1. Call to order – Roll Call

2. Approval of Minutes: July 17, 2019; August 7, 2019; and October 2, 2019

3. Hearings
   A. Zoning ordinance regarding ground floor, street facing, commercial window transparency requirements
      Applicant: City of St. Louis Park
      Case No.: 18-70-ZA

4. Other Business

5. Communications

6. Adjournment

**STUDY SESSION**

1. Rezoning C-2 General Commercial properties to C-1 Neighborhood Commercial (20 min.)

2. Parkway Residences development and environmental assessment worksheet (30 min.)

If you cannot attend the meeting, please call the Community Development office, 952.924.2575.

Auxiliary aids for individuals with disabilities are available upon request. To make arrangements, please call the administration department at 952/924-2525 (TDD 952/924-2518) at least 96 hours in advance of meeting.
STUDY SESSION

The study session commenced at 6 p.m.

1. Sam’s Club land use and development study

Laura Chamberlain, consulting planned with HKGi, presented on the background research, site and environmental analysis, land use and development scenarios that were explored, criteria for evaluating the scenarios, the city council’s policy direction, and the ultimate study recommendations. The mixed-use redevelopment scenario was most favored by the majority of the city councilmembers because the potential jobs and housing mix best supported and took full advantage of the future LRT station. Although, the 6 of the 7 city councilmembers still wanted future development to focus on housing and affordable housing on the site.

Ms. Chamberlain shared that the planning commission will be holding the public hearing and make recommendations on three proposed action items at their August 21, 2019 meeting. The plan recommended amending the comprehensive plan future land use designation from commercial to transit-oriented development.

The plan recommended changing the zoning from General Commercial (C-2) to Business Park (BP) on the north side of the site and High Density Residential (RC) on the south side of the site. Finally, the plan recommended creating a definition for self-storage facility that distinguishes it from warehouse/storage uses and restricting self-storage facilities to industrial properties.

Ms. Chamberlain also shared the input received at a recent neighborhood meeting held on the subject of the land use and zoning amendments.
Chair Eckholm stated that he favored the multi-family residential redevelopment scenario.

Commissioner Erwin concurred with the Chair. She also asked about the potential environmental justice consideration of having housing and especially affordable housing located on a site where there is contamination.

Mr. Walther noted that similar concerns were raised councilmembers Harris and Mavity. Public health and safety would absolutely need to be protected both during construction activities and long-term for any employees, residents or visitors to the site. There are effective ways to do this and other similarly contaminated sites have successfully redeveloped in the city.

Chair Eckholm stated he wanted an emphasis on pedestrian oriented design throughout the site and connections to pedestrian networks around the site. With that, to make sure that conflict points between vehicles and pedestrians on the site were minimized, with pedestrians getting the priority in design.

Chair Eckholm was concerned about splitting the zoning of the site, because it might mean the reuse of the building could leave the remainder of the site unused for a while, or could mean that any residential buildings put in there would have to look down on an old, unused building.

Commissioner Erwin stated mini-storage on the site would not be appropriate.

2. Planning Commissioner training with City Attorney

Commissioner received a presentation from City Attorney Soren Mattick. The training and resource materials covered several topics as an introduction for new commissioners and a refresher for seasoned commissioners. Topics included role of the planning commission, open meeting law, conflicts of interest, developing defensible findings of fact, and conduct of public hearings.

3. Ground Floor Window Transparency

Mr. Walther introduced the topic. He noted the commission discussed this topic previously in 2018 and at a joint meeting with the city council in 2019. The commission had not yet come to any agreement on a few points in the proposed ordinance. Also, he noted three new members joined the commission recently.
He said the city council wants to require window transparency for ground floor commercial uses; particularly for high pedestrian areas and ground floor retail. He asked for the commission’s guidance on how staff could edit the ordinance satisfy the commissioners remaining concerns.

The discussion included the importance and challenges of providing flexibility in the code in order to allow developers, property owners or businesses to both meet the intent and still meet their business needs. Balancing the desire for transparency and the business need for privacy in some situations.

The discussion also focused on when property owners would be required to comply with the new rules.

Commissioners also discussed the scope of the requirements, including the districts and types of buildings and uses.

Mr. Walther shared an email that was received by Commissioner Robertson who suggested edits to reduce the minimum transparency requirements. He stated that while the city’s desired percentages may be higher, the city regulations should not set too high of a minimum requirement.

Commissioners also asked staff to review the amount of window area that could be covered by signs. There were concerns the maximum amount may be too low.

4. Inclusionary housing zoning code amendment

There was no discussion on this item. Mr. Walther provided an update to Commissioners regarding recent changes to the Inclusionary Housing policy and that staff intended to add some of the new policy requirements to the zoning code to bolster the new policy.

The meeting adjourned at 9 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sean Walther
Planning and Zoning Supervisor
UNOFFICIAL MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION STUDY SESSION
ST. LOUIS PARK, MINNESOTA
AUGUST 7, 2019 – 6:00 p.m.
COUNCIL CHAMBERS

MEMBERS PRESENT:  Jim Beneke; Lynette Dumalag; Carl Robertson; Courtney Erwin; Claudia Johnston-Madison

MEMBERS ABSENT:  Matt Eckholm; Jessica Kraft

STAFF PRESENT:  Sean Walther; Michael Sund; Meg McMonigal; Lauren Michaels; Marney Olson; Brian Hoffman

GUESTS PRESENT:  Environment and Sustainability Commission

STUDY SESSION

1. Communications

Sean Walther shared on Monday August 5, the city council approved on the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. The council also reviewed the first reading of the ordinance for the Comprehensive Rezoning, which rezones 72 parcels and approval was recommended without any amendments. So, August 19 it is expected to go for a second reading for consent.

Mr. Walther explained there will be a neighborhood meeting held for the Sam’s Club for people that are within 500 feet of the property on Thursday, August 8 at the Municipal Service Center from 6:15 – 7:30 p.m. to go over the presentation that was shown at the planning commission previously as an informational item along with the specifics of the comprehensive plan amendment, to transit oriented development and the rezoning from general commercial (C-2) to a mixture of business park (BP) and high density multiple family residential (RC). This will help prepare for the public hearing that is planned for August 21 with the planning commission.

Tuesday, August 13 will be a planning workshop for the Texa-Tonka small area plan, this is the second workshop. It would be from 6:00 – 7:30 p.m. at Lennox Community Center.

Mr. Walther then did a staff update and explained community development intern Akua Opoku resigned and her last day was Tuesday, August 6, and Jacquelyn Kramer will return in about 12 days from her leave of absence.
A preview was given for the next Planning Commissions agenda on August 21. The Sam’s Club, Public Hearing will be on there and the C1 Zoning District Amendments, which restricts the size of retail. There may be a Study Session regarding Parking Overlay for the Historic Walker Lake District.

Mr. Walther said he is anticipating an environmental assessment worksheet to be submitted to the City for review and comments related to future phases of the Parkway 25 development, as they have additional phases, they would like to build out over the next few years.

2. Elections

Elections Specialist, Michael Sund went over the outreach plan and how rank choice voting works and explains how, having it discussed among all the Boards and Commissions will help increase turnout and participation in elections. Michael also spoke about the Ambassador Program, which is for anybody who is a community leader, someone who can be a resource for people within the community. Michael went into detail on what rank choice voting is and how it works. He explained you do not have to vote for multiple people, but its best that you do in case the first person you voted for doesn’t win the first round. In order to win the first round is if the applicant wins over 50% of votes.

3. Efficient Buildings Ordinance Presentation

The Environment and Sustainability Commission was also in attendance for this item.

Mr. Hoffman explained the presentation being shown tonight will also be presented to business owners in September for public outreach. And have this ordinance brought to City Council in October for first and second reading to become adopted, by the end of the year.

Katie Jones, with the Center of Energy and Environment began the presentation. She described how the presentation is about what benchmarking is and the framework happening around the ordinance. Benchmarking is a lot like MPG for buildings, it also brings together two silos of information for a building; one is the meter consumption silo which includes: electricity, natural gas, steam or hot water and the water consumption which brings together the type of construction the building is.

Commissioner asked how the energy is measured.
Ms. Jones explained it is measured by a special tool called the Energy Start Measure Portfolio it is provided by the EPA.

Ms. Jones says Cities who have saved between 1 to 3 percent annually and a total of 7% in the first year.

Commissioner Johnston-Madison asked what the average cost might be for the business owners to get started.

Ms. Jones responded it’s about 4 to 10 hours for the setup and ongoing would it would be up to 3 hours in subsequent years. This is what is typical for Minneapolis currently who has been doing this for about 5 years. There are no fees, so the cost is in staff time to track and enter the data.

4. New housing policies and programs overview, including fair housing update

Marney Olson shared information with the planning commission regarding the city’s fair housing policy update which clarifies which staff person at the city will be designated as the fair housing official. That person will be the human rights commission staff liaison. The fair housing official will help refer people to appropriate agency at the State or Federal government to file a formal complaint. Another element of the policy update is to provide fair housing training to staff and training opportunities for area rental property owners and managers about who is protected under the fair housing regulations and how they are protected. The last component is data collection regarding new housing development. These updates are required as a condition of grants.

Ms. Olson also shared information about the city’s compliance processes for the city’s inclusionary housing policy. She shared that the policy is available on the city website under housing and affordable housing. The policy was recently amended to include a 1 for 1 replacement when naturally occurring affordable housing is being removed as part of a development, and requires development that request a planned unit development or a comprehensive plan amendment to comply with the inclusionary housing policy. She described the guidebook, the initial meetings staff hold with the property management, staff review of files to verify compliance with both tenant income qualifications and rent being charged. If the development is a tax credit project, they can substitute the tax credit certification to demonstrate compliance.

Commissioner Robertson asked what happens when a tenant’s income increases. Ms. Olson responded that is addressed in guidebook and policy, and it is consistent with tax credits regulations. If qualified a tenant qualified when they began renting the unit, their
income can increase to up to 140% of eligible income limits. If that higher income has been sustained a period of time, then that tenant would no longer be eligible to continue to receive the reduce rent.

Commissioner Robertson asked if a property owner switched the rental unit that is subsidized in order to avoid making a tenant move. Ms. Olson responded, yes, there is flexibility to do so if the unit meets the requirements and property manager/owner wants to handle it in that way.

Ms. Olson shifted the presentation to the tenant protection ordinance for naturally occurring affordable units. Marney described the process that led to this proposal. If sell property and meet the definition of NOAH, the there is a 3-month period where tenants are given a notice of any rental rate changes or non-renew leases. If less notice is provided, then the new property owner is required to pay relocation expenses for the tenants that are displaced. This give the tenants more time to identify a new place to live that meets their needs.

Ms. Olson also shared information about the new established local housing trust fund which will be funded by the Housing and redevelopment authority (HRA) levy can be used for grants or loans, rehabs, financing of housing. While the policy is in place, there is not yet any funds collected and available, yet. It is expected that in 2020 the city will prepare for how to best direct those funds. The fund would also be able to accept donations from other sources to fund activities.

Commissioner Dumalog asked if the city does work with a land bank to preserve sites for affordable housing. Although the economic development authority has acquired sites for future affordable housing development and in that way behaved similar to a land bank’s approach.

Commissioner Robertson asked if affordable housing is taking precedence over previously goals of filling a gap in larger houses for families. Ms. Olson stated that affordable housing is the top priority, but the city continues housing programs to incentive rehabilitation and expansions of single-family houses in the Move Up in the Park loan and assistance program. That is still allowed, even if the result is that that house becomes less affordable.

Other programs described were the 4d program, multiple-family rental rehabilitation loan program, Kids in the Park rental program, down payment assistance program, and the addition of 15 family unification vouchers and 8 mainstream vouchers this year which allowed the city to serve more people. She shared that the new housing policies and programs overview are all detailed in the city’s annual housing activities report, which is also available on the city website.
The study session adjourned at 8 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elena Roberts
Recording Secretary
MEMBERS PRESENT: Jim Beneke, Lynette Dumalag, Matt Eckholm, Courtney Erwin, Jessica Kraft, Carl Robertson. Youth member Alanna Franklin.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Claudia Johnston-Madison

STAFF PRESENT: Jacquelyn Kramer, Jennifer Monson, Sean Walther

GUESTS PRESENT: Rita Trapp, consulting planner with HKGi

STUDY SESSION

The study session commenced at 6:00 p.m.

1. Accessory dwelling units

Rita Trapp, consulting planner with HKGi, provided background on accessory dwelling units (ADU). She noted this is a strategic priority of the council related to housing, and the planning commission will be asked to provide feedback to staff on the proposed zoning amendment and the provided policy questions.

Ms. Trapp noted the goals of the city related to ADUs, including that they offer a continuum of diverse lifecycle housing choices suitable for households of all income levels including, but not limited to affordable, senior, multi-generational, supportive and mixed income housing, disbursed throughout the city. She added ADUs can be attached, detached or within the existing housing, and the city is interested in providing all three types.

Commissioner Dumalag asked about how ADUs fit into the comprehensive plan, and how they align, what limitations are and a discussion about how to deal with this would be helpful also.

Chair Eckholm stated a discussion of best practices on ADUs would be helpful also, so as to balance regulations, and not have an ongoing need for variances.

Commissioner Robertson asked when a single-family dwelling with an ADU becomes a duplex.
Sean Walther, senior planner, stated an ADU is typically smaller than the original unit, and added later, whereas a duplex is larger. There will be distinguishing features of an ADU, and it will fall under a certain category in the code.

Commissioner Robertson asked if an ADU exists and is rented out, will the city need to be notified and will the owner need to be licensed.

Mr. Walther stated this will need to be determined, and if the unit is not owner occupied. He added a registration of land use might be needed, and how this will be navigated remains to be seen.

Commissioner Eckholm stated he would like to see a contingency plan in place for owner occupancy duplexes, where the owner moves out, and the ADU is still being rented. He would like to discuss the possibility of two different tracks being utilized in a case like this.

Commissioner Dumalag had a question on sale, and if a parcel could be split in two and sold.

Mr. Walther stated that would be a subdivision and that would be possible, if the owner could meet the minimums and not create non-conformities, then it could work.

Commissioner Kraft stated she felt it would not be necessary for the owner to occupy the dwelling, with ADUs.

Commissioner Erwin asked about Airbnb or VRBO rentals.

Mr. Walther stated these short-term rentals are not currently allowed in the city, but this could be better defined in the code. He added a number of policies within the code will be coming up for discussion and will need to be addressed by the commission in the near future.

Commissioner Robertson stated the impact to neighborhoods will be important to consider and asked if resident approval will be needed for ADUs, or if licensing will be needed.

Ms. Trapp noted other areas for discussion include size of ADUs.
Commissioner Eckholm said there is potential for many ADUs in two-story garages, but he has concerns this might push past size limits set and would there be teardowns and new structures built.

Commissioner Robertson stated he does not think this would be a concern, but a mechanism should be in place for variances to be addressed.

Ms. Trapp asked if the 300 – 800 square foot size of ADUs is appropriate.

The commissioners discussed and agreed the square foot size was appropriate, as well as the square footage limit for 4 people.

Ms. Trapp asked the commissioners about off-street parking, stating that currently two off-street parking spaces are allowed now. Ms. Trapp noted council directs and staff recommends there be no additional off-street parking.

The commissioners discussed this issue and noted if an ADU was added to a dwelling, and if the code might have a limit in any additional off-street parking – this could be a cause for concern.

Ms. Trapp asked the commissioners about design, and if there should be limits to design elements with an ADU.

The commissioners had a few concerns with exterior stairways, windows and extra doors. Commissioner Robertson added the current regulations should remain in place, and there should be no special additional design elements for ADUs.

Commissioner Eckholm preferred no additional stairways.

Commissioner Kraft stated if additional stairs are in scale or not out of place, they could work fine.

Ms. Trapp asked the commissioners about ADU scale and massing, height, setbacks and impervious surface limitations.

Commissioner Eckholm added the setback of the structure would need to be further back, if the structure were built taller than allowed.

Commissioner Kraft added a ratio might need to be developed related to setback and height.
Commissioner Eckholm noted also there should be a path to the ADU also, so as not to walk through a yard to get to the ADU.

Mr. Walther stated the final draft will go to the planning commission in November or December of 2019, and to city council by the end of December.

2. Texa Tonka small area plan

Jennifer Monson, planner, presented the report. She noted many of the commercial properties located near the Texas Avenue and Minnetonka Boulevard area, have been owned by the same property group for many decades. This ownership group has decided they will divest many of the commercially zoned properties in Texa-Tonka in the coming years.

Ms. Monson stated a survey of area residents was conducted with over 800 responses, along with two neighborhood meetings. Ms. Monson added the planning process will continue with more public input adding it will conclude in December.

Commissioner Kraft asked if this plan takes into account any short-term planning.

Ms. Monson stated yes, noting there will be many aesthetic upgrades during the short term.

Commissioner Beneke stated he hoped there would be more outdoor seating at restaurants in the Texa Tonka area.

Ms. Monson noted that was a desire of many and was noted in the survey responses as well.

Mr. Walther added the commissioners are invited to complete the survey as well.

3. 2020 Census

The commissioners had no concerns about the 2020 census at this time.

Mr. Walther stated in the interest of time, the 2020 census topic will be added to a future study session agenda.

Mr. Walther noted a future study session topic will include C1 and C2 rezoning.

The meeting was adjourned at 8 p.m.
3A.  Zoning guidelines for ground floor street facing transparency requirements

Location:  C-1, C-2, and retail, service and restaurant uses in the O and BP districts

Case Number:  18-70-ZA

Applicant:  City of St. Louis Park

Recommended motions:

- Chair to close public hearing.
- Motion to recommend approval of the Zoning Ordinance Amendment pertaining to Section 36-4 Definitions and Section 36-366 Architectural Design to establish transparency requirements for ground floor street facing facades in the C-1 and C-2 Districts, and retail, service, and restaurant uses in the O and BP Districts.

Summary of request:  The city proposes an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance to Section 36-366 to establish transparency requirements for ground floor street facing facades in the C-1 and C-2 Districts, and retail, service, and restaurant uses in the O and BP Districts, and to Section 36-4 Definitions to define transparency.

Background:  In summer 2018, city council directed staff and the planning commission to consider zoning standards for ground floor window transparency to increase vibrancy along the city’s commercial streets. The planning commission and city council have since discussed the importance of ground floor transparency requirements and have provided feedback on a draft ordinance during several study sessions.

The city has regulated the amount of ground floor transparency in planned unit developments to increase the interaction between the internal spaces of a building with the public realm. One of the city’s goals is to allow people inside buildings to easily observe street life and improve public safety. Ground floor transparency regulations are particularly important in areas where there is high pedestrian traffic, as transparency can help create a vibrant and safer street. Ground floor windows and transparent doors may also strengthen the commercial viability of a use by attracting customers and adding to the enjoyment of the pedestrian’s experience on the street.

In January 2019 the planning commission voted 6 to 0 to recommend denial of the ordinance, prompting a joint meeting between the planning commission and city council to discuss the intent of the ordinance and planning commission’s recommendation. The planning commission met in June and September to discuss the ordinance and recommended a minimum ground floor transparency of 50 percent on the façade along the front of the building.

The attached draft ordinance responds to feedback from the planning commission and city council. The intent of the ordinance is to be flexible, especially for small businesses and existing buildings, yet provide for a safe and active pedestrian realm and vibrant streets.

The limitations on window paintings and window signs that are included in the ordinance would be applied to all businesses, existing and new in the districts listed above. The remainder of the
ordinance would be applied when upgrades and renovations to buildings occur. The regulations establishing a minimum percentage of transparency on the front and side street facing facades does not apply to existing buildings. This requirement will be enforced on all new buildings and buildings which expand the gross floor area of the building by more than 50 percent.

**Recommendations:** Staff recommends approval of the attached amendment to the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to definitions and architectural design.

**Supporting documents:** Ground floor transparency ordinance draft

Map of areas affected

**Prepared by:** Jennifer Monson, Planner

**Reviewed by:** Sean Walther, Planning and Zoning Supervisor
Ordinance No. ___-19

Ordinance relating to Section 36-4 Definitions and Section 36-366 Architectural Design to establish transparency requirements for ground floor street facing facades in the C-1 and C-2 Districts, and retail, service, and restaurant uses in the O and BP Districts

The City of St. Louis Park does ordain:

Section 1. The City Council has considered the advice and recommendation of the Planning Commission (Case No. 18-70-ZA).

Section 2. Sections of Chapter 36 of the St. Louis Park City Code are hereby amended by adding underscored text and deleting strikethrough text. Section breaks are represented by ***.

CHAPTER 36
ZONING

Section 36-4 Definitions

************

Ground Floor Transparency means the measurement of the percentage of a facade that has highly transparent, low reflectance windows at the pedestrian level, measured between 2’ and 8’ above grade.

************

36-366 Architectural design

**

(b) Standards.

**

(3) Ground floor transparency.

a. The following façade design guidelines shall be applicable to all ground floor street-facing facades in the C-1 and C-2 Districts, and retail, service, and restaurant uses in O and BP Districts:

i. Window paintings and signage shall cover no more than 10 percent of the total window and door area.

ii. Visibility into the space shall be maintained for a minimum depth of three (3) feet. Display of merchandise is allowed within this three (3) feet.
iii. Interior storage areas, utility closets and trash areas shall not be visible from the exterior of the building.

iv. No more than 10 percent of total window and door area shall be glass block, mirrored, spandrel, frosted or other opaque glass, finishes or material including window painting and signs. The remaining 90 percent of window and door area shall be highly transparent, low reflectance windows with a minimum 60 percent transmittance factor and a reflectance factor of not greater than 0.25.

v. For all new buildings constructed after January 1, 2019, and existing buildings which expand the gross square footage of the building by more than 50 percent, the minimum ground floor transparency shall be 50 percent on the front façade, and 20 percent on all other ground floor street facing facades.

vi. The city acknowledges a degree of flexibility may be necessary to adjust to unique situations. Alternatives that provide an increase in pedestrian vibrancy and street safety including but not limited to public art and pedestrian scale amenities may be considered and may be approved by the Zoning Administrator, unless the development application requires approval by City Council, in which case the City Council shall approve the alternate transparency plan.

(3)(4) Additions and accessory structures. The exterior wall surface materials, roof treatment, colors, textures, major divisions, proportion, rhythm of openings, and general architectural character, including horizontal or vertical emphasis, scale, stylistic features of additions, exterior alterations, and new accessory buildings shall address and respect the original architectural design and general appearance of the principal buildings on the site and shall comply with the requirements of this section.

(4)(5) Screening.

a. The visual impact of rooftop equipment shall be minimized using one of the following methods. Where rooftop equipment is located on buildings and is visible within 400 feet from property in an R district, only the items listed in subsections 1 and 2 shall be used.

1. A parapet wall.
2. A fence the height of which extends at least one foot above the top of the rooftop equipment and incorporates the architectural features of the building.
3. The rooftop equipment shall be painted to match the roof or the sky, whichever is most effective.

b. Utility service structures (such as utility meters, utility lines, transformers, aboveground tanks); refuse handling; loading docks; maintenance structures; and other ancillary equipment must be inside a building or be entirely screened from off-site views utilizing a privacy fence or wall that is at least six feet in height. A chain link fence with slats shall not be accepted as screening.

c. All utility services shall be underground except as provided elsewhere in this chapter.

(5)(6) Parking ramps. All new parking ramps shall meet the following design standards:

a. Parking ramp facades that are visible from off the site shall display an integration of building materials, building form, textures, architectural motif, and building colors with the principal building.
b. No signs other than directional signs shall be permitted on parking ramp facades.

c. If the parking ramp is located within 20 feet of a street right-of-way or recreational trail, the facade facing the street shall be subject to the same requirements for exterior surface materials as for buildings.

(6)(7) Awnings and canopies.

a. Awnings and Canopies.

1. Construction. Awnings and canopies shall have noncombustible frames. If an awning can be collapsed, retracted or folded, the design shall be such that the awning does not block any required exit.

2. Projection. Awnings and canopies less than 25 feet in width may extend up to two feet from the face of the nearest curb line measured horizontally.

3. Clearance. All portions of any awning and canopy shall provide at least eight feet of clearance or any walkway and twelve feet of clearance over any driveway or roadway.

4. Supports. Canopy posts or other supports located within a public right-of-way or easement shall be placed in a location approved by the city engineer.

b. Permit required. A building permit shall be issued prior to the installation of any awning or canopy. In addition to the building permit, an encroachment agreement shall be issued by the city engineer prior to the installation of any awning or canopy that extends into, upon or over any street or alley right-of-way, park or other public property. The encroachment agreement shall include provisions that hold the owner of the awning or canopy liable to the city for any damage which may result to any person or property by reason of such encroachment or the removal of such encroachment. Additional conditions may be imposed on encroachment permits to protect the health, safety or welfare of the public or to protect nearby property owners from hardship or damage or to protect other public interests as determined by the city engineer.

c. Submission requirements. The following information shall be submitted prior to the installation of an awning or canopy.

1. Application form and fee. A separate fee shall be required for the building permit and encroachment agreement.

2. Dimensioned and scaled site plan and building elevations.

3. Four sets of drawings for each awning or canopy proposed.

d. Projections to be safe. All such projections over public property shall be structurally safe, shall be kept in a safe condition and state of repair consistent with the design thereof and repaired when necessary in the opinion of the city engineer or building official by and at the expense of the person having ownership or control of the building from which they project.

e. Removal upon order. The owner of an awning or canopy, any part of which projects into, upon, over or under any public property shall upon being ordered to do so by the city engineer remove at once any part or all of such encroachment and shall restore the right-of-way to a safe condition. Such removal and restoration of the right-of-way will be at the sole expense of the property owner. The city may, upon failure of the property owner
to remove the encroachment as ordered, remove the encroachment, and the reasonable
costs of removing such encroachment incurred by the city shall be billed and levied
against the property as a special assessment.

Section 3. This ordinance shall take effect (December 13, 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Reading</td>
<td>November 4, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Reading</td>
<td>November 18, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Publication</td>
<td>November 28, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Ordinance</td>
<td>December 13, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviewed for administration: Adopted by the City Council (November 18, 2019)

Thomas K. Harmening, City Manager

Jake Spano, Mayor

Attest: Approved as to form and execution:

Melissa Kennedy, City Clerk

Soren Mattick, City Attorney
Ground floor transparency ordinance

Zoning districts affected

Legend

- C-1 Neighborhood Commercial
- C-2 General Commercial
- BP Business Park (retail, service, & restaurant uses only)
- O Office (retail, service, & restaurant uses only)

Source: Community Development 2019
1. Rezoning C-2 General Commercial properties to C-1 Neighborhood Commercial

Case Number: 19-26-ZA
Applicant: Initiated by the community development department
Review Deadline: 60 days: N/A 120 days: N/A
Recommended motions: No action requested. Staff will present the proposed rezoning and ask for comments and direction.

Summary of request: The city council, on February 20, 2018, directed staff to consider options for limiting the size of businesses within commercial districts. Their interest was in part to avoid big box and junior box stores and similar commercial buildings in certain areas of the city, and to promote smaller businesses. Staff facilitated several discussions in study sessions with the planning commission and city council which resulted in the following recommendations:

1. Rezone several properties that are zoned C-2 General Commercial to another zoning district that is consistent with the approved 2040 Comprehensive Plan future land use designation. This step was completed on August 19, 2019.

2. Process an amendment to the C-1 Neighborhood Commercial zoning district to establish maximum size limits for retail and service uses. This amendment was completed on September 16, 2019, and the amendment is now in effect.

3. Rezone additional properties that are guided for commercial use in the comprehensive plan and zoned C-2 General Commercial to C-1 Neighborhood Commercial instead. This is the final step in the process that staff will present at the study session. Staff recommended delaying the rezoning of C-2 properties to C-1 until the text amendments to the C-1 zoning district were approved. That way the owners of the properties proposed to be rezoned to C-1 could see the C-1 district regulations as amended before commenting on the proposed rezoning.

Next steps: An open house will be conducted for the property owners and business owners impacted by the proposed rezoning. Staff will also invite the property owners located within 350 feet of the subject properties. Staff expects to hold this meeting the week of November 4, 2019.

A public hearing before the planning commission is tentatively scheduled for November 20, 2019.

Supporting documents: Maps of the properties proposed to be rezoned.

Prepared by: Gary Morrison, Assistant Zoning Administrator
Reviewed by: Sean Walther, Planning and Zoning Supervisor
Legend

- Rezone C2 to C1
- M-X Mixed Use
- C-1 Neighborhood Commercial
- C-2 General Commercial
- BP Business Park
- PUD Planned Unit Development
2. Parkway Residences development and environmental assessment worksheet

Location: W 31st Street between Glenhurst Ave. and Inglewood Ave.

Case Number: 19-27-CP; 19-28-S; 19-29-PUD; 19-30-VAC

Applicant: Sela Investments

Review Deadline: TBD

Recommended motions: Provide feedback on the development concept for Parkway Residences

Summary of request: Sela Investments proposes a new development, Parkway Residences. The proposed development is located along 31st Street West near Glenhurst Avenue South and consists of four new multi-family buildings adding up to 223 new units. The project will also include the rehabilitation of three existing apartment buildings that contain 24 units for a project total of 247 residential units. The development also entails the removal of 12 existing buildings. Parkway Residences is immediately adjacent to Parkway 25, a 112-unit, mixed-use development with 12,000 square feet of commercial, that was constructed in 2017 by the same developer.

Parkway 25 did not require an environmental assessment worksheet (EAW). However, the Parkway Residences development exceeds the threshold of a mandatory EAW by having a total of more than 150 attached units in a development that would also require a change to the comprehensive plan.

An EAW has been prepared for the Parkway Residences developer per Minnesota Rules 4410.4300. City of St. Louis Park is the responsible government unit (RGU) for review of the EAW, and city council approved a resolution authorizing the distribution of the EAW on October 7, 2019 for review and comment. The 30-day comment period will be open from October 21 to November 20, 2019. The EAW is posted on the city’s website and will be published in the Environmental Quality Board (EQB) Monitor on October 21, 2019.

The city received the following applications:
- Land use application to re-guide portions of the site from medium density residential to high density residential in the 2040 Land Use Map;
- Subdivision application to replat the properties;
- Rezoning application to rezone the properties from C-2 General Commercial and R-4 Multiple-Family Residence to PUD Planned Unit Development;
- Alley vacation
Site information:

Site area (acres):
2.5 acres

Current use:
Commercial, single-family, duplex, and multi-family residential uses

Current 2040 land use guidance
TOD - transit oriented development
RM - medium density residential

Proposed 2040 land use guidance
TOD - transit oriented development
RM - medium density residential
RH - high density residential

Surrounding land uses:
North: Multi-family residential and right-of-way
East: Multi-family residential
South: Multi-family residential
West: Single-family and multi-family residential uses.

Current zoning
C-2 general commercial
R-4 multiple-family residence

Proposed zoning
PUD planned unit development
Background: In 2016, the city approved a Planned Unit Development for Sela to construct Parkway 25, a 112-unit mixed-use building with 12,000 square feet of commercial space along County Road 25 Frontage Road. Since 2016, Sela Group, LLC has acquired additional properties in the area to create the proposed Parkway Residences development site.

Present considerations: The Parkway Residences development is a collection of 15 properties consisting of single-family homes and an assortment of smaller apartment buildings along both sides of 31st Street West between Inglewood Avenue South and Glenhurst Avenue South. The development properties are not all contiguous thus the project will be built amongst other existing buildings. The development will remove twelve of the existing buildings and will reinvest in the rehabilitation of three apartment buildings. The development consists of four new multi-family buildings creating 223 new units plus 24 units from the rehabilitated apartment buildings for a total of 247 residential units. The development plan segments the project into four campuses to be built in phases: west campus, north campus, southwest campus and southeast campus plus the three existing apartment buildings to remain.

The north campus (Site 1 – see map above) is toward the center of the site and includes six existing residential buildings north of 31st Street West. The homes will be replaced with a 4-story, 95-unit apartment building with two-levels of underground parking. This apartment building is expected to be the first phase of the project.

The southeast campus (Site 2 – see map above) consists of two single-family homes that will be developed as a 6-unit townhome. The townhome will be developed with affordable units as
The west campus (Site 3 – see map above) includes an existing strip center at the southeast corner of Inglewood Avenue South and County Road 25 that will be replaced with an up-to 11-story apartment building. The building will consist of up to eight-floors of residential units (84 units) with parking and lobby space in the first two floors and the top floor dedicated to amenity space. There is one-level of underground parking.

The southwest campus (Site 4 – see map above) is at the corner of Inglewood Avenue South and 31st Street West. It includes the removal of three existing single-family homes for the construction of a 4-story, 38-unit apartment building with one level of underground parking. The southwest campus is proposed to be a later phase of the project.

The existing housing includes the three apartment buildings south of 31st Street West that will remain and be renovated. The apartments include a total of 24 units of which 22 are considered naturally occurring affordable housing (NOAH) and will remain as NOAH designated housing units.

The Parkway Residences development is proposed to start construction in the spring of 2020 with the 4-story, 95-unit apartment building plus the renovations of the three existing apartment buildings. The following phases will be based on market demand and entitlements. It is expected that market demand will be supported by the project being within ½ mile of both the Beltline Station and the West Lake Station on the Southwest Light Rail (SWLRT) Corridor and based upon the success of Parkway 25. There are no changes to the alignments of the existing utilities or roadways.

Parkway Residences follows Sela Investments’ Parkway 25 project (4015 County Rd. 25) that was constructed in 2017. The combined projects include a total of 359 residential units and 12,000 square feet of commercial/office space. Parkway 25 was not reviewed as an EAW. However, the proposed Parkway Residences in combination with Parkway 25, crosses the threshold of a mandatory EAW by having a total of more than 150 attached units in a development that also requires a change to the comprehensive plan. When combined, the two projects fall within the mandatory EAW per MN Rules 4410.4300, subpart 19 C. Residential Development & 4410.4300, subpart 1, 3-year look-back requirement.

**Traffic and parking study:** A traffic and parking study was completed for the proposed development to evaluate existing conditions within the study area, analyze traffic and parking impacts to the adjacent roadway network, and recommend any improvements needed to accommodate the proposed development. The traffic and parking study will be included within the EAW for public comment. The study found Parkway Residences to have minimal impact to the transportation network and no changes will be necessary to the surrounding street network. The parking study found there to be a slight deficit in parking for Site 2. The plans have been revised since the parking study was completed. All parking for the other buildings is completely contained within parking and surface lots, and Site 2 will be the only site utilizing on-street parking.
Next steps: A neighborhood meeting will be held in late October. Planning Commission will hold a public hearing sometime in November and will make recommendations to city council, who will review the applications in December.

Recommendations: Provide feedback on the development concept for Parkway Residences

Supporting documents: Site plan, zoning map existing and proposed, EAW documents, traffic and parking study

Prepared by: Jennifer Monson, Planner
Reviewed by: Sean Walther, Planning and Zoning Supervisor
Study session meeting of October 16, 2019 (Item No. 2.)
Title: Parkway Residences development and environmental assessment worksheet

Site plan
**Study session meeting of October 16, 2019 (Item No. 2.)**

*Title: Parkway Residences development and environmental assessment worksheet*

---

**Zoning map: existing and proposed**

- **Existing Zoning**
  - R4 Multi-Family
  - C2 General Commercial

- **Proposed Zoning**
  - PUD Planned Unit Development

---

*St. Louis Park, Minnesota*

Experience LIFE in the Park

**Existing Zoning**
- R-4 Multiple-Family Residence
- C-2 General Commercial

**Proposed Zoning**
- PUD Planned Unit Development

---

*Scale: 0 - 340 - 680 Feet*
To: Jennifer Monson, AICP  
City of St. Louis Park  

From: Tom Sachi, PE, Associate  
Zach Toberna, EIT  

Date: September 6, 2019  

Subject: Parkway Residences Development Traffic and Parking Study  

Introduction  

SRF has completed a traffic and parking study for the proposed residential development located in the southeast quadrant of the CSAH 25 and Inglewood Avenue intersection in St. Louis Park, MN (see Figure 1: Project Location). The main objectives of this study are to review existing operations within the study area, evaluate traffic and parking impacts to the adjacent roadway network, and recommend any necessary improvements to accommodate the proposed development. The following sections provide the assumptions, analysis, and study conclusions offered for consideration.  

Existing Conditions  

The existing conditions were reviewed to establish a baseline to identify any future impacts associated with the proposed development. The evaluation of existing conditions includes various data collection efforts and an intersection capacity analysis, which are outlined in the following sections.  

Data Collection  

Vehicle turning movement and pedestrian/bicyclist counts were collected by SRF during the a.m. and p.m. peak periods the week of April 4, 2019 at the following intersections:  

- CSAH 25 and France Avenue  
- CSAH 25 Frontage Road and France Avenue  
- CSAH 25 Frontage Road and Glenhurst Avenue  
- CSAH 25/CSAH 25 Frontage Road and Inglewood Avenue  
- Glenhurst Avenue and West 31st Street  
- Inglewood Avenue and West 31st Street  

Observations were completed to identify are roadway characteristics (i.e. roadway geometry, speed limits, and traffic controls). Currently, CSAH 25 and Minnetonka Boulevard are four-lane divided roadways with a 35-mile per hour (mph) posted speed limit in the study area, while other area roadways are two-lane undivided facilities with 30-mph speed limits. Both CSAH 25 and Minnetonka Boulevard are functionally classified as minor arterials; France Avenue (north of CSAH 25) is functionally classified as a collector. Other study roadways are functionally classified as local streets. Existing geometries, traffic controls, and volumes within the study area are shown in Figure 2.
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Table 1 summarizes the existing traffic control at the study intersections.

### Table 1. Existing Traffic Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Traffic Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSAH 25 and France Avenue</td>
<td>Traffic Signal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAH 25 Frontage Road and France Avenue</td>
<td>3-Way Stop Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Southbound France Avenue is Uncontrolled)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAH 25 Frontage Road and Glenhurst Avenue</td>
<td>Side-Street Stop Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAH 25 Frontage Road and Inglewood Avenue</td>
<td>3-Way Stop Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Southbound Inglewood Avenue is Uncontrolled)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAH 25 and Inglewood Avenue</td>
<td>Side-Street Stop Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenhurst Avenue and West 31st Street</td>
<td>Uncontrolled*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inglewood Avenue and West 31st Street</td>
<td>Uncontrolled*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Uncontrolled intersections were assumed to operate as all-way yield controlled.

### Intersection Capacity Analysis

An existing intersection capacity analysis was completed using Synchro/SimTraffic software (V9.2) to establish a baseline condition to which future traffic operations could be compared. Capacity analysis results identify a Level of Service (LOS) which indicates how well an intersection is operating. Intersections are graded from LOS A through LOS F. The LOS results are based on average delay per vehicle, which correspond to the delay threshold values shown in Table 2. LOS A indicates the best traffic operation, while LOS F indicates an intersection where demand exceeds capacity. Overall intersection LOS A though LOS D is generally considered acceptable in the Twin Cities area.

### Table 2. Level of Service Criteria for Signalized and Unsignalized Intersections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOS Designation</th>
<th>Signalized Intersection Average Delay/Vehicle (seconds)</th>
<th>Unsignalized Intersection Average Delay/Vehicle (seconds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>≤ 10</td>
<td>≤ 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>&gt; 10 - 20</td>
<td>&gt; 10 - 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>&gt; 20 - 35</td>
<td>&gt; 15 - 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>&gt; 35 - 55</td>
<td>&gt; 25 - 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>&gt; 55 - 80</td>
<td>&gt; 35 - 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt; 80</td>
<td>&gt; 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For side-street stop/yield-controlled intersections, special emphasis is given to providing an estimate for the level of service of the side-street approach. Traffic operations at an unsignalized intersection with side-street stop/yield control can be described in two ways. First, consideration is given to the overall intersection level of service. This takes into account the total number of vehicles entering the intersection and the capability of the intersection to support these volumes. Second, it is important to consider the delay on the minor approach. Since the mainline does not have to stop, the majority of delay is attributed to the side-street approaches. It is typical of intersections with higher mainline traffic volumes to experience high-levels of delay (i.e. poor levels of service) on the side-street approaches, but an acceptable overall intersection level of service during peak hour conditions.

Results of the existing intersection capacity analysis shown in Table 3 indicate that all study intersections currently operate at an acceptable overall LOS C or better during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. However, several queuing issues were observed at the CSAH 25/France Avenue signalized intersection. Eastbound queues along CSAH 25 were observed to extend through the adjacent signalized intersection at Minnetonka Boulevard approximately 15 to 20 percent of the p.m. peak hour. Queues on the northbound approach of the CSAH 25/France Avenue intersection regularly extended to the CSAH 25 Frontage Road during both peak hours. These northbound queues are a result of limited vehicular storage due to the closely spaced CSAH 25 Frontage Road rather than an intersection capacity issue. No other significant delay or queuing issues were observed in the field or traffic simulation at the study intersections.

Table 3. Existing Intersection Capacity Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>A.M. Peak Hour</th>
<th>P.M. Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAH 25 and France Avenue</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>26 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAH 25 Frontage Road and Glenhurst Avenue (1)</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>9 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAH 25 Frontage Road and Inglewood Avenue (1)</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>6 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenhurst Avenue and West 31st Street (2)</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>3 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inglewood Avenue and West 31st Street (2)</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>3 sec.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Indicates an unsignalized intersection with side-street stop control, where the overall LOS is shown followed by the worst approach LOS. The delay shown represents the worst side-street approach delay.

(2) Uncontrolled intersection treated as a side-street yield control intersection for the purpose of the capacity analysis.
Proposed Developments

The proposed development is generally bounded by the CSAH 25 Frontage Road to the north, Inglewood Avenue to the west, West 31st Street to the south, and Glenhurst Avenue to the east. The proposed development has four distinct areas within the project site. Site 1 is currently occupied by three (3) single-family homes and three (3) 12-unit apartment complexes, which would be replaced by a 95-unit apartment building. Site 2 is currently occupied by two (2) single-family homes and would be replaced by six (6) townhomes. Site 3 is currently occupied by a veterinary clinic and would be replaced by an 11-story, 86-unit apartment building, while Site 4 is currently occupied by three (3) single-family homes and would be replaced by a 39-unit apartment building. As noted, all current land uses are planned to be replaced by the proposed development, which is illustrated in Figure 3. The proposed development was assumed to be fully-completed by the end of year 2024.

Access to the development is proposed at the following locations:

- Site 1 Access (1-Location): Glenhurst Avenue, approximately 80 feet north of West 31st Street; shared-access with the Parkway 25 Apartments
- Site 2 Access (1-Location): Shared access with 3925 West 31st Street, opposite Glenhurst Avenue
- Site 3 Access (1-Location): CSAH 25 Frontage Road between Inglewood Avenue and Glenhurst Avenue
- Site 4 Access (1-Location): Inglewood Avenue, approximately 100 feet south of West 31st Street

Within the bounds of the proposed development, there would be a net decrease of six (6) driveways along West 31st Street and a net decrease of one (1) driveway along the CSAH 25 Frontage Road. Note that a Site 5 is shown on the site plan, however, these units are slated for renovation and no changes to unit/parking totals are expected.

Year 2025 No Build Condition

A no build condition was analyzed in order to understand how the study area is expected to operate, regardless of the proposed development. To help determine future operations, traffic forecasts were developed for the year 2025 no build condition, which takes into account general area background growth and other planned area developments. The evaluation of the year 2025 no build condition, which includes an intersection capacity analysis, is summarized in the following sections.

Traffic Forecasts

To account for general background growth in the area, an annual growth rate of one-half percent was applied to the existing peak hour traffic volumes to develop year 2025 background forecasts. This growth rate is consistent with historical growth in the study area (based on MnDOT AADT volumes), the Parkway 25 Traffic Study previously completed by SRF in 2016, and Southwest Light Rail Transit (SWLRT) forecasts. The resultant year 2025 no build condition traffic forecasts are shown in Figure 4.
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**Intersection Capacity Analysis**

To determine how the adjacent roadway network will accommodate year 2025 background traffic forecasts, an intersection capacity analysis was completed using Synchro/SimTraffic software. Results of the year 2025 no build intersection capacity analysis shown in Table 4 indicates that all study intersections are expected to continue to operate at an acceptable overall LOS C or better during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. The existing queuing at the CSAH 25 and France Avenue intersection is expected to continue under year 2025 no build conditions. Additionally, westbound queues are expected to extend to the adjacent signalized intersection (at Drew Avenue) during the a.m. peak hour between five (5) and 10 percent of the peak hour.

Table 4. Year 2025 No Build Intersection Capacity Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>A.M. Peak Hour</th>
<th>P.M. Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAH 25 and France Avenue</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>29 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAH 25 Frontage Road and France Avenue</td>
<td>B/B</td>
<td>14 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAH 25 Frontage Road and Glenhurst Avenue</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>9 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAH 25 and Inglewood Avenue</td>
<td>A/C</td>
<td>17 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAH 25 Frontage Road and Inglewood Avenue</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>6 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenhurst Avenue and West 31st Street</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>3 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inglewood Avenue and West 31st Street</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>3 sec.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Indicates an unsignalized intersection with side-street stop control, where the overall LOS is shown followed by the worst approach LOS. The delay shown represents the worst side-street approach delay.

(2) Uncontrolled intersection treated as a side-street yield control intersection for the purpose of the capacity analysis.

**Year 2025 Build Conditions**

To help determine impacts associated with the proposed developments, traffic forecasts were developed for year 2025 build conditions (i.e. one year after anticipated completion). The year 2025 condition accounts for general area background growth and traffic generated by the proposed development. The evaluation of the year 2025 build condition, which includes a trip generation estimate for the proposed development and intersection capacity analysis, is summarized in the following sections.

**Traffic Forecasts**

To help determine impacts associated with the proposed development, traffic forecasts were developed for year 2025 conditions (i.e. one year after anticipated completion). The year 2025 build condition incorporates the year 2025 no build traffic forecasts, in addition to traffic generated by the proposed development.
To account for traffic impacts associated with the proposed development, trip generation estimates for both the existing and proposed land uses were developed for the a.m. and p.m. peak hours and a daily basis. These estimates, shown in Table 5, were developed using the *ITE Trip Generation Manual, Tenth Edition*. Note that the existing trip generation estimates were developed to provide a comparison between existing and proposed land uses and to determine the approximate number of net new roadway system trips.

Table 5. Trip Generation Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type (ITE Code)</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>A.M. Peak Hour Trips</th>
<th>P.M. Peak Hour Trips</th>
<th>Daily Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Land Uses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 1: Single-Family Housing (210)</td>
<td>3 DU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 1: Low-Rise Multifamily Housing (220)</td>
<td>36 DU</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 2: Single-Family Housing (210)</td>
<td>2 DU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 3: Veterinary Clinic (640)</td>
<td>3,000 SF</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 4: Single-Family Housing (210)</td>
<td>3 DU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Existing Site Trips</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Land Uses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 1: Mid-Rise Multifamily Housing (221)</td>
<td>95 DU</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 2: Low-Rise Multifamily Housing (220)</td>
<td>6 DU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 3: High-Rise Multifamily Housing (222)</td>
<td>86 DU</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 4: Mid-Rise Multifamily Housing (221)</td>
<td>39 DU</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Trips</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modal Reduction (10%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-2)</td>
<td>(-6)</td>
<td>(-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Site Trips</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Site Trip Reduction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-13)</td>
<td>(-22)</td>
<td>(-22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net New Site Trips</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that a 10 percent modal reduction was applied to the proposed development trip generation to account for available and planned transit options in the study area (Metro Transit Route 17 and future Green Line LRT). Accounting for the modal reductions, the proposed development is expected to generate a total of approximately 69 a.m. peak hour, 82 p.m. peak hour, and 1,040 daily trips.

To determine the approximate net change in overall roadway system trips, trips from the existing land uses were subtracted from the proposed development site trips. Taking into account the existing site trip reductions, the proposed development is expected to generate a total of approximately 34 a.m. peak hour, 38 p.m. peak hour, and 636 daily net new system trips.
These trips were distributed throughout the area based on the directional distribution shown in Figure 5, which was developed based on existing area travel patterns and engineering judgment. The resultant year 2025 build conditions traffic forecasts are shown in Figure 6.

**Intersection Capacity Analysis**

To determine how the adjacent roadway network will accommodate year 2025 traffic forecasts, an intersection capacity analysis was completed using Synchro/SimTraffic software. Results of the year 2025 build condition intersection capacity analysis shown in Table 6 indicate that all study intersections are expected to operate at an acceptable overall LOS C or better during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. The previously identified queuing issues are not expected to significantly change as a result of the proposed development. Queuing is expected to increase between one (1) and two (2) vehicles during the peak periods. Note that side-street delays at the CSAH 25 Frontage Road and Inglewood Road intersection are expected to decrease during the p.m. peak hour. Although vehicular volumes increase, this can be attributed to an increase in thru and right-turning vehicles, which have a lower delay, reducing the overall delay of the approach. No other significant delay or queuing issues are expected at the study intersections.

It should be noted that no capacity issues were identified in a qualitative review of the proposed driveways. Given the minimal anticipated impact of the proposed development on study area traffic operations, no roadway improvements are recommended from an intersection capacity perspective. Note that based on the results of the year 2025 build condition analysis, an extension of France Avenue to West 31st Street is not necessary to accommodate traffic forecasts in the area.

**Table 6. Year 2025 Build Condition Intersection Capacity Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>A.M. Peak Hour</th>
<th>P.M. Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAH 25 and France Avenue</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>30 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAH 25 Frontage Road and France Avenue</td>
<td>B/C</td>
<td>17 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAH 25 Frontage Road and Glenhurst Avenue</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>9 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAH 25 Frontage Road and Inglewood Avenue</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>6 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenhurst Avenue and West 31st Street</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>3 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inglewood Avenue and West 31st Street</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>3 sec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAH 25 Frontage Road and Access</td>
<td>A/A</td>
<td>3 sec.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Indicates an unsignalized intersection with side-street stop control, where the overall LOS is shown followed by the worst approach LOS. The delay shown represents the worst side-street approach delay.

(2) Uncontrolled intersection treated as a side-street yield control intersection for the purpose of the capacity analysis.
Parking Review

The proposed development sites are expected to provide a total of 331 off-street parking spaces and 12 on-street spaces based on the information provided by the development team. A review of both City Code and ITE parking demand values was completed to determine if the proposed parking supply is sufficient to accommodate the proposed developments. The City Code was reviewed and determined to require one parking space per bedroom within multi-family residential developments. A parking analysis based on the City Code is presented within Table 7.

Table 7. Parking Demand Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type (ITE Code)</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Bedrooms</th>
<th>Supply</th>
<th>City Code Req</th>
<th>Surplus/(Deficit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site 1: Mid-Rise Multifamily Housing (221)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 2: Low-Rise Multifamily Housing (220)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 3: High-Rise Multifamily Housing (222)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 4: Mid-Rise Multifamily Housing (221)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>(-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the City Code requirements, development sites 1, 2, and 3 are expected to meet the City Code parking requirements for off-street parking. Site 4 is expected to have a deficit of five (5) spaces. However, the developer has noted that there are 12 off-street parking spaces around the site which may be used to alleviate this deficit, if necessary.

The estimate of the anticipated parking demand for the proposed development per dwelling unit was completed using the *ITE Parking Generation Manual, Fifth Edition* for the average and 85th percentile peak parking demand rates. Results of the parking analysis shown in Table 8 indicate that as whole, the development is expected to provide adequate parking to meet both the average and 85th percentile parking demands.

Table 8. Parking Demand Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type (ITE Code)</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Supply</th>
<th>ITE Parking Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 1: Mid-Rise Multifamily Housing (221)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 2: Low-Rise Multifamily Housing (220)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 3: High-Rise Multifamily Housing (222)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 4: Mid-Rise Multifamily Housing (221)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, there is expected to be between a 23 and 65 space surplus based on the ITE parking demand rates for the site as a whole. However, when the average and 85th percentile rates are reviewed for each individual site, there are expected to be deficits. The deficits are detailed in the following:

- It is expected that Site 4 will have a 17 space deficit based on the ITE average parking demand rate and a 23 space deficit based on the 85th percentile demand rate.
- It is expected that Site 1 will have a one (1) space deficit based on the ITE 85th percentile parking demand rate.

In order to alleviate the deficits for sites 1 and 4, a review of the existing on-street parking supply/demand was completed to determine if sufficient on-street parking capacity is available to accommodate the expected deficits. On-street parking was reviewed during three (3) overnight (i.e. peak residential parking) time periods the week of August 5, 2019. The peak demands are shown in Figure 7. Based on these parking utilization surveys, the following takeaways are noted:

- There is expected to be limited parking availability along both West 31st Street between Inglewood Avenue and Ewing Avenue and Glenhurst Avenue. These roadways were approximately 90 to 95 percent utilized during the peak periods, with approximately up to five (5) spaces available.
- Inglewood Avenue between south of West 31st Street and CSAH 25 Frontage Road is approximately 50 percent utilized, with approximately eight (8) spaces available.
- CSAH 25 Frontage Road between Inglewood Avenue and Glenhurst Avenue is approximately 65 percent utilized, with approximately nine (9) spaces available.

It is not expected that the on-street parking can accommodate all of the expected deficit between Sites 1 and 4 based on the 85th percentile parking demand, and therefore, these sites may need to identify other parking options, if necessary.

A potential option is to contract/identify an agreement with any available parking capacity at other sites, particularly Site 3, which is expected to have over 40 spaces of surplus capacity. Note that the distance between Sites 3 and 4 is approximately 200 feet. If this agreement was done, the available on-street parking could be utilized to accommodate guest parking if no specific guest parking is provided within the development parking lots. Another option would be to implement travel demand management strategies that encourage less vehicular dependence and ownership at Site 4. These could include unbundling parking from the rent, limit units to one (1) space per unit, providing multimodal accommodations via bicycle parking and repair stations or transit incentives, or potentially providing delivery services for grocery and other errand types.
On-Street Peak Parking Demands

Figure 7
**Site Plan Review**

A review of the proposed site plan was completed to identify any issues and recommend potential improvements with regard to site access, traffic circulation, parking, and pedestrian connectivity. The following information summarizes the findings.

**Site Access**

Since the proposed driveways are expected to operate adequately without any apparent safety issues and represent a net decrease in overall access for the proposed development area, the proposed driveways are considered appropriate.

**Traffic Circulation**

Truck turning movements should be reviewed to ensure that garbage/delivery trucks have adequate accommodations to negotiate internal parking lot aisles. The movement of general passenger vehicles within the parking lots is not expected to be an issue.

**Pedestrian Connectivity**

The proposed site plan includes sidewalks along the CSAH 25 Frontage Road, Glenhurst Avenue, and Inglewood Avenue. The sidewalks have appropriate connections to the development as well as to proposed parking lots. These sidewalk connections can help accommodate multimodal users, which can reduce vehicular impacts on area roadways. The new proposed pedestrian accommodations are shown in Figure 8. These sidewalk improvements will help provide connections for residents and guests to utilize transit or the extensive trail network. The available and planned multimodal options are shown in Figure 9.
Proposed Sidewalk Improvements
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Summary and Conclusions

The following study summary and conclusions are offered for your consideration:

1) Results of the existing intersection capacity analysis indicate that all study intersections currently operate at an acceptable overall LOS C or better during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. However, several queuing issues were observed at the CSAH 25/France Avenue signalized intersection:
   a) Eastbound queues along CSAH 25 extended through the adjacent signalized intersection at Minnetonka Boulevard during the p.m. peak hour approximately 15 to 20 percent of the p.m. peak hour.
   b) Northbound France Avenue queues regularly extended to the CSAH 25 Frontage Road during both peak hours. These northbound queues are a result of limited vehicular storage due to the closely spaced CSAH 25 Frontage Road rather than an intersection capacity issue.

2) The proposed developments are generally bound by the CSAH 25 Frontage Road to the north, Inglewood Avenue to the west, West 31st Street to the south, and Glenhurst Avenue to the east, which are currently occupied by eight (8) single family homes, three (3) 12-unit apartments, and a veterinary clinic. Construction of the proposed development was assumed to be complete by the end of the year 2024. Access to the developments are proposed at the following locations:
   a) Site 1: Glenhurst Avenue about 80 feet north of West 31st Street and shared access with Parkway 25 Apartments
   b) Site 2: Via 3925 West 31st Street, opposite Glenhurst Avenue
   c) Site 3: CSAH 25 Frontage Road, between Inglewood Avenue and Glenhurst Avenue
   d) Site 4: Inglewood Avenue approximately 100 feet south of West 31st Street

3) To account for general background growth in the area, an annual growth rate of one-half percent was applied to the existing peak hour traffic volumes to develop year 2025 (i.e. one year after construction) background forecasts.

4) The proposed developments are expected to generate a total of approximately 69 a.m. peak hour, 82 p.m. peak hour, and 1,040 daily trips.
   a) Accounting for vehicles already generated by the existing land uses that are proposed to be removed, the development is expected to generate a total of approximately 34 a.m. peak hour, 38 p.m. peak hour, and 636 daily net new system trips.

5) Results of the year 2025 no build intersection capacity analysis indicate that all study intersections are expected to operate at an acceptable overall LOS C or better during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.
   a) Previously documented queuing issues at the intersection of CSAH 25 and France Avenue remain similar for year 2025 conditions, with westbound queues occasionally reaching the adjacent signalized intersection at Drew Avenue five (5) to 10 percent of the a.m. peak hour.
6) Results of the year 2025 no build intersection capacity analysis indicate that all study intersections are expected to operate at an acceptable overall LOS C or better during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.
   a) Minimal increases in queueing are expected (i.e. between one (1) and two (2) vehicles).
   b) No other significant delay or queuing issues are expected at the study intersections.
   c) No capacity issues were identified in a qualitative review of the proposed access locations.

7) Given the minimal anticipated impact caused by the adjacent and proposed developments on study area traffic operations, no roadway improvements are needed from an intersection capacity perspective.

8) Based on the City Code requirements, development sites 1, 2, and 3 are expected to meet the City Code parking requirements for off-street parking. Site 4 is expected to have a deficit of five (5) spaces.

9) It is expected that Site 4 will have a 17 space deficit based on the ITE average parking demand rate and a 23 space deficit based on the 85th percentile demand rate.

10) It is expected that Site 1 will have a one (1) space deficit based on the ITE 85th percentile parking demand rate.

11) Overall, there is expected to be between a 23 and 65 space surplus based on the ITE parking demand rates for the site as a whole.

12) There is expected to be parking availability along the following roadways
   a) West 31st Street between Inglewood Avenue and Ewing Avenue and Glenhurst Avenue. These roadways were approximately 90 to 95 percent utilized during the peak periods, with approximately up to five (5) spaces available.
   b) Inglewood Avenue between south of West 31st Street and CSAH 25 Frontage Road is approximately 50 percent utilized, with approximately eight (8) spaces available.
   c) CSAH 25 Frontage Road between Inglewood Avenue and Glenhurst Avenue is approximately 65 percent utilized, with approximately nine (9) spaces available.

13) It is not expected that the on-street parking can accommodate all of the expected deficit between Sites 1 and 4 based on the ITE 85th percentile parking demand, and therefore, these sites may need to identify other parking options, if necessary.

14) These options including entering into a shared parking agreement with an adjacent building or implementing travel demand management strategies to reduce vehicle ownership to meet the expected demand.

15) A review of the proposed site plan was completed to identify any issues and recommend potential improvements with regard to site access, traffic circulation, parking, and pedestrian connectivity. The following information summarizes the findings:
   a) The proposed driveways are considered appropriate.
b) Truck turning movements should be reviewed to ensure that garbage/delivery trucks have adequate accommodations to negotiate internal parking lot aisles.

c) Sidewalks are proposed along both the CSAH 25 Frontage Road, Glenhurst Avenue, and Inglewood Avenue. The sidewalks have appropriate connections to the developments as well as to proposed parking lots.