a.f. 0.20 serv		8.579 LF. 0.30 some	48 ++ 1/		
				Let 13	K454 a.f. 0.19 acre 10.406 a.f. 0.34 acre		8,454 s.f. 0.19 acres	40 +4- 14 40 44- 14		
				Des	278,594 a.f 5.47 acte		276,594 uf 6.40 xees			
				0224	2200 CONTROL 100	C 22 (25)	THOUGH 20 202 1242			


FIELD CREW	NO. 1	BY	DATE	REVISIONS	USE (INCLUDING COPYING, DISTRIBUTION, AND/OR CONVEYANCE OF	I hereby certify that this survey, plan of r
RLS					INFORMATION) OF THIS PRODUCT IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED WITHOUT	my direct supervision and that I am a du
DRAWN BY			A		SATHRE-BERGQUIST, INC.'s EXPRESS WRITTEN AUTHORIZATION. USE WITHOUT	laws of the State of Minnesota.
JML					SAID AUTHORIZATION CONSTITUTES AN ILLEGITIMATE USE AND SHALL THEREBY	Dated this 70-day of August, 2014.
CHECKED BY					INDEMNIFY SATHRE-BERGQUIST, INC. OF ALL RESPONSIBILITY. SATHRE-BERGQUIST, INC. RESERVES THE RIGHT TO HOLD ANY ILLEGITIMATE	Land the Albany of August. 2014.
RLS					USER OR PARTY LEGALLY RESPONSIBLE FOR DAMAGES OR LOSSES RESULTING	652
DATE		-			FROM ALEGITMATE USE	Rory L. Symmetien, PLS N
	-					monoistant fare com

report was prepared by me or under ity Licensed Land Surveyor under the LEERS To sugar dinnesone License No. 44565




LAKE ELMO, MINNESOTA








Line/Chard Direction	Delta Angle
NO" 25 34.56"W	
N19" 40" 15.37"E	40"11'40"
N391 48' 05 30'E	
N19" 36" 11.65"E	40*1947*
N0" 33' 42.00"W	


SYME	IOL LEGEN	ID
DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED	EXISTING
NUMOR CONTOUR	- 000-	
NALOR CONTOUR		
307438		
RIATERMAN		
BUILDING SETSACK BOOMCARY		
PARCEL BOUNDARY LINE		
DRAMAGE AND UTILITY EASEMENTS		
SLEEP AND CONTER		
REDUT-OF-WAY		
DRAWTINE WICLEWOUTS		
MOXYARD CATOLINAM		
CATCHEASIN	-10-00-	
OTOM SEVER MARKE	- 10 - 10	
NAMED FILD SECTION WIRE AND		- * 0
STORM STUDIORE LANES	187	[4]
SAMETARY STUCTURE LANS.	(1)	(3)
EMETARY SEWER MORESE		
HTERAN		*
GATE WALVE		with with
witt	0	0
DRAW FLOW TELEVER AND ON	100	
EMERGENCY OVERFLOW SWALE	1	1
SOL BORNGLOGATION		3
SATUDICE	2	
THE E PRESERVATION / ENCL		
BARRICADE	TTOR SAME	TT 08 8883
SPOT ELEVATION		
THE SPOT ELEVATION	-	-
ITANY POLE		09
LIGHT FOLE	in the second se	0
HUNDONP PARKING SPACE	A A	ě.
The second second second	10 A	































LOCATION OF ANY AND ALL	EXISTIN	GUMLITIES	DEFORE COMMENC	CHAIR THE CONTINUED BHALL DETERMINE THE EAST THE WORK IT A CAREER TO BE FULLY REPORTED FOR MA ATE MAD PRESERVE ANY AND ALL EXETTED UTILITIES.	¥3				
DRAWING NAME	NO.	BY	DATE	REVISIONS	USE (INCLUDING COPYING, DISTRIBUTION, AND/OR CONVEYANCE OF	THEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PLAN OR SPECIFICATION WAS	10.5440		CITY PROJE
and the second s	BASE_PARCELE 01 ERJ 08/11/14 UTLITY VIEWPORT REVISIONS	INFORMATION) OF THIS PRODUCT IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED WITHOUT	PREPARED BY ME OR UNDER MY DIRECT SUPERVISION AND THAT I	SEEKS HUN-		-			
DRAWN BY	02	ERI	08/14/14	STORM REVISIONS	SATHRE-BERGOUIST, INC'S EXPRESS WRITTEN AUTHORIZATION. USE WITHOUT SAID AUTHORIZATION CONSTITUTES AN ILLEGITIMATE USE AND SHALL THEREBY	AM A DULY REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA.	2 10 4	SATHRE-BERGQUIST, INC.	-
ERJ	03	ERJ	08/26/14	SHOW WETLAND & IMPACT	INDEMNIFY SATHRE-BERGOUIST, INC. OF ALL RESPONSIBILITY.	Service of the state of Service service	- Cultat		LAKE E
CHECKED BY		- 1			SATHRE-BERGOUIST, INC. RESERVES THE RIGHT TO HOLD ANY ILLEGITIMATE	Rout S Water		150 SOUTH BROADWAY WAYZATA, MN, 55381 (952) 476-8000	and the second sec
RSM OATE		1 - I			USER OR PARTY LEGALLY RESPONSIBLE FOR DAMAGES OR LOSSES RESULTING FROM ILLEGITMATE USE.	ROBERT S. MOLSTAD, P.E.			MINNES
08/08/14					From Social meta solo-	Data: 08/08/14 Lie. No. 2-641-8	794 444		



CONSTRUCTION NOTES 1. INSTALL SILT FENCE AS SHOWN ON PLAN, AS REQUIRED BY THE CITY OF LAKE ELMO OR DIRECTED BY THE

2. THE WATER QUALITY POND MUST BE EXCAVATED AT THE BEGINNED OF GRADING OPERATIONS TO PROVIDE TEMPORARY STORM WATER DETENTION DURING CONSTRUCTION, SAND AND SLT MUST BE REMOVED FROM THE POND AS NECESSARY QURING CONSTRUCTION AND AT THE COMPLETION OF THE PROJECT.

3. BEGIN GRADING, INSTALL PERFORATED RIGER PIPE IN PONDS WHEN POND GRADING IS COMPLETE. TEMPORARY DRAMAGE PIPE SHALL BE USED FOR INTERMEDIATE GRADINGE OVENN THE CONSTRUCTION. PERIOD AS NECESSARY AND DIRECTED BY THE ENGINEER. INSTALL SILT FENCE ARXIND EXCAVATED PONDS.

4. INSPECT POND, SET FENCE, AND ROCK ENTRANCE BERM AFTER ALL RAINFALL EVENTS AS REDURED BY

S. LINE ALL PONDS WITH A MINIMUM IT ORGANIC SOL'S & SEED SLOPES BETWEEN NM, AND 100 YR HW, WITH A WATER TOLERANT MIX, (OR AS NOTED)

6. REMOVE PERFORATED RISER PIPE WHEN STORM SEWER AND OUTLET STRUCTURE FOR PONDS ARE INSTALLED

7. POND - 10:1 BENCH (1 FOOT) THEN 4:1 MAX

8. LO & WO PADS 3:1 MAX. ALL OTHER SLOPES 4:1 MAX (UNLESS NOTED)

25-0-10 AT 100 LIBS JACRE, (UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED) D. ONLY PROGREGOROUS FREE FEBRULEUR IS TO BE USED ON SITE. E. WILCOM WITH TYPE IA TA ARTE OF 2 TONSKOLEK AND DISC MICHOR IMMEDIATELY AFTER PLACEMENT. USE WOODFREE BLANKET ON ALL SLOPES 3:1 (FT) OR ORE/ATEL. P. PLACE APPROVED DISCOME SEVER IN SET PROTECTION IN OR AROUND ALL STORM SEWER INLETS AND MAINTAIN UNTIL STREET CONSTRUCTION IS COMPLETED. REFER TO CITY DITALS ST-22 A ST-23 FOR APPROVED DEVICES. G. MAINTAIN ALL SK.T FENCE UNTIL TURF HAS GEEN ESTABLISHED M. RESTORATION WORK WILL BE COMPLETED WITHIN 72 HOURS OF GRADING COMPLETION.

10, GRADE BACK 3' FROM FACE OF ALL RETAINING WALLS

11. MAINTAIN TEMPORARY DRAMAGE ALONG EAST SIDE OF PROPERTY LINE.

12. SILT FENCE - BEFORE ORADING - 5,780 LF

GENERAL NOTES: 1. THE GRADING CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL STORM WATER INSPECTIONS ACCORDING TO THE INFORM WATER PERMIT. THIS INCLUDES BOTH WEIRLY INSPECTIONS AND INSPECTIONS DOING AFTER A STORM VIEW, A CONY OF THE INSPECTION REPORT MUST BE EMAILED TO THE ENGINEER AND DEVELOPER ON A WEIRLY INSEE

2, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PLACE INLET PROTECTION DEVICES IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF LAKE ELMO DETAIL, 57-226, 57-23, FOR ALL STORN BEWER INLETS AND MAINTAIN THEM AS AN EFFECTIVE SR.T CONTROL DEVICE. INLET PROTECTION SHALL BE REMOVED WHEN RESTORATION HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED.

3. ALL RETAINING WALLS WILL REQUIRE A STRUCTURAL DESIGN, A BUILDING PERMIT & A FINAL INSPECTION REPORT.

4. A 11-22 CRUSHED ROCK ENTRANCE BERM SHALL BE PLACED AT THE SITE ENTRANCE. TO REPLACE SILT FENCE AND MINIMUZE EROSION ON TO THE STREETS. THE ROCK SERVIS SHALL BE THE WIDTH OF THE ENTRANCE AND 2 FEET HIGH WITH 41 SLOPES (SEE DCTAL)


5. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL MAINTAIN POSITIVE ORANAGE AWAY FROM THE BUILDING RAD AND STREET AREAS THROUGHOUT CONSTRUCTION.

5. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL ATTEMPT TO PREVENT SOIL MATERIALS FROM LEAVING THE SITE BY EROSION AND VEHICLE WHEEL TRACKING. HE SHALL ME RESPONSIBLE FOR CLEANING OF STREET, BOULEVARD AND UTILITY FACULTIES THAT RECEIVE ANY ERODED ON TRACKED SOIL MATERIAL OR UTHER CONSTRUCTION DEBRIS OR MATERIAL

7. EXISTING UTILITIES SHOWN ARE SHOWN IN AN APPROXIMATE WAY ONLY. THE CONTRACTOR SNULL DETERMINE THE EXACT LOCATION OF ANY AND ALL EXISTING UTILITIES BEFORE COMMENCING WORK, HE ACKTEST ON BE FULLY REPORTING EFFORT. ANY AND ALL DAMAGES ARISING OUT OF HIS FAILURE TO EXACTLY LOCATE AND PRESERVE MY AND ALL EXISTING

A BUILDING PACE ARE KE DEEP, URLESS OTHERMISE NOTED. THE FRONT AND REAR BUILDING PAD LINES ARE BHOWN ON THE PLAN. THE ENGINEER SHOAD BE CONTACTED # THE CONTRACTOR HAS ANY QUESTIONS REGARZING BUILDING PADS.


	100 50 0 50 100 SCALE IN	200 19 19 19
T	PRELIMINARY GRADING PLAN	FILE NO. 3129-047
	VILLAGE PARK PRESERVE GWSA LAND DEVELOPMENT	GP1 GP5




EXISTING UTERTES SHOWN AND SHOWN MAN ANYHOLAWATE WAT ONLY. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL OF TRANSP. THE EXACT LOCATION OF ANY AND ALL EXISTING UTERTING SUCCESSION WORK. HE ADDRESS TO BE MALL RESPONDED FOR ANY MAY ALL DWALLES AND ALL EXISTING UTERTING TO EXACT VICTORIAN DESCRIPTION AND ALL DESCR

RAWING NAME	NO.	BY	OATE	REVISIONS
ASE_PARCELE	01	ERJ	06/11/14	UTILITY VIEWPORT REVISIONS
DRAWN BY	02	ERJ	08/14/14	STORM REVISIONS
ERJ	03	ERS	08/26/14	SHOW WETLAND B IMPACT
CHECKED BY	47.0	165403	1250522	Patient contraction and contraction
RSM		-		
DATE	1			







## 

DRAWING NAME	NO:	8Y	DATE	REVISIONS
ASE_PARCELE	01	ERU	08/11/14	UTILITY VIEWPORT REVISIONS
DRAWN BY	02	ERU	08/14/14	STORM REVISIONS
ERU	03	ERJ	08/26/14	SHOW WETLAND & IMPACT
CHECKED BY	10.00	1.016-	1102211	NOT BEAUTIMENT AND COUNTY
RSM				
DATE				
08/08/14				

USE (INCLUDING COPYING, DISTRIBUTION, AND/OR CONVEYANCE OF INFORMATION) OF THIS PRODUCT IS STRUCTLY PROHIBITED WITHOUT SATHRE-BERODULIST, INC. 1 EXPRESS WRITTEN AUTHORIZATION. USE WITHOUT SATA UTHORIZATION CONSTITUTES AN ILLEGITIMATE USE AND SHALL THEREBY INDEMNIFY SATHRE-BERGOUIST, INC. OF ALL RESPONSIBILITY. SATHRE-BERGOUIST, INC. RESERVES THE RIGHT TO HOLD ANY ILLEGITIMATE USER OR PARTY LEGALLY RESPONSIBLE FOR DAMAGES OR LOSSES RESULTING FROM LLEGITIMATE USE.


I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PLAN OR BPECERCATION WAS PREPARED BY ME OR UNDER MY DIRECT SUPERVISION AND THAT I AM A DULY REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA.

Robert S Martos ROBERT S. MOLSTAD, P.E. Date: 08/08/14 110. No. 2-642.1




LAKE EL MINNES

Stormenster Pord #1 SE Hed - STI 0 Hed - S	AANNING AVENUE NORTH CSAH NO HS
	50 25 0 25 50 100
LAKE ELMO,	PRELIMINARY GRADING PLAN     HEENO.       VILLAGE PARK PRESERVE     GP4       GWSA LAND DEVELOPMENT     GP5







LAKE ELMO, MINNESOTA














MODEDT NAME AND NUMBER







MMON NAME	BOTANICAL HAME	QUANTIT	SIZE	NOTES	
LEES					
iden Reamond	Tica americana Redmond	9	25"88	straight single leader	
ckberry	Cetts occidentals	12	25'88	straight single leader	
ney Locust 'Skyane'	Gleditsia Incanthos var menmia "Skytine"	12	2.5"88	straight single leader	
nceton Elm	Ulmus americana 'Princeton'	11	25'88	straight single leader	
er Birch	Betula mgra	16	25"88	mul6-stem	
d Maple	Acer ruburm	15	2.5"88	straight single leader	
d Cak	Quercus /ubra	19	25"88	straight single leader	
gar Magie	Acer saccharum	11	2.5"88	straight single leader	
ramp Oak	Quercus bicolor	5	2.5"88	straight single leader	
nte Oak ERGREENS	Quercus alba	112	25*88	straight single leader	
ick Hills Spruce	Piecea glauca densata	30	6'88		
rway Pice	Pinus resmosa	28	6'88		
rway Spruce	Pices ables	38	6'88		
vie Pice	Pinus strobus	28	6'88		


COMMON NAME	BOTANICAL NAME	QTY.	SIZE	NOTES
EES	CT 2/16 28	1150	description -	Strange and send
enspire Linden	Titla cordata "Greenspire"	34	2.5"88	Straight single leader
lumn State Maple	Acer x freemans 'Jeffersted'	25	25'88	Straight single leader
ckberry	Cetts occidentalis	39	2.5"88	Straight single leader
neyLocust	Gleditsia moanthos var. mermis "Imperia"	29	2.5"88	Straight single leader
ncelon Ekm	Ulmus americana 'Princeton'	14	2.5"88	Straight single leader
d Maple	Acernubrum	32	2.5"88	Straight single leader
d Oak	Quercus rubra	32	25'88	Straight single leader
gar Maple	Acer saccharum	27	25'88	Straight single leader
vite Oak	Quercus alba	23	25'88	Straight single leader


me -	Scientific Name	N Mitt	Seed/sqft	Rate / acre	
at Grass	Agropyran trachycaulum	4,0	7.1	2.8 lb	
	Agrostis alba	3.0	233.7	Z 1 /b	
negrass	Brantus inérntal	14.0	12.4	9.8 lb	
	Lolium perenne	21.0	81.0	14.7 15	
Ignig	Medicapa sativa	60	21.6	4.2 %	
	Particum virgatum	3.0	10.8	2.1 lb	
	Phleum proetense	3.0	56.3	2.1 ib	
grass	Paa compressa	14.0	\$19.9	9816	
egrass	Poa protensis	29.0	648.7	20.3 fb	
£1	Triffolum	3.0	37.8	2.1 lb	















DRAWING NAME NO. BY DATE REVISIONS DRAWN BY 1044 CHECKED BY



MMON NAME	BOTANICAL NAME	QUANTIT	SIZE	NOTES
EES				
den Redmond	Tilla americana Redmond	9	25'88	straight single leader
ckberry	Celts occidentals	12	25'88	straight single leader
ney Locust 'Skyine'	Gleditsia tricanthos var inermis 'Skyline'	12	2.5"88	straight single leader
ncelon Elm	Ulmus americana 'Princelon'	11	25'88	straight single leader
er Birch	Betula rugra	15	2.5"88	mut-stem
d Maple	Acer ruburm	16	25"88	straight single leader
d Oak	Quercus rubra	19	25'88	straight single leader
gar Maple	Acer saccharum	11	2.5"88	straight single leader
amp Öak	Quercus bicolor	5	2.5"88	straight single leader
vite Oak	Querous alba	11	25.88	straight single leader
ERGREENS	0.0102-02000		100000	N 105-042-042 1000
ck Hils Spruce	Piecea glauca densata	39	6° BB	
nway Pine	Pinus resinosa	28	6' BB	
way Spruce	Picea abies	36	5' BB	
vie Pine	Pinus strobus	28	6'BB	

BOTANICAL NAME	OTY.	SIZE	NOTES
5	77.4	CONTRACT NO.	a construction of the
The cordate 'Greenspre'	34	2.5°8B	Straight single leaver
Acer x treemanil 'Jeffersred'	25	2.5"88	Straight single leader
Cettis occidentalis	39	2.5"88	Straight single leader
Gleditsia bicanthos var. mermis "impenal"	29	25'88	Straight single leader
Ulmus americana 'Princeton'	14	2.5"88	Straight single leader
Acer rubrum	32	2,5"88	Straight single leader
Quercus rubra	32	2.5"88	Straight single leader
Acer saccharum	27	2.5"88	Straight single leader
Quercus alta	23	25"88	Straight single leader
	Tila cordata 'Greenspre' Acer x freemani 'Jeffersred' Cettis occidentalis Gleditsia bicanthos var :inermis 'Imperial' Ulmus americana 'Proceson' Acer rubrum Acer saccharum	Tila cordata 'Greenspre'     34       Acer x freemanii 'Defersred'     25       Certis occidentalis     39       Gleditsia breanthos var inermis 'Impenal'     29       Ulmus americana 'Princeton'     14       Acer rubrum     32       Quercus rubra     32       Acer saccharum     27	Tila cordata 'Greenspire'     34     2.5" BB       Acer x freemanii 'Jeffersred'     25     2.5" BB       Cetts oocidentalis     39     2.5" BB       Gleditsia bicanthos var inermis 'Imperial'     29     2.5" BB       Ulmus americana 'Proceton'     14     2.5" BB       Quercus rubran     32     2.5" BB       Quercus rubra     32     2.5" BB       Quercus rubra     32     2.5" BB       Quercus rubra     32     2.5" BB

me .	Scientific Name	% Mix	Seed/sqft	Bate /ac	10
at Grass	Agropyron trachycautum	4.0	7.1	2.8 b	
	Agrostis siba	3.0	233.7	2.1 /b	
negrass	Bromus inermis	14.0	32.4	9.8 lb	
	Lolum permine	21.0	\$1.0	14.7 Ib	
pina)	Medicago sativa	60	21,6	4.2 h	
	Panicum wrgatum	3.0	10.8	2.1 16	
	Phleum proetense	3.0	56.3	2.1 lb	
g/455	Pop compressa	14.0	539.9	9.8 jb	
egrass	Poa pratensis	29.0	648.7	20.3 (b)	
	Frifloium	3.0	37.8	2115	














# CITY OF LAKE ELMO WASHINGTON COUNTY, MINNESOTA

# **RESOLUTION NO. 2014-60**

### RESOLUTION APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CITY OF LAKE ELMO COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CHANGING THE FUTURE LAND USE DESIGNATION OF THE HOLLIDAY PARCEL LOCATED IN THE VILLAGE PLANNING AREA

WHEREAS, the City of Lake Elmo has established a Comprehensive Plan that provides a compilation of background data, policy statements, standards, and maps, which help to guide the future physical, social, and economic development of the City; and

WHEREAS, GWSA Land Development, LLC, 10850 Old County Road 15. Suite 200, Plymouth, MN. ("Applicant") has submitted an application to the City of Lake Elmo ("City") to amend the Lake Elmo Comprehensive Plan, a copy of which is on file in the City Planning Department; and

WHEREAS, the request to amend the Comprehensive Plan was submitted along with a Sketch Plan for a proposed single-family residential subdivision in the southeast portion of the Village Planning Area; and

WHEREAS, the Lake Elmo Planning Commission held a public hearing on June 30, 2014 to consider the request to amend the Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, on June 30, 2014, the Lake Elmo Planning Commission unanimously adopted a motion to recommend that the City Council approve the request to amend the Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, the City Council reviewed the recommendation of the Planning Commission and the proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan at a meeting on July 15, 2014;

**NOW, THEREFORE**, based upon the testimony elicited and information received, the City Council makes the following:

### FINDINGS

- That the Applicant has submitted a request to amend the Comprehensive Plan in accordance with the procedures as established by the Lake Elmo Planning Department and Lake Elmo Planning Commission.
- 2) That the request to is to amend the Future Land Use Map (Map 3-3 in Chapter III Land Use Plan) and Village Planned Land Use Map (Map 3-5 in Chapter III - Land Use Plan) in the Lake Elmo Comprehensive Plan, and to specifically change the future land use

designation a parcel of land located immediately west of Manning Avenue North (CSAH 15) and immediately north of 30th Street North (PID 13,029,21,44,0002) from RAD - Rural Area Development to V-LDR - Village Urban Low Density Residential,

- 3) That the Comprehensive Plan Amendment will apply to property legally described in the attached Exhibit "A".
- 4) That the subject property associated with the Comprehensive Plan Amendment request is currently located within the City's sanitary sewer service area.
- 5) That the proposed amendment will allow for the private market to complete the construction of the Village Parkway minor collector road, a critical transportation improvement needed to serve the upcoming growth and development and increased projected traffic volumes within the Village Planning Area.
- 6) That the area impacted by the proposed amendment is relatively small, and that the potential increase in residential units associated with the amendment is not inconsistent with the projected levels of planned growth and development in the Village Area under the Village Land Use Plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that based on the foregoing, the flake Elmo-City Council hereby approves the Applicant's request to amend the Lake Elmo Comprehensive Plan, subject to and contingent upon the following:

- 1) Submission of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment to the Metropolitan Council and the receipt of formal notification from the Metropolitan Council that its review has been completed and approved.
- 2) As part of the preparation of Preliminary Plans for the Village Preserve South subdivision. the applicant shall prepare a screening plan along the western boundary of the Holliday parcel adjacent to the Meleod parcel that effectively buffers the proposed residential subdivision from the rural single family lot to the west.

Passed and duly adopted this 15th day of July 2014 by the City Council of the City of Lake Elmo. Minnesota.

ATTEST:

AUSEC !!

Adam Bell, City Clerk

### EXHIBIT A

Legal Description (PID 13.029.21.44.0002)

The South 498.6 feet of the South Half of the Southeast Quarter (S1/2 of S1.1 4): Section Thirteen (13). Township Twenty Nine North (29N.), Range Twenty-one West (21W.): except the West 1273.0 feet of the South Half of the Southeast Quarter of said Section Thirteen (13). And excepting therefrom that portion of the above tract conveyed to the County of Washington by that certain Quit Claim Deed dated March 30, 1987, and filed of record in the Office of the Washington County Recorder on April 2, 1987 as Document No, 535377.

# MEMORANDUM

# FOCUS ENGINEERING, inc.

Cara Geheren, P.E.	651.300.4261
Jack Griffin, P.E.	651.300.4264
Ryan Stempski, P.E.	651.300.4267
Chad Isakson, P.E.	651.300.4283

Date: September 4, 2014

To:	Kyle Klatt, Planning Director
Cc:	Nick Johnson, City Planner
From:	Jack Griffin, P.E., City Engineer

Re: Village Park Preserve Preliminary Plat Review

An engineering review has been completed for the Village Park Preserve. A Preliminary Plan submittal was received on August 27, 2014. The submittal consisted of the following documentation prepared by Sathre-Bergquist, Inc.:

- Village Park Preserve Site Plans, Preliminary Plat, and Preliminary Plans August 14, 2014.
- Stormwater Management Plan, dated August 7, 2014.

#### STATUS/FINDINGS: Engineering review comments are as outlined below.

#### AGENCY AND THIRD PARTY APPROVALS

- The proposed drainage plan indicates the direct discharge of storm water runoff from the site to the property to the south, including the installation of a storm sewer outfall pipe. The applicant must submit written permission from the impacted property owner acknowledging and consenting to this discharge location, volume and rate(s).
- A permanent utility easement must be provided in the City standard easement form for the outfall storm sewer pipe. The easement should be a condition of final plat approval.
- The site plan is dependent upon and subject to a storm water management plan meeting State, VBWD and City rules and regulations.
- The City must receive written approvals from Washington County to verify the proposed work along Manning Avenue.
- The City must receive copies of the written approvals from Northern Natural Gas for the proposed utility and trail crossings. Any conditions of approval must be provided.
- Plan revisions are necessary to fully incorporate and comply with the Lake Elmo engineering design standards.
- Easement widths appear to provide the 30 foot minimum utility width. Additional easements and amendments may be required as the plan continues to evolve through the process.

#### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUIRED

- No phasing plan was submitted. A phasing plan must be submitted for staff review to verify feasibility of working infrastructure at each phase.
- Existing conditions are incomplete. The Plans do not provide existing conditions in sufficient detail to allow staff to review the proposed grading and infrastructure as it relates to existing conditions at the Plat

perimeters, including the storm sewer outfall pipe south of 30<sup>th</sup> Street and the existing watermain along 30<sup>th</sup> street.

- Grading contours must be fully completed at all Plat perimeters.
- Overland Emergency Overflows (EOFs) must be provided throughout the grading plan to facilitate a complete review of the grading plan and storm water flood protection for storm water ponds and localized low points.
- Stormwater facility maintenance access roads are not shown on the plans.

#### GRADING PLAN

- The grading plan is substantially complete however some contours remain incomplete near the plat perimeter. All contours must be completed to demonstrate a drainage design that does not negatively impact adjacent properties.
- Additional plan review is necessary once EOFs are provided to review for adequate flood protection for each adjacent lot. It appears that 8-10 lots have low floor elevations that do not meet the 2 feet of freeboard above the pond HWLs or 1 foot above an adjacent EOF.
- The HWL for Infiltration Area 1SE encroaches into Lot 1, Block 1. The HWL area must be fully contained within an Outlot dedicated to the City.
- The HWL for Stormwater Pond 1SE encroaches into the 30<sup>th</sup> Street R/W. The HWL area must be fully contained within an Outlot dedicated to the City and may not encroach the existing City R/W.
- Maintenance access roads meeting City Standards must be provided to each Stormwater pond and infiltration basin. Plan revisions are needed to provide adequate maintenance access to all storm water facilities. Access must be accommodated without impacts to the proposed infiltration benches.
- Stormwater Pond designs do not meet the City requirements, exceeding the maximum depth allowed of 10 feet. Additional design configuration concerns include maximum side slopes, maintenance of the infiltration bench, narrow constrictions within the ponds, and long term water levels.
- Additional catch basins are needed along Road 3 to meet maximum curb runs of 350 feet.

#### STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

- The site plan is dependent upon and subject to a storm water management plan meeting State, VBWD and City rules and regulations. Storm water facilities proposed as part of the site plan to meet VBWD permitting requirements must be constructed in accordance with the City Engineering Design Standards Manual available on the City website.
- The Stormwater model should be revised as documented in the attached EOR review memorandum and the Stormwater facilities revised accordingly.
  - > Adjust assumed CN runoff coefficients and account for on-site depressional areas.
  - Provide additional supporting documentation for assumed infiltration rates and adjust to lower rates as needed.
  - Provide additional documentation to demonstrate the feasibility of the proposed new outlet and lowering of the outlet invert along Manning Avenue.
  - > Update the model to include turn lanes improvements.
  - Update water quality value in table.

#### MUNICIPAL WATER SUPPLY

- Municipal water supply is available at the Reid Park lift station site and along 30<sup>th</sup> Street N. Connections to both locations will be required and have been shown on the Preliminary Plans.
- Watermain alignment will need to be revised as part of the final construction plans to better align within the paved street surfaces.
- Watermain stubs to adjacent property and pipe oversizing will continue to be reviewed by City staff as the development progresses forward and oversizing routes may need to be changed as part of the final

construction plans. Watermain oversizing is paid by the City as a reimbursement addressed within the development agreement.

• Hydrant and system valve locations will be reviewed with the Fire Chief and Public Works as part of the final construction plans.

#### MUNICIPAL SANITARY SEWER

- Municipal sanitary sewer is available at the Reid Park lift station site. The applicant is responsible to extend the municipal sanitary sewer to the development site at developers cost.
- To serve the property to the south, the invert at the 30th Street location must be at 905. This is required to remain responsive to future private ISTS system failures.
- A review of alternative sewer alignments and pipe oversizing was previously completed by City staff and provided to the applicant for input. The preliminary plans show a pipe configuration that is not consistent with the staff plan recommendation.
- Additional manholes will need to be incorporated in the plans to improve the street centerline alignment for the sanitary sewer and allow watermain at a 10 foot offset to remain within the paved street surface.
- Sanitary sewer pipe stubs to adjacent property and pipe oversizing will continue to be reviewed by City staff as the development progresses forward. Revisions may need to be incorporated as part of the final construction plans. Sewer pipe oversizing has been accounted for through the Village East Trunk Sanitary Sewer project. Therefore, the sewer pipe oversizing must be installed at no cost to the City.

#### **RESIDENTIAL STREETS**

- All streets must be designed to meet the City's Engineering Design Standards including R/W width, street width and cul-de-sac radii. The plans appear to substantially conform to this requirement.
- The street grades and profiles must be adjusted to meet the minimum K-value of 37 for vertical sag curves.
- The eyebrow designs for Roads 5, 6 and 7 propose a unique design. The roadway geometry requires additional review to ensure adequate pavement width and turning radius for emergency and maintenance vehicles. Turning templates must be submitted.
- The geometry for Road 5 requires particular attention to avoid conflicts along the higher volume roadway of Village Parkway. Road 5 should be shifter further north to align the south curb with Road 2. This would provide additional southbound left turn lane length for Village Parkway.

#### VILLAGE PARKWAY (NEIGHBORHOOD COLLECTOR STREET)

- Village Parkway will serve as a neighborhood collector for the new development in the southeastern Village area, essentially becoming the primary access in and out of the future neighborhoods. Obtaining increased mobility from a typical residential street will be necessary to accommodate the new growth while providing additional access and circulation into and out of the Village Downtown. Between State Highway 5 and the UP Railroad, Village Parkway will provide parking along one or both sides of the street to accommodate the mixed use development planned for the west side of the collector road. South of the UP Railroad the street will be posted as "No Parking".
- Village Parkway must be constructed according to the Village Parkway design standards and typical section as prepared by City staff. The street design must also meet Municipal State Aid design standards for an urban collector with ADT < 10,000; 35 mph design speed. The projected 2030 ADT is 5,800. The City typical section must be placed on the Preliminary Street Plans.
- The access management guidelines for Village Parkway must be established by the City and carefully planned out along its entire corridor from 30<sup>th</sup> Street to State Highway 5. Road 5 has been placed roughly 300 feet from 30<sup>th</sup> Street. A 330 foot access spacing is recommended. The additional 30 feet would help to provide additional turn lane length along Village Parkway.
- Right and left turn lanes are required along 30<sup>th</sup> Street when the Village Parkway intersection is constructed. The Preliminary Plans should be revised to provide a turn lane Plan Sheet to detail the turn

lane dimensions, including pavement widths, lane widths, turn lane lengths and tapers for staff review. It appears that the proposed turn lanes will need to be lengthened to meet typical turn lane design standards.

- The street grades and profiles must be adjusted along Village Parkway to meet the minimum K-value of 49 for vertical sag curves and minimum K-value of 29 for vertical crest curves. In addition, street grade changes along Village Parkway should be minimized and softened (not using minimum standards with every adjustment). The proposed profile must be revised to reduce the vertical curves to avoid a roller coaster effect along this high volume roadway. Street alignment transitions must be revised to rely on minimums only when necessary.
- The minimum horizontal curve radius for Village Parkway is 375 feet. C1 is currently proposed with a 250 foot radius.

memo



651 Hale Avenue North Oakdale, Minnesota 55128 telephone: 651.770.8448 facsimile: 651.770.2552 www.eorinc.co

Date	9/3/2014		
То	Jack Griffin	Contact info	Lake Elmo
cc		Contact info	
cc		Contact info	
From	Brett H. Emmons, Jay Hill	Contact info	EOR
		Contact info	
Regarding	Lake Elmo, Village Park Preserve Development – Respond to City's List o		
	Stormwater Review Issues		

The information in these review comments are based on review of the following stormwater issues, per the city's request:

- Stormwater model input assumptions.
- Upstream runoff properly accounted for, including the pond discharge from Easton Village.
- Stormwater routing management is a workable plan for the area. The system must be able to accommodate the Downtown Village drainage.
- Flood protection (HWLs and Emergency overflows), including recommendations.
- Pond configurations and depths from the city's long term ownership and maintenance perspective (i.e. the deep storm water pond along Manning).

Documents submitted for the development review include:

- Preliminary Plan Set for Street, Utility, Grading, Landscape, and Drainage Area Plans, by Sathre-Bergquist, dated 8/8/14
- Stormwater Management Plan including 3 soil borings, by Sathre-Bergquist, dated 8/7/14

Stormwater Management and Stormwater BMPs:

1. CN and Runoff Assumptions – Proposed existing conditions (predevelopment) CNs appear too high and on-site depressional storage is not accounted for, thus providing a less conservative standard/target for their postdevelopment design.

<u>Discussion</u>: Predevelopment CNs are listed at 69 for agricultural areas (compared to post-development CNs of 74). The CN of 69 for existing conditions is high for the low runoff character of the existing lands. Also, observed runoff during rain events indicates that there is not much runoff until large events are experienced and/or snowmelt. Assuming higher predevelopment CNs leads to less conservative assumptions and reduced standards for peak rate control. For example, note that compacted yard/urban lawns are listed as CN 61 in post-development (much lower than existing CN of 69). Typically we would require a CN of 58 for predevelopment conditions to ensure

An Equal Opportunity Affirmative Action Employer

conservative assumptions for hydrologic routing and flood control. Areas in the model subcatchments for the open water pond with CNs of 100 do not appear in the model and should be included. On-site depressional storage is not accounted for in existing conditions and should be included.

2. Infiltration Assumptions – The assumed infiltration rate of 0.5 in/hr may be too high and is inconsistently applied and presented in the report and models.

<u>Discussion</u>: The assumed infiltration rates do not appear to be consistent between the models (HydroCAD and P8) and the narrative (Report Summary) of the Stormwater Management Plan. The narrative mentions using 0.5 in/hr in one pond, #1SE (only pond where infiltration bench is shown), and states this rate is assumed as a "conservative" rate. The P8 model uses 1.0 in/hr instead of 0.5 in/hr. The HydroCAD modeling has infiltration in all the ponds in the development instead of just pond #1SE. The rate of 0.5 in/hr is not very conservative especially for the soils in the upper 24 ft – 29 ft (boring ST-2 and ST-3, within the basin). Water table readings indicate a high water table may exist, although the readings between borings are inconsistent (possibly perched system). There is one (1) point infiltration estimating nor is it good practice (more samples are needed) and the infiltration method and results need additional review.

3. Stormwater Routing Using New Outlet – The new outlet is lower than the existing outlet under 30<sup>th</sup> St., but it is not clear what the downstream elevations and capacities are to ensure the new outlet is feasible, nor are details of the connection given.

<u>Discussion</u>: The most downstream pond and one influencing HWLs on the other development ponds is pond 1SE. Pond 1SE has a listed NWL of 911.0, which is almost two feet below the existing culvert invert of 912.8 under 30<sup>th</sup> St. Details are needed on the new outlet for pond 1SE shown in the southeast corner (invert, size, type of pipe, permissions off-site, downstream conveyance elevations and capacity, etc.). No tailwater is used in the model for pond 1SE and this assumption should be verified. Provide information on the downstream conveyance to ensure that elevation and capacity exists for the proposed flows (186 or 331 cfs-? for 100-yr rainfall event) and associated calculated HWLs.

4. Stormwater Modeling – The information provided in the summary and modeling are inconsistent and details on where the upstream flow values originate from are lacking, making evaluation of flow routing difficult.

<u>Discussion</u>: The model should be updated to better represent what is happening hydrologically in the system. Provide information on where the Existing Conditions peak flow rates come from and how they were derived. Comparing proposed peak flow rates to existing conditions is difficult without context on the existing flow rates – and the capacity of the system downstream to convey that flow. Show how and where upstream flows (2-yr 100 cfs, 10-yr 172 cfs, and 100-yr 331 cfs per Report Summary) will come into the site. Which values for incoming flows is correct, the Runoff Comparison table or the HydroCAD modeling, since they are factor of ~2X different (e.g., table 2-yr = 100 cfs, model 2-yr = 54 cfs)? The only inlet to pond 1SE is a 15" storm sewer in the northeast corner. Pipe size and inverts need to be shown for the proposed new outlet for pond 1SE (the regional flow path). Pipe sizes and inverts should also be labeled on the

Emmons & Olivier Resources, Inc.

grading plans. As noted above, no tailwater is shown in the model for pond 1SE and this assumption should be verified with downstream information.

5. Include Associated Improvements – Accounting for localized road improvements are not included.

<u>Discussion</u>: If there are road improvements planned (development-specific) on city or county roads for access to the development (e.g., turn lanes, by-pass lanes, etc.), that additional runoff should also be accounted for in the analysis and sizing.

6. Flood protection – Surface Emergency Overflows (EOFs) are not shown or provided below critical building/home elevations.

Discussion: All building lowest floors should be 2 feet above the 100-yr high water level or 1 foot above the overland emergency overflows (EOFs), whichever is greater. Show all EOFs on the plans and show the potential inundated areas if the pipes were blocked, since it appears many of the home elevations do not satisfy 1 foot above the emergency overflow. Emergency overflows should be provided for all low points and ponds. The lowest building opening should be set at a minimum of 1' above the EOF. The preference is to adjust some of the grading to provide an overland overflow, but as an alternative we would consider installing a secondary (separate) EOF pipe from the ponds. The pipe would be set at or slightly higher than the HWL of the pond and should be sized adequately large enough to be considered non-clogging (36" minimum). Street low points should have an EOF that limits ponding/flooding depth to a maximum of 2' in order to allow emergency access to all properties. With EOFs issue addressed, there are still proposed homes with their lowest floor not meeting the 100-yr HWL + 2' freeboard standard, including: Block 1 lot 1; Block 7 lot 1; and Block 8 lots 1, 15, 16, 17.

7. Pond Configurations – Various aspects of pond configurations (maintenance access and relation to infiltration bench, infiltration design, and narrow portion for conveyance) need to be addressed and could impact future city maintenance.

<u>Discussion</u>: Pond access for maintenance (20' minimum width and maximum grade of 10%) should be shown for all facilities including access to inlet and outlet structures on the grading plans. For pond 1SE with the infiltration bench, how would access and maintenance be accomplished without impacting or destroying the infiltration BMP? Provide infiltration bench and infiltration area construction details for how the BMPs will connect to porous materials at depth. There is a narrow, shallow spot in pond1SE, which conveys regional flows, that could be susceptible to filling with cattails and obstructing flow and should be modified to avoid a restriction. Pond configuration should be reviewed by a city maintenance staff.

 Pond Water Depths and Long-Term Levels – Pond depths exceed the city standard of 10' maximum and uncertainty about water levels in pond 1SE along Manning Ave. raise some concerns.

<u>Discussion</u>: Details on the pond configuration and construction are needed before the ponds can be accepted. Ponds 1SE and 2SE are proposed to be 13' and 12' deep respectively, exceeding the maximum depth of 10' and should be reduced. A water budget should be performed for pond 1SE to determine if the proposed water levels will be acceptable for the city (safety, maintenance, aesthetics, etc.).

Emmons & Olivier Resources, Inc.

9. Pond Side Slopes - Review pond side slopes for maintenance.

<u>Discussion</u>: State the maximum slopes on ponds, specifically 1SE, on the grading plans. Notes on sheet GP1 mention maximum of 4:1 slopes, but grading plans appear steeper than that. Slopes greater than 3:1 typically are not allowed, and depending on where water levels stabilize, this also impacts the appropriate slopes and where 10:1 safety benches are appropriate.

10. Spring Runoff - Review if spring snowmelt would impact the design.

<u>Discussion</u>: Depending on the final configuration of the regional flow system, determine if a spring snowmelt critical event should be evaluated in the design.

11. Drawdown Time – Demonstrate 48 hour drawdown is accomplished with regional flows.

<u>Discussion</u>: Provide draw down time analysis in the infiltration basins. The drawdown requirement is 48 hours. These facilities appear to be on-line and would be subject to the regional flows from upstream, potentially impacting the draw down time.

12. Water Quality Report – Correct water quality value in table.

<u>Discussion</u>: The Stormwater Report table Provided TP Removal Efficiencies (%) lists a value of 97.9% removal of TP which does not appear to match the model output so it should be updated.

13. Landscaping Plan – The provided landscape plan is incomplete for infiltration areas.

<u>Discussion</u>: Provide landscaping plan and details for the infiltration areas. Seeding only of infiltration areas should be avoided; use at least 50% coverage of plugs for the plantings to enhance establishment. An alternative to seed mix 250, with invasive species such as smooth brome, should be used, except possibly in roadside areas.

Other Considerations:

- 14. The VBWD should quantify and address the downstream flooding and/or water quality implications of the proposed development and increased runoff.
- 15. Coordination with VBWD on maximum bounce in the infiltration BMPs should be addressed since pond and infiltration area 1SE show a bounce of 4.5 feet for 100-yr event, exceeding VBWD's maximum bounce of 1.5 feet.
- 16. Erosion and sediment control, once planning/design approach has been finalized, should be reviewed for protection of ponding and infiltration areas and downstream areas.

Not all aspects of the submittal were reviewed. Additional items may arise as final design is reviewed. Please let us know if you have questions regarding the comments.

Emmons & Olivier Resources, Inc.

Station #1 3510 Laverne Ave. No. Lake Elmo, MN 55042 651-770-5006



Station #2 4259 Jamaca Ave. No. Lake Elmo, MN. 55042 651-779-8882

August 27, 2014

After review of the PRELIMINARY PLAT - VILLAGE PARK RESERVE, the following are items that will need to be addressed, moving forward:

- ROADWAYS
  - o Street naming and numbering per city ordinance.
- FIRE HYDRANTS
  - Spacing/Location, it appears there are some that may be closer than the 500' spacing required and could be eliminated. Locate on corners of intersections to gain the most benefit from hydrants.

Reviewed by

Greg Malmquist, Fire Chief

"Proudly Serving Neighbors & Friends"

**Public Works Department** 

Donald J. Theisen, P.E. Director

Wayne H. Sandborg, P.E. Deputy Director/County Engineer



September 3, 2014

Nick Johnson City Planner City of Lake Elmo 3600 Laverne Avenue North Lake Elmo, MN 55042

RE: Washington County comments on the preliminary plat for the Village Park Preserve in the City of Lake Elmo

Dear Mr. Johnson,

Thank you for providing the County with the concept plan of the Village Preserve South subdivision in Section 19, Township 29, Range 20, City of Lake Elmo The project will consist of 104 single family residential lots on 63 6 acres. Based on review of the plans, we offer the following comments and recommendations to consider as you process this subdivision application through the City of Lake Elmo:

- The proposed access point on 30<sup>th</sup> Street is acceptable to the County. A collector roadway is identified in the center of the subdivision that will connect 30<sup>th</sup> Street to Trunk Highway (TH) 5 through the Easton Village subdivision.
- The Functional Classification of CSAH 15/ Manning Avenue is "A" Minor Arterial Roadway, expander category. The future right-of-way requirement within this section of roadway is 184 feet. As part of the subdivision plat, there should be an additional 42 feet of right-of-way dedicated to Washington County. This will need to be verified prior to final plat. There also needs to be additional right-of-way at the 30<sup>th</sup> and CSAH 15/Manning Avenue intersection since this is programmad for a traffic signal and additional turn lanas in the future. Traffic staff will review the plan and provide comments directly to the city engineer.
- A Right of Way Permit will be required for any work in the CSAH 15/Manning Avenue right-of way as it relates to the davelopment. A plan set is required with the application and include any grading, installation of culverts, installation of water and sewer services, left and right turn lanes on CSAH 15/Manning Avenue, signage, landscaping, and any other improvements within county right-of-way.
- The proposed project will generate pedastrian/bicycle traffic on CSAH 15/ Manning Avenue so pedestrians from the future development will need to access any future off road trail. The future trail along CSAH 15/Manning Avenue will be constructed as part of the CSAH 15/Manning Avenue project.
- The developer or the city must submit the drainage report and calculations to our office for reviaw of any downstream impacts to the county drainage system. Along with the drainage calculations, we will request written conclusions that the

volume and rate of stormwater run-off into the county right-of way will not increase as part of the project. Stormwater drainage and future drainage easements along Manning Avenue are being coordinated with the Manning Avenue Project.

As the developer plans the stormwater facilities on this property, there should be consideration for setbacks from county right-of-way and perimeter landscape elements and berming.

- Access control must be dedicated to Washington County along the CSAH 15/Manning Avenue.
- Washington County's policy is to assist local governments in promoting compatibility between land use and highways. Residential uses located adjacent to highways often result in complaints about traffic noise. Traffic noise from this highway could exceed noise standards established by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA), the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the U.S. Department of Transportation. Minnesota Rule 7030.0030 states that municipalities are responsible for taking all reasonable measures to prevent land use activities listed in the MPCA's Noise Area Classification (NAC) where the establishment of the land use would result in violations of established noise standards. Minnesota Statute 116.07, Subpart 2a exempts County Roads and County State Aid Highways from noise thresholds.

County policy regarding development adjacent to existing highways prohibits the expenditure of highway funds for noise mitigation measures in such areas. The developer should assess the noise situation and take any action outside of County right of way deemed necessary to minimize the impact of any highway noise.

If you have any questions or comments to the responses on the Village Preserve concept plan, please contact me at <u>Ann.pung-terwedo@co.washington.mn.us</u>.

Sincerely, nn PTerwedolch

Ann Pung-Terwedo Senior Planner

C. Carol Hanson, Office Specialist

R/Plat Reviews/City of Lake Elmo/Village Preserve South

# METROPOLIUN AIRPORTS COMMISSION



Minneapolis-Saint Paul International Airport 6040 - 28th Avenue South - Mioneapolis, MN 55450 2799 Phone (612) 726-8100

September 3, 2014

Mr. Nick Johnson City Planner City of Lake Elmo 3800 Laverne Avenue North Lake Elmo, MN 55042-9629

Re: Village Park Preserve Preliminary Plat Review Lake Elmo Airport

SENT VIA EMAIL

Dear Mr. Johnson:

As requested in your Land Use Review package dated August 26, 2014, the Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) has reviewed the Village Park Preserve Preliminary Plat that will be presented to the Lake Elmo Plan Commission on September 8, 2014. We appreciate the opportunity to review the document, and offer the following comments.

#### Aircraft Over Flights and Noise

The proposed Village Park Preserve development is located adjacent to the Lake Elmo Airport in an area that receives aircraft overflights. Although the Baseline Year 2005 and Forecast Year 2025 65 DNL Noise Contours do not appear to encompass any of the proposed residential parcels, the eastern portion of the property is located in close proximity to the Forecast 65 DNL Noise Contour line. (Residential development should not occur within the 65 DNL Noise Contour.) It is the MAC's experience that placing residential areas in such locations around airports can result in noise complaints and resident concerns about aircraft noise. The MAC requests that prospective property buyers within the proposed Village Park Preserve development be provided information on the properties' locations relative to the Lake Elmo Airport and the related existence of aircraft operations over this area.

#### Water Quality - Surface Water Runoff

The Village Park Preserve Preliminary Plat provides some information about the location of proposed storm water ponds for the development area. As outlined in previous review comments provided for the adjacent Easton Village Concept Plan and Preliminary Plat, open water ponds, especially those with mowed grass nearby, have been shown to be hazardous to the flight of aircraft due to the use of the ponds by Canada geese and other waterfowl. The FAA's Advisory Circular 150/5200-33B, *Hazardous Wildlife Attractants On or Near Airports*, can be found on the agency's web page via the following link.

http://www.faa.gov/documentLibrary/media/advisory\_circular/150-5200-335/150\_5200\_33b.pdf

Mr. Nick Johnson September 3, 2014 Page 2

This Advisory Circular outlines the restrictions and prohibitions surrounding drainage areas within the vicinity of airports as well as guidelines for not only ponds, but other potential wildlife attracting sources. According to the circular, the entire development area under consideration lies within the separation distance recommended by the FAA (5,000 feet for airports serving piston-powered aircraft).

The MAC fully supports the use of infiltration basins in the vicinity of the Lake Elmo Airport, and encourages all ponding areas to be designed as dry ponds that are non-attractive to waterfowl. If this is not possible, we offer the following suggestions to reduce the attraction to wildlife: design ponds with no slope benches; maintain a water depth of less than two feet so that wateremergent growth can occur; plant tall grasses around ponds; install riprap around ponds; and/or cover ponds with a grid of kevlar wire to keep birds out. Based on the Grading Plan included in the Preliminary Plat, the normal water depth in all of the proposed stormwater ponds appears to exceed the recommended two feet. We are concerned that these ponds are being proposed as open water retention facilities, and request that infiltration basins be designed instead. Please provide additional information about the design of the stormwater ponds, including the outfall elevations, proposed water release rates, and measures that will be taken to reduce the attractiveness of the ponds to waterfowl. At the time of the Final Plat, we will object to the use of open water retention ponds that do not incorporate appropriate waterfowl mitigation features. Finally, please identify who will be the responsible party for long-term maintenance of these ponds.

#### Airspace

Due to the proximity of this proposed development to the Lake Elmo Airport, we request that the applicant file an aeronautical study with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) for any structure or object, including temporary construction equipment, which will exceed a height of 35 feet above the ground within this development area and provide a copy of the study results to the MAC prior to the commencement of construction activities. Additional information about the process to file an aeronautical study with the FAA can be found on the agency's Obstruction Evaluation/Airport Airspace Analysis website via the following link.

#### https://oeaaa.faa.gov/oeaaa/external/portal.jsp

#### Street Luminaries

Due to the close proximity of the proposed development to the runways at the Lake Elmo Airport, we request the street luminaries be down-lighted to avoid confusion by pilots as they approach the airfield at night.

#### Landscaping

The Preliminary Landscaping Plan indicates that a mixture of deciduous and evergreen trees will be planted along the south and east sides of Stormwater Pond #1SE. We are concerned that the trees closest to the approach surface for Runway 4 could one day grow to become an obstruction to the Airport's airspace and impact flight procedures. In addition, fruits borne by these trees (if any) may attract wildlife. We request that vegetation in this area be limited to

Mr. Nick Johnson September 3, 2014 Page 3

shrubs and tall grasses. The City must also be aware that any of the trees planted in the vicinity of an approach surface may require removal at some future date if they become an obstruction to the airspace of the Airport and compromise flight procedures.

#### Construction Measures

Please ensure that the contractor is required to develop and implement a dust control plan that will prevent airborne particulates generated during construction from interfering with aircraft operations at the Lake Elmo Airport.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Village Park Preserve Preliminary Plat. The Lake Elmo Airport is an important recreational and transportation asset to the City and the region. If you have any questions, please contact me at 612-726-8129 or via e-mail at <u>neil raiston@mspmac.org</u>.

Sincerely,

NoL RAGION

Neil Ralston, A.A.E. Airport Planner

cc: Bridget Rief, MAC Chad Leqve, MAC Joe Harris, MAC Patrick Mosites, MAC



# VILLAGE PARK PRESERVE (PARCEL E) DESIGN REVIEW REPORT LAKE ELMO, MN

### LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW DATED SEPTEMBER 4<sup>TH</sup>, 2014

### REVIEWED PLAN SET DATED AUGUST 8<sup>™</sup>, 2014

#### Required Action Items by Village Park Preserve Project Landscape Architect

- 1. Provide your calculations for street frontage trees on sheet LP1.
- 2. Please represent planting areas within centers of Cul-de-sacs.
- 3. Provide temporary and permanent groundcover vegetation utilizing 100% native landscape plants for all lots, commonly held HOA & City R.O.W. areas with the exception of the areas noted to be sodded, irrigated and managed as traditional turf bed areas. Suggested native cover for proposed home lots could be Little Bluestem with the addition of some (10+ species) native wildflowers depending on aesthetic look desired (all blue flowers, mix of flowering times, etc...). Suggested permanent native cover should provide the most appropriate ecologically correct mixes. A suggested example would be to reference the seed mixes offered by MN Native Landscapes (<a href="http://www.mnnativelandscapes.com/">http://www.mnnativelandscapes.com/</a>). Please provide the appropriate mix for each specific proposed landscape situation. For example the short dry upland mix for a non-irrigated upland outlot area where shorter grasses are desired adjacent to paths or streets.
- 4. Provide landscape irrigation plans for all commonly held HOA & City R.O.W. areas.
- 5. We would encourage the use of some native understory shrubs & flowering trees (clump or single stem) to add aesthetic interest and promote pollinator & wildlife food/habitat. Also, other native trees such as quaking aspen and tamarack would also be encouraged in a variety of sizes to replicate a natural planting pattern.

### SINCERELY,

### LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE, INC.

STEPHEN MASTEY, ASLA, CLARB, LEED AP BD+C DIRECTOR OF DESIGN