REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
Planning Commission meetings are being conducted in a hybrid format with in-person and remote options for attending, participating, and commenting. The public can make statements in this meeting during the planned public comment sections. Some members of the Commission may attend virtually. Members of the public may attend virtually by following instructions below.

Remote Attendance/Comment Options: Members of the public may attend this meeting by watching on cable channel 16, streaming on CCXmedia.org, streaming via Webex, or by calling 1-415-655-0001 and entering access code 2462 668 2897. Members of the public wishing to address the Commission remotely have two options:

- Via web stream - Stream via Webex and use the ‘raise hand’ feature during public comment sections.
- Via phone - Call 1-415-655-0001 and enter meeting code 2462 668 2897. Press *3 to raise your hand during public comment sections.

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Agenda

3. Approval of Minutes
   January 10, 2022, Planning Commission Meeting

4. Informal Public Hearing – Future Land Use Map Amendment, Zoning Map Amendment, Subdivision
   Applicant: Artessa Development, LLC
   Address: Southeast corner of 7001 Golden Valley Road

   – End of Televised Portion of Meeting –
   To listen to this portion, please call 1-415-655-0001 and enter meeting access code 2462 668 2897.

5. Council Liaison Report

6. Other Business
   a. Reports on Board of Zoning Appeals and Other Meetings

7. Adjournment
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

This meeting was conducted in a hybrid format with in-person and remote options for attending, participating, and commenting. The City used Webex to conduct this meeting and members of the public were able to monitor the meetings by watching it on Comcast cable channel 16, by streaming it on CCXmedia.org, or by dialing in to the public call-in line.

1. Call to Order
   The meeting was called to order at 7:00 by Chair Pockl.

   Roll Call
   Commissioners in person: Adam Brookins, Sophia Ginis, Lauren Pockl
   Commissioner remote: Rich Baker, Mike Ruby
   Commissioners absent: Chuck Segelbaum, Andy Johnson
   Staff present: Myles Campbell – Planner, Jason Zimmerman – Planning Manager
   Council Liaison present: Gillian Rosenquist

2. Approval of Agenda
   Chair Pockl asked for a motion to approve the agenda.
   MOTION made by Commissioner Ginis, seconded by Commissioner Brookins, to approve the agenda of January 10, 2022.
   Staff took a roll call vote. Motion carried.

3. Approval of Minutes
   Chair Pockl asked for a motion to approve the minutes from December 13, 2021.
   MOTION made by Commissioner Brookins, seconded by Commissioner Baker to approve.
   Staff took a roll call vote. Motion carried.

4. Informal Public Hearing – Rezone Properties to Achieve Compliance with the 2040 Comp Plan
   Applicant: City of Golden Valley
   Address: Lewis Road and Post Office

   Jason Zimmerman, Planning Manager, introduced the topic and reminded Commissioners about the process of coming to conformance with Future Land Use Map in the 2040 Comp Plan. Staff is requesting to rezone 10 properties within two areas in the downtown area. Staff displayed the Future Land Use Map and the existing zoning map in order to compare what has been done and what is left to complete.
Two areas are being addressed in this proposal:

**Group 1 – Lewis Road**
- Nine parcels along Lewis Road and 10th Avenue
- Historically have been zoned (and used) as light industrial
- The Downtown Study has confirmed the Comprehensive Plan guidance for Mixed Use – close to downtown and could provide multifamily, office, retail/service uses, and public open space along Bassett Creek
- Request to rezone to Neighborhood Mixed Use (from Light Industrial, Industrial, and Commercial)

**Group 2 – U.S. Post Office**
- 7701 Golden Valley Road
- In past Comprehensive Plans, was guided for Public Facility (now called Institutional - Civic)
- Zoning never changed to match (currently Commercial)
- Would not impact the allowed use but would bring it into alignment with respect to zoning
- Request to rezone from Commercial to Institutional - Civic

**Recommendation**
Following the provisions of State statute (sec. 473.858, subd. 1) and the requirements of the Metropolitan Council with respect to comprehensive planning, staff recommends:
- Rezone Lewis Road parcels to Neighborhood Mixed Use
- Rezone 7701 Golden Valley Road from Commercial to Institutional - Civic

**Chair Pockl** opened the public hearing at 7:11pm and invited in person commenters to speak first.

*Susan Thompson*
*1031 Orkla Drive*
My property abuts the north side of the Lewis portion. I have concerns about rezoning when we don’t know what’s coming in. Will the standard for noise be increased or decreased? On the north side of tenth street, that isn’t just storage but active semi’s pulling in and out as early as 5am; I wonder how the noise will change with this rezoning. I also have concerns about the property that will abut mine as four stories will block all the sunshine on my house. What considerations have been taking regarding infrastructure when it comes to these changes. I know that’s hard to answer as we don’t know what will go in to those areas. Regardless of how the 4-story building is placed or built, I’d like to know if screening will be provided to help the privacy of the homes that building will overlook.

*Steve Rogers*
*President/CEO Anchor Plastics*
My property is in the rezoning and I’m wondering why someone hasn’t spoken to me before this notice of rezoning was sent out. My business is a family and industrial business and as I understand it, our business will be grandfathered in regardless of the zoning. Where are the zoning areas going to be
located for more jobs to be provided for the community? There is a lot of new housing being placed in this City but with the uptick in developments, we’re seeing an uptick in crime. I’m also wondering if Golden Valley is going to another area where we can put in new businesses. If Golden Valley doesn’t want Industrial companies in the city, I’d like to know.

Chair Pockl invited call in commenters to speak.

Sam Nevab
Owner of 8043 Lewis Road (American Rug Laundry)
Some of my concerns were expressed by Steve, my neighbor. I’m primarily concerned about future development and the outcome of that for our business. I’d like to know if there are plans for development in case there are mixed-use potentials for our properties.

Chair Pockl closed the public hearing at 7:21pm

Staff addressed the questions about bigger picture and development plans. The rezoning doesn’t mean the City is moving anyone out from their property. It means that if there’s change in these locations in the future, this designates what kind of use can go there. Current uses can stay forever as long as the use stays the same. The owner may also sell to a company with a similar use; if the owner sells to someone with a different use, it just needs to match the new zoning.

Addressing the first commenter, staff stated that rezoning now lays the groundwork for opportunities for change. The Comp Plan lays out a vision for the City and while this change may not occur for 20-30 years but this is the first step. More specific inquiries regarding screening, etc., would be addressed with a developer if they show interest in the property. It is possible for a fourth story on a theoretical building but that highest level has a greater setback to help prevent excessive shading.

Regarding the semi-traffic, that’s not supposed to be happening. Police officers have been in contact with the storage company and we’ll need to make sure they have a follow up.

Staff and Commissioners went on to discuss Mixed-Use, Comp Plan planning, and the length of time this process has already been in effect.

Chair Pockl opened the discussion

Lewis Road Parcels
Commissioner Baker stated the Planning Commission rarely hears from residents who feel like they’re not well informed about these changes, and that reflects well on City and their effective outreach. He would like staff to understand why this rezoning wasn’t as well communicated. Chair Pockl echoed this statement and added it may be due to the nature of the Comp Plan process and involved parties. Commissioner Ginis noted that as steps progress over a long period of time, new and different residents are aware of steps at different times.
MOTION made by Commissioner Brookins, seconded by Commissioner Ruby, to follow staff recommendation and recommend the rezoning of the Lewis Road parcels to Neighborhood Mixed Use. Staff took a roll call vote. Motion passed unanimously.

MOTION made by Commissioner Brookins, seconded by Commissioner Pockl, to follow staff recommendation and recommend the rezoning of 7701 Golden Valley Road from Commercial to Institutional - Civic. Staff took a roll call vote. Motion passed unanimously.

5. Discussion – Outdoor Service Areas

Jason Zimmerman, Planning Manager, reminded commissioners that in 2021 three points were made in regards to this topic and went in depth on each:

- Interim uses discussed in 2021, with agreement among Commissioners that it could be a possible solution to the issues facing Schuller’s around an outdoor patio (though not perfect).
- Would need a zoning text amendment to create a temporary Outdoor Service Area use that could be applied throughout the city under specific circumstances.
- City Council confirmed a desire to do this at a Work Session late in the year.

Staff reviewed the current three types of Temporary Uses in Golden Valley and discussed the interest in addressing outdoor dining and outdoor sales. A temporary Outdoor Service Area use could be established as a fourth category. Staff addressed the need to establish this in zoning districts as a permitted use and text added to the Temporary Use section of code.

Staff addressed the proposed review and approval process, conditions of use, length of time the permits will be allowed, and the renewal process.

Staff Conclusion
Given the ability for most businesses to install outdoor seating or to conduct outdoor sales without going through an extensive approval process, staff believes it is unlikely the temporary Outdoor Service Area option would be pursued outside of the well-known situation at Schuller’s.

The City Council supports this action and has directed the Planning Commission to finalize zoning language for consideration at a public hearing.

Commissioner Ginis asked how a restaurant’s continuous renewal of a temporary permit can be communicated to new residents as the desirable solution. As homes are bought and sold, new residents may not understand zoning districts and uses. Staff discussed that the public hearing process, as part of the renewal, will allow for residents to voice opinions and understand the process. Staff and
Commissioners went on to discuss Schuller’s specifically and the intricacies of creating an outdoor space that is temporary in case the permit isn’t renewed.

Commissioners asked for a review on this change and spot zoning, staff explained that this isn’t spot zoning as the zoning of this property isn’t changing.

The language surrounding “term end” was confusing for Commissioners so they directed staff to clarify.

6. Discussion – Accessory Dwelling Units

Myles Campbell, Planner, reintroduced this topic as it was discussed by Planning Commissioners through the summer of 2021 and discussed at the Council Work Session in November 2021. The Council supported adoption of an ADU ordinance and directed the Commission to draft regulations.

Staff went on to discuss the three main components of a typical ADU ordinance: location, size and appearance, administration. Staff dove into each item and what might be regulated under each component, as well as what is not regulated.

Staff moved on to zoning districts that allow ADUs as well as minimum lot sizes, maximum lot coverages, maximum ADU size and floor area limit. Within this conversation staff also addressed zoning code as it relates to size and appearance: setbacks, height and massing, design guidelines, exterior entrances, parking requirements, owner-occupancy, utility hookups, and the permitting process.

Staff wanted to hear commissioners’ thoughts on detached ADUs early on, since this ADU type opens up many logistical questions in regard to regulation.

- Are the existing setbacks for detached accessory structures (5 ft. from side and rear property lines) sufficient?
  - If different setbacks are established, how does this impact the convertibility of existing detached structures?
- Would detached accessory structures above a garage be allowed? To what height?
  - Would a freestanding detached ADU be limited to the existing 10 ft. maximum, or have its own max height allowance?
- Would a detached ADU count towards the code’s 1,000 sq. ft. limit of accessory structures (including garages) in R-1 and R-2, or would they only be limited based on a max floor area, the same as internal ADUs?

Initial Staff Recommendations

- Allow for attached and internal ADUs by right in the R-1 and R-2 zoning districts
  - Consider allowing detached ADUs via conditional use permit in the R-1 and R-2 zoning districts
- Consider developing a purpose statement for ADUs similar to Minnetonka
• Hold internal and attached ADUs to the same site requirements from code as principal structures (setbacks, building envelope, impervious surface)
• Limit floor area to 33-35% of gross floor area, or 950-1000 sq. ft., whichever is less
• Set objective but minimal design standards: matching materials, roof pitch matching the predominant roofline
• Require 1-2 additional off-street parking spaces for an ADU unit
  o Conversion of garage space to support an ADU should not reduce the minimum required off-street parking amount.
• Follow Public Works and Building Inspections recommendations regarding utility connections; if none, potentially forgo a regulation
• No minimum lot size requirement/minimal requirement such as 8-9,000 sq. ft.
• No additional lot cover requirement

Commissioner Ruby asked if guidelines are in place for how to tax the owner for the ADU. Will the existing taxes on the main home expand or will the homeowner be taxed for two homes on the same lot. Staff stated that often a new unit gets a new address and often that means it’s taxed separately. However, staff will connect with the Finance department to understand the financial investment for taxes.
Clarity was provided around potentially removing regulatory barriers around ADU while balancing the impact to neighbors and neighborhoods.

Detached and attached ADUs were discussed. Commissioner Ginis stated that it’s worth considering how detached ADUs can work in Golden Valley. They’re a way to enter this process and offer flexibility. There are ways to protect the integrity of a neighborhood while offering this as an option. Commissioner Baker stated support for ADUs and wants to see them by right as much as possible, however supporting detached ADUs should be done cautiously and maybe with CUPs. The conversation came back to this topic and the potential of multiple ADUs on a property was discussed. Staff will review this language and how it relates to principal structure requirements and sq footage.

The conversation continued on to discuss parking spaces, off street parking, and the requirements they’re on a hard surface. Language around transferring ADU usage with the sell of a home was discussed.

Staff will look closer at detached ADUs and tax implications.

Chair Pockl ended the televised portion of the meeting at 9:19pm.

7. Council Liaison Report
Council Member Rosenquist reported that new Council Member LaMere-Anderson was sworn. The upcoming Council Work Session would focus on the proposed Legislative Priorities and conversations with state representatives, and there would also be a consideration of a local mask mandate. She indicated that the Council had decided to rotate liaison responsibilities in 2022, so the Planning
Commission would have a new Council Member at the next meeting. Finally, she noted that the Council sent the Artessa proposal back to the Planning Commission for additional review following significant changes to the plans.

8. Other Business

9. Adjournment
   
   MOTION by Commissioner Brookins to adjourn, seconded by Commissioner Pockl, and approved unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 9:34 pm.

___________________________________________
Andy Johnson, Secretary

______________________________
Amie Kolesar, Planning Assistant
Date: January 24, 2022
To: Golden Valley Planning Commission
From: Jason Zimmerman, Planning Manager
Subject: Informal Public Hearing – Future Land Use Map Amendment for a Portion of 7001 Golden Valley Road – Artessa

Property address: Southeast portion of 7001 Golden Valley Road
Applicant: Artessa Development, LLC
Property owner: Golden Valley Country Club
Current use: Golf course driving range
Proposed lot size: 2.35 acres
Current Land Use: Institutional
Proposed Land Use: High Density Residential
Current Zoning: Institutional - Parks (I-P)
Proposed Zoning: High Density Residential (R-4)
Adjacent uses: Golf course (west and north), vacant office (east), office and medical clinic (south)
Summary of Request
Artessa Development, LLC, originally proposed four planning actions to allow for the development of a portion of the driving range owned by the Golden Valley Country Club. They requested a change to the Future Land Use Map (from an Institutional use to High Density Residential use), a change to the Zoning Map (from the Institutional (I-4) Zoning District to the High Density Residential (R-4) Zoning District), a subdivision of the property to create a new lot of approximately 2.35 acres, and a conditional use permit to allow for the construction of a sixth floor on the proposed 97-unit senior cooperative building.

At its meeting on December 13, 2021, the Planning Commission voted (6-0) to recommend denial of the land use change, (6-0) to recommend denial of the zoning change, (6-0) to recommend approval of the preliminary plat, and (6-0) to recommend denial of the conditional use permit.

Subsequently, the developer revised the plans to remove a floor (negating the need for the conditional use permit) and modified the massing and architecture of the proposed building. On January 4, 2022, the City Council voted (4-1) to send the revised plans back to the Planning Commission for additional review. While expressing general support for the project, on the whole they looked to the Commission to further vet the plans and to listen to feedback from the neighborhood before taking action.

Background
7001 Golden Valley Road is the street address for the Golden Valley Country Club and Golf Course. Despite being bisected by Golden Valley Road and a Union Pacific-owned railroad, the entire Country Club site is considered a single parcel. Overall, the parcel is 148.76 acres (which will be reduced slightly now that the Greenway Villas PUD in the northwest corner has been granted final approval); however, this request is only related to a portion of the parcel located in the southeast corner of the site. The area in question is at the far end of the existing driving range, along Country Club Drive and adjacent to the vacant property previously occupied by Optum (United Health).

City staff were first approached by the Country Club in late 2019. The Club had identified areas of its property which were no longer necessary or relevant to the golf course use, and they wanted to better understand the approvals necessary in order to sell these portions of the property for subsequent redevelopment. This site in the southeast corner of the lot was first marketed to builders and investors in 2020, following which the club selected Lifestyle Communities to partner with on the redevelopment.

Existing Conditions
The proposed site is approximately 2.35 acres. It currently makes up the southern portion of the driving range for the Country Club and contains a number of mature (legacy) oak trees. It fronts on Country Club Drive, to the south, which is classified as a major collector and is a municipal state-aid street. The property to the east was recently rezoned for use as a light industrial business center.

There are no structures located within the proposed parcel. For decades it has served as the far end of the driving range and is currently populated with large oak trees. A private access drive runs
north along the west edge of the site, connecting Country Club Drive with the Country Club parking lot. Under the current proposal, the south end of this drive would be shifted slightly to the west and the connection would remain.

The site also has a fair amount of topography, dropping as much as 30 feet from the high point along Country Club drive to a low point in the northeast corner of the site.

**Proposal**

The original proposal for the site was to change the guided land use, change the zoning, proceed with a subdivision that would create a new lot, and request a conditional use permit to construct a sixth story on the proposed building. However, upon a recommendation of denial from the Planning Commission, the applicant has since submitted revised plans showing a shorter building (five stories) with fewer units (78). At five stories, the conditional use permit is no longer needed and the applicant has officially withdrawn that application.

Artessa Development would now like to construct a 78-unit senior cooperative building at this location. An updated project narrative provided by the applicant is attached and describes the project in more detail. Staff will note, as in previous land use and zoning change requests, that while a current proposal is being put forward, if the land use and zoning changes are approved they are not tied to this developer or to this project and could change in the future without any additional review or input from the City (assuming a by-right project that is not a PUD and does not require any variances to proceed). Even the proposed use as a senior cooperative could change should this specific proposal not move forward.

Having said that, the current plan is now to construct a five-story building with two levels of underground parking and direct access to Country Club Drive. Due to the requested change in land use/zoning by the developer, the project would be subject to the City’s Mixed-Income Housing Policy and therefore a number of units (anywhere from 10% to 15% of the total number) would be required to be rented or sold as affordable and remain affordable for a period of not less than 20 years. The applicant has indicated nine units would be reserved as affordable units for 30 years. The project would not be directly associated with the Country Club, but nothing would restrict the residents from taking advantage of their proximity to the golf course.

Draft civil site development plans have been provided by the applicant and are attached, but staff emphasizes that the approvals for land use and zoning should be reviewed somewhat independent of these, as those decisions are mostly unrelated to the proposed building. Consideration of the minor subdivision (in the subsequent staff memo) will take the proposed site plans into account more directly.

**Neighborhood Notification and Public Comments**

As required under the City’s Neighborhood Notification Policy, a neighborhood meeting was held in the City Council Chambers on the evening of December 2. Approximately 39 individuals attended – mostly residents from the neighborhood as well as a few members of the Country Club. Four individuals attended via Zoom. The plans discussed at this meeting were for the initial proposal. Primary concerns shared by many were the impact of traffic on Country Club Drive – both during
the lengthy construction period and beyond, especially given there is no outlet onto Olson Memorial Highway going eastbound. There were also critical comments about the size/scale/massing and architecture of the building, with the main concern being that it was too large and would dominate the skyline for the homes across the street. In general, there was openness to a senior cooperative as a model for independent living in Golden Valley.

Following the meeting, staff has received a number of written communications regarding this proposal – these are included as the last attachments for this agenda item. A number of comments were provided via email to Council Members, while others went to staff. An online petition was also submitted in opposition to the project. The Golden Valley Country Club sent a letter of support and provided their members with a Fact Sheet. A handful of Country Club members were among those who commented.

At of the date of the City Council hearing, staff was aware of letters of support from the Country Club, four Country Club members, and two other individuals; letters of opposition from eleven residents; and a petition signed by 57 residents opposing the project. One subsequent email was received in opposition to the proposal.

**Required Process**
Support from the Planning Commission and City Council for this proposal would also necessitate review and approval from the Metropolitan Council for the change in land use, requiring a delay in the final vote on the rezoning and the subdivision until the land use change was approved.

**Staff Review**
The City Code does not set specific standards for changing a future land use designation, and the City Council – with the input of the Planning Commission – has a great deal of latitude in deciding if the request is consistent with the overall direction and vision of the Comprehensive Plan. In making a determination, the City should take into account the land use descriptions outlined in the Comp Plan as well as any potential impacts on the character of the area.

For reference, it is important to understand what both the existing and proposed land uses entail and the expectations placed on those land uses in the Comprehensive Plan. The 2040 Comp Plan has the following description of the Institutional - Parks and Natural Areas use:

*This category includes open spaces used as golf courses, ball fields, playgrounds, parks, nature areas, stormwater ponding areas, and other undeveloped remnants. This does not include vacant land envisioned for other uses in the future.*

The High Density Residential land use is described as follows:

*Apartment buildings and condominiums are the predominant high-density residential uses, with senior facilities allowed at higher densities in some locations through a Conditional Use Permit. This land use is generally located near commercial, office, or institutional uses with access to multi-modal options.*
The High Density Residential land use allows development in a range of 20 to 100 units per acre (though the higher end of this range requires separate approval via a Conditional Use Permit under the City’s zoning regulations). At 2.35 acres, this site could theoretically accommodate anywhere from 47 to 235 units.

Residential Demand
The City’s 2040 Comprehensive Plan, with significant input from the 2017 Maxfield Housing Needs Analysis, acknowledges a relative shortage of senior housing in Golden Valley as well as demand for for-sale or condominium units. As proposed, the Artessa development would address both of these areas, though in the form of cooperative ownership rather than condominiums. It would also contribute nine affordable units to the housing mix based on the current proposal and the City’s Mixed-Income Housing Policy.

Traffic
Engineering staff have evaluated the likely traffic resulting from this proposal using the standard trip generation numbers employed by traffic engineers. These models assume an average of 3.24 trips per day per unit for a senior building, which would have resulted in approximately 314 new trips per day based on the original 97 units proposed. At 78 units, the trip calculation would be 253 new trips per day. It is likely that a large portion of these trips would find their way to Olson Memorial Highway heading to and from downtown Minneapolis. Because the connection between Country Club Drive and Douglas Drive was removed in 2017 as part of the reconstruction of the County road, in order to go eastbound from this location it is necessary to first travel west to Rhode Island Avenue and then use the signalized intersection at Highway 55. Properties along this section of Country Club Drive – residential and non-residential alike – would experience an increase in the number of vehicles driving by. However, the increase would be fairly minor in the larger scheme of trips which were last measured as 1,550 in 2017 prior to the closure of the eastern terminus.

Staff requested a brief traffic analysis from the City’s consulting traffic engineer and the result confirmed that the minimum number of trips projected for Country Club Drive would be generally spread throughout the day and would not impact the safety or operations of the associated intersections (see attachment).

As noted above, reguiding and rezoning this property for High Density Residential use would not necessarily designate this site for senior use. A different proposal for general multi-family apartments (a permitted use under the proposed zoning) would be associated with a higher trip generation (an average of 4.54 trips per day per unit) and so could result in more traffic along Country Club Drive.

Context
The current mix of land uses in proximity to the site are quite different from the use being proposed.
The site is surrounded to the north and west by the operations of the Golden Valley Country Club – specifically the driving range, tennis courts, and the tee boxes for Hole #3. To the south, single-family homes are located west along Country Club Drive while the Park Nicollet Parkinson’s Center, a law office, and a Montessori pre-school are directly across the street. 6300 Olson Memorial Highway (the old Optum site) is in the process of being redeveloped as a light industrial business center. In a slightly larger radius, there are other industrial uses across Douglas Drive, the Perpich Center for Arts Education south of Olson Memorial Highway, and medium density residential north of the railroad tracks.

The closest High Density Residential developments (all senior buildings) are in the downtown area or adjacent to Schaper Park to the east.

Staff notes the general lack of retail or service establishments in the area. The closest commercial businesses are located in the downtown, roughly three-quarters to one mile to the west along Country Club Drive. There are no parks in the area. The Country Club, while a significant green/open space, is private property and would not be an option for recreation for future residents.

Other High Density Residential properties in Golden Valley have tended to be located either near commercial nodes (the downtown or the Duluth/Hwy 100 area) or directly on larger capacity roadways (I-394, Olson Memorial Highway, Medicine Lake Road, etc.). While both Olson Memorial
Highway and Douglas Drive are nearby, neither is immediately accessible given the restricted access from Country Club Drive.

Finally, the height allowed for the use being proposed is greater than the height allowed for any of the other surrounding uses. Current revisions to the plans have reduced the height by one floor and have stepped back the upper floors to provide a more gentle transition to the neighborhood to the south.

Comprehensive Plan Consistency
Finally, staff reviewed the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan to help determine if this proposed change in land use was following the intent of the City’s central guiding document. Based on the application materials, staff found the following goals and policies to support the reguiding of the site for high density residential use.

Land Use
- **Goal 1: Create a Complete Community** – Strive for a diverse and balanced community that contains a variety of residential areas, major employers, retail, service, institutions, and parks and open spaces.
  - **Objective 1.1** – Improve the variety of housing options, with a focus on accommodations for seniors.

Housing
- **Goal 2: Expand the Variety of Housing Options** – Expand the variety of housing types and designs to allow all people a housing choice for all life stages and all economic means.
  - **Objective 2.1** – Prioritize the need for senior housing in the community and support a variety of senior living arrangements.
- **Goal 3: Increase Housing Affordability** – Increase housing opportunities at a cost that low- and moderate-income households can afford without compromising their ability to pay for other essential needs.
  - **Objective 3** – Support the production of new, high-quality, affordable housing in the City.

However, there are other goals and policies that could be seen to conflict with the proposal.

Land Use
- **Goal 2: Minimize Conflicts and Impacts of Change** – Develop a regulatory framework designed to minimize potential conflicts between land uses.
  - **Objective 1.2** – Arrange land uses so there are compatible transitions between major land use types.

Staff Findings
In order to provide support for the recommendation below, staff is offering the following findings of fact related to reguiding the proposed parcel to a High Density Residential designation:

1. The City would benefit from the addition of affordable units that would be required as a result of a change in land use.
2. The proposed use of this site for High Density Residential – and more specifically as a senior cooperative building – fits with a number of the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan while potentially conflicting with others.

3. The site is currently in an area with a variety of land use designations nearby, but none are as intense or allow for the extent of massing that could result here should the property be guided for High Density Residential.

4. Instead of acting as a transition between different land uses (Single-Family and Office to Open Space), the proposed use could function as a barrier by inserting a more intense use between other less intense uses.

5. Engineering staff have concluded that the amount of traffic generated by a senior use is able to be absorbed by Country Club Drive given its current traffic levels and its type of construction. The increase in trips would not impact the safety or operations of the associated intersections.

6. A specific project has been proposed in association with the change in land use, but there is no guarantee a more intense or impactful proposal would not emerge that would be allowed once a High Density Residential designation was established.

Discussion at Planning Commission and City Council
The Planning Commission heard the initial future land use map amendment, zoning map amendment, subdivision, and Conditional Use Permit requests at its meeting on December 13. For both the land use and the zoning change, the Planning Commission voted 6-0 to recommend denial of the requests. While generally supporting the proposed use and recognizing the need for more senior housing in the city, Commissioners were concerned about the height and massing of the proposed building, as well as the concerns around traffic raised by staff and the surrounding neighborhood. Finding that the standards for subdivision were met, the Commission voted (6-0) to recommend approval of the preliminary plat with conditions proposed by staff.

On January 7, the City Council heard from a number of residents as well as members of the Country Club. While no direct vote was taken on the revised proposal, Council Members stated they were generally supportive of the concept and were hopeful that the changes already made to the plans – along with the traffic analysis – would help addresses many of the concerns raised by nearby residents and business owners.

Recommended Action
Based on the findings above, staff recommends approval of the requested amendment to the Future Land Use Map, changing the guided land use for a portion of 7100 Golden Valley Road from Institutional - Parks and Natural Areas to High Density Residential.

Attachments:
Future Land Use Map (1 page)
Revised Project Narrative (6 pages)
Plans for Artessa Cooperative at Golden Valley dated September 24, 2021 (21 pages)
Trip Distribution Review Summary dated December 29, 2021 (1 page)
GOLDEN VALLEY COOPERATIVE

RE: APPLICATION TO THE CITY OF GOLDEN VALLEY FOR CONSIDERATION OF:

- FUTURE LAND USE CHANGE TO HIGH DENSITY
- REZONING TO R4
- CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR A 6th STORY AND ADDITIONAL HEIGHT ABOVE 60 FEET
- PRELIMINARY PLAT APPROVALS

DATE: 12.23.2021

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Full Name: Artessa Development, LLC [Ben Landhauser, Vice President]
Daytime Phone: 612.875.1618
Email Address: ben@thislifestyle.com
Street Address: 4938 Lincoln Drive
City, State, Zip: Edina, MN 55436
### SUMMARY TABLE OF SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO PROPOSAL/APPLICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REVISED PROPOSAL</th>
<th>ORIGINAL</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNIT COUNT</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>-19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFORDABLE UNITS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[10% OF TOTAL MINIMUM]</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+12.5% ABV MIN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENSITY [UNITS/ACRE]</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>41.28</td>
<td>-19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC COUNTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[TRIPS PER DAY]</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>-19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING SQ FT</td>
<td>218,762</td>
<td>259,630</td>
<td>-15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICULAR [RATIO]</td>
<td>1.9 : 1</td>
<td>1.9 : 1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICYCLE [#]</td>
<td>60+</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>+150%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRIC CHARGING [#]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+200%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4TH FLOOR STEPBACK</td>
<td>43 FEET</td>
<td>35 FEET</td>
<td>+123%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTIAL 5TH FLOOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEPBACK</td>
<td>114 FEET</td>
<td>35 FEET</td>
<td>+226%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># OF STORIES</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX HEIGHT</td>
<td>60 FEET</td>
<td>72.5 FEET</td>
<td>-17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPERVIOUS SURFACE</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>+1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UPDADTE PROJECT NARRATIVE

The conceptual site plan identifies a 4.5-story cooperative building comprised of approximately 78 homes. These 78 +/- cooperative homes range in characteristics from 1 bedroom 1 bath to 2 bedroom + den and 2 bath. As the property boundary and planned acquisition has been coordinated with the Golden Valley Country Club, the objective of both parties has centered around preserving as much open space and golf course related functions on the remaining Club property as possible. The design of the cooperative building is intended to compliment and leverage the unique topography of the site. Floor and unit composition has been deliberately assembled to reduce both the interior and exterior massing of the building. From any vantage point, the building appears much smaller than the overall size and number of homes would suggest. 2 levels of underground parking enable the building footprint to remain compact, while providing more than a 1:1.5 ratio of stalls to units within the building. The current façade concept is intended to provide visual interest and intrigue that compliments but doesn’t detract from the Golden Valley Country Club or the surrounding commercial office buildings. The revised building composition is responsive to the scale and massing concerns expressed by nearby single-family residential neighborhood. Strong horizontal banding and a mix of materials accentuate the lower levels and significant articulation provided by the building design. Step backs are provided on the southwestern and eastern legs of the building. From the southern leg of the building, the 3rd to 4th floor is stepped back to reduce massing at the closest point from Country Club Drive. Emphasis visually falls on the 3rd floor and enables the 4th floor to reflect the rolling and undulating topography of the Golden Valley Country Club property. On the partial 5th floor, the building is stepped roughly 114 feet away from Country Club Drive, so the majority of what is visually seen from drivers and passers by is a 3-4 story building. Any impact of the partial 5th floor is placed at the farthest reaches of the cooperative parcel from the residential or neighboring commercial properties.

The cooperative has an age qualification requirement that entails at least one owner of every home in the building to be 62 years of age or older. The proposed cooperative community has been modeled to align with the City’s Mixed-Income Housing Policy. 9 homes (11.5%) will be priced and sold to initial buyers at values consistent with the published 80% AMI levels as established by the Metropolitan Council. Over-time all share values (cooperative home values) will appreciate at a maximum of 2% annually, which will enable those 9 homes to remain at the 80% AMI or become more financially attainable to income levels below 80% for a 40-year period of time. Because of the fixed appreciation levels of all homes in the cooperative, all homes will become more financially attainable over time as the general real estate market will fluctuate at an average appreciation rate greater than the maximum 2% appreciation of the cooperative shares.

Similar to other Artessa Cooperatives, the building is finished with extensive common area amenities (approximately 9,500+ sf) that enable our owners to have access to more daily living space and community connection opportunities within the cooperative. The cooperative amenity areas include:

- Great Room: A large gathering and hosting space with full kitchen, pantry and a variety of seating spaces designed for both large and small groups to get together.

- Entertainment Suite: This entertainment suite is the perfect place to get together and watch a movie, play cards or a game on the brand-new shuffleboard table. Your grand kids won’t stop talking about how fun it is to go visit
grandma and grandpa once they see all that the entertainment suite has to offer – including an arcade game table.

- **Hospitality Suite:** A secluded hospitality suite becomes the perfect get away for smaller social gatherings like your wine club, family holiday celebrations and anything in between.

- **Wellness Studio:** Whether your daily routine involves a workout, yoga or meditation, the Wellness Studio provides an escape for you to keep that routine in check or get a chance to start a whole new one involving state of the art equipment and multi-purpose flooring selected specifically for the Zvago GV Club community.

- **Business Center:** The business center provides working owners a space to take meetings and all the office amenities similarly found in a co-working space.

- **Guest Suites:** These guest quarters allow you to host additional friends or family in your home without having to upsize your unit in the process. Each guest suite reflects the same characteristics you’d find in a king bed suite in a hotel.

- **Makerspace:** Looking for an area to build a new murphy bed, polish up your skis, tune up your bike or create something without feeling like you are making a mess? Active hobbyists and artists alike transform this space into the woodshop or studio space of their dreams as part of the cooperative living experience.

The unit composition of the cooperative includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT TYPE</th>
<th># OF UNITS</th>
<th>SQ. FT. RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ONE BEDROOM + DEN</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,110 – 1,302 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 BEDROOM</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1,360 - 1,422 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 BEDROOM + DEN</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1,600 – 1,796 sf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cooperative does have a full time (32 – 40 hrs. per week) building manager and part-time maintenance technician (20 - 30 hrs. per week) on the premises. These individuals are overseen by a professional property management company.

**PROPERTY INVOLVED:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS/ LEGAL</th>
<th>PID</th>
<th>PROPERTY OWNER</th>
<th>CONTRACT/PERMISSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7001 Golden Valley Road / See attached Legal Description on Survey</td>
<td>Part of 321182121002</td>
<td>Golden Valley Country Club</td>
<td>Purchase Agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### REZONING INFORMATION OF PROPERTIES INVOLVED:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPERTY</th>
<th>COMPREHENSIVE PLAN GUIDANCE</th>
<th>CURRENT ZONING</th>
<th>PROPOSED ZONING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See Attached Legal Description on Plat</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Natural Areas</td>
<td>I4 – Golf Courses, Parks, Playgrounds &amp; City Offices</td>
<td>(R4) High Density Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### R4 ZONING PROPOSAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGULATION</th>
<th>REVISED PROPOSAL</th>
<th>CHANGE FROM ORIGINAL PROPOSAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRINCIPAL USE:</td>
<td>Multifamily Cooperative</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCESSORY USE(S):</td>
<td>Enclosed and underground parking structure</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRONT YARD SETBACK (MIN) (SOUTH):</td>
<td>35 feet</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDE YARD SETBACK (MIN) (WEST &amp; EAST):</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAR YARD SETBACK (MIN) (NORTH):</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEIGHT (MAX):</td>
<td>60 Feet*</td>
<td>7.3% Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIZE OF PROPERTY:</td>
<td>2.35 acres</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPERVIOUS SURFACE:</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENTIAL DENSITY (GROSS UNITS/ACRE):</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>8% Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEPBACK FROM 3RD TO 4TH FLOOR: [SOUTHERN BUILDING LEG]</td>
<td>8 feet</td>
<td>+123%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEPBACK FROM 4TH TO 5TH FLOOR: [FROM COUNTRY CLUB DRIVE]</td>
<td>114 feet</td>
<td>+226%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = AVG HEIGHT MEASURED FROM GRADE AT FRONT OF BUILDING (SOUTHERN FACE)
### PROJECTED TRAFFIC COUNTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># OF TRIPS PER UNIT</th>
<th>TOTAL # OF TRIPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REVISED PROPOSAL</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORIGINAL PROPOSAL</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHANGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>-19.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PARKING REQUIREMENTS VS. PROPOSAL:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>USE: MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPOSAL</strong> [BASED ON 97 UNITS]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RATIO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COUNT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GARAGE PARKING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SURFACE PARKING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PARKING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BICYCLE PARKING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING SPACES</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The required number of parking spaces per the City’s requirements for multi-family buildings is: 146 spaces (1.5/unit). The required number of bicycle parking spaces per City requirements is: 8 bicycle spaces (5% of required vehicle spaces).

Respectfully Submitted,

Ben Landhauser AICP  
Executive Vice President  
Main 612.875.5637  
Direct 612.875.1618  
ben@thislifestyle.com
See Sheet V1.1 for Detail in This Area.
Below is a summary of the trip distribution review for the proposed Artessa development. The high-level review assumes no U-turn maneuvers would be made at the signals and that all of the traffic will utilize either the Rhode Island intersection or the RIRO intersection at Hwy 55.

**Trip Distribution Review Summary**

**Trip Generation**

Per ITE’s Trip Generation Manual (11th Edition), a Senior Adult Housing – Multifamily (Land Use 252) provides the following average rates for a 78-unit building:

- Daily Traffic: 253 trips (126 entering, 127 exiting)
- AM Peak Hour: 16 trips (5 entering, 11 exiting)
- PM Peak Hour: 20 trips (11 entering, 9 exiting)

**Trip Distribution**

Looking at the most recent AADT data, I assumed the following overall distribution:

- 45% entering/exiting from/to the west on Hwy 55
- 45% entering/exiting from/to the east on Hwy 55
- 10% entering/exiting from/to the north on Rhode Island Ave

**Trip Assignment**

At the intersection of Rhode Island Ave & Country Club Dr and Hwy 55 & the Right-In/Right-Out intersection, the assumed trip assignments are summarized in the below table (based on above trip generation/distribution information):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Rhode Island Ave &amp; Country Club Dr</th>
<th>Hwy 55 &amp; Country Club Dr (RIRO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB LT</td>
<td>NB RT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Peak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- It is estimated that a total of 11 vehicles will be added to the Rhode Island intersection during the PM peak hour (busiest hour)
- It is estimated that a total of 9 vehicles will be added to the Hwy 55 RIRO intersection during the PM peak hour.
- The new trips will likely be dispersed evenly throughout the hour (i.e. not in the same 1-2 minute period). Therefore, the added trips are not expected to impact the operations or safety of either intersection.

I hope this is useful for your discussions. Please let me know if you have any questions or wish to see additional information/discussion.

Thank you,
Erin

Erin Jordan, PE (IA, MN, WI)
Traffic Engineer
*Short Elliott Hendrickson, Inc.*
Summary of Request
Artessa Development, LLC, originally proposed four planning actions to allow for the development of a portion of the driving range owned by the Golden Valley Country Club. They requested a change to the Future Land Use Map (from an Institutional use to High Density Residential use), a change to the Zoning Map (from the Institutional (I-4) Zoning District to the High Density Residential (R-4) Zoning District), a subdivision of the property to create a new lot of approximately 2.35 acres, and a conditional use permit to allow for the construction of a sixth floor on the proposed 97-unit senior cooperative building.

At its meeting on December 13, 2021, the Planning Commission voted (6-0) to recommend denial of the land use change, (6-0) to recommend denial of the zoning change, (6-0) to recommend approval of the preliminary plat, and (6-0) to recommend denial of the conditional use permit.

Subsequently, the developer revised the plans to remove a floor (negating the need for the conditional use permit) and modified the massing and architecture of the proposed building. On January 4, 2022, the City Council voted (4-1) to send the revised plans back to the Planning Commission for additional review. While expressing general support for the project, on the whole they looked to the Commission to further vet the plans and to listen to feedback from the neighborhood before taking action.

For details on the background of this rezoning request and the existing conditions of the site itself, please refer to the accompanying memo on the proposed change in guided land use.

Proposal
The zoning request would change the designated zoning from Institutional - Parks and Natural Areas (I-P) to High Density Residential (R-4).
Required Process
Support from the Planning Commission and City Council for this proposal would also necessitate review and approval from the Metropolitan Council for the change in land use, requiring a delay in the final vote on the rezoning and the subdivision until the land use change was approved.

Staff Review
The City Code does not set specific standards for changing a zoning designation, and the City Council – with the input of the Planning Commission – has a great deal of latitude in deciding if the request is consistent with the broader zoning map for the city. In making a determination, the City should take into account the purpose of zoning as outlined in the City code, which is “to regulate land use within the City, including the location, size, use, and height of buildings, the arrangement of buildings on lots, and the density of population within the City for the purpose of promoting the health, safety, order, convenience, and general welfare of all citizens of the City.” (Sec. 113-2)

This rezoning request seeks to change the site’s zoning from Institutional (I-4) to High Density Residential. The purpose statements for both districts follow:

Institutional Zoning
The purpose of the Institutional Zoning District is to establish areas where both public and private institutional uses such as schools, hospitals, parks, golf courses, nursing homes, and public buildings may be located.

High Density Residential Zoning
The purpose of the High Density Residential (R-4) Zoning District is to provide for high density housing (up to 50 units per acre for multifamily dwellings and up to 70 units per acre for senior and disability housing) along with directly related and complementary uses. Multifamily dwellings and senior and disability housing is permitted to a density of 100 units per acre with a conditional use permit.

Allowed Uses
The following principal uses are listed as permitted in the Institutional (I-4) Zoning District:

1. Golf courses, country clubs, and polo fields, excepting those carried on as a business such as miniature golf courses
2. Parks, playgrounds, City offices, fire stations, and other lands incidental to the operation of the City
3. Essential services, Class I

In addition to these three uses, adult day care centers and child care centers are permitted by conditional use permit.

In the High Density Residential Zoning District, allowed uses are multi-family buildings, senior and physical disability housing, foster family and group foster family homes, and residential facilities serving up to 25 persons. Additional density in multi-family and senior and disability housing (up to
100 units per acre) may be allowed through a conditional use permit, as well as structures in excess of five stories, residential facilities serving more than 25 persons, or retail sales, Class I or II restaurants, and professional offices on the ground floor when located along a minor arterial or major collector street.

Compatibility
Another important consideration is whether the rezoning would be compatible with surrounding uses.

The site sits in the corner of a large parcel (the Country Club) zoned Institutional (I-4) and likely to remain as open space/golf course for many years. It is adjacent to another larger property recently rezoned to Light Industrial. Across Country Club Drive, immediately adjacent properties are also zoned Office. Single-family homes extend down Country Club Drive to the west towards the downtown and south to Olson Memorial Highway.

The nearest multi-family development is on the far side of the railroad tracks to the north. A medium density development is located along Golden Valley Road and two new apartments are being planned for the corner of Golden Valley Road and Douglas Drive. As a zoning district, the current proposal would stand as an island among other uses. While the applicant has suggested the site would be convenient for seniors given the proximity to the downtown and transit options on Douglas Drive, the reality is that a walk to the closest portion of the downtown is roughly three quarters of a mile away and the bus service on Douglas and Olson Memorial is limited to stops every half hour during AM and PM rush hours (future Bus Rapid Transit may come to Olson
Memorial Highway with a potential stop at Douglas Drive). There are no retail or service uses in the area that could become walkable destinations, and no public open spaces. The Luce Line Regional Trail does sit adjacent to the location along Country Club Drive.

**Setback Requirements and Height Restrictions.** In the High Density Residential Zoning District, front yard setbacks for principal structures are 25 feet from the property line, similar to other zoning districts in the city. For this property, required side and rear yard setbacks would be 20 feet. Building height is limited to five stories or 60 feet, whichever is less, though a conditional use permit could allow the height to increase to six stories.

**Traffic**

As described in the land use memo, traffic associated with a multi-family building could vary depending on the type of facility and the number of units. The current proposal would be expected to generate a bit more than 250 new trips per day. Country Club Drive is able to handle this level of traffic, though adjacent properties may notice the increase.

**Staff Findings**

In order to provide support for the recommendation below, staff is offering the following findings of fact related to reguiding the proposed parcel to a High Density Residential designation:

1. The City would benefit from the addition of affordable units that would be required as a result of a change in zoning.
2. The proposed use of this site for High Density Residential – and more specifically as a senior cooperative building – fits with a number of the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan while potentially conflicting with others.
3. The site is currently in an area with a variety of zoning designations nearby, but none are as intense or allow for the extent of massing that could result here should the property be zoned for High Density Residential.
4. Instead of acting as a transition between different zoning designations (Single-Family Residential (R-1) and Office to Institutional - Parks and Natural Areas), the proposed designation could function as a barrier by inserting a more intense designation between other less intense designations.
5. A High Density Residential zoning designation has typically been located near a commercial node – providing access to retail and services – or on a major roadway with access to high frequency transit. The location being proposed lacks those qualities. Senior housing, however, may benefit from being removed from a busier corridor.
6. Though potential residents of a multi-family building would have views of the Golden Valley Country Club grounds, the site is private property and no public open space is nearby to allow for outdoor recreation (active or passive).
7. Engineering staff have concluded that the amount of traffic generated by a senior use is able to be absorbed by Country Club Drive given its current traffic levels and its type of construction. The increase in trips would not impact the safety or operations of the associated intersections.
8. A specific project has been proposed in association with the change in zoning, but there is no guarantee a more intense or impactful proposal would not emerge that would be allowed once a High Density Residential zoning district was established.

Discussion at Planning Commission and City Council
The Planning Commission heard the initial future land use map amendment, zoning map amendment, subdivision, and Conditional Use Permit requests at its meeting on December 13. For both the land use and the zoning change, the Planning Commission voted 6-0 to recommend denial of the requests. While generally supporting the proposed use and recognizing the need for more senior housing in the city, Commissioners were concerned about the height and massing of the proposed building, as well as the concerns around traffic raised by staff and the surrounding neighborhood. Finding that the standards for subdivision were met, the Commission voted (6-0) to recommend approval of the preliminary plat with conditions proposed by staff.

On January 7, the City Council heard from a number of residents as well as members of the Country Club. While no direct vote was taken on the revised proposal, Council Members stated they were generally supportive of the concept and were hopeful that the changes already made to the plans – along with the traffic analysis – would help address many of the concerns raised by nearby residents and business owners.

Recommended Action
Based on the findings above, staff recommends approval of the requested amendment to the Zoning Map, changing the guided land use for a portion of 7100 Golden Valley Road from Institutional - Parks and Natural Areas (I-P) to High Density Residential (R-4).

Attachments:
Zoning Map (1 page)
Date: January 24, 2022
To: Golden Valley Planning Commission
From: Jason Zimmerman, Planning Manager
Subject: Informal Public Hearing – Preliminary Plan for Subdivision for Artessa Senior Cooperative located on a portion of 7001 Golden Valley Road

Summary of Request
Artessa Development, LLC, originally proposed four planning actions to allow for the development of a portion of the driving range owned by the Golden Valley Country Club. They requested a change to the Future Land Use Map (from an Institutional use to High Density Residential use), a change to the Zoning Map (from the Institutional (I-4) Zoning District to the High Density Residential (R-4) Zoning District), a subdivision of the property to create a new lot of approximately 2.35 acres, and a conditional use permit to allow for the construction of a sixth floor on the proposed 97-unit senior cooperative building.

At its meeting on December 13, 2021, the Planning Commission voted (6-0) to recommend denial of the land use change, (6-0) to recommend denial of the zoning change, (6-0) to recommend approval of the preliminary plat, and (6-0) to recommend denial of the conditional use permit.

Subsequently, the developer revised the plans to remove a floor (negating the need for the conditional use permit) and modified the massing and architecture of the proposed building. On January 4, 2022, the City Council voted (4-1) to send the revised plans back to the Planning Commission for additional review. While expressing general support for the project, on the whole they looked to the Commission to further vet the plans and to listen to feedback from the neighborhood before taking action.

For details on the background of this subdivision request and the existing conditions of the site itself, please refer to the accompanying memo on the proposed change in guided land use.

Proposal
The proposed subdivision request would create a new 2.35 acre lot in the southeast corner of the existing Country Club parcel.
In contrast to the plans initially submitted to the City, the updated plan set has reduced the height of the building from six stories to five stories and has provided building step-backs on portions of floors four and five. In addition, the proposed exterior materials have been adjusted based on feedback from the neighborhood during the first public hearing.

Overall, the applicant has attempted to address many of the concerns addressed by nearby residents, including the number of trips generated (based on the number of units), the height of the building, and the architectural massing.

**Required Process**
Support from the Planning Commission and City Council for this proposal would also necessitate review and approval from the Metropolitan Council for the change in land use, requiring a delay in the final vote on the rezoning and the subdivision until the land use change was approved.

**Staff Review**
Because the proposed subdivision is not part of a recorded plat or a recorded registered land survey, it does not qualify as a minor subdivision and therefore must proceed under the more general subdivision process identified in the City Code (Sec. 109). The applicant has submitted all of the information required to process the request, including a site survey of existing conditions, a tree inventory, and a preliminary plat (Artessa at Golden Valley).

The proposed lot area is 2.35 acres. If the property were to be rezoned to High Density Residential (R-4), as proposed, the minimum lot area requirement of 20,000 square feet would be met. In addition, the minimum lot with of 150 feet at the front setback line would also be met. Therefore, the proposed subdivision would meet all dimensional requirements of the zoning district.

In the R-4 district, the front yard setback is 25 feet and side and rear yard setbacks are 20 feet. Given the size of the proposed lot, there would be a sufficient building envelope for development.

Current plans indicate a shared private roadway between the Golden Valley Country Club and future residents in order to access underground parking to the rear of the building. As is typical when shared arrangements are proposed, staff would require copies of any agreements to ensure maintenance and other responsibilities are adequately provided for.

Consistent with the requirements of Sec. 109-167 of the City Code, the City may require a reasonable portion of the proposed subdivision to be dedicated to the public for public use as a park, playground, public open space, etc. Alternatively, a park dedication fee may be contributed in lieu of land. The City’s adopted fee schedule sets this rate at 6% of the current land value. This fee may only be used for future acquisition of land for other public use, development of existing park and playground sites, or debt retirement for land previously acquired for such public purposes.

**Necessary Transportation Improvements**
As identified in Chapter 4 of the City’s 2040 Comprehensive Plan, this area has been identified as a target location to provide a needed local street connection between Country Club Drive and the signalized intersection at Douglas Drive:
Country Club Dr/Frontage Rd Extension
As part of the Douglas Dr project, direct access from Country Club Dr to Douglas Dr north of Hwy 55 was eliminated as a safety improvement. The access was realigned to operate as a right-in/right-out between Country Club Dr and Hwy 55. To improve local street connectivity, it is desirable to extend Country Club Dr north to join the existing signalized intersection of Douglas Dr and the North Hwy 55 Frontage Rd east of Douglas Dr. This would require acquisition of right-of-way from the currently vacant site in the northwest quadrant of Hwy 55 and Douglas Dr. (Golden Valley 2040 Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 4: Transportation, pages 4-34 and 4-35)

This also falls under one of the chapter’s listed implementation actions for Goal 2: Improve the Functionality and Safety of the Road Network:

“Review redevelopment proposals for opportunities to implement roadway improvements, monitor traffic impacts, implement access management strategies, and resolve safety deficiencies.” (Golden Valley 2040 Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 4: Transportation, page 4-45)

In discussions with the applicant and Country Club following the Planning Commission hearing, staff have determined that right-of-way to advance the planning of this future public road should not occur at this time, but should wait until future development takes place on the Golden Valley Country Club driving range in order to determine the best option for locating a segment that would align with the east/west segment being planned for 6300 Olson Memorial Highway.

Additional Department Review
Engineering staff have reviewed the preliminary plat and noted that the following questions or issues would need to be addressed as part of the permitting process:

- The applicant is proposing to remove 20 mature oak trees (18 are legacy oaks) and potentially impacting more oaks with the access and retaining wall construction on east side. The applicant should try to preserve these trees before removing and stepping through mitigation options discussed in City code. Consider reducing or relocating the amount of surface parking and adjusting the site and grading plans.
- The applicant must attempt to provide above-ground multi-benefit stormwater treatment, or provide documentation as to why that can’t be achieved.
- Soil borings are needed in the exact locations where infiltration systems are proposed.
- Pervious pavement systems are often placed under parking areas and other low travel and low vehicle weight areas to reduce sedimentation and chloride accumulation, maintenance/plowing issues, and ice/freeze conditions. How many trips will be generated over this system per day? Any large vehicles? Is this pervious pavers or porous asphalt pavement or other? These systems require regular maintenance with commercial vacuum equipment. A maintenance agreement would be needed.
- City code requires applicant to minimize runoff to the maximum extent practicable. The applicant is steepening grades on the east side of the site and discharging and directing
stormwater toward the adjacent property. What are the pre- and post-runoff rates at the point of discharge? Where is the EOF for the pervious paver system if the CB inlet is blocked and the street overtops? Is there the potential to work with the property owner to the east on an underground connection? Where does the neighbor’s CB inlet flow to?

- BCWMC plan review and approval is required.

The Fire Department has also reviewed the application and has indicated that during permitting the applicant would need to confirm the maneuverability of ladder trucks through the front circle as well as the “T” at the rear of the building.

Review by Three Rivers Park District was provided given the adjacency of their rights-of-way to this property. Minor comments related to construction as it may impact the Luce Line Regional Trail were provided to staff.

**Evaluation of Preliminary Plat**

According to Section 109-67 of the City Code, the following are the regulations governing approval of preliminary plats for subdivisions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor/Finding</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Council may require changes or revisions as it deems necessary for the health, safety, general welfare, and convenience of the City.</td>
<td>Standard met. There is no need for the dedication of additional right-of-way at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The approval of a preliminary plat is tentative only, involving only the general acceptability of the layout as submitted.</td>
<td>Standard met. Staff have reviewed the layout and find it to be generally acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Prior to approval of the preliminary plat by the Council, the engineering proposals pertaining to water supply, storm drainage, sanitary sewer service, roadway widths, traffic impacts, and the surfacing of streets shall be approved by the City engineer and other public officials having jurisdiction.</td>
<td>Standard conditionally met. While the specifics of the site design remain to be fully developed as part of the submittals for the potential site development, there are no known issues related to water supply, storm drainage, or sanitary sewer service. Increases in traffic created by this proposal, while impacting adjacent properties, would not rise to the level of concern with respect to congestion or roadway condition. Staff are requiring copies of shared access agreements with the Golden Valley Country Club for review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No plat shall be approved for a subdivision which covers an area subject to periodic flooding or which contains extremely poor drainage facilities and which would make adequate drainage of the streets and lots difficult or impossible, unless the subdivider agrees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to make improvements which will, in the opinion of the City Engineer, make the area completely safe for occupancy and provide adequate street and lot drainage.

Standard met. The City Engineer has determined that the site should drain adequately.

5. No plat shall be approved for a subdivision that does not meet the requirements specified in this chapter.

Standard met.

Discussion at Planning Commission and City Council
The Planning Commission heard the initial future land use map amendment, zoning map amendment, subdivision, and Conditional Use Permit requests at its meeting on December 13. For both the land use and the zoning change, the Planning Commission voted 6-0 to recommend denial of the requests. While generally supporting the proposed use and recognizing the need for more senior housing in the city, Commissioners were concerned about the height and massing of the proposed building, as well as the concerns around traffic raised by staff and the surrounding neighborhood. Finding that the standards for subdivision were met, the Commission voted (6-0) to recommend approval of the preliminary plat with conditions proposed by staff.

On January 7, the City Council heard from a number of residents as well as members of the Country Club. While no direct vote was taken on the revised proposal, Council Members stated they were generally supportive of the concept and were hopeful that the changes already made to the plans – along with the traffic analysis – would help addresses many of the concerns raised by nearby residents and business owners.

Recommended Action
Based on the findings above, staff recommends approval of the proposed Preliminary Plan for Subdivision for a portion of 7100 Golden Valley Road (Artessa at Golden Valley) subject to the following conditions:
1. The applicant shall include on the final plat the dedication of all drainage and utility easements deemed necessary to meet City Code requirements.
2. A park dedication fee equal to 6% of the land value shall be paid prior to the release of the final plat.
3. The applicant shall provide copies of the shared use access easements/agreements over the Golden Valley Country Club property for vehicle trips associated with the development onto Country Club Drive and Golden Valley Road for review by the City.
4. The City Attorney will determine if a title review is necessary prior to approval of the final plat.

Attachments:
Revised Civil Plans dated January 18, 2022 (18 pages)
Revised Floor Plans dated December 20, 2021 (7 pages)
Revised Building Elevations dated December 28, 2021 (3 pages)
Revised Perspectives dated December 23, 2021 (9 pages)
Letter to the City Council dated January 13, 2022 (2 pages)
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REMOVAL NOTES:

1. All existing structures, buildings, and improvements, existing utilities, streets, sidewalks, curbs, and gutters shall remain in their existing condition unless otherwise shown on the drawings or approved by the City.

2. Site soil water pollution prevention (SWPPP) plan is required for construction storm water management.

3. Removal of materials not noted on the drawings shall be in accordance with the City's requirements.

4. Trees to be removed shall be coordinated with utility owner prior to construction activities.

5. Existing trees to be protected during construction shall be noted on the drawings.

6. Erosion control should be coordinated with the City and any BMPs required during construction shall be noted on the drawings.

7. Remaining materials shall be disposed of at a legal site in accordance with state and local regulations.

8. Remaining materials shall be disposed of at a legal site in accordance with state and local regulations.

9. Remaining materials shall be disposed of at a legal site in accordance with state and local regulations.

10. Remaining materials shall be disposed of at a legal site in accordance with state and local regulations.

11. Remaining materials shall be disposed of at a legal site in accordance with state and local regulations.

12. Remaining materials shall be disposed of at a legal site in accordance with state and local regulations.
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1. **Construction Limits**
   - Before you dig, call.
   - Know what's below.
   - VEHICLES (UPS, FED-EX, USPS). DELIVERIES SHALL OCCUR AT THE FRONT.
   - SCREENED EXTERIOR LOCATION AND BE REMOVED BY COMMERCIAL CO. WEEKLY.
   - TRASH REMOVAL: TRASH SHALL BE COLLECTED IN INTERIOR OF-SITE.
   - SNOW REMOVAL: ALL SNOW SHALL BE STORED ON-SITE OUTSIDE.

2. **Note on Materials**
   - EXISTING PAVEMENT AND REMOVE AND REPLACE PER CITY STANDARDS.
   - 9" VCP TO GUTTER WHERE APPLICABLE-SEE PLAN.
   - CONCRETE DRIVEWAY (A Public R/W).
   - STOP SIGN C&G, PER CITY SPECIFICATION, OR REPORT WAS SPECIFIED (PAD OR WALK) SEE GEOTECHNICAL SPECIFICATION, OR REPORT WAS SPECIFIED.
   - ACCESSIBLE ROUTE MATCH EX. BIT.
   - LIGHT DUTY BITUMINOUS PAVEMENT (IF APPLICABLE).
   - ACCESSIBLE PARKING.

3. **Operations Notes**
   - CITY OF GOLDEN VALLEY SITE SPECIFIC NOTES.
   - TRASH REMOVAL: TRASH SHALL BE COLLECTED IN INTERIOR OF-SITE.
   - SNOW REMOVAL: ALL SNOW SHALL BE STORED ON-SITE OUTSIDE.
   - TRASH REMOVAL: TRASH SHALL BE COLLECTED IN INTERIOR OF-SITE.
   - SNOW REMOVAL: ALL SNOW SHALL BE STORED ON-SITE OUTSIDE.

4. **Site Area Table**
   - SITE AREA TABLE:
   - CITY OF GOLDEN VALLEY SITE SPECIFIC NOTES.
   - TRASH REMOVAL: TRASH SHALL BE COLLECTED IN INTERIOR OF-SITE.
   - SNOW REMOVAL: ALL SNOW SHALL BE STORED ON-SITE OUTSIDE.
   - TRASH REMOVAL: TRASH SHALL BE COLLECTED IN INTERIOR OF-SITE.
   - SNOW REMOVAL: ALL SNOW SHALL BE STORED ON-SITE OUTSIDE.

5. **Site Plan**
   - CITY OF GOLDEN VALLEY SITE SPECIFIC NOTES.
   - TRASH REMOVAL: TRASH SHALL BE COLLECTED IN INTERIOR OF-SITE.
   - SNOW REMOVAL: ALL SNOW SHALL BE STORED ON-SITE OUTSIDE.
   - TRASH REMOVAL: TRASH SHALL BE COLLECTED IN INTERIOR OF-SITE.
   - SNOW REMOVAL: ALL SNOW SHALL BE STORED ON-SITE OUTSIDE.

6. **Operational Notes**
   - CITY OF GOLDEN VALLEY SITE SPECIFIC NOTES.
   - TRASH REMOVAL: TRASH SHALL BE COLLECTED IN INTERIOR OF-SITE.
   - SNOW REMOVAL: ALL SNOW SHALL BE STORED ON-SITE OUTSIDE.
   - TRASH REMOVAL: TRASH SHALL BE COLLECTED IN INTERIOR OF-SITE.
   - SNOW REMOVAL: ALL SNOW SHALL BE STORED ON-SITE OUTSIDE.
GENERAL GRADING NOTES:

1. ALL DISTANCE LOCATIONS SHOWN ARE APPROXIMATE. CONTACT SOILS ENGINEER FOR ACTUAL LOCATION.

2. SITE USES A CONTINUOUS LAYOUT FOR GRADING NOTES.


5. ALL CONTRACTORS SHALL COMPLETE THE SET GRADE CONSTRUCTION AS BUILT IN THE CONTRACTOR'S DRAWINGS AND CONTRACT SPECIFICATIONS. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL FOLLOW THE CONTRACTOR'S DRAWINGS AND CONTRACT SPECIFICATIONS. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ENSURING ALL REQUIRED TESTS AND INSPECTIONS ARE CONDUCTED AND THE SOILS ENGINEER SHALL APPROVE THE TESTS AND INSPECTIONS.


GROUNDWATER INFORMATION:


CONSTRUCTION SEQUENCING

1. INSTALL IN-FILL MATERIAL TO ADEQUATELY VEGETATE THE CONTRIBUTING DRAINAGE AREA. INSTALL UTILITIES (WATER, SANITARY SEWER, ELECTRIC, PHONE, FIBER OPTIC, ETC) PRIOR TO SETTING FINAL GRADE OF BIORETENTION DEVICE.

2. PERFORM CONTINUOUS INSPECTIONS OF EROSION CONTROL PRACTICES. INSTALL SILT FENCE AND/OR OTHER APPROPRIATE TEMPORARY EROSION CONTROL DEVICES TO PREVENT SEDIMENT FROM LEAVING OR ENTERING THE BIORETENTION DEVICE DURING CONSTRUCTION.

3. PREVENT SEDIMENT FROM LEAVING OR ENTERING THE PRACTICE DURING CONSTRUCTION.

4. INSTALL ROOF TILES OR OTHER APPROPRIATE TEMPORARY ROOFING CONTROL COVERS TO PREVENT SEDIMENT FROM ENTERING THE BIORETENTION DEVICE.

5. INSTALL ROOF TILES OR OTHER APPROPRIATE TEMPORARY ROOFING CONTROL COVERS TO PREVENT SEDIMENT FROM ENTERING THE BIORETENTION DEVICE.

6. INSTALL TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT EROSION CONTROL PRACTICES.

7. INSTALL DRAINAGE SYSTEMS FOR COLLECTION OF INFILTRATED INFILTRATION PRACTICE.

8. PERFORM ALL TESTING IMPERIAL, AS REQUIRED.

9. PLACE SOILS OR OTHER UNDERLYING MATERIALS THAT CONSTITUTE THE MINIMUM 2 AND MAXIMUM 5 ADJUSTING RINGS. GROUT BETWEEN RINGS, CASTING, AND UNDERDRAIN GRAVEL BLANKET.

10. PERFORM ALL TESTING IMPERIAL, AS REQUIRED.

(Note: All materials below the specified bioRetention depth shall be undisturbed, undamaged, unless otherwise noted.)

KEY

1. TYPICAL
2. FREE DRAINING ANGULAR WASHED STONE 3/4" - 2" PARTICLE SIZE (NON LIMESTONE MATERIAL THAT CONTAINS LESS THAN 5% DELETERIOUS MATERIALS) INSTALL TO MIN. 95% STANDARD DENSITY PER AASHTO T99.

3. VARIABLE 

4. PIPE BEDDING - PVC

5. PIPE BEDDING - RCP & DIP

6. UNDERGROUND INFILTRATION SYSTEM

7. TYPICAL SECTION VIEW
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IRRIGATION NOTES:

1. CONTRACTOR SHALL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR THE CORRECT AND COMPLETE INSTALLATION OF ALL IRRIGATION SYSTEMS, INCLUDING但对于具体问题请参考具体文本内容。
CITY OF GOLDEN VALLEY EROSION CONTROL NOTES:

- Contact City for specific erosion control notes.

**SWPPP NOTES:**

1. All existing utility locations shown are approximate. Contact the City of Golden Valley for utility locations, which will be filled in on the plan. If any utility is hit during construction, the contractor shall, within 24 hours of discovery, contact the City of Golden Valley.

2. If the project is greater than one acre and greater than one acre, the contractor is responsible for obtaining any erosion control permits required by the City.

3. All operations and equipment control practices, as well as all cover measures contained in this SWPPP and the minimum requirements, additional practices may be required during the course of construction.

4. City of Golden Valley Erosion Control Notes:

- Contact City for specific erosion control notes.

**SWPPP - EXISTING CONDITIONS**

1. All existing utility locations shown are approximate. Contact "GOPHER STATE ONE CALL" (651-454-0002 or 800-252-1166) for utility locations, 48 hours prior to construction. The contractor shall repair or replace any utilities that are damaged during construction at no cost to the owner.

2. This project is greater than one acre and requires an MPCA NPDES permit. The contractor is responsible for obtaining any erosion control permits required by the City.

3. See sheets SW1.0 - SW1.5 for all erosion control notes, descriptions, and practices.

4. See grading plan for additional grading and erosion control notes.

5. The contractor is responsible for SWPPP implementation, inspections, and compliance with NPDES permit.
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### NOTES

- PLACE GEOTEXTILE FABRIC, OVERFLOW, EXTEND 7" BEYOND BOX
- PLACE GEOTEXTILE FABRIC, OVERFLOW, EXTEND 7" BEYOND BOX

### OVERFLOW AT TOP OF FILTER ASSEMBLY

1. REPLACE INLET GRATE UPON COMPLETE INSTALLATION OF INLET PROTECTION FABRIC.
2. CONTRACTOR SHALL REMOVE ALL ACCUMULATED SEDIMENT AND DEBRIS FROM THE SURFACE OF THE SYSTEM AFTER EACH STORM EVENT AND AT THE COMPLETION OF THE CONTRACT.
3. REFERENCE APPLE VALLEY STANDARD PLATE ERO-4C.

### EROSION STOP

1. PLACE STAPLES 2 FEET APART TO KEEP MATTING FIRMLY PRESSED TO SOIL.

### EROSION BLANKET

1. COMPOST FILTER LOGS (BIO ROLLS) SHALL BE FILTREXX EROSION CONTROL SOXX OR APPROVED EQUAL.
2. COMPOST FILLER TO BE MADE FROM A COMPOST BLEND 30%-40% GRADE 2 (SPEC 3890) AND 60%-70% PARTIALLY DECOMPOSED WOOD CHIPS, PER MNDOT SPEC 3897.
3. FILTER FABRIC SHALL BE GEOTEXTILE KNITTED MATERIAL WITH MAX. OPENINGS OF 3/8".
4. IF MULTIPLE ROLLS NEEDED, OVERLAP BY MIN. 12" AT ENDS AND STAKE.
5. SILT SHALL BE REMOVED ONCE IT REACHES 80% OF THE HEIGHT OF THE ROLL OR AS DEEMED NECESSARY BY SITE CONTRACTOR TO MAINTAIN PROPER FUNCTION.

### EROSION CONTROL BLANKET

1. PLACE COMPOST FILLER MIXTURE WITHIN 6" OF BOTH SIDES OF OPTIMUM BASE EDGE OF THE FILTER FABRIC.

### SEDIMENT BIO-ROLL / COMPOST FILTER LOG

1. FILL UPSTREAM BASE EDGE WITH 2" OF DIRT OR COMPOST TO EMBED ROLL.
GENERAL SWPPP REQUIREMENTS AND NOTES

SWPPP

1. Construction activities that generate stormwater are subject to the stormwater discharge requirements of this SWPPP. A SWPPP must be prepared by a person(s) knowledge and experienced in the application of erosion and sediment control. Construction activity begins when the SWPPP is submitted to and approved by the engineer, contractor and relevant authorities.

2. Site Specific SWPPP: The contractor must prepare and maintain a SWPPP for the project which identifies the appropriate erosion and sediment control practices required for the project with the necessary supporting documentation. The SWPPP must be submitted to the engineer and any other relevant authorities for approval. In the event that the contractor fails to follow the approved SWPPP, the engineer shall issue a stop work order and/or additional instructions.

3. Inspection of Construction Activities: The engineer, or another designated representative, is responsible for conducting inspections of the construction activities for compliance with the SWPPP. Inspections may be conducted on a pre-determined schedule or as needed to ensure compliance with the SWPPP.

4. Maintenance of SWPPP: The SWPPP must be maintained and updated as necessary to reflect changes in the construction activities or project conditions. The SWPPP must be kept at the site during construction by the permittee who has operational control of that portion of the construction site.

STORMWATER DISCHARGE DESIGN REQUIREMENTS

1. Erosion and Sediment Control: The contractor must implement erosion and sediment control practices to minimize the amount of soil erosion and sedimentation into surface waters. These practices must be designed to prevent water quality standard exceedances.

2. Stormwater Management: The contractor must design and install stormwater management systems to control the quantity and quality of stormwater runoff. These systems must be designed to prevent water quality standard exceedances.

3. SWPPP Review: The engineer or another designated representative is responsible for reviewing the SWPPP submitted by the contractor. The review must be conducted to ensure that the SWPPP meets the requirements of this SWPPP.

4. SWPPP Submission: The SWPPP must be submitted to the engineer for approval. The SWPPP must be submitted to the engineer at least one week prior to the start of construction activities.

SWPPP ATTACHMENTS (ONLY APPLICABLE IF SITE 1 ACRE OR GREATER)

1. Site Specific SWPPP: The contractor must prepare and maintain a SWPPP for the project which identifies the appropriate erosion and sediment control practices required for the project with the necessary supporting documentation. The SWPPP must be submitted to the engineer and any other relevant authorities for approval. In the event that the contractor fails to follow the approved SWPPP, the engineer shall issue a stop work order and/or additional instructions.

2. SWPPP Review: The engineer or another designated representative is responsible for reviewing the SWPPP submitted by the contractor. The review must be conducted to ensure that the SWPPP meets the requirements of this SWPPP.

3. SWPPP Submission: The SWPPP must be submitted to the engineer for approval. The SWPPP must be submitted to the engineer at least one week prior to the start of construction activities.

CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY REQUIREMENTS

1. Erosion and Sediment Control: The contractor must implement erosion and sediment control practices to minimize the amount of soil erosion and sedimentation into surface waters. These practices must be designed to prevent water quality standard exceedances.

2. Stormwater Management: The contractor must design and install stormwater management systems to control the quantity and quality of stormwater runoff. These systems must be designed to prevent water quality standard exceedances.

3. SWPPP Review: The engineer or another designated representative is responsible for reviewing the SWPPP submitted by the contractor. The review must be conducted to ensure that the SWPPP meets the requirements of this SWPPP.

4. SWPPP Submission: The SWPPP must be submitted to the engineer for approval. The SWPPP must be submitted to the engineer at least one week prior to the start of construction activities.

Supplementary Site Specific Erosion Control Notes:

1. Supplementary Notes: The SWPPP must include any supplementary notes related to erosion and sediment control. These notes must be included in the SWPPP and must be submitted to the engineer for approval.

2. SWPPP Review: The engineer or another designated representative is responsible for reviewing the SWPPP submitted by the contractor. The review must be conducted to ensure that the SWPPP meets the requirements of this SWPPP.

3. SWPPP Submission: The SWPPP must be submitted to the engineer for approval. The SWPPP must be submitted to the engineer at least one week prior to the start of construction activities.

CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY REQUIREMENTS

1. Erosion and Sediment Control: The contractor must implement erosion and sediment control practices to minimize the amount of soil erosion and sedimentation into surface waters. These practices must be designed to prevent water quality standard exceedances.

2. Stormwater Management: The contractor must design and install stormwater management systems to control the quantity and quality of stormwater runoff. These systems must be designed to prevent water quality standard exceedances.

3. SWPPP Review: The engineer or another designated representative is responsible for reviewing the SWPPP submitted by the contractor. The review must be conducted to ensure that the SWPPP meets the requirements of this SWPPP.

4. SWPPP Submission: The SWPPP must be submitted to the engineer for approval. The SWPPP must be submitted to the engineer at least one week prior to the start of construction activities.
PRELIMINARY:

IF YES, A WATER QUALITY VOLUME OF ONE INCH OF RUNOFF FROM THE CUMULATIVE NEW IMPERVIOUS SURFACES MUST BE RETAINED ON SITE (SEE PART III.D OF THE PERMIT) UNLESS PROHIBITED DUE TO:&

IF YES, DESCRIBE HOW FILTER BACKWASH WATER WILL BE MANAGED ON THE SITE OR PROPERLY DISPOSED (SEE PART III.D.3 OF THE PERMIT):

UPON STABILIZATION DESCRIBED ABOVE, THE CONTRACTOR AND OWNER SHALL MUTUALLY TRANSFER THE NPDES PERMIT TO THE NEXT OWNER WITH DOCUMENTS DESCRIBING THE NATURE OF:

2. DESCRIBE PROCEDURES FOR COMPLETING FINAL STABILIZATION AND TERMINATING PERMIT COVERAGE (SEE PART IV.G.1-5):

FINAL STABILIZATION WILL BE ACCOMPLISHED WITH PAVEMENT, SOD AND LANDSCAPE MATERIALS.

· INCLUDE ALL CALCULATIONS AND DESIGN INFORMATION FOR THE METHOD SELECTED. SEE PART III.D. OF THE PERMIT FOR SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH EACH METHOD.

ALL HAZARDOUS WASTE WILL BE APPROPRIATELY DISPOSED OF OFF SITE ACCORDING TO LOCAL AND STATE LAWS.

· 8. IDENTIFY ADJACENT PUBLIC WATERS WHERE THE MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES (DNR) HAS DECLARED "WORK IN WATER RESTRICTIONS" DURING FISH SPAWNING TIMEFRAMES.

BMPS IN APPENDIX A (C.1, C.2, C.3 & C.4-TROUT STREAM) MUST BE ADDED TO THE SWPPP AND IMPLEMENTED. (III.A.7). THE ADDITIONAL BMPS ONLY APPLY TO THOSE PORTIONS OF THE PROJECT THAT DRAIN TO ONE OF THE RECEIVING WATERS.

· 5. IS THE PROJECT LOCATED IN A KARST AREA SUCH THAT ADDITIONAL MEASURES WOULD BE NECESSARY TO PROJECT DRINKING WATER SUPPLY MANAGEMENT AREAS AS DESCRIBED IN MINN. R. CHAPTERS 7050 AND 7060?

· 7. DOES THE SITE DISCHARGE TO A WATER THAT IS LISTED AS IMPAIRED FOR THE FOLLOWING POLLUTANT(S) OR STRESSOR(S): PHOSPHORUS, TURBIDITY, DISSOLVED OXYGEN OR BIOTIC IMPAIRMENT? USE THE SPECIAL AND LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER

· 1. DESCRIBE THE LOCATION AND TYPE OF ALL TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT EROSION PREVENTION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES (BMP’S). INCLUDE THE TIMING FOR INSTALLATION AND PROCEDURES (E.G., MOWING, SEEDING, MULCHING, ETC.) TO REINSTATE NATURAL VEGETATION.

· 2. WILL THE PROJECT INCLUDE USE OF FILTERS FOR BACKWASH WATER?

· 4. DESCRIBE METHODS TO MINIMIZE VEHICLE TRACKING AT CONSTRUCTION EXITS AND STREET SWEEPING ACTIVITIES:

· 6. DESCRIBE METHODS TO BE USED TO MINIMIZE SOIL COMPACTION AND PRESERVE TOP SOIL (UNLESS INFEASIBLE) AT THIS SITE:

· 2. DESCRIBE METHODS OF TEMPORARILY STABILIZING SOILS AND SOIL STOCKPILES (E.G., MULCHES, HYDRAULIC TACKIFIERS, EROSION BLANKETS, ETC.):

· 8. DESCRIBE ADDITIONAL EROSION PREVENTION MEASURES THAT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED AT THE SITE DURING CONSTRUCTION (E.G., CONSTRUCTION PHASING, MINIMIZING SOIL DISTURBANCE, SEED AND MULCH AS WELL AS EROSION CONTROL BLANKETS WILL BE UTILIZED AS NECESSARY

· 9. IF APPLICABLE, INCLUDE ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS IN APPENDIX A PART C.3 REGARDING MAINTAINING A 100-FOOT BUFFER ZONE OR INSTALLING REDUNDANT BMPS FOR PORTIONS OF THE SITE UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF:

· 10. DESCRIBE PRELIMINARY WATER QUALITY VOLUME FOR IMPERVIOUS SURFACES BEFORE BEGINNING CONSTRUCTION OR PROJECT FOR IMPERVIOUS SURFACES THAT WILL BE BUILT AFTER COMPLETION OF THE CONSTRUCTION PERIOD:

· 1. DESCRIBE THE SUMMARY BMPs FOR EACH SPECIFIC AREA OF THE PROJECT.

· 1. SPECIAL WATERS. DOES YOUR PROJECT DISCHARGE TO SPECIAL WATERS?

· 8. DESCRIBE PLANS FOR USE OF SEDIMENTATION TREATMENT CHEMICALS (E.G., POLYMERS, FLOCCULANTS, ETC.) SEE PART IV.C.10 OF THE PERMIT:

· 7. FOR DRAINAGE OR DIVERSION DITCHES, DESCRIBE PRACTICES TO STABILIZE THE NORMAL WETTED PERIMETER WITHIN 200 LINEAL FEET OF THE PROPERTY EDGE OR POINT OF DISCHARGE TO POST CONSTRUCTION AREA OF IMPERVIOUS SURFACE:

· 4. DESCRIBE METHODS TO MINIMIZE VEHICLE TRACKING AT CONSTRUCTION EXITS AND STREET SWEEPING ACTIVITIES:

· 6. DESCRIBE METHODS TO BE USED TO MINIMIZE SOIL COMPACTION AND PRESERVE TOP SOIL (UNLESS INFEASIBLE) AT THIS SITE:

· 2. DESCRIBE METHODS OF TEMPORARILY STABILIZING SOILS AND SOIL STOCKPILES (E.G., MULCHES, HYDRAULIC TACKIFIERS, EROSION BLANKETS, ETC.):

· 8. DESCRIBE ADDITIONAL EROSION PREVENTION MEASURES THAT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED AT THE SITE DURING CONSTRUCTION (E.G., CONSTRUCTION PHASING, MINIMIZING SOIL DISTURBANCE, SEED AND MULCH AS WELL AS EROSION CONTROL BLANKETS WILL BE UTILIZED AS NECESSARY

· 9. IF APPLICABLE, INCLUDE ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS IN APPENDIX A PART C.3 REGARDING MAINTAINING A 100-FOOT BUFFER ZONE OR INSTALLING REDUNDANT BMPS FOR PORTIONS OF THE SITE UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF:

· 10. DESCRIBE PRELIMINARY WATER QUALITY VOLUME FOR IMPERVIOUS SURFACES BEFORE BEGINNING CONSTRUCTION OR PROJECT FOR IMPERVIOUS SURFACES THAT WILL BE BUILT AFTER COMPLETION OF THE CONSTRUCTION PERIOD:

· 1. DESCRIBE THE SUMMARY BMPs FOR EACH SPECIFIC AREA OF THE PROJECT.

· 8. DESCRIBE PLANS FOR USE OF SEDIMENTATION TREATMENT CHEMICALS (E.G., POLYMERS, FLOCCULANTS, ETC.) SEE PART IV.C.10 OF THE PERMIT:

· 7. FOR DRAINAGE OR DIVERSION DITCHES, DESCRIBE PRACTICES TO STABILIZE THE NORMAL WETTED PERIMETER WITHIN 200 LINEAL FEET OF THE PROPERTY EDGE OR POINT OF DISCHARGE TO POST CONSTRUCTION AREA OF IMPERVIOUS SURFACE:

· 4. DESCRIBE METHODS TO MINIMIZE VEHICLE TRACKING AT CONSTRUCTION EXITS AND STREET SWEEPING ACTIVITIES:

· 6. DESCRIBE METHODS TO BE USED TO MINIMIZE SOIL COMPACTION AND PRESERVE TOP SOIL (UNLESS INFEASIBLE) AT THIS SITE:

· 2. DESCRIBE METHODS OF TEMPORARILY STABILIZING SOILS AND SOIL STOCKPILES (E.G., MULCHES, HYDRAULIC TACKIFIERS, EROSION BLANKETS, ETC.):

· 8. DESCRIBE ADDITIONAL EROSION PREVENTION MEASURES THAT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED AT THE SITE DURING CONSTRUCTION (E.G., CONSTRUCTION PHASING, MINIMIZING SOIL DISTURBANCE, SEED AND MULCH AS WELL AS EROSION CONTROL BLANKETS WILL BE UTILIZED AS NECESSARY

· 9. IF APPLICABLE, INCLUDE ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS IN APPENDIX A PART C.3 REGARDING MAINTAINING A 100-FOOT BUFFER ZONE OR INSTALLING REDUNDANT BMPS FOR PORTIONS OF THE SITE UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF:

· 10. DESCRIBE PRELIMINARY WATER QUALITY VOLUME FOR IMPERVIOUS SURFACES BEFORE BEGINNING CONSTRUCTION OR PROJECT FOR IMPERVIOUS SURFACES THAT WILL BE BUILT AFTER COMPLETION OF THE CONSTRUCTION PERIOD:

· 1. DESCRIBE THE SUMMARY BMPs FOR EACH SPECIFIC AREA OF THE PROJECT.

· 8. DESCRIBE PLANS FOR USE OF SEDIMENTATION TREATMENT CHEMICALS (E.G., POLYMERS, FLOCCULANTS, ETC.) SEE PART IV.C.10 OF THE PERMIT:

· 7. FOR DRAINAGE OR DIVERSION DITCHES, DESCRIBE PRACTICES TO STABILIZE THE NORMAL WETTED PERIMETER WITHIN 200 LINEAL FEET OF THE PROPERTY EDGE OR POINT OF DISCHARGE TO POST CONSTRUCTION AREA OF IMPERVIOUS SURFACE:

· 4. DESCRIBE METHODS TO MINIMIZE VEHICLE TRACKING AT CONSTRUCTION EXITS AND STREET SWEEPING ACTIVITIES:

· 6. DESCRIBE METHODS TO BE USED TO MINIMIZE SOIL COMPACTION AND PRESERVE TOP SOIL (UNLESS INFEASIBLE) AT THIS SITE:

· 2. DESCRIBE METHODS OF TEMPORARILY STABILIZING SOILS AND SOIL STOCKPILES (E.G., MULCHES, HYDRAULIC TACKIFIERS, EROSION BLANKETS, ETC.):

· 8. DESCRIBE ADDITIONAL EROSION PREVENTION MEASURES THAT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED AT THE SITE DURING CONSTRUCTION (E.G., CONSTRUCTION PHASING, MINIMIZING SOIL DISTURBANCE, SEED AND MULCH AS WELL AS EROSION CONTROL BLANKETS WILL BE UTILIZED AS NECESSARY

· 9. IF APPLICABLE, INCLUDE ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS IN APPENDIX A PART C.3 REGARDING MAINTAINING A 100-FOOT BUFFER ZONE OR INSTALLING REDUNDANT BMPS FOR PORTIONS OF THE SITE UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF:

· 10. DESCRIBE PRELIMINARY WATER QUALITY VOLUME FOR IMPERVIOUS SURFACES BEFORE BEGINNING CONSTRUCTION OR PROJECT FOR IMPERVIOUS SURFACES THAT WILL BE BUILT AFTER COMPLETION OF THE CONSTRUCTION PERIOD:

· 1. DESCRIBE THE SUMMARY BMPs FOR EACH SPECIFIC AREA OF THE PROJECT.

· 8. DESCRIBE PLANS FOR USE OF SEDIMENTATION TREATMENT CHEMICALS (E.G., POLYMERS, FLOCCULANTS, ETC.) SEE PART IV.C.10 OF THE PERMIT:

· 7. FOR DRAINAGE OR DIVERSION DITCHES, DESCRIBE PRACTICES TO STABILIZE THE NORMAL WETTED PERIMETER WITHIN 200 LINEAL FEET OF THE PROPERTY EDGE OR POINT OF DISCHARGE TO POST CONSTRUCTION AREA OF IMPERVIOUS SURFACE:
**SW1.5**

THE PERMITTEE(S) IS/ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE INSPECTION AND MAINTENANCE OF TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT BMP'S AS WELL AS EROSION PREVENTION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL BMP'S UNTIL THIS INSPECTION CHECKLIST IS AN OPTION FOR SMALL CONSTRUCTION SITES. LARGE CONSTRUCTION SITES AND LINEAR PROJECTS REQUIRE MORE EXTENSIVE/MORE LOCATION SPECIFIC INSPECTION REQUIREMENTS.

### DISCLOSURES:

1. 
2. 
3. 

### ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>REVISION SUMMARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE SWPPP:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ISSUE/SUBMITTAL SUMMARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IS THE SITE WITHIN ONE AERIAL MILE OF A SPECIAL OR IMPARED WATER?</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IS THE INSPECTOR CERTIFIED IN SEDIMENT AND EROSION CONTROL AND IS IT DOCUMENTED IN THE STORMWATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN (SWPPP)?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WERE ANY DISCHARGES SEEN DURING THIS INSPECTION, SEDIMENT, WATER, OR OTHERWISE?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILL A PERMANENT WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM BE UTILIZED IN THIS PROJECT AS REQUIRED AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH PART II.E. OF THE PERMIT DESCRIPTION?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SWPPP - ATTACHMENTS

**ATTACHMENT B: SWPPP INSPECTION FORM**

**ATTACHMENT C: MAINTENANCE PLAN FOR PERMANENT STORM WATER TREATMENT SYSTEM**
UNIT A2.1
1,600 SQ FT.

WELLNESS CENTER
1,600 SQ FT.

PARKING - 56 CARS

MAKERS SPACE

CHARGING STATION
NORTH ELEVATION
SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"

WEST ELEVATION
SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"
January 13, 2022

Hi All,

Thank you for your careful consideration of our neighborhood opposition to the Artesa development. We hope you have had the opportunity to read all of our letters and petition comments. While we recognize the efforts that the Developer made to partially mitigate one of the issues outlined by the neighbors, specifically the height, we still feel the proposal falls short of satisfying the criteria outlined by the planning commission and in the Comprehensive plan for 2040. Our support remains with the creation of affordable senior homes and maintaining a green step city. The modified proposal by the developer does little to change our opposition and we concur with the planning commission's original recommendation of denial to rezone at this time. We would like to see what developments occur in the Optum space first, possibly providing homes, businesses and a public access route via Douglas for potential future proposals of development on the Country Club land.

Points:

1. Affordability: GV Median property value is $399K. Retirees from Golden Valley are unlikely to downsize in retirement only to upscale their mortgage to $700K+.
2. Impact to property values - 3 realtors were questioned and provided informal analysis of impacts on home values in the immediate neighborhood and assessed neighborhood values will drop from 5-10%. Will reassessment of home values be included in the analysis?
3. Green step city: The developer did not confirm their materials or builds were LEED and could not guarantee any efforts to save the legacy trees.
4. Two large builds in a short period of time over 2 years – The Club is concerned about loss of revenue over 1 summer generated from the range, many in this neighborhood work from home, are there concerns for the 2 years + impacts to our neighborhood with increased pollution, noise, and traffic?
5. Industrial equipment on a residential street - Will assessment of potential street damage be levied on the developer or residents? Many of the homes are very old with very old sewage systems, will potential vibrational damages be levied against the developer?
6. The comparison made between a large apartment complex to a small bar deck - The deck requested was supported by the wider neighborhood to help a small historic business survive a pandemic. You cannot compare a multi-million-dollar development on a private golf club to a public bar near downtown Golden Valley. The traffic from the bar generally heads out to Rhode Island and an already congested intersection and not into our residential neighborhood (we walk).
7. Potential solutions? The Optum build be dealt with first and will hopefully provide jobs, homes and an access road for potential future proposed builds on the Country Club grounds and leave the bike path intact.
We truly hope you will pause to consider the wider impacts to our small neighborhood, many of us have put our life savings into restoring these old homes and have more to lose than a game. We hope to have your support.

Suzanne Forward
6745 Country Club Drive