

Chaska Park Board
May 11th, 2021
Meeting Minutes
Chaska Event Center
In person and Via Zoom

1. Call to Order

The May 11th meeting of the Chaska Parks Board was called to order by Chair David Downs at 7 pm, in person and via Zoom.

2. Roll Call-Monteith

In Person-David Downs, Jason Branch, Elizabeth Wynveen, Georgiann Keyport, Jalen Destin, Thomas Massey,

Attendance via Zoom: Donelle Heieie, Karli Cich, Zach Saueressig

Staff: Marshall Grange, Mary Monteith, Kevin Wright, Communications Manager

3. Adopt Agenda

Motion by Saueressig, second by Branch to adopt the May 11th meeting agenda.

Downs asked Monteith to do Roll Call-All Aye's

4. Visitor Presentation

None. Those present are here for Agenda item 7A, Wagner property.

5. Approve Previous Meeting Minutes

Motion by Wynveen, second by Branch to approve Park Board minutes from April 13th, 2021.

Motion Carried.

6. Receive Council and Planning Meeting Minutes

6A. Council Minutes April 5th

6B. Council Minutes April 19th

6C. Planning Minutes March 10th

7. Action Items

7A. Recommendation to City Council & Planning Commission on Lennar Concept Plan for Wagner property

Grange introduced this concept to the board. The placement of this neighborhood park aligns with the 2040 Comp plan, which is our guiding document.

Shared site location, the property in red is the property to be developed. Grange noted the current park locations, the yellow dot is a Jonathan mini park, Acorn Park (Jonathan owned) and Shadow Wood, (city owned). He also addressed the distance between the parks. The blue dot is where we determined the park should go.

Grange shared the concept plan that was submitted by Lennar for review. There is a three-step process for development, a concept plan, a preliminary and then a final plan. Since there will be a park in this development, the park board is responsible for reviewing that piece of this development and making comments and recommendations. The plan then goes on to the planning commission for review and comment, then lastly to the council for preliminary approval. The total site acreage is 45.47, currently showing 102 lots. The city can take up to 10% of the land for park dedication (4.55 acres), cash in lieu of land, or a combination. We are seeking some land and some cash from the developer.

Grange spoke to the Park Exhibit from Lennar and pointed out the recommended location for the park in the NW corner. The developer proposed 2.6 acres for the park, on the back north side of the homes, including a breakthrough between two lots.

His role in this as director of Parks and Rec is to define the best option, what provides the most value for park use, we want to make sure that we are getting land dedication that is useable for the park. Ask the question, how can we use this land for the park. Some of this shows undevelopable land and steep slopes, it would be difficult to get a trail through some of the areas. In his recommendation, lot 52 over from the east, is not usable, it is only about an acre. It is a narrow space, located to the east between a steep slope and the backs of those lots. I am not seeing purpose for that triangular piece, it is not usable area, so not including in the park land dedication. On the Western edge, on the backside of 54/56 are unusable for programming as well.

Grange's recommendation is to omit 3 lots, 53, 54, 55. That would net 2.65 acres, contained in one area, providing nice sightlines into the park, and accessibility. It also highlights the new park for the development. In addition to removing the 3 lots, the city could also look into access to the park off Autumn Woods Park as well. Taking the remainder of the park value in cash to use the funds to do the playground park area.

Grange turned things over to the Park Board for questions:

Keyport-What type of amenities will there be in the park. Grange addressed that, too early for that yet. Once final plan approval, we would talk through that more.

Wynveen-what's typical acreage of Chaska parks? Grange, per National Parks Association, around 3 to 15 acres. There are existing Chaska parks that are way smaller though as well. What feels right here?

Massey-the park entrance, what would that look like? Grange, there are some trees along there, ideally provide sightlines. No parking.

Wynveen-your map of other parks in Jonathan. What is the potential for Jonathan Association to be involved with this? Where are these discussions at? Not sure, that would be between the council and Jonathan.

Saueressig-is there a feeling of too many parks there already? Grange, falls back again to the Comp plan and the vision expressed in it. Staying true to that goal. Shadow Woods is the nearest, a small park behind two houses. Yes, there is a need.

Downs, will certainly serve the needs of the east and north residents.

Cich-would that natural wetland area be kept? Grange, yes, absolutely. The city prioritizes trees and maintaining them.

Wynveen-that area is densely wooded, not ideal for kids and animals. There is a lot of brush back there. Grange, could be a factor in needing those lots omitted for a larger park space.

Josh Metzger-Lennar, as far as joining the Jonathan Association, still exploring that, attorneys are looking into it. Excited to be in Chaska.

He understands where Grange is coming from, and his request, we will probably revise the plan to reflect that. Hoping that there is flexibility, as those three lots are prime lots. Revise things to reflect a 2.5-acre park.

Emily Rome Welter-2887 Ironwood Blvd. She has a signed petition from most of the area around this site, she will share with you. 110 households. They are exceptionally concerned with this development, including the park issues talked about here, as well as the density.

This land is 45.46 acres, there are 150 acres around it, where 100's of us built our homes.

The density proposed for this development is not at all similar to the other existing neighborhoods. That will be addressed in depth at both the upcoming planning and council meetings. The 2.5-acre park you mention earlier, that is the same size as the Jonathan mini park, which has been paid for and maintained by Jonathan residents for years. While we are happy to share our parks, we are not happy to fund the enjoyment of another development that is not participating in sharing in that.

The other piece, that mini park serves 58 homes. What we are proposing here is 102 homes, it simply is not enough. It cannot be balanced on the backs of those of us who have been contributing for years. Think about that, think carefully about the amount of land there and expand that park space.

Everyone here is concerned about this. 110 families. We want to be good neighbors, but this is exceptionally upsetting. We ask you to really look at what is being proposed. 102 homes compared to 58. Focus on the 3-15 acres, specify the 3 lots that you want omitted.

The Park location, consider the traffic it will bring.

You identify the lots to be taken out, it is outrageous that they be allowed cart blanc. They will not do it in our favor. Please strongly consider our opposition to what they are doing here and what they are proposing.

What is the average size of neighborhood parks? Grange shared that NRPA states 3-15 acres.

Doug Schoon, 3095 Autumn Woods Dr-I am recommending to close Autumn Woods Dr to Julian, make it a trail. So many kids cut through here daily going from Pioneer to Audubon, it is dangerous. This is a missed opportunity for a great trail.

Jeremey Landkammer-Here on behalf of Jonathan Association, I serve on the board. We have made it clear to the city planning commission that it is our intent to welcome this type of development, I hope that Lennar moves forward with working with us. I am concerned about the idea of Autumn Woods Drive entrance, not sure how they would access this, there is no trail, it is a very busy road. Concerns with safety and children. Encourage the park board to think about these things. It could be a park for all of Autumn Woods and to work with the Jonathon Association to incorporate that.

Jay Rohe-3621 Cavallo Pass-Historical prospective to this. I represented this group when I was elected. You have the power to look at this park proposal and say no or make things right. It was always a thought this property would be an extension to Autumn Woods. To not be a part of the Jonathan Association would be a big mistake. You have the power to look at this on its merits. From a park perspective, it could be bigger, a larger location. Putting density in when we have the opportunity to connect this neighborhood.

Kirsten Taylor-2893 Forest Ridge, referenced in the 2040 Comp Plan open space is so important. There is no trail along Autumn Woods. Look at the plat design, include some of those things. Consider a trail. Open space that is part of the 2040 plan. Hit that 3-15-acre park, of usable space. Where you are putting the pond and trails. Consider all that.

Mark Lundgren-3075 Autumn Woods Dr. I commend you on the comments on the on-street parking. The park is too small, there is a density issue. If residents from Julian area and Audubon can use it, you will have a parking issue. Expand it.

Downs, neighborhood parks are meant to be walked to

Branch-this is a neighborhood park, right? Clarification? Yes

Emily-I need to better understand the working of the land, money part, explain the workings of park dedication. Grange, could take up to 10% of the land, any more than that would need to be purchased. If we took all the land, we would need to fund the park via taxes.

Emily- Jeremy's comments, if you took all the land, the Jonathan Association has money to build parks. Taking more land to serve a denser neighborhood, marrying it with Jonathon, I would hope that enters these discussions as an option.

Saueressig, to Emily, so it boils down to your petition, what are specifically your wants. Emily, bigger park, and trails, the density concern of the development, concern on increased traffic, and to be a part of Jonathan Association.

Taylor-Hopes it becomes part of the Jonathon Association, that would be great.

Nicole Loeding-2867 Ironwood, safety is big. 100 new homes, 200 new kids, the increased capacity and safety.

Jeremy-clarify, Jonathon invested \$120,000 into Acorn, \$70,000 into Ironwood/Butternut this year. We would love to work with Lennar and take those monies and this space and build it out. There is limitation to these parks, we look at investment we need to make to service these communities. Jonathan would like to work with the city on the amenities on this park and the surrounding neighborhoods.

Gretchen K-2868 Ironwood Blvd., I speak on the trail system, we get out on them, and meeting new people, the safety around things and getting to know people. Echo Emily, get things in writing to Lennar, what you would like proposed, number of lots, etc., to the developer.

Doug-Questions on the process moving forward, Downs explained.

Kim, 2874 Ironwood Blvd. Question on park land allocation, does it consider the density to park land? Grange, we are not looking at the number of homes, we are looking at the amount of space that is there. Generally looking at 2.5-2.65 acres, for a nice grassy area as well as playground and maybe trails. Park access for Autumn Woods drive.

Saueressig-Disconnect between Lennar and Jonathan? Grange not a part of those discussion. Good to know that those conversation are occurring though. Our decisions tonight is based on what we have before us.

Downs, Close the public part, discussion amongst us now, try and focus on just the park piece.

Do we want to proceed with the recommendation that Grange provided to us?

Wynveen, I am disappointed in the park size. Ask for 53, 54, 55, also ask for 56 as well. You need more space for this park, that is to support this amount of community members. If you drive north, there are no parks there either. 2.65 acres is not enough.

Heieie, question, can trails be added/expanded along Autumn Woods north side. Always a fan of more trees, more parkland, more space.

Grange-We would need to come up with a finance resource to build, maintain those trails.

Downs that should be a part of the Master Bike/Trail plan discussion. Not here, we cannot bite off too much.

Grange, may be opportunity for trails along the northern side of that wetland, the city owns that land. Bring trails through there to access the park there, lot 52 to the east.

Saueressig-what are we making recommendation on tonight. Grange, has his recommendations for tonight that he laid out. Do you agree with mine or go another route? Put our best foot forward with city council. We are just a recommending body to them.

Downs, we should get the other concerns outside of our area, to appropriate staff. Grange will do.

Downs-Staff should look into the relationship between the city and Jonathon. Not sure who that staff is or what department.

Branch-concerned with hypotheticals expressed today with regards to Jonathan. Deal with the facts here.

Discussion on a neighborhood meeting that Lennar had held previously.

Grange-Pulled up his recommendation, may need to be more specific with things. Generally going into this, 2.65 minimum acres, recommendation receiving park land and cash, omit 53, 54, 55.

Destin-what is the full size of the development we could take 4.55 acres. Who is responsible for the trails? Grange trails become an amenity we would consider within the park. If we took all the land, whatever trails, playground area, etc., we would need to find the money to do that.

Massey-Alternative to not build the park and take the cash. I agree with Liz, not big enough, do we go up to the 4.55 acres. Maybe we look at the city talking with Jonathan, also access on the north side is a large safety concern. Are those concerns addressed by the planning commission?

Grange, road traffic, is the city and planning, the city has the obligation to do as safely as we can.

Downs-extend the park to the road, get more land. Why wouldn't we include that plot the city owned.

Shoon-walk that property, it is so dense you cannot see oncoming traffic. Always has been a safety issue.

Lundgren-take the land, do not worry about what you are going to put there tonight. You will not get more land later.

Wynveen-request more land for these residents, there will be new families with lots of children who need a big park to play in.

Downs-there is no more suitable land to take. This is a pretty good size area. 4.5 acres is the max.

Heieie-push for more land, this would be a minimum, include a strong recommendation.

Downs, we need to make a recommendation. Is 2.5 acres adequate? Marshall has said it is, I have to agree with him.

Branch-A small park, but big amenities. If we take the land, where will the money come from.

Keyport, we are hearing a density issue when compared to parks around them. Can you recommend to council, tell Lennar to give us more land?

Grange-yes, a recommendation to council, to take the full 10% of land, they would factor that into their discussion. Would need new drawings from Lennar then as well. What is the financial impact on us, \$4,000 per residential unit? 102 units, 100% cash would be \$408,000. At 2.65 acres, \$180,000 to use on amenities. Question of what would Jonathan's contribution be?

Jeremy, it would be best that Lennar did not deed it to the city. Jonathan HOA would like to see Lennar join Jonathan and become a common area property of Jonathan. We would work with the developer on determining that contribution.

Wynveen, recommend what our residence are asking for. 4.5 acres is my recommendation.

Downs, make a motion for Grange's proposal.

2.5 acres, omit the 3 lots, 53, 54, 55

Motion by Massey, 2nd by Heieie

Discussion-Wynveen strongly suggests make a motion to increase the acreage 2.65

Grange suggested to go with Heieie's idea, "strong recommendation to look for more acreage" verbiage.

Further discussion to amend.

Motion to proceed with Grange's proposal, at a minimum with a strong recommendation to find more acreage than the 2.65, if at all possible. Contiguous to the 3 lots, 55, 54, 53. At a minimum strongly recommending that we look for more space if at all possible. Also, the removal of the NW corner of lot 52, over to the east and not including that wedge on the eastern corner in the initial proposal.

Motion by Heieie, 2nd by Cich

Roll Call, Motion Carried

7B. Recommendation to City Council to Approve Carver County SHIP Grant Agreement for Youth Soccer

As part of the Park RX discussions with Carver County, we have been looking at health care and prescribing time in the parks. Then the pandemic hit. We have been looking at diversity and getting more out to explore and enjoy the parks. Look at what barriers there may be and focusing on the Latino community. It was identified that the 7th/8th graders, had nowhere to play soccer. This grant helped address the concern, SHIP dollars were available for \$1,000 for equipment and the coach they will use. A formal agreement from them, that we need to recommend to council approval for the funds.

Downs, who will work with this? Recreation staff will be a part of it. We are hoping for access to the parents to better discuss what their barriers are, and how we can better serve them. Will this be on-going? Will assess things as we move forward.

Motion by Branch, second by Keyport to make Recommendation to the City Council to approve Carver County SHIP Grant Agreement for Youth soccer. Motion carried.

8. Discussion items

8A. Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan Update

Grange-Project management team meeting, May 18th, 5:30pm. Seeking community engagement. Project website, Walkbikechaska.org, a lot of information there. Key things, online survey as well as an online WikiMap. Public can play around with it, create new route, trails etc., all ideas would be visible to the public. As of last week, 500 responses. Still want to make sure

we have things out there. Our goal is 1,000. 430 + were via the survey, not the map. So will change the focus a bit.

Other interesting things, the online survey, options to pick walking only, biking only, or both. 25% picked walking only. Majority were both. Compared to other cities, we have way more walkers. Also 75% were female responders, which is very high.

Some areas we are lacking, teens up to age 29, have very low response. Looking to Jalin for some help there. Also, the households of 75+ ages, and households with median income of \$100,000 or less. 2-3 more weeks left for the survey. May bring in a translator to help reach some underserved neighborhoods. Encourage more to interact with those tools.

Branch, maybe the Wikimap putting in your email turned people off? Grange, it is to filter out your comments and go back in to add to it. That is the reasoning for it.

Wynveen, encourage you all to take the survey. Go to: Walkbikechaska.org

8B. CIP Projects Update

Cortina Woods neighborhood park meeting moved to tomorrow at 5:30 due to bad weather last week. An opportunity to thank the residents for their part in the survey results. Jung to talk on the CIP program.

Lake Grace trail, lots going on there. Next week, the crane will be there for moving the bridge. The trail work will wrap up in June.

Resurfacing of the tennis courts and basketball courts at the Town Course Park next week.

Seeking bids on hockey board replacement at Clover Ridge

Cricket Pitch at McKnight to start

Crews at City Square Park, replacing the roof of the Gazebo. The rest of the park is set for next year.

8C. Community Gardens

Keyport presented a PowerPoint presentation on the benefits of community gardens.

Downs asked Grange if he talked with Brian Jung on if there are resources available for this?

Not currently there are not. A longer discussion would need to occur if it is viable option.

Currently the 2 gardens the city has are all rented. There also is one in Jonathan off Bavaria, that currently is not being used.

Question asked if we could offer more if there was interest? Will look more into it and report back. Grange, first determine interest level, is it clustered or spread out? Are people willing to drive to them? A good social aspect as well for all ages.

Keyport recently met with our preschool staff on incorporating a program in with our kids.

Suggested that we look at incorporating it with intergenerational interest. Chat more at the next meeting.

9. Other Business

9A. Board Member Reports

Wynveen-Cycle Chaska, May 22nd. You can sign up on-line, or in person, 3 different options to pick from. The Summer Activity Guide is available on-line. Activities are filling up fast, so get in there and check the programs out.

Keyport-the city's shade tree program is great!

Cich-recently walked the Orange Loop, was fun, went past the dog park for the first time.

Heieie-walking more, people are out hiding Chaska rocks. Shared info. on the Monarch way stations, a cool educational idea for down the road.

Saueressig-Great to go into the CCC with no reservation now! Feels free! Recently noticed the memorial picture of Karen in the Lodge window, very nice.

Downs, thanks for sticking around tonight, a late one.

10. Adjourn

Motion by Saueressig to Adjourn the meeting, second by Wynveen

- MINUTES -
CHASKA CITY COUNCIL
May 3, 2021

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Windschitl at 7 pm.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Roll Call

Roll call was taken. Present: Councilmembers Hatfield, Hubbard, Huang, Grau, and Mayor Windschitl.

Absent: None.

Also Present: Kevin Ringwald, Community Development Director; Liz Hanson, City Planner; Luke Melchert, City Attorney; Noel Graczyk, Administrative Services Director; City Engineer Matt Clark; Nate Kabat, Assistant Administrator; and Matt Podhradsky, City Administrator.

4. Adopt the Agenda

Motion by Councilmember Hatfield, second by Councilmember Hubbard to adopt the agenda as presented. Motion carried.

5. Proclamation

5.A. National Teacher's Appreciation Week

Mayor Windschitl read a proclamation naming May 2nd-8th as National Teacher's Appreciation Week.

Chris Commers, President of Chaska Education Association Local 748, thanked the City for its support over the years.

The Council thanked the teachers and noted the important role they play in students' lives.

Nicole Klitzke, Chair of District 112 Foundation, recognized Eric Songer's reception of the Teacher of the Year Award.

Mr. Songer recognized the work of his fellow teachers and thanked the District 112 Foundation for their support and thanked the City for their support to teachers.

6. Visitor Presentation

6.A. Purple Reigns/Arts Consortium of Carver County

Barb Hone, Chairperson Arts Consortium of Carver County, provided an update of the Purple Reigns event that the Arts Consortium of Carver County is putting on in June. She noted the Consortium is hosting a celebration on June 17 at the Community Center from 6:30pm-8:30pm.

6.B. Annual State of the Library Presentation

Heidi Hoks, Caver County Library Systems Director, introduced Jodi Edstrom, Branch Manager, who provided the annual State of the Library presentation.

Councilmember Hubbard inquired if donations are able to be brought in yet.

Ms. Edstrom stated that option will open up again in a couple of weeks.

Councilmember Huang asked if there is anything that the library found useful over the pandemic that they will keep as a service moving forward.

Ms. Hoks explained what services patrons have suggested keeping.

Councilmember Grau noted he looks forward every year to the annual update from the library.

Assistant Administrator Kabat thanked Ms. Edstrom for helping his family have plenty of books while distance learning.

Councilmember Hubbard and Mayor Windschitl thanked the library staff for the services they provide.

7. Minutes

Motion by Councilmember Hatfield, second by Councilmember Grau to approve the minutes of the April 19, 2021 City Council meeting. Motion carried.

8. Consent Agenda

Mayor Windschitl recognized the work that City Administrator Podhradsky does every year.

City Administrator Podhradsky thanked City Staff for all their work and stated it is an honor to work for the City.

Motion by Councilmember Huang, second by Councilmember Hubbard to approve the Consent Agenda Items A through D:

A. City Administrator Annual Review

Motion to approve administrator goals for 2021 and adjust the City Administrator's annual salary with a 1.5% performance increase retroactive to January 1, 2021.

B. Massage Therapy Registration

Motion to approve Massage Therapy Registration No. MTR-21-05 to allow Kristine Loeffelbein to practice Therapeutic Massage out of Bee Well Massage, 123 3rd St. Suite#3, Chaska.

C. Adopt Resolution 2021-25, Accepting Gifts and Donations

Motion to adopt Resolution No 2021-25 acknowledging and accepting gifts to the City of Chaska received during the period January 1, 2021 through March 31, 2021.

D. Joint Powers Agreement for Dispatch Study

Motion to approve the Joint Powers Agreement between Carver County, Chaska, and Chanhasen for completing a Dispatch Services Study and to authorize the Mayor

and City Administrator to enter into the agreement on behalf of the City.
Motion carried.

9. Action Items

9.A. Public Hearing: Adopt Resolution 2021-26, Public Improvement Hearing for the 2021 Street & Utility Reconstruction Project

City Administrator Podhradsky introduced the item to the Council.

City Engineer Clark presented the item to the Council.

City Administrator Podhradsky summarized the public assessment hearing process.

Councilmember Hubbard asked if the business owners have seen the preliminary assessment map.

Mayor Windschitl inquired if there is an incentive on this bid for early completion.

City Engineer Clark stated there is not with this project.

Mayor Windschitl opened the public hearing at 8:13 pm.

Mayor Windschitl closed the public hearing at 8:14 pm.

Councilmember Huang noted this project is consistent with previous projects.

Motion by Councilmember Huang, second by Councilmember Hubbard to adopt Resolution No. 2021-26, Ordering the 2021 Street & Utility Reconstruction Project; directing the City Engineer to prepare the project plans and specification documents, and further, scheduling a Public Assessment Hearing for June 7, 2021. Motion carried.

10. Bills

10.A. Accounts Payable Council Roster 5-3-2021

The Council requested further information about bills on pages 18 and 24 .

City Administrator Podhradsky provided further detail regarding those bills.

Motion by Councilmember Huang, second by Councilmember Grau to approve the bills as presented. Roll call was taken. Voting aye: Councilmembers Hatfield, Hubbard, Huang, Grau and Mayor Windschitl. Voting nay: None
Motion carried.

11. Other Business

11.A. City Administrator's Report

11.B. Biweekly 5-3-2021

11.C. 1st-Qtr 2021 Investment Report dated May 3rd, 2021

Councilmember Hubbard:

- Noted the tools and survey put out by the Steering Committee for the Bicycle-Friendly Community are active and encouraged residents to use them.
- Reported May is bike month and that there is Cycle Chaska Event at Lion's Park on May 22 with sign-ups on the website.

Councilmember Huang:

- Noted he testified on behalf of SouthWest Transit and the Suburban Transit Association to the Minnesota Senate Transportation Committee last week and provided an update.
- Reported he was part of an American Asian Pacific Islanders panel discussion at Crown of Glory Church about racism in America. He stated he was honored to be able to do that and thanked the organizers for putting it on. Councilmember Grau commented that the panelists all did an amazing job.
- Noted the Highway 41 Project open house is on Thursday.
- Wished moms and Happy Mother's Day.

Councilmember Grau:

- Shared comment regarding how much he appreciates teachers and all they do for students and especially thanked his children's teachers.

Councilmember Hatfield:

- Noted the Cub Leadoff Party is Saturday at 4pm at Athletic Park.
- Noted residents can sign up to get notifications regarding the Highway 41 project.
- Shared what she learned when researching American Asian Pacific Islander Heritage Month.
- Wished all the moms Happy Mother's Day.

Attorney Melchert:

- Noted that Minnesota maintained its 8 House of Representatives with the recent census. Councilmember Hatfield recognized the work the Human Rights Commission did to promote the census.

City Administrator Podhradsky:

- Noted that the bi-weekly report lists what City activities will occur this summer.

Mayor Windschitl:

- Noted the groundbreaking for Hwy 212 is tomorrow.
- Noted the Lion's Park Shelter will be rebuilt after Labor Day. City Administrator Podhradsky provided a brief update regarding the project.
- Noted the Spring-Cleaning Event was last Saturday and it went smoothly.
- Reported the State Amateur Baseball Tournament is in Chaska from August 20-September 4th.
- Mentioned Mike Tudor has resigned, and he thanked him for all the work he has done and wished him good luck on his future endeavors.

- Wished moms Happy Mother's Day.

11. Adjourn

Motion by Councilmember Huang, second by Councilmember Hatfield to adjourn the meeting at 9:52 pm.

Motion carried.

Chaska Planning Commission Minutes
April 14th, 2021

1. Call to Order

Chair Dahlke called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

2. Roll Call

Roll call was taken. Members present: Commissioners Dahlke, Urbanski, Sailer, Lacey, Brass, Olson, and Rylee.

Members absent: None

Also present: Luke Melchert, City Attorney; Kevin Ringwald, Community Development Director; and, Liz Hanson, City Planner.

Chair Brass read aloud a statement explaining that due to the COVID-19 pandemic the Chaska Planning Commission met via electronic means. He explained how the public can still be involved in the meeting and discussions.

3. Adopt the Agenda

Chair Dahlke noted that item 7.A. Review of the Zoning Ordinance Amendments for Landscaping and Subdivisions/City of Chaska/PC #2021-05, #2021-06 has been postponed and item 7.D. has been added to Consider Filling the Open Vice-Chair Position.

Motion by Commissioner Olson, second by Commissioner Urbanski, to adopt the agenda as amended.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes – all. Motion carried.

4. Visitor Presentation

There were none.

5. Minutes

Motion by Commissioner Lacey, second by Commissioner Rylee, to approve the minutes of the March 10, 2021 Planning Commission meeting.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes – all. Motion carried.

6. Consent Items

There were none.

7.A.POSTPONED: Review of the Zoning Ordinance Amendments for Landscaping and Subdivisions/ City of Chaska/PC #2021-05 #2021-06.

7.B. PUBLIC HEARING: Recommended Approval of the Zoning Ordinance Amendment (ZOA) to the Fence Ordinance/City of Chaska/PC #2021-04. The applicant is requesting approval of a

City Planner Liz Hanson presented the item to the Commission for the request to approve a ZOA to the fence requirements for enclosing pools, reducing the height requirement from 5 feet to 4 feet and also to include a regulation that chain link fences are not considered decorative.

Chair Dahlke opened the public hearing at 7:16 p.m.

Michael Henderson, stated that 5,000 gallons according to his math ends up being 16 x 16 x 2.5 deep pool and asked where the City got the 5,000-gallon figure from.

City Planner Hanson stated that she believes that number came directly from the building code.

There being no additional comments, Chair Dahlke closed the public hearing at 7:17 p.m.

Motion by Commissioner Sailer, second by Commissioner Brass, to recommend to the City Council approval of the Zoning Ordinance Amendment to Section 9.20 of the Zoning Ordinance (Fences) for decorative fences and fences enclosing swimming pools.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes – all. Motion carried.

7.C. Recommend Approval of the Concept Plan for Cantissimo of Chaska/Anasazi Holdings LLC/PC #2021-03.

City Planner Liz Hanson presented the item to the Commission.

Commissioner Rylee asked whether there were any delineated wetlands on this property.

City Planner Hanson stated that they have not yet gotten to the technical portions so they aren't sure yet. She stated that will be a requirement as the applicant prepares for the Preliminary Plat.

Community Development Director Ringwald stated that generally where they are proposing buildings are significant burr oaks which would suggest that area is not wetlands, but there may be other places where they may impact them.

Commissioner Rylee stated that it appears to be a lot of impermeable surface on a very small lot. He asked if staff had a sense of the drainage patterns for the lot and asked if there may be off-site upgrades that may be ancillary to this project.

City Planner Hanson stated that she is not sure about the possibility of off-site upgrades. She stated that they are planning to correct the drainage swale that is currently on the site and will have to provide their own on-site drainage system but noted that they do not have the drainage details yet because a stormwater plan is not required during the concept phase. She stated that that all of those details will be thoroughly hashed out as part of the Preliminary Plat phase.

Commissioner Sailer stated that he agrees with the City's position that traffic and access are very important and should be worked on. He stated that he is happy to hear that the applicant has

already met with the adjacent development and noted that he thinks lining up the access is extremely important. He asked if the cross-easement access does not happen if that limits this property in the future and whether the City would need to change its designation within the long-range plan. He stated that in general, he thinks the plans look good for a concept plan.

Chair Dahlke state that one thing he likes about this plan as opposed to the last plan that was considered is this proposal would involve a huge downturn in traffic and number of people in the area. He stated that he would expect the neighbors to the south would be much happier with this scenario than what was originally planned for the site.

Commissioner Urbanski stated that he is very happy with the way this project looks. He stated that is a beautiful building that gives a residential appearance which is great. He stated that going from a four-story structure to a single-story structure makes a big difference on this corner. He stated that what has been presented thus far appears to have been well thought out.

Commissioner Lacey stated that he felt this proposal fit the lot much better than the previous concept.

Chair Dahlke noted that this is not a public hearing, but he has noticed that there is at least one individual with their hand raised and asked if they would like to comment on this item.

Tom Collins, 439 Campfire Curve, stated that he is a resident of the property to the south at Pioneer Point. He stated that he would totally agree that this proposal is much more attractive than the previous proposal. He stated that he sees a few ways to address the concern about traffic and the intersection as it crosses over to Target and shared some ideas. He stated that one option will affect the home owners at Pioneer Point. He explained that he was unable to attend the March 10, 2021 meeting and would like to know, when the developers say that they will be working with members of the Pioneer Point community who they were referring to. He asked if it was the board of directors, the property manager, or the original developer for the property and noted that he would like to know who was in charge of communicating and setting up that meeting. He stated that they have private roads in their community and if the roads match up, they will be running into their private property.

City Planner Hanson stated that the City is hoping to solidify who the best contact may be from Pioneer Point but it will ultimately be a discussion between the developer and the Pioneer Point development in terms of coming to an agreement. She stated that the City is open to relaying the information to the developer if residents have a good contact for Pioneer Point.

Mr. Collins noted that there are three boards at Pioneer Point as well as a master board. He would suggest that the developer get in touch with City's Management located in northeast Minneapolis in order to get in touch with the master board.

Will and Jackie Hope, 421 Wilderness Drive, stated that they just wanted to bring forward a few observations. Mr. Hope noted that City Planner Hanson mentioned that the buildability of the site was challenging which he thinks is a dominant issue along with the density issue. He stated because this is a triangular piece of property, it forces the workable space to be even more dense. He stated that during a school day, this access point is already a very dangerous situation which should be taken into consideration when the traffic study is completed. Mr. Hope stated

that City Planner Hanson used the phrase 'as this moves forward' and he would ask if the Planning Commission already had intentions to approve this project.

Chair Dahlke explained that this is a concept plan which means there will be two more steps before this is considered an approved project. He noted that concept plans, by their very nature, are a bit more vague. He stated that unless the Planning Commission sees something that is outrageously out of whack or against zoning ordinances, concept plans are generally approved so they can go onto the next step and answer all the questions answered.

Mr. Hope stated that for the project to go through there needs to be wiggle room in the setbacks, access will also require accommodation, and there will need to be an accommodation made for a parking lot butting up against residences. He asked if those are some of the conversation points that will come up in the next phase.

Chair Dahlke explained that is exactly those kinds of items that will be discussed and open for negotiation as it moves forward.

Jackie Hope stated that assisted living residents are able to have cars in many situations, so the parking area will not just be for staff and guests. She asked if this is only memory care or if it would be assisted living/memory care.

City Planner Hanson stated that it is memory care and assisted living. She stated that specifics about the parking question may be better answered by the development team in terms of what they anticipate for who will park there. She stated that they have been given the information that, more than likely, the residents will not have their own vehicles.

Chair Dahlke asked if the parking lot size and setback meets code.

City Planner Hanson confirmed that the parking lot, as proposed, meets City code.

Mr. Hope stated that the final point he would like to make is to reiterate the statement made by City Planner Hanson that the buildability of the site is challenging and many accommodations will need to be made for this to move forward.

Lois Pankratz, 373 Campfire Curve, stated that she is a former president of one of the associations in Pioneer Point. She explained that they had sent in a number of concerns about a year ago when the other proposal was being considered. She stated that many of the residents are very concerned about the traffic issue and she agrees that this proposal is far better than the previous proposal. She stated that she is very concerned that the residents of Pioneer Point have a say and understand when the issues will be discussed so homeowners will have an opportunity to weigh in on this proposal. She stated, for example, she was unaware of the March 10, 2021 meeting and does not know who set it up because some people were not even informed about it. She stated that she would ask that there be clear communication with all the residents of Pioneer Point. She stated that she had sent a letter to the City but was not sure if it had been received.

City Planner Hanson asked if it had been sent recently.

Ms. Pankratz stated that it was submitted when the last proposal was being considered.

City Planner Hanson stated that she believes it would be in the old file and noted that staff can dig it out and provide it as a supplement to the developer.

Chair Dahlke stated that if Ms. Pankratz still had a copy of the letter, the easiest thing to ensure it is attached to this application, is to resubmit it to staff.

City Planner Hanson suggested that she submit the letter to ehanson@chaskamn.com.

Ms. Pankratz asked if the four access points that were considered with the last proposal were once again being reconsidered for this project.

City Planner Hanson explained that there are four recommendations that were done with the previous traffic study in terms of where access could go and properly operate, but it is kind of up to the developer on how they wish to move forward. She stated that from the City's perspective, the best-case scenario is to move the access further south to fully align with Super Target and still provide some type of separation from Pioneer Point.

Ms. Pankratz stated that she is concerned about the traffic issues because it could be quite dangerous added to the existing traffic, especially during school times when people are coming and going.

Michael Henderson, 2783 Wagon Wheel Curve, stated that his home is very close to the proposed shallow infiltration pond. He stated that this neighborhood has a lot of children which he assumes will be attracted to this infiltration pond. He asked how deep the pond will be and how it would drain in the event of a 500-year rainfall event. He stated that they also did not receive any notification of the March 10, 2021 meeting with the developer. He stated that this does appear to be a well thought out plan and would welcome the opportunity to participate in the conversation, but there needs to be communication so residents know about it. He stated that it seems as though it would be easier to move the Target side of the misalignment than to move it on this side. He stated that he walks a lot and crossing the street to get to Target is a challenge. He stated that alignment will be important and will perhaps also require a rethinking of the crosswalks in the area. He stated that he also has a bit of concern over the large trash bin on the edge of the parking lot especially if it may contact medical waste and also with the possibility of critters getting access to it. He stated that he would be interested in participating in the conversation about those details.

Chair Dahlke stated that one of the points that will have to be brought up is about the communication between the developer and the Pioneer Point neighborhood.

Nathan Running, 525 Smithtown Court, Victoria, stated that he is one of the developers for this project. He stated that there are few questions that he can address tonight. He stated that more details will come as they progress through the next stage. He stated that with relation to parking, they will be assisted living by definition, however, they are a high acute care facility. He stated that they have a building in Fridley that people are welcome to tour if they like, but clarified that no residents will have automobiles. He stated that the questions surrounding the drainage and the pond will be worked out through the engineering and noted that they currently do not know

how deep the pond will be. He stated that regarding notification on the past meeting, they worked with City staff and mailed things out. He stated that they have been trying to get a hold of somebody with Pioneer Point and have worked with City Planner Hanson trying to get in touch with somebody on the association to get the contact information. He stated that he wished that they would have had the information about getting in touch with the master board prior to the March 10, 2021 meeting. He stated that they still have a lot of work to do and reminded everyone that this is a concept plan and the concerns will be worked through.

Commissioner Brass stated that he wanted to reiterate that if a concept plan is approved, it is done with conditions and noted that there are about 30 recommended conditions for this application. He stated that those conditions will answer many of the questions being raised by residents tonight.

Mr. Hope asked how the Planning Commission determines medium density versus high density.

Chair Dahlke stated that this property is zoned for this type of building.

City Planner Hanson stated that density wise, per the Comprehensive Plan, which is a guiding document, this property is about 3 acres so the density would calculate to a little under 11 units/acre.

Mr. Hope stated that all 3 acres is not developable property so he does not understand why it would be used in the calculations.

City Planner Hanson stated that they consider local access streets in their calculation.

Mr. Hope stated that in his opinion that is the factor between medium density and high density because not all the acreage is developable.

Community Development Director Ringwald stated that he understands Mr. Hope's concerns but the City has standard definitions which are applied to all properties. He stated that this is a medium density proposal and reiterated that this is how density has been calculated throughout the City.

Julie Pfeiffer, 2783 Wagon Wheel Curve, stated that she has lived here since 2006 and her concern with this concept plan is mainly the buffer of noise because right now, they have the beautiful woods. She stated that it is currently noisy with the trees in place and has concerns about when some of the trees are removed that there will be more noise. She stated that it is a beautiful trail along Pioneer, but the nature itself is lovely. She stated that she does not agree with this concept and wishes the residents would have been notified about the March 10, 2021 meeting and noted that she had not received anything in the mail. She stated that she did get a letter from the City information her of tonight's meeting which she appreciated. She stated that she would question whether there is really a need for this type of project because there are already a few assisted living buildings in the area. She asked if there was a great demand and if people were already signed up for this location.

Todd Ofsthun, TCO Design, he stated that they received their mailing labels for the meeting from the City and apologized that people had not received notice of the meeting. He asked City Planner

Hanson to provide his contact information to any interested residents and noted that he was more than happy to send them plans and information. He stated that he feels very comfortable with this project and thanked the residents for sharing their concerns. He stated that this project will house a minimum number of residents who will be pretty stationary and are not driving which he thinks is a perfect fit for this corner. He stated that they have been trying to get in touch with the home owners association and any contact information the residents may have for him would be appreciated. He stated that there is an easement that was recorded with the County that their surveyor is taking a look at to see what was agreed to in 2001. He stated that they are not necessarily in favor of going through Pioneer Point with the access, but suspects that is what the easement is for. He reviewed some of the other potential challenges with access and noted that many of these questions will be answered during the next phase. He stated that he feels comfortable that this project concept has the least traffic impact. He reiterated that he would like residents to get in touch with City Planner Hanson for his contact information and noted that he would be happy to talk with people on the phone or via e-mail. He stated that the plan is for a one-story building that has no underground parking and they want to save as many trees as possible.

Community Development Director Ringwald asked Mr. Ofsthun to comment on the market analysis question that was raised.

Mr. Ofsthun stated that he has worked with this ownership group for a few years and they are really pushing for small facility type projects and the other facilities that they own and operate are similar to what is being proposed. He stated that they kind of operate on the 'small town' thing and they have done market studies which show that this site will support this type of facility. He reiterated that this will be an acute care/memory care facility and the residents will not be driving. He stated that this facility will not compare to the larger facilities that are being built in the area.

Mr. Running stated that they have completed two market studies on this location for acute care and memory care and the demand is there within a 5-mile radius of this location. He stated that he had submit a copy of the market study to the City if they would like to see it.

Community Development Director Ringwald stated that would be helpful.

Commissioner Rylee asked about the setback and whether going from 125 to 100 feet off of Pioneer Trail will require a variance.

City Planner Hanson stated that in this instance, it would be a rezoning and coupled into that is the analysis of determining if the deviance from 125 is appropriate.

Commissioner Rylee asked if rezoning was separate from approval of the concept plan.

City Planner Hanson stated that it is a separate process and would happen during the preliminary phase.

Chair Dahlke noted that rezoning will require a public hearing so residents would have an opportunity for input in that forum.

Commissioner Brass stated that it is currently an open zone, which is like having it in a holding pattern. He stated that the City is not really changing the zoning, it is zoning to the guided use within the Comprehensive Plan.

City Planner Hanson stated that she agreed with that description and noted that this property will more than likely be rezoned to a PRD which is a Planned Residential District.

Commissioner Rylee asked if there were other properties adjacent to this that are using 100-foot setbacks so this project would be consistent with those.

City Planner Hanson stated that the properties across the street meet the 125-foot setback.

Commissioner Rylee stated that they have put a ton of work into this but he has concerns about approving a concept plan that is contingent upon the Planning Commission approval of a rezoning and a setback change at a later date. He stated that, to him, it feels like it is putting the cart before the horse.

Commissioner Brass noted that he believes this is standard procedure if there is an open zone and would be rezoned at the preliminary plat stage to its designated zoning according to the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Olson stated that he has a similar feeling to Commissioner Rylee surrounding the assumption that it is a done deal on the easement of the setback. He stated that it almost has to go with the thought that the developer has to come back with the preliminary plan of checking all the boxes to be able to say that everything has been done and is not a done deal that the easement will be given, but they have to do more due diligence in order to check that box. He stated that much of this will come together at the preliminary stage.

Community Development Director Ringwald stated that he agrees with Commissioner Olson that one of the things that is useful to the developer and the neighborhood is the City identifying the issues that they need to address. He stated that what he hears from the Commission is that one of the issues that they need to address is the reduction of the setback. He stated that the City is sort of giving them a laundry list of these things, through this first part of the process, with a lower bar, that the developer will need to work on as it moves forward. He stated that all the items that have been mentioned with regard to things like access, traffic, and screening are things that will not be resolved today, but is a way for the developer to get a list of things in a public setting that allows them to know the things they need to work on.

Commissioner Rylee thanked Community Development Director Ringwald for that explanation and stated that he is supporter of this type of development in the community and is a huge advocate for making sure that the City has the full life cycle accommodated within how the City develops.

Commissioner Brass stated that he was pleasantly surprised to see this concept and feels it has been well thought out. He stated that the reduction in units is favorable and thinks with a memory care facility where there will practically be nobody driving and is not even close to the amount of traffic that could have been on this site and will be minimal. He stated that there was a question raised about the demand for this type of product. He stated that he is not sure it is appropriate for the Planning Commission to judge someone else's demand. He stated that if they want to

spend the money to do the project and it falls without the guidance and laws established, they can do it and should not be judged on whether or not the Commission feels there is a demand for this product in the market.

Community Development Director Ringwald stated that the demand information is good information to have, but agreed that the Planning Commission has a set of rules it needs to abide by in making their decisions. He stated that that this information though helps residents understand why the project is being pursued.

Commissioner Brass stated that he agreed with Commissioner Rylee in his support for making sure the City has full life cycle accommodations. He stated that he is a commercial agent in the Twin Cities market and can confirm that this population is extremely underserved. He reiterated that he just did not feel the 'demand' information should be taken into consideration when the Commission is making its recommendations.

Motion by Commissioner Brass, second by Commissioner Sailer, to recommend to City Council approval of the Concept Plan for a new 32-unit assisted living and memory care building subject to the following conditions:

1. Approvals shall be based on the following graphic exhibits:
 - a. Narrative (pgs 1-5), submitted by TCO Design, dated March 1, 2021.
 - b. Project Narrative Addendum (Impact to Public Safety), submitted by TCO Design, dated April 1, 2021
 - c. Neighborhood Meeting Discussion, submitted by TCO Design, undated
 - d. Traffic Study Update for Cantissimo of Chaska (pgs 1-4), submitted by Swing Traffic Solutions, dated March 24, 2021
 - e. Traffic Assessment – Hazel View Senior Housing Development (pgs 1-12), submitted by Spack Solutions, dated November 29, 2019
 - f. Context Map/Site Influences (pg A1.4), submitted by Jim Mackey Architect, dated March 1, 2021
 - g. Existing Conditions Plan, submitted by Premier Land Surveying, dated March 23, 2018
 - h. Boundary & Topographic Survey, submitted by Premier Land Surveying, dated May 17, 2017
 - i. Site Plan (pg A1.1), submitted by Jim Mackey Architect, dated March 1, 2021
 - j. Surrounding Area Site Plan (pg A1.3), submitted by Jim Mackey Architect, dated March 1, 2021
 - k. Previous Concept Excavation Area Plan (pg A1.2), submitted by Jim Mackey Architect, dated March 1, 2021
 - l. Building Floor Plan (pg A2.1), submitted by Jim Mackey Architect, dated March 1, 2021
 - m. Elevation Drawings (pg A3.1), submitted by Jim Mackey Architect, dated March 1, 2021
 - n. Renderings (pg A3.2), submitted by Jim Mackey Architect, dated March 1, 2021
2. Coordination with the City Engineer with regard to utilities, grading and drainage.
3. Installation of all site lighting at a 0-degree angle with the light source fully concealed at the property line.
4. Provision of photometrics and specs for all exterior lighting proposed, including any canopy lighting.
5. Provision that all facades provide 360-degree architecture.

6. Provision of usable open space that provides a unique area(s) with usable amenities.
7. Provision of a detailed summary of indoor and outdoor amenities of the site and detail drawings to be provided at the preliminary submittal.
8. Provision of Usable Open Space to be provided on site that is compliant with Section 9.11.4.1.1.
9. Utilization of natural stone as a Class I material.
10. Description, design and materials of the proposed building to indicate how it fits into Chaska and to be addressed at preliminary submittal.
11. No exterior storage will be permitted.
12. Provision of hydrant placement needs to accommodate City standards for hydrant placement and fire code standards.
13. Provision of two direct pedestrian connections to the public trails running along Hundertmark Road and Pioneer Trail and to be shown in the preliminary submittal.
14. Provision to submit Utility and Site Plan As-Built prior to a certificate of occupancy being issued.
15. Provision of a fence spec of the proposed fencing on the north and south sides to be included at the preliminary submittal.
16. Provision of sufficient landscape screening to be achieved between the parking lot, westerly driveway access and southern lot line and to be shown on the landscape plan at preliminary submittal.
17. Provision of landscaping along the patio fence on the north side of the building and to be shown on the landscape plan at preliminary submittal.
18. Provision of adequate landscaping to be included around the east patio space and to be shown on the landscape plan at preliminary submittal.
19. Provision of a tree preservation plan that optimizes tree preservation for the site to the greatest extent possible, and is consistent with staff's marked up exhibit in the body of this report.
20. Any and all building signage shall be submitted separately, meet the sign ordinance, and shall obtain sign permits prior to installation.
21. Provision of a storm water management plan meeting City and Carver County WMO standards.
22. Provision of a safety separation between the pedestrian pathway and proposed infiltration pond and to be addressed at the preliminary submittal.
23. Compliance with applicable zoning requirements, in particular Chapter 9 (General Requirements).
24. Provision that all mechanical equipment will be fully screened from view.
25. Compliance with section 9.11 Building Design/Materials and Site Design.
26. Adherence with the Engineers Memo dated April 9, 2021.
27. Adherence with Carver County Public Work's memo dated March 29, 2021.
28. Provision of a left turn lane on Hundertmark Road consistent with Carver County and City standards.
29. If a full access onto Hundertmark is proposed it is recommended to align across from the existing Target access on the west side of Hundertmark Road to provide consistent intersection traffic operations and adequate sight lines.
30. Provision that a cross access easement be explored on Pioneer Pointe's site so that the site access can be moved southerly to line up with Super Target's access and to be addressed prior to preliminary submittal.

31. Provision of a Traffic Impact Analysis addressing Carver County's and the City's comments related to site access, turn lanes, roadway improvements, and intersection operations at Hundertmark and Pioneer Trail, and to be submitted at preliminary.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes – all. Motion carried.

7.D. Consider Filling the Open Vice-Chair Position

Commissioner Brass stated that he is open to serving as Vice-Chair.

Motion by Commissioner Urbanski, seconded by Commissioner Lacey, to nominate Commissioner Brass to serve as Vice-Chair of the Planning Commission.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes – all. Motion carried.

8. Other Business

8.A. Receive Other Meeting Minutes

8. A.i Receive the March 15th EDA Meeting Minutes.

8. A. ii Receive the Feb 9th 2021 Park Board Meeting Minutes.

8. A. iii Receive the Feb 22nd and March 15th 2021, City Council Meeting Minutes.

Commissioner Urbanski

- Asked if in person meetings would be happening any time soon.

Community Development Director Ringwald explained that staff was waiting to hear from the Council. He stated that he suspects that they will continue to use some aspect of Zoom because it does allow people to participate in a way that was not open to people before. He stated that he is hopeful that by the summer months the Planning Commission will be meeting in person again.

Commissioner Dahlke

- Thanked everyone who expressed their concern while he was ill.

9. Adjourn

Motion by Commissioner Brass, second by Commissioner Rylee, to adjourn the meeting at 8:53 pm.

Motion carried.



© 2021 - Hyland Software