



Shakopee Planning Commission

Meeting

Minutes

July 6, 2017

7:00 PM

Council Chambers

Presiding Chair Kent Robbins

Chair Robbins called the meeting to order.

1. Roll Call

Commissioners present: Anita Botamer; Lori Brandon; Jody Brennan; Kent Robbins; Mark McQuillan; Steve Mangan, Mark Seifert

Staff present: Director of Planning and Development Michael Kerski; Senior Planner Mark Noble

2. Approval of Agenda

Commissioner Lori Brandon made a motion to approve the Agenda, seconded by Commissioner Steve Mangan and the motion passed.

7 - 0

3. Call for Notarized Affidavits, Proof of Neighborhood Meeting and Sign in Sheet for appropriate Public Hearing

Staff has received these items.

4. Recognition by Planning Commission of Interested Citizens

No one responded.

5. Consent Business - (All items listed in this section are anticipated to be routine. After a discussion by the Chair there will be an opportunity for members of the Commission to remove any items from the consent agenda for individual discussion. Those items removed will be considered following the Public hearing portion of the agenda. Items remaining on the Consent Agenda will not be discussed and will be approved in one motion.)

A. Vacation of Public Right-of-Way and Public Drainage & Utility Easements

Commissioner Lori Brandon made a motion to approve the Consent Business as presented, seconded by Commissioner Mark McQuillan and the motion passed.

6. General Business

A. PUBLIC HEARING: Preliminary Plat for Canterbury Park 7th Addition, and PUD Amendment

Commissioner Mark Seifert made a motion to open the Public Hearing, seconded by Commissioner Anita Botamer and the motion passed.

7 - 0

Senior Planner Mark Noble presented Preliminary Plat for Canterbury Park 7th Addition, and PUD Amendment. Mr. Robbins asked Mr. Noble to show on the overhead the location of this proposed development and Mr. Noble did so. Mr. Kerski also noted that one of the unique aspects of this development is that this will be the city's first garaged parking ramp complex and showed the location on the overhead. He also showed where the public access will be located, since this will be a gated community.

Mr. Robbins asked Mr. Kerski to clarify the parking garage and the unusual aspect of it. Mr. Kerski answered that the parking garage will be constructed so the apartment building will be built around it. The majority of the resident parking is basically enclosed in the parking garage that will not be visible because the parking garage will be wrapped by the units. Mr. Robbins asked if residents parked their cars, they would be able to get to their units with shelter and Mr. Kerski answered that he was correct.

Ms. Botamer asked how many levels the parking garage would be and Mr. Kerski answered that it would be multi-level.

Mr. Robbins asked if the proposed 41 ft. height of the buildings were within city code and Mr. Noble stated that it was. The Major Recreation Zone has setbacks generally based on the height, but with the new text amendment there are some additional setback requirements for residential. This site as proposed, generally meets these requirements.

Mr. Noble also shared the most recent comments he had received from Scott County regarding this project. He stated that the County is reviewing the EAW for Canterbury. Mr. Robbins asked what an EAW was and Mr. Noble stated that it was an environmental worksheet and showed on the overhead the area that the EAW would encompass. Besides the apartments, the EAW included townhouses to the north and south and then also a commercial area. This review is in progress. This information will be shared with the City Council after that. Scott County is also looking into the roundabouts and Mr. Noble stated that the city staff has had several discussions about them as well. There was a traffic study done for this area in 2014 and the city engineer is working with the consultant to review that to see if there are any

differences from what the traffic study concluded to what is proposed now. This is part of the EAW as well. Mr. Kerski noted that the traffic department has retained WSB and one of the things that the city is looking at is the 50 mph posted speed on Eagle Creek Blvd. The police department survey showed that it is closer to 60 mph right now, so WSB is looking at some ways of traffic calming in this area and they are doing a study on whether a roundabout is the best solution versus a signal. He showed on the overhead the locations of a hard median as well as some changes to the alignment of the streets. This is one of the city engineer's goals is to connect this property back into the city network. Historically, this has been kind of an isolated property, with some farming in the area. The Canterbury area has been disconnected from all of the neighborhoods and essentially has been a sea of parking lots. There will be an urbanization of the corridor connecting the Seagate property, hotel, Culver's and the convenience store on the corner. As part of the redevelopment plan, there will be a realignment of this area for better access.

Ms. Brandon had a question about the parking, with the asphalt requiring going from the city code requirements down to less than 2 spaces per unit. She understood that there was a study that this was derived from; however, she wanted to know what the city's experience has been in the winter months, since it seems like parking areas get reduced when there is a lot of snow. Mr. Kerski answered that the benefit of this project is that it includes parking garages with covered decks, so there will not be the need for snow removal on those decks. It will not be a situation where there are a lot of surface lots having to store a lot of the snow. Also, he noted that one of the city's tasks right now is re-evaluating all of the city's parking calculations for both commercial and residential. Shakopee is one of the more over-parked communities in the Cities. The APA just came out with a pretty exhaustive study that we are at the very highest end of all communities and the trend nationally is more 1.5 spaces for apartments. At 1.65 spaces proposed, this is actually higher than that. Commissioners will most likely see a Code Amendment in the fall that will adjust the parking ratios, especially with the changes in retail.

Mr. Mangan asked about the grade in the 1st phase of development being rather low, and if it would require any kind of fill to build it up. Mr. Kerski answered that the applicant could address this, but he noted that one of reasons why the developer went to structured parking is that they hit bedrock on just about all of the locations on this site, so he does not think fill will be a big issue here.

Mr. Robbins asked Mr. Noble for a rough timeline on the development. Mr. Kerski answered that the applicant could speak to this also, but in general, based on the redevelopment requirements, there likely will not be any building construction this calendar year; it would be in the spring. There likely will be grading and some road and utility work, probably in the early fall and winter, depending upon what kind of winter we have. Mr. Noble clarified that the EAW needs to come back before anything could happen and Mr. Kerski answered that the EAW not only handles

traffic, but other environmental issues, as we are next to a major drainage canal and it will address all of the issues that the state requires.

Mr. Tony Kuechle, representative of Doran Companies/Doran Canterbury 1, addressed the Commission. He stated that this project is a joint venture between Doran Companies, based out of Bloomington and Canterbury Park Holding Corporation. In addition to Mr. Noble and Mr. Kerski's reports, Mr. Kuechle brought along software that they use where they take the actual architectural plans, civil plans and landscaping plans and interprets them into a virtual tour. He played this virtual tour for the Commissioners. It starts at the realigned Shenandoah Drive to the new gate house and ended with the 2nd clubhouse. The site grade will be brought up approximately 4 feet. For the question regarding parking, in the last 5-6 years they have seen the need for parking spaces go down. In an urban location, they will typically do 1 parking stall per unit. In a suburban location, they will do 1 parking stall per bedroom. At this location, there are 407 bedrooms and there will be 509 parking stalls. He believes these additional 100 parking stalls will be adequate for visitors. It is typically about 1.3 or 1.4 stalls per unit. For the timing question, he noted that the EAW has been submitted and it is under review. They are going through the PUD and platting process now. If the TIF plan is approved, work on the public infrastructure will work around Canterbury's schedule with some prep work in the fall and again in the early spring to get as much done as they can. They could then pick it up in the fall and complete it, so as not to interrupt the operations at Canterbury Park. The project most likely would start in the spring and they will do a staged occupancy. Given the size of the building and the way they are constructing it, they will probably turn over the first units in 12 -14 months and the last units in 18-20 months. They will occupy the building starting on one end and follow the construction around. When they get to approximately 50-60% leased on the first building, given the size and how long it takes for construction, they will come back in for approvals on the 2nd phase.

Ms. Botamer asked what the rental range would be and Mr. Kuechle answered they just completed their market study on this project and they have determined that the average rental range would be approximately \$1.70 per square foot of rented apartment area per month. A 1 bedroom apartment would range from 710 square feet to 846 square feet; these came in slightly higher at about \$1.80 per square foot, at \$1321 to \$1500 a month. Two bedrooms are \$1800 a month and 3 bedrooms are \$2,160 a month. Ms. Botamer asked if she was correct in noting that she only saw about 3-4 three bedroom units per floor and Mr. Kuechle stated that there were 3 stacks of 3 bedrooms for a total of 9 three bedroom units. Ms. Botamer asked about the donut parking concept and where this came from. Mr. Kuechle noted that these types of parking concepts are predominantly built in the south where they do not do the heating and cooling. What they have seen is that there are southern developers now that have moved into this marketplace and have been building this product. City Walk in Woodbury, Sky at Arbor Lakes in Maple Grove and then there is also one in Bloomington. They have studied this as well as their structural engineers have done

this before and they are capable of a project like this.

Mr. Mangan asked if there were any plans for retail on the project and Mr. Kuechle answered that there are conceptual plans for retail on the project and this is addressed within the EAW.

Ms. Brennan asked if he knew where most of the residents will be working at. Mr. Kuechle answered that when they do a project like this in a suburban neighborhood like Shakopee, the actual demographic profile is usually 40% empty nesters, 25-30% young professional couples and the balance are singles. They are very excited about Seagate and the amount of engineers that they have at their location. As they look at Scott County in their primary market area for this project, there is a vacancy rate of 1.2% so there really is pent up demand in this market for an apartment project. Ms. Brennan asked if the central parking area required any kind of special fire protection. Mr. Kuechle answered that it would be heated parking with a sprinkler system within it.

Mr. McQuillan asked what the construction material would be on the building and Mr. Kuechle answered that the building itself would be constructed out of wood to today's new energy code, so primarily 2 x 6 studs around the perimeter. They do a wood frame structure from top to bottom and then between each individual floor they put in a "sound mat" as well as Gyp-Crete, a concrete-based product to help with any kind of sound transfer. One of the things that separates them from the marketplace is that they then insulate every wall within the project, including closets and corridors.

Mr. Mangan asked if they had conducted a study regarding how many multi-family units were available in Shakopee and what they would expect to see for occupancy right away, or if it would take 2-3 years to fill it up. Mr. Kuechle stated that their lease out projections for this project are 24 months. They hired a firm out of Baltimore and they came in and spent time in Shakopee as well as with city staff about all of the proposed projects within Shakopee and what was available for development. They also interviewed major employers and looked at other rental projects within the city. They determined that the vacancy rate is 1/2%. They take into account every proposed project in Shakopee, as well as Savage, Prior Lake and into Eden Prairie, and have come up with 24 months before the project is filled from their projections.

Mr. Robbins asked what TIF was for the audience and Mr. Kuechle answered that it stood for Tax Increment Financing. Mr. Robbins asked if they had applied for this and were waiting for approval and Mr. Kuechle answered that Canterbury Park has applied for the TIF package as it relates to helping pay for the public improvements of Shenandoah Drive and some other improvements on their property. Mr. Robbins asked how much this project was going to cost and Mr. Kuechle stated that he believes the cost to be around \$48 million dollars. Mr. Robbins stated that with the

cost of the rents stated earlier, that people who live here would have to make a lot of money, and he is wondering who is going to live there. Mr. Kuechle answered that they will have 210 one bedroom units with a rental range of \$1300 - \$1500 and that this is based upon the market study that they secured for the project.

Ms. Kathy Stafford, 2378 Eagle Creek Blvd, addressed the Commission. She had a question about the access on Hauer Trail and since it is both a public access road as well as private, she wanted some clarification if these was going to be just for the residents going into the apartment complex or if it would come through Shenandoah. She also asked about the large trees along that roadway and if they were to remain or be removed. Her main concern she had with the project was that they have lived there for over 40 years and there were 12 homes between Canterbury and Marschall Road. The two lane road had a 50 mph speed limit and then the County came in and made it 4 lanes and dropped the speed limit to 40 mph. This 40 mph speed limit change never happened because the County said that the state was the one who controlled the speed limit. They have people drag racing and are lucky if someone goes 60 mph. It is very dangerous right now; it is hard to mow the lawn along the boulevard and it is difficult to get the mail. The police department is very lax on patrolling it or even keeping watch on speed limits. Vierling is always patrolled and it has the flashing 30 mph speed sign. There is only one crosswalk at Vierling Drive. Mr. Robbins asked what the posted speed limit was and Ms. Stafford answered that it was 50 mph. She stated that if there were more entrances added or roundabouts added to Eagle Creek, she believes that the speed limit does need to be addressed.

Ms. Jeanne Douglas, 2389 Alysheba Court, addressed the Commission. She stated that this was a really exciting project, but that it did impact her yard. She showed the Commissioners her property on the overhead, which are the twinhomes right at the end of Shenandoah Road. She showed where there was a curve in the road in relation to her deck. She stated that she had not seen any measurements, but when she looked at the plans, she was wondering if the curve could maybe swing a bit earlier, since there is an easement that was given to the city when their development went in. There is also a very large cottonwood tree in that area that is really nice and she was just wondering what would happen to it.

Ms. Pam Platt, 2395 Alysheba Court, addressed the Commission. She is a new resident, moving in approximately 1 week ago. She is concerned about the street that would be almost going through Ms. Douglas' back yard. She is also concerned about the tree line behind their properties and most likely they will be removed or if there could be clarification on what would happen when the road goes through there. She also would like to know how tall the trees would be in the new boulevard.

Mr. Robbins asked Mr. Noble and Mr. Kerski to address the speed limit question and Mr. Kerski stated that WSB is under contract to look at that area down to the Hwy. 169 intersection. He believes everyone is aware of the speeds on Eagle Creek

Boulevard with the posted speed of 50 mph. This is why the study is being done. If a roundabout were to be done, it would have to be large enough for fire trucks. They have found that roundabouts tend to be traffic calmers, since drivers have to slow down pretty significantly. That is one of the reasons why there are seven roundabouts proposed, between Shenandoah and 12th Ave., since there was concern from the county that this would be a cut through from Hwy. 101. This is designed so that a truck/tractor trailer cannot go through there. This is designed for slow speed, with landscaping, sidewalks, boulevards and trees. WSB is looking at how Shakopee meets the expectations when there is an event at Canterbury to get them out but also look at ways to calm traffic on this road. The city engineer understands that this is a big issue.

Mr. Robbins asked about the concern about swinging the road out a little more away from the resident's property and Mr. Kerski answered that the original road alignment was actually even closer to those homes. They will have to look at the geometry and they can ask the applicant if their landscape architect and engineer to talk about the connection that he pointed to on the overhead. Mr. Noble commented that when the Canterbury 6th addition was looked at, it included Shenandoah Drive running north/south, that there was a lot of discussion about this area. He also noted Mr. Loney's position on traffic design was to not make too significant of a sweep at that location. Regarding the landscaping and tree line that the resident was concerned about, if that road would have been built as a commercial-type road with multiple lanes, a significant number of those landscaping plantings would have been removed.

With what is proposed this evening, there would be less intense of an access point and whether any of those trees can be saved or not is something the city can certainly work with the applicant on. Most likely a majority of them will have to be removed, but as with the rest of their site, they are providing quite a bit of landscaping and he would anticipate a well-landscaped access here as well. Mr. Robbins asked Mr. Noble for clarification on whether or not he knew for sure if the trees were going to be removed to his knowledge or that this is something that could be worked out with the applicant. Mr. Noble mentioned, this is going to be pretty limited access as it is going to be a right in on one property and a left in on the other property. This is going to be designed to allow access to these two properties and a secondary access to this new development. The city will have to look at how wide this needs to be to still be a public street. He showed on the overhead where it was going to be heavily landscaped and he believes even more so now than what would have happened on previous plans. The city wants larger trees and so so there is a bigger impact early on and he believes the applicant also wants this.

Mr. Robbins asked if there were neighborhood meetings held on this project and Mr. Kerski answered that the applicant did hold a neighborhood meeting and said he was sure that they would be happy to share with the Commissioners what the sentiment was.

Mr. Kuechle answered that they did hold a neighborhood meeting roughly three weeks ago and the results of that were the concerns that were expressed here tonight. There were also some concerns about the road going behind their homes and at one point had proposed that it be a private drive. They have been working with city staff and are going to maintain it as a public drive.

Commissioner Lori Brandon made a motion to close the Public Hearing, seconded by Commissioner Steve Mangan and the motion passed.

7 - 0

DISCUSSION:

Ms. Brandon stated that this looks like a pretty unique development to add to the city and it looks like it is going to have a lot of attractive amenities. It makes sense to her where it is being placed and she is happy to see this project move forward and add to our city.

Mr. Robbins agreed that this is an exciting project. He stated that the applicant was present this evening and heard all of the testimony and concerns. He is hopeful that the applicant and city staff will work to see what can be done to answer the concerns of the people that spoke here tonight, with the speed limit being one of them. To address the concern about the trees, he noted that the applicant is proposing a very generous landscape and he understands that the testimony tonight was about the existing trees and whether or not they would stay. This is a wonderful project with wonderful amenities.

Mr. McQuillan commented that the development that was presented tonight was kind of the vision that they saw from the original owners 30 years ago when the track was first proposed. It has now come to fruition where they are seeing the type of development that the city had hoped Canterbury Park would bring to the community. He wanted to commend Randy and staff and the development team for a nice project coming forward.

Commissioner Steve Mangan made a motion to approve Preliminary Plat for Canterbury Park 7th Addition, and PUD Amendment, seconded by Commissioner Mark Seifert and the motion passed.

7 - 0

Anita Botamer - aye

Jody Brennan - aye

Mark Seifert - aye

Steve Mangan - aye

Mark McQuillan - aye

Kent Robbins - aye
Lori Brandon - aye

7. Other Business

None.

8. Adjourn to Thursday, August 3, 2017 at 7:00 p.m.

Commissioner Lori Brandon made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:06 pm, seconded by Commissioner Anita Botamer and the motion passed.

7 - 0