



STAFF REPORT

DATE: 6/6/2017
REGULAR
ITEM #: 18
MOTION

TO: City Council
FROM: Stephen Wensman, Planning Director
AGENDA ITEM: Parcel A – Schiltgen Property Concept PUD
REVIEWED BY: Emily Becker, City Planner
Jack Griffin, City Engineer
Mike Bent, Building Official
Greg Malmquist, Fire Chief
Ann Pung Terwedo, Senior Planner, Washington County

BACKGROUND:

GWSA Land Development is requesting approval of a concept planned unit development (PUD) for a portion of the Schiltgen Farm at the corner of CSAH 14 and CSAH 17. The Concept PUD proposes 279 detached single family dwellings on 99.12 acres with a net density of +/- 2.9 dwelling units per acre (DUA). A portion of the property is within the Sunfish Lake shoreland and subject to the shoreland ordinance regulations.

The Planning Commission held a public hearing and reviewed the concept PUD plans on May 22, 2017 and made a recommendation with conditions based on findings.

ISSUE BEFORE COUNCIL:

The City Council is being requested to adopt Resolution 2017-061 approving the Concept PUD plans for the development on Schiltgen Farm, Parcel A.

PROPOSAL DETAILS/ANALYSIS:

The Concept Plan was reviewed by the Planning Commission and the Commission provided review comments. The Concept PUD is based upon the development being granted bonus density through the PUD, but has not provided concept plan details to justify the additional density. The developer has revised his narrative to explain how he expects to meet the requirements for amenity points, justifying the proposed density. From a Staff perspective, the developer may describe how he intends to meet the requirements for amenity points, but until the concept plans or preliminary plans actually show the amenities, the points cannot be awarded. Therefore, the density in the concept plan should be approved conditionally, only if the developer can provide justification for the needed amenity points with the preliminary plat submittal (a new staff recommended condition). The Planning Commission discussed the development and the primary issues discussed were about justification for the density, the inadequacy of the open space overlay buffer on the north and west sides of the property, the need to provide street stubs to adjacent development, and setback modifications.

The Parks Commission reviewed the concept PUD plans and recommended that the City accept cash in lieu of park land dedication with the final plat, although the City's Comprehensive Parks System Plan identifies the need for a neighborhood park in this area. The Commission recommends a public trail, consistent with the Comprehensive Trail plan as long as the Hamlet on Sunfish's trails can be dedicated to the City, which is acceptable to the Sunfish HOA as long as the trail corridor can be surveyed by the City for conveyance.

One item discussed briefly during the Planning Commission review was the request by the Chavez family for a road access to their parcel located about 380 feet to the southwest of the proposed development. The Chavez family is interested in selling their lot as a buildable parcel and to do so, it will need road access. The Chavez family is having the property surveyed in order to determine the buildable area on the property after shoreland and zoning setbacks are considered. The Chavez family will also likely be requesting a comprehensive plan amendment and zoning map amendment in order to connect to city sewer and develop as an urban parcel. To date, Staff is uncertain whether the lot is buildable and whether there is any obligation to provide access.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There are no fiscal impacts at this time. When the property develops, it will have urban services and will pay sewer and water connection charges, building permit fees and the like. The development will also provide needed sewer connection to the Hamlet on Sunfish, which will solve an ongoing environmental threat to the City.

Planning Commission/Public Hearing:

Two residents spoke at the public hearing held on May 22 with concerns about traffic on CSAH 17 and the proposed densities.

The Planning Commission recommended approval (7-0) with the the following conditions:

- Condition # 12 was modified to read, "That the developer provide off-street parking for the proposed HOA clubhouse/pool area.
- That the side yard setbacks be 10 ft. / 5 ft. consistent with the V-LDR zoning district or as an alternate, 7.5 ft. /7.5 ft. on each side, including window wells being outside of utility easements.
- That the Village Parkway design be carried through in this development with the southern road at least to the first street stub providing access to the south.
- Condition #1 was stricken.

The Planning Commission added the following findings:

- The current concept PUD plan does not provide justification for a density bonus of more than 10 points under the City PUD Ordinance
- The proposed green space buffers on the north and west are too narrow as shown
- The Planning Commission is open to reducing the front yard setback for side loaded garages to 20 feet provided here is sufficient architectural detail on street facing facades.

OPTIONS:

The Council has the following options:

1. Adopt Resolution 2017-061 approving the concept PUD plans with the conditions and findings recommended by Staff and the Planning Commission

2. Amend Resolution 2017-061 approving the concept PUD plans with amended conditions and findings
3. Deny Resolution 2017-061 and provide findings for denial to be drafted into a new resolution at the next meeting.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff and the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the Concept PUD plans for Parcel A – Schiltgen property with the following motion:

“Motion to adopt Resolution 2017-061 approving the PUD Concept Plan for Parcel A – Schiltgen property subject to conditions and based on findings.

ATTACHMENTS:

- Resolution 2017-061
- Revised Applicant Narrative for City Council meeting

**CITY OF LAKE ELMO
WASHINGTON COUNTY
STATE OF MINNESOTA**

RESOLUTION NO. 2017-061

*RESOLUTION APPROVING A THE GWSA LAND DEVELOPMENT'S PARCEL A -
SCHILTGEN CONCEPT PUD PLANS*

WHEREAS, the City of Lake Elmo is a municipal corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Minnesota; and

WHEREAS, GWSA Land Development, 10850 Old County Road 15, Suite 200 Plymouth, MN 55441 submitted an application to the City of Lake Elmo (City) for a Concept PUD Plan for a 279 detached single family residential planned unit development on 99.12 acres, a copy of which is on file in the City of Lake Elmo Planning and Zoning Department; and

WHEREAS, notice has been published, mailed and posted pursuant to the Lake Elmo Zoning Ordinance, Section 154.102; and

WHEREAS, the Lake Elmo Planning Commission held public hearing on May 22, 2017 to consider the Concept PUD approval request; and

WHEREAS, the Lake Elmo Planning Commission adopted a motion recommending approval of the Concept PUD subject to 16 conditions of approval; and

WHEREAS, the Lake Elmo Planning Commission has submitted its report and recommendation concerning the Concept PUD as part of a memorandum to the City Council from the Planning Director for the June 6, 2017 Council Meeting; and

WHEREAS, the City Council reviewed the application at its meeting held on June 6, 2017 and made the following findings of fact:

1. That the PUD Concept Plan is consistent with the intent of the Lake Elmo Comprehensive Plan and the Future Land Use Map for this area.
2. That the PUD Concept Plan complies with the general intent of the Village-Urban Low Density Residential zoning districts with PUD modifications.
3. That the PUD Concept Plan generally complies with the City's Subdivision regulations.
4. That the PUD Concept Plan is generally consistent with the City's engineering standards with exceptions as noted in the City Engineer's memorandum dated May 8, 2017.
5. The PUD Concept Plan meets the minimum requirement for a PUD including minimum lot area, open space and street layout.
6. The PUD Concept Plan meets more than one of the required PUD objectives identified in Section 154.751 including providing: 1) more adequate, usable, and suitably located open space and recreational amenities and other public facility than would otherwise be provided under conventional development techniques. 2) Preservation and enhancement

of important environmental features through careful and sensitive placement of buildings and facilities, and 3) Allowing the development to operate in concern with a redevelopment plan in certain areas of the City and to ensure the redevelopment goals and objective will be achieved.

7. The current concept PUD plan does not provide justification for a density bonus of more than 10 points under the City PUD Ordinance
8. The proposed green space buffers on the north and west are too narrow as shown
9. The Planning Commission is open to reducing the front yard setback for side loaded garages to 20 feet provided here is sufficient architectural detail on street facing facades.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City Council does hereby approve the Concept PUD Plans for Parcel A – Schiltgen prepared by GWSA Land Development subject to the following conditions:

1. That the future preliminary plat and preliminary PUD Plans submittal identify all requests for flexibility from the V-LDR zoning district.
2. That all comments of the City Engineer's Memorandum dated May 8, 2017 be addressed with the future preliminary plat and preliminary PUD Plans submittal.
3. That a shoreland tier analysis be provided with the future preliminary plat and preliminary PUD Plans submittal with the required 50% protected open space.
4. That the developer provide trails as recommended by the Parks Commission.
5. That any approval be contingent on complying with Washington County's requirements and requests pertaining to right-of-way, turn lanes and trail needs.
6. That the preliminary plat and preliminary PUD Plans submittal include a landscape and buffering plan to address open space overlay area requirements.
7. That 6 ft. sidewalks be provided on one side of all city streets.
8. That wetlands and wetland buffer areas be contained on outlots outside of lot areas.
9. That fees in lieu of park land dedication be provided as required by 153.14 with future final plat.
10. That the preliminary plat and preliminary PUD Plans submittal include a detailed subdivision phasing plan which includes a timeline for providing sanitary sewer to the Hamlet development.
11. That the preliminary plat and preliminary PUD Plans submittal include off-street parking for the proposed HOA clubhouse/pool area.
12. That the preliminary plat and preliminary PUD Plans submittal include a detailed architectural plan and clearly identify the various architecture styles and locations for them on the plans.
13. That the developer comply with any comments to be provided by the MnDNR.

14. That the side yard setbacks be 10 ft. / 5 ft. consistent with the V-LDR zoning district or as an alternate, 7.5 ft. /7.5 ft. on each side, including window wells being outside of utility easements.
15. That the Village Parkway design be carried through in this development with the southern road at least to the first street stub providing access to the south.
16. That the density shown in the concept plan is not presently justified, but may be considered with the preliminary plat submittal.

Passed and duly adopted this 6th day of June, 2017 by the City Council of the City of Lake Elmo, Minnesota.

Mike Pearson, Mayor

ATTEST:

Julie Johnson, City Clerk



Lake Elmo Parcel A

PUD Concept Plan Narrative

May 31, 2017

This narrative is a supplement to the one prepared on April 20th in preparation for the Planning Commission meeting to help address and answer some of the concerns of the Commission.

Amenity Points:

- Additional Open Space - At least 20% of the project area not within street right-of-way shall be preserved as open space to qualify for a PUD. Our development includes 23% open space within the project area. We are also dedicating an additional 7+/- acres of open space east of Reid Park. Although not included in the immediate project area, the dedication will increase the open space to 32% - 12% more than required amounting to nearly 10 acres. Amenity Points – 10
- Pedestrian Improvements – A trail network wasn't shown on the sketch plan as we anticipated City input into the location and direction of trails. We plan to install and connect to existing trail networks to create connectivity. It was mentioned by Planning Commission that this isn't worthy of amenity points since it's included in the Comprehensive Plan, but I haven't found in the PUD ordinance where it states the amenity be in addition to what is required in the Comprehensive Plan. The trail will be an amenity for the residents of Lake Elmo. Amenity Points – 5
- Theming – Development signage, fencing, landscaping, lighting, and site furnishings, including the clubhouse will adhere to the Lake Elmo Branding and Theming study. We do not have a clubhouse design yet, but it will pay tribute to the Lake Elmo heritage. Amenity Points – 3
- Plaza – The definition states that “the development shall include some form of plaza or public square that is wholly or partly enclosed by a building. Plazas are landscaped or paved open areas that shall have a minimum area not less than 1,000 square feet. Plazas for commercial or mixed-use developments shall be open to the public during daylight hours.” Our development is proposing a Pool and Clubhouse area with a tot lot that is 0.90 acres, roughly 39,000 square feet. This area is a gathering spot for the entire neighborhood and will be used for community gatherings, meetings and events. It was mentioned in the Planning Commission meeting that this amenity point was meant for public use and doesn't qualify. As stated in the definition above, Plazas for commercial and mixed-use are designed to be open to the public, leading me to deduct that it is not a requirement for residential and therefore is worthy of amenity points. Amenity Points – 5
- Public Right-of-Way – The definition states “dedication of land and construction of a public road, trail, pathway, or greenway that is part of an approved city plan, but outside the scope of the immediate project area.” This can be interpreted in different ways, but the dedication of 7 acres of land east of Reid Park to go along with the 2.8 acres previously dedicated with Village Preserve meets one of the specific objectives outlined in the Comprehensive Plan Village Land Use Plan under Parks and Trails. The expansion of Reid Park is listed multiple times as a Natural Resource Preservation area and is highlighted on Village Open Space Plan. The addition of land east of Reid Park is specifically mentioned in the Comprehensive Village Land Use Plan multiple times and even highlighted as an opportunity to acquire environmentally sensitive lands that could be incorporated into recreation. Amenity Points – 5-10
- Site Amenities Not Listed – The PUD ordinance also states that “The City may also consider the allotment of amenity points for site amenities that are not otherwise specified within this ordinance as part of the preliminary plan phase of the planned development.” If the City doesn't find that amenities listed above fall into the appropriate amenity description as stated, we are asking for

consideration for the Reid Park expansion, Pool, Clubhouse and tot lot, additional open space with a 3.3 acre park under this category. Amenity Points – 10+ (if not considered elsewhere).

In addition to those things mentioned above, we are seeking amenity point consideration for expanding the sewer at an accelerated rate to Hamlet of Sunfish Lake. “Building Partnerships” is listed in the Village Land Use plan as guiding principle #8 – as stated in my first narrative, we are in a position to develop this property well ahead of schedule due to a partnership with the City and two other local developers that teamed to pay for the sewer extension north from Reid Park to Lake Elmo Avenue. We are bringing this project forward at this time in a continued effort to partner with the City as well as the Hamlet of Sunfish Lake community by extending the needed sewer west through our property to Hamlet. Amenity Points - 10

And last, a portion of the neighborhood will include snow removal and mowing for the age targeted cottage lots. Amenity Points – 2

Lot Area and Width:

As mentioned in the narrative, we are seeking a reduction in the minimum lot width and area. We feel based on our experience in Village Preserve and the supply of approved lots with V-LDR minimums, the smaller lots provide us the best opportunity to move forward with a project at this time. This will also allow us to provide a number of different housing choices for families of all sizes and ages. It should be noted that the minimum lot area for V-LDR is 9,000 sf and the average lot area we are proposing is 9,424sf taking the residential lot area of the entire development and dividing by the number of lots.

Front Yard and Side Yard Setbacks:

We feel this is the most important of the variances we are requesting. We are proposing a smaller front yard setback on a portion of the lots to accommodate a side loaded garage for our Cottage Lots. In other communities we have developed for this product, it is common and often preferred by Cities to have as small as a 10’ setback as it reduces impervious surface and leads to a visually more appealing streetscape. The larger the setback, the farther the front door gets pushed back to accommodate the side-loaded garage requiring additional driveway.

In addition, but just as important, we would also like to receive a variance on the side yard setbacks. Instead of the 5’/10’ and/or 7.5’/7.5’, we are asking for 8’/6’ or 7’/7’ with living space on both sides. The extra foot will give our builders more flexibility and allow them to offer a larger variety of housing types and amenities within the home.

Buffer:

The aerial view shows that there is already a large amount of buffer and open space around our development area. The aerial also shows distances to the closest structures with the closest being 235’. We are proposing a landscaped berm as a buffer in areas that aren’t already heavily screened or adjacent to natural buffers such as a large stand of trees and wetland. We would prefer to use the large amount of open space provided within the development where it is more usable.

Pool & Clubhouse Parking:

In our experience, it has worked best to provide a cut-out for temporary drop-off and pick-up vs a dedicated parking lot for the pool & clubhouse area. The trails and sidewalks offer easy access and promote walkability. It also lessens the burden on the HOA for maintenance and policing of parking for guests and other visitors.