



**To:** Ken Roberts, City of Lake Elmo Planning Director  
**From:** Lucius Jonett, Wenck Landscape Architect  
**Date:** July 24, 2019  
**Subject:** City of Lake Elmo Landscape Plan Review  
Union Village (formerly Bentley Village) 1<sup>st</sup> Phase, Review #1

**Submittals**

- Final plat – Phase 1 Plans (Tree Inventory, Tree Preservation, Landscape), dated 5-24-2019, received 5-24-2019.

**Location:** Northwest quadrant of the intersection of Keats Ave. N & Interstate Hwy 94, Lake Elmo, MN. South of the Savona Development.

**Land Use Category:** Urban Medium Density Residential

**Surrounding Land Use Concerns:**

The property to the north (Savona Development) is Urban Low Density Residential and is less intensive land use than the proposed Urban Medium Density Residential. Screening is required on the north boundary.

The properties to the west (Lampert's lumber yard), east and south are, or are guided, to be Commercial or Mixed-Use Commercial zones which are more intensive land use than this proposed Urban Medium Density Residential. Screening is not required on the west, east or south boundaries.

**Special landscape provisions in addition to the zoning code:** This proposed development will be required to provide screening along all borders North, South, West and East consisting of either a masonry wall or fence in combination with landscape material that forms a screen at least six feet in height and not less than 90% opaque on a year-round basis.

**Tree Preservation:**

A. A tree preservation plan has been submitted that does meet all requirements.

Entire Site			
Total Caliper Inches of Significant Trees On-Site:	905	Cal Inches	
Common Trees	270		
Conifer/Evergreen Trees	0		
Hardwood Trees	635		
Significant Inches Removed On-Site	724	Cal Inches	
Common Trees	236		
Conifer/Evergreen Trees	0		
Hardwood Trees	488		
30% Tree Removal Limits (Cal. Inches)	Allowed	Proposed	
Subtract Common Tree Removals	81	236	
Subtract Conifer/Evergreen Tree Removals	0	0	
Subtract Hardwood Tree Removals	190.5	488	
Removals in excess of 30% allowances			
Removals in excess of 30% allowances	452.5	Cal Inches	
Common Removals in Excess of 30% Allowance	155.0		
Conifer Removals in Excess of 30% Allowance	0.0		
Hardwood Removals in Excess of 30% Allowance	297.5		
Common Tree Replacement Needed (1/4 the dia inches removed)	38.8	Cal Inches	
Conifer Tree Replacement Needed (1/2 the dia inches removed)	0.0	Cal Inches	
Hardwood Tree Replacement Needed (1/2 the dia inches removed)	148.8	Cal Inches	
<b>Common Tree Replacement Required @ 2.5" per Tree</b>	16	<b># Trees</b>	
<b>Conifer Tree Replacement Required @ 3" per 6' Tall Tree</b>	0	<b># Trees</b>	
<b>Hardwood Tree Replacement Required @ 2.5" per Tree</b>	60	<b># Trees</b>	

- B. There is a significant tree on the property. Tree ID #2742 – 44" DBH Oak. The tree is not marked for removal.
- C. Tree replacement is required because more than thirty (30) percent of the diameter inches of significant trees surveyed will be removed.
- D. Tree replacement calculations follow the required procedure and are correct.
- E. This project is residential development; therefore mitigation replacement trees shall be in addition to landscape required tree counts.

### **Landscape Requirements:**

The landscape plans meet the code required number of trees.

	Preliminary Plan (Code Required)	Proposed	1st Phase Proposed	
Street frontage	5908			Lineal Feet
Lake Shore	0			Lineal Feet
Stream Frontage	0			Lineal Feet
Total Linear Feet	5908			Lineal Feet
/50 Feet = Required Frontage Trees	119			Trees
Development or Disturbed Area	-			SF
Development or Disturbed Area	41.6			Acres
*5 = Required Development Trees	208			Trees
Required Mitigation Trees	76			
<b>Required Number of Trees (*)</b>	<b>403</b>			
<b>Total Trees to Date</b>		<b>403</b>	<b>124</b>	

\* Residential development - mitigation replacement trees are in addition to landscape required tree Counts.

1. A minimum one (1) tree is proposed for every fifty (50) feet of street frontage.
2. A minimum of five (5) trees are proposed to be planted for every one (1) acre of land that is developed or disturbed by development activity.

The landscape plans do meet the minimum compositions of required trees:

Master Plan	Qty	% Composition	
Deciduous Shade Trees	173	43%	>25% required
Coniferous Trees	171	42%	>25% required
Ornamental Trees	59	15%	<15% required
<b>Tree Count</b>	<b>403</b>		

Phase 1	Qty	% Composition	
Deciduous Shade Trees	57	46%	>25% required
Coniferous Trees	51	41%	>25% required
Ornamental Trees	16	13%	<15% required
<b>Tree Count</b>	<b>124</b>		

The landscape plans do show the required mitigation tree types and quantities:

	Required	Preliminary Plan	1st Phase
Common Trees	16	111	27
Conifers	0	171	51
Hardwood Trees	60	62	30

A. A landscape plan has been submitted that does meet all requirements.

- B. The landscape plan does meet the landscape layout requirements:
- C. Interior Parking Lot Landscaping – The development does not include interior parking lots.
- D. Perimeter Parking Lot Landscaping – The development does not include perimeter parking lots.
- E. Screening – The landscape plan does meet screening requirements.

**Special Landscape Considerations:**

- A. 5<sup>th</sup> Street – The development is along 5<sup>th</sup> Street, which has been previously or is schedule to be constructed by other developments. No additional landscape requirements are required of this applicant.

**Findings:**

1. Requiring full screening along the north property line (5<sup>th</sup> Street) is not recommended as it will interfere with the required boulevard tree plantings in the 5<sup>th</sup> Street Design Guidelines.
2. The property to the South is currently vacant land (Rural Development Transitional guided for Commercial development in 2030 Comprehensive Plan and Mixed Use Commercial in draft 2040 Comprehensive Plan). Currently vacant can be interpreted as a currently less intensive use than this proposed development and by ordinance would require screening. Because the property to the South is planned to be a more intensive land use, then by ordinance future development of the South properties would be required to provide screening. The proposed single row planting along the south property of this development's preliminary plat is a fair compromise for current conditions. If the development occurs in multiple phases, each phase should be evaluated for changes of intensity along the southern border, and screening requirements adjusted accordingly.

**Recommendation:**

The 1<sup>st</sup> Phase landscape plans submitted for the Union Park development are consistent with the preliminary plat landscape plans approved on July 24, 2019. It is recommended that the 1<sup>st</sup> phase landscape plans be approved.

Sincerely,



Lucius Jonett, PLA (MN)  
Wenck Associates, Inc.  
City of Lake Elmo Municipal Landscape Architect