

APPROVED MINUTES

EDEN PRAIRIE PLANNING COMMISSION

MONDAY, AUGUST 26, 2019

**7:00 PM—CITY CENTER
Council Chambers
8080 Mitchell Road**

COMMISSION MEMBERS:

John Kirk, Charles Weber, Ann Higgins, Andrew Pieper, Ed Farr, Michael DeSanctis, Christopher Villarreal, Carole Mette, Balu Iyer

CITY STAFF:

Julie Klima, City Planner; Rod Rue, City Engineer; Matt Bourne, Manager of Parks and Natural Resources; Kristin Harley, Recording Secretary

I. CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER

Chair Farr called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE – ROLL CALL

Commission members Pieper, Kirk, Iyer and Weber were absent.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION: DeSanctis moved, seconded by Higgins to approve the agenda. **MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

IV. MINUTES

MOTION: Mette moved, seconded by DeSanctis to approve the minutes of August 12, 2019. **MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. PARAVEL APARTMENTS

Request for:

- Planned Unit Development Concept Review on 4.962 acres
- Planned Unit Development District Review with waivers on 4.962 acres
- Site Plan Review on 4.962 acres
- Preliminary Plat of an outlot into one lot on 4.962 acres

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 26, 2019

Page 2

Ryan Sailer, of Timberland Partners Development, presented a PowerPoint, gave an overview of the history of his firm, and presented the application. He described the stakeholder engagement process, which included a community open house held in September, 2018 and a Metropolitan Council Livable Communities Design Workshop held in April, 2019. The planned community consisted of 246 total units, a mixture of studio, one-, and two- units, with 63 affordable units and 425 parking stalls, 358 of which would be covered. Included would be 327 bicycle parking spaces.

He addressed the development's density, the increase in the number of the parking stalls, the increase in the available green space due to the reduced building footprint, more effective public connection with better articulation at building corners and site connections, and the change from the original design of multiple towers to one fully connected and integrated building. He described the community amenities offered by the development. The redesign included a number of sustainable community characteristics.

Evan Jacobson, Principal, Tushie Montgomery Architects, displayed the site overview and the site master plan and described the site layout and circulation. This was Phase II of a three-phased development. The landscape plan included a mix of programmed active and passive spaces, with plantings, benches, bike racks, an elevated terrace with a fire pit, grill stations, a pool and a community garden. Jacobson displayed a rendering of the courtyard design and aerial views from two angles.

Sailer described the proposed timeline and the community outreach process.

Mette asked for and received clarification on the number of affordable units during the TIF period would be 50 affordable units at 50 percent AMI for the TIF requirements and 13 inclusionary units would be provided in perpetuity. She asked if the affordable units would only be in the five-story portion of the building. Sailer replied the units in the north side of the building held larger units making it challenging to make these the affordable units, but the entire building was integrated and the amenities will be available to all residents. He noted that 21 of the units on the north side of the building fell within the 100 percent AMI, and that the affordable units could "float" and were not expressly set out in the building. Mette asked if other projects in Eden Prairie were likewise seven story wood construction, and Sailer replied several were being proposed in the Twin Cities but this project would be the first to do it.

Villarreal thanked the applicant for the EV charging stations and asked if the development would allow for level two/DC fast-charging stations and for composting. Sailer could not answer absolutely. Villarreal asked for and received clarification that the southeast line was a median that separated the development from traffic, and which property was reserved for Phase III development. He

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 26, 2019

Page 3

asked if there could be a three-point turn onto Prairie Center Drive. He also asked for an estimate of the setback between the building and Prairie Center Drive. Jacobson replied it varied between 22 to 28 feet.

Higgins urged that underground parking be sensitive to the wetland and creek area adjacent to the property. Sailer replied there had been extensive geotechnical testing to determine the soil composition prior to construction. DeSanctis asked if there was a need for a beacon due to its proximity to Flying Cloud Airport, and Sailer replied the project would be submitted to the FAA to determine this. DeSanctis asked for the policy for removal and disposal of construction materials. John Fletcher of Presbyterian Homes replied with the 200-foot height limit he did not see the need for a beacon. Regarding the construction materials, there would be asbestos testing, and would work with Futures of Minnesota to remove and deconstruct appliances, doors, et cetera. He expected the actual deconstruction of the buildings themselves within the next four weeks.

Farr asked if at the access to the short term parking/delivery area one makes a loop turn past the median Villarreal asked about, or if one had to make a right turn to access Columbine Road. Sailer replied he hoped drivers would not make a U-turn around the median and instead exit to Columbine. Farr asked for a general phasing of the street system. Sailer replied Presbyterian Homes would complete the entire road infrastructure, other than the back side of the site coming in from CVS.

Klima presented the staff report. There would be coordinated site amenities throughout the project: streetscaping, crosswalks, benches, light ballards, et cetera. Density and height waivers were being requested. The project is also seeking a waiver for parking. Staff recommended revision of the landscaping plan calculations to include additional areas as noted in the staff report. There is also a waiver requested to the group usable open space accessible to all residents. Public art was also a part of this project. Staff recommended approval of the development with conditions, as noted in the staff report.

Farr asked Rue to address proposed three-quarter turn at the access from Prairie Center Drive. Rue replied Presbyterian Homes was building the “spine” or main roadway and the initial access would be a full intersection, then become a three-quarter turn in the future as would be warranted by safety concerns. He had no specific dates for this change. Farr asked if the unnamed street could be used for solely southbound traffic or if there could be a U-turn through the median to go north on Prairie Center Drive. That would be the busiest internal intersection. Rue replied he would not encourage a U-turn but it could be done. There were other alternatives for egress.

Mette asked what the inclusionary housing policy requirements were since the proposed inclusionary housing with this project is different than what has been

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 26, 2019

Page 4

provided in other projects. Klima replied the City does not have a formal inclusionary housing policy as the Housing Task Force is working toward a recommendation to provide the City Council. Inclusionary housing has been addressed on a project-by-project basis. She offered to keep the Planning Commission members informed. Mette asked if the sidewalk along Columbine Road between CVS and the wetland had a crosswalk planned there, or if the only access was across Prairie Center Drive. Rue replied the City would discourage a crosswalk at the CVS entrance. One could be marked either at Castlemoor Drive or the center unnamed east-west street, both of which had better sightlines. Mette noted pedestrians would use whatever was convenient whether or not a crosswalk existed. Higgins concurred this was an important point, and stated it was difficult to turn left and go up the hill from CVS due to the lack of visibility. Villarreal asked for a response to Mette's recollections on how the inclusionary units were distributed. Klima replied the dispersion of affordable units met the requirement because it was one building within the TIF district.

Farr noted the property line to the north formed an acute angle within the driveway leaving the CVS and asked if the southerly driveway, which was one lane in each direction and was not busy, could not be repurposed into a one-lane driveway, or removed entirely, and turned over to green space. Even though this driveway was not part of the project review, he thought this was the opportunity to make better use of this land. Klima agreed the southerly driveway was likely put in to support the 2008 development but added there had been no conversation with the CVS ownership. Farr asked for feedback from other commissioners and the applicant. He also noted the metric of parking based on bedrooms rather than on units made more sense to him and asked for staff comments. Klima replied the parking requirements for this zoning district were established some time ago and a bedroom count was more flexible and has been utilized in other zoning districts. This development did provide one parking stall per bedroom.

MOTION: Higgins moved, seconded by Villarreal to close the public hearing.
MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

Higgins asked for clarification of the TIF period. Janet Jeremiah, Eden Prairie Community Development Director, replied the maximum TIF period for a housing district was 26 years. The City would expect the affordability to remain during that period, even if the TIF were to be paid off earlier. This was subject to negotiations. Villarreal asked for the setback of the north section referenced by Farr. Jacobson replied there was a point intrusion there at 12 feet with an average of 20-22 feet. No negotiations had been undertaken for an easement. DeSanctis noted according to the legend with a scale of one inch to 80 feet, there was less than a 12 foot encroachment. Jacobson replied the legend might not be accurate. Klima replied the minimum setback was indeed 12-13 feet. Farr urged the applicant to dig deeper and explore the feasibility of converting the encroaching property on CVS and explore green space. Sailor replied the developer would

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 26, 2019

Page 5

have to track down ownership; this was a difficult question to answer but the possibility could be explored.

Villarreal stated he was largely in support of the project. He had one concern related to the location of all affordable housing in the five-story section with the limited number of two-bedroom apartments, which he calculated to be around 13 percent of units available for families or other residents than empty-nesters and residents who wished for studios. Farr noted on page seven of the staff report there was a minimum listed two-bedroom units that were to be affordable. Sailor replied there was no “us and them” difference in this project. There was one building and would be marketed that way to all. The units themselves would be the same finished packages and everyone would have access to all amenities. Villarreal stated he wished to make more of the two-bedroom units available. Mette agreed, but stated the affordable units (24 percent) were proportionate to the overall mix, and this was how the commission members should approach the question. Villarreal concurred.

DeSanctis noted one of the sustainability would be green roofing trays over portions of concrete podium and asked if there was an opportunity for a rooftop garden or community garden. Jacobson replied the green roofing trays were exclusively on the courtyard side because that was where the podium ended. Rooftop gardens were an option, but this would require decreasing the patio to make room for planting. Farr noted occupant loads could be an issue with rooftop gardens. He commended the project and appreciated the refinements, saying the white cast stone materials were a strong element. He asked the applicant to ensure the scale and pattern did not approach a “concrete block” appearance. He appreciated the wide variety of useful interesting and inviting amenities.

Mette agreed the white stone should avoid looking like “concrete block” and suggested the applicant use something like the beige stone used in City Place in Woodbury. She said she was happy with the parking redesign and approved of the design overall; the amenity space justified the waivers. Higgins stated she looked forward to the development and reminded the applicant there would be children eventually. School buses would be important to consider. DeSanctis stated this was truly a 21-century project and was deeply impressed with the effort, considering it a substantial contribution to the aesthetics and skyline of the commercial district.

MOTION: Villarreal moved, seconded by DeSanctis to recommend approval of the Planned Unit Development Concept Review on 4.962 acres, the Planned Unit Development District Review with waivers on 4.962 acres, the Site Plan Review on 4.962 acres, and the Preliminary Plat of an outlot into one lot on 4.962 acres based on plans stamp dated August 16, 2019 and the staff report dated August 26, 2019. **MOTION CARRIED 5-0**

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 26, 2019

Page 6

VI. PLANNERS' REPORT

Klima stated the Planning Commission was being asked to adopt a resolution finding that a modification to the redevelopment plan for project area number 5 and tax increment financing plan for tax increment financing district number 24 conformed to the general plans for the development and redevelopment of the City. Staff recommended approval.

Farr asked if it mattered if the district was first in conformance in the 2030 or the 2040 plan, and Klima replied in either case the district would be in conformance. Farr asked if this would include the entire City and Jeremiah replied the district encompassed only the property. The project area was coterminous with the City boundary, allowing staff to be more nimble in finding funding, and county sources were also possible funding sources.

Higgins asked if a development that was not part of this district would take advantage of this funding, and Jeremiah affirmed the City could not collect TIF from other areas without establishing an actual district. Mette asked if it was typical to have the project area be the entire City. Jeremiah replied it was very common for the redevelopment area to be coterminous with the City boundaries. Farr asked if the commercial development would be asking for TIF funding. Jeremiah replied Presbyterian Homes did not request TIF and did not expect the commercial development would request TIF either.

MOTION: Villarreal moved, seconded by DeSanctis to adopt Planning Commission Resolution number 2019-01 finding that a modification to the redevelopment plan for project area number 5 and Tax Increment Financing plan for TIF district number 24 conformed to the general plans for the development and redevelopment of the City.

MOTION CARRIED 5-0

VII. MEMBERS' REPORTS

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Higgins moved, seconded by Villarreal to adjourn. **MOTION CARRIED 5-0.** The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.