

**CITY OF HANOVER  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
JANUARY 28, 2019  
OFFICIAL MINUTES**

**Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance**

Stan Kolasa called the January 28, 2018, Planning Commission Meeting to order at 7:00 pm. Members present were Stan Kolasa, Jim Schendel, Michelle Armstrong (arrived at 7:07 pm), Dean Kuitunen and Mike Christenson. Also present City Planner Cindy Nash, City Engineer Justin Messner, Alternate Council Liaison Jim Zajicek and Administrative Assistant Amy Biren. Many guests were present.

**Oath of Office**

Jim Schendel and Mike Christenson took the Oath of Office with Biren acting as the witness for the City.

**Selection of Chair and Vice Chair**

**MOTION:** Kuitunen moved to nominate Stan Kolasa for chair seconded by Schendel.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**MOTION:** Kuitunen moved to nominate Jim Schendel for vice chair seconded by Christenson.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

Kolasa suggested moving New Business ahead of Unfinished Business to make the meeting more efficient.

**Approval of Agenda**

**MOTION** by Schendel to approve the amended agenda, seconded by Christenson.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**Approval of Minutes from the December 17, 2018 Regular Meeting**

**MOTION** by Schendel to approve the December 17, 2018, minutes, seconded by Christenson.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**Citizen's Forum**

Jim Zajicek, Alternate Council Liaison, addressed the audience with the information that he has attended meetings where Senator Mary Kiffmeyer was in attendance. He expressed his concern regarding the I-94 Corridor Construction project that will be starting this year and continuing for the next three years and how it will impact the traffic load going through Hanover. Senator Kiffmeyer suggested that residents voice their concerns to their county commissioners, Hennepin County Commissioner Jeff Johnson and Wright County Commissioner Mike Potter, by sending them emails and letters. Kiffmeyer suggested communicating as a community and asking them for a face-to-face meeting. An audience member asked what the impact would be by doing the suggested things. Zajicek said that it shows the elevated concern of the community and raise awareness of the heavy traffic that CSAH 19 experiences. He said that it may lead to the counties advertising alternate routes rather than having everyone funnel through Hanover.

Armstrong arrived at 7:07 pm.

**Public Hearing**

None

Kolasa reminded the audience that there is not a public hearing on any topic tonight at which residents would speak. He would acknowledge audience members to allow them to speak.

## **New Business**

### **River Town Villas Concept Plan**

Nash introduced a proposal to redevelop a four-acre parcel on the corner of Church Street and River Road into villa homes. She reminded the Commission and audience that a concept plan is not a legal binding agreement, but rather an opportunity for a developer to gather information, likes and dislikes, and suggestions from the Commission and residents.

Andy Weitnauer, Wits Land Company; Tim Bellin, Bellin Construction; and Paul Kangas, Loucks Associates, presented PowerPoint slides explaining the concept of the River Town Villas. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation was included in the agenda packet and attached at the end of the minutes. The plan is to build 18 single-level detached villas with options for a basement on the 4.3 acre site. The villas are intended to be luxury villas with two to three different floor plans and exterior styles in multiple colors and textures. Bellin Construction will be the exclusive builder and the homes will generally run between \$325,000 and \$425,000. They will be located on a private street and placed in a meandering pattern.

Claudia Pingree, 11711 Riverview Road, commented that the price point may be too high for some, but that the villas presented are beautiful and she loves the look of the development. Bellin responded that this is a general price point, but that they do not want to suffer quality in exchange for a lower price.

An audience member asked if this would be an HOA. They responded yes, it would.

David Seiler, 11354 Riverview, asked if they would be sound-proof as there were neighboring properties that conducted business that involved crushing rock. He was thanked for his suggestion.

Nash asked the Commission for their feedback and if they would like to provide specific suggestions.

Kangas addressed the Commission stating that their group had met with staff to hear initial reaction to the concept plan and had already made some changes. Concern was expressed about the drive being private as well as utilities. Setbacks have already been addressed since initially the villas were close together. The redesign showed that the villas would meet garage to garage and house to house with the side setback being larger at the house than the garage. Kangas also said that in 2003 there was a development proposed on the same site that Loucks also helped with, but that little information remained from that plan. He indicated that the present concept plan was better than the past one.

Armstrong asked where guest would park. Kangas showed the parking spots on the concept plan map, indicating that some of them were covered by the tree line.

Christenson asked about the width of the private drive. Kangas replied that it is 26 feet in width. They chose to go with that width in order to minimize the appearance of all garage with a little front house. The lots themselves are 55 foot wide.

Kuitunen asked to whom were they marketing and if it was to be single families? Weitnauer responded that anyone could live there and they were not looking at an age-restricted development.

Christenson asked if families did live there, would the kids need to walk to Church Street to get on the bus. Nash replied yes, that a bus would not travel a private street.

Nash asked the Commission for their feedback on the private drive. Armstrong said she was not against it and Kuitunen agreed, stating that on a parcel that size, it would need to be a private drive. Schendel expressed concern that should something in the future happen where the City would need to assume responsibility for it, it would be tough to maintain. Kolasa asked Nash if this is a common occurrence. Nash responded that there have been occurrences where an HOA would ask for a private street to be

assumed by a city, but that it is usually where an HOA did not plan for the future maintenance of it. She indicated that language would be included in the developer's agreement so that this would not occur.

Kuitunen asked about private utilities versus public utilities. Nash said that Hanover does not have a history of private utilities and conditions would need to be included in the developer's agreement. Messner added that this is common in such a plan as this one. Easements would be required by the City, but that the HOA would be responsible for maintaining them. Armstrong asked if this makes the HOA fees higher. Messner replied that they may since they need to put money away for future maintenance. He echoed Nash stating that there will be specific language included in the developer's agreement.

Pingree asked about how emergency vehicles would be able to turn around in the development. Nash replied that the Fire Department has started looking at the plan and will verify that turning movements would work in the development. She also explained how the hammerhead turn arounds work.

An audience member asked about how a special needs student would be picked up as they need to be picked up at their house and cannot walk to Church Street. Nash said that the smaller buses, such as those used to transport special needs people, should be able to turn around as it is smaller than a fire truck. Messner added that full-size buses have specific rules for turning and prohibiting backing up in reverse.

Armstrong said she likes the staggered look of the homes and it appears to be thoughtfully laid out. She also likes having the living area matching the living area and the garage to garage aspect.

Christenson said that it seems that the homes are a little close together.

Kuitunen said he is concerned about fire safety.

Kangas was asked about parking. He said that the driveway will allow two parking spots and there will be guest parking available.

Kuitunen and Armstrong asked about garage size. Bellin said that he realizes that 576 square feet is the ideal. They would like a garage size a bit smaller, but that is still large enough for a bigger vehicle. Armstrong stated she would like it as close to the 576 as possible. Kuitunen agreed.

Pingree asked about snow removal. Kangas said that would be privately handled.

Christenson asked about the square footage of the homes. Kangas said that it would more than likely be around 1900 square feet and then there would be more square footage if the home had a basement. He said that not all buyers want a basement and some homes would be slab on grade.

Kangas went on to say that this development is not intended to be entry level housing. They are looking at having a higher level of finish versus a lower price point.

Christenson asked if there was going to be demand for this type of housing. Armstrong said that this will appeal to many buyers as it is a private area and less traffic.

Nash said to the Commission that a recommendation to Council is needed.

Kolasa asked about the garage size. Nash said that the developer will be looking at a planned unit development (PUD) and more than likely will have a reduced garage size.

Kolasa expressed concern that the City will end up with the private drive in the future. Nash said that tends to happen in older HOA neighborhoods because it may not have been adequately documented.

Kangas spoke to the garage size concern. He said that since the HOA was maintaining the development, maintenance equipment would not need to be stored in a garage. Second, if the garage is too large, it limits the aesthetics of the home. He suggested that a garage size could be around 480 square feet, but added that he has not discussed this with the client.

Armstrong said that people need a place to store stuff. Christenson suggested making the garage deeper. Kuitunen said that they don't want the garage to be the dominant feature seen when looking at the house.

Schendel said he would like the street wider and for it to be a public street, but if it is to be a private drive, then the HOA language needs to be very strong and very specific. Nash replied that any development on this parcel will have to have a private drive due to the size of the parcel.

Kangas said that the private drive will be built to high standards, possibly even city standards, and that having a good HOA will provide for future maintenance.

Nash said that with the private drive, they will be able to maintain the 30 foot rear yard setback.

Kuitunen asked if an environmental assessment worksheet (EAW) would be needed. Nash replied that it was not required for a development of this size.

Kuitunen asked who would be in charge of the stormwater ponds. Messner said that it is preferred that the City owns and maintains the stormwater ponds because the City is held to maintain water quality and keep up with MS4 requirements.

**MOTION** by Armstrong to forward the River Town Villas Concept Plan to Council for approval with the notes that were taken, seconded by Christenson.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

## **Unfinished Business**

### **Rezoning, Planned Unit Development and Preliminary Plat for the Development to be known as Hanover Cove**

Nash updated the Commission on events that have occurred since the December Planning Commission meeting:

- The City has received comments in emails and showed a summary of the concerns in a slide of a PowerPoint presentation. These occurred after the Public Hearing and all will be included in the review and all will go to Council.
- The developer has made changes to the plans including some engineering items; flex lots to narrow patio homes; reducing the number of lots by five; adding parking areas; and decided not to change the 38 foot wide lots to 50 foot wide lots as requested.

Nash reminded the Commission that a PUD can deviate from current ordinances for the purpose of creating better overall design, environmental protection and an improved living environment. A PUD cannot be granted solely for the economic advantage to the developer.

Nash went over what is being requested in the PUD versus current zoning. Each housing type was explained. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation is attached to the minutes.

Nash explained that a higher density request in a PUD may be compensated for by providing additional private amenities and increasing the efficiency in public facilities and services. This can be achieved by the location, amount and proposed use of common open space; the location, design, and type of dwelling units; and the physical characteristics of the site.

Nash told the Commission that staff is asking for a recommendation tonight from Planning Commission. She explained that legally the City has 120 days to review the proposal and the deadline is approaching. By making a recommendation tonight, Planning Commission will give Council time to make a decision and the ability to discuss it at more meetings. There are three possible recommendations that the Planning Commission may give: 1) recommend approval as presented; 2) recommend approval with changes; or 3) recommend denial.

Nash said that she has made a table for each request and if the Commission would like, she will go through it step by step in order to help them make a decision.

Armstrong stated that the Commission had issues with the smaller patio homes and it appears that desire to make changes was ignored by the developer.

Alan Roessler, Paxmar, stated that the narrow lots remained because as the phases occur, they wanted to be able to offer multiple types of housing during each phase. If the narrow lots were removed, that would result in only three lots being removed and the developer would have limited housing types to offer.

Armstrong asked about the phasing of the development. Roessler showed the Commission how the phasing would occur and the types of housing offered by using the phasing map included in the Preliminary Plat.

Kuitunen said that the lots appear to very close together. Schendel agreed, saying that the width of the lot is not 38 feet. Nash said that is true and was called out in comment #8 of her memo.

Roessler said he feels that the narrow lots will be in demand because of the price point of \$225,000.

Christenson asked about enlarging the garage size. Roessler said they are still asking for the size that was initially requested which is smaller than the current ordinance.

Christenson suggested that the lots be made wider.

Nash said that building design has the house work with the size of garage presented.

Roessler said that buyers will be aware of the size of the garage when purchasing the home. He indicated that if a home owner has more stuff they will look for a bigger home or get off-site storage. Armstrong responded that people do not realize how small a garage is until they move in and their stuff needs to be put somewhere.

Christenson asked why smaller lots are being included. Armstrong replied that is the price point people want.

Pingree said that a small garage size is not the issue, rather it is the houses being on top of one another.

Nate Brown, 11794 Riverview Road, asked what is the price point with the garage being increased in size. Roessler said that the infrastructure costs are constant, but by including narrower lots, the cost is dispersed among more people. Brown replied that was an answer to his question.

Gretchen Barrett, 10580 106<sup>th</sup> Avenue North, said that people do not move to Hanover for a small lot.

Brown asked what will be the lot prices. Roessler responded that a smaller lot will be \$50,000, but that a wider lot does not increase in price foot by foot.

Kuitunen asked if there are still issues with the road width. Messner replied that the City Standard is 36 foot wide streets and the road do not meet the standard. He went on to say that the way the lots are configured, parking would not be possible on both sides of the street. Parking could be signed for only one

side of the street, but that would have to be done by City resolution. He added that some additional parking (off-street) was added.

Armstrong asked what is Nash's thoughts on parking and is it sufficient. Nash replied that driveways will accommodate some parking. If the street is widened, driveway footage will be lost and possible parking spots.

Heather Sandberg, 11578 Riverview Road, asked who was going to enforce the no parking. Messner replied that law enforcement would need to do. Sandberg stated that the City has limited policing hours and did not believe this was a viable option.

Armstrong made the observation that the Planner's comments in this meeting's memo seemed to be the same as those for the December meeting. Nash replied that was correct.

Armstrong questioned the purpose of the outlot that was added. Nash replied that it does not have a purpose.

MaryAnn Hallstein, 339 Jandel Avenue, asked who takes care of the outlots with parking spaces. Nash replied that it would be outlined in the developer's agreement that the HOA would maintain them. Messner agreed that it would need to be discussed with the developer.

Armstrong asked Messner what his thoughts about the street width. Messner said that the City needs to stand firm on the street width meeting the City Standard. She asked him if the streets could be different widths rather than only one width. Messner showed on the plat map where possible street widths could deviate from the City Standard. His concern with the narrower widths would if emergency vehicles would be able to access the area and believes that it would be possible if the parking was restricted. He stated that the City Standard does allow a minimum width of 28 feet, but that would make street parking extremely difficult. Messner went on to say that the right of way is not changed at all even if the street width changes. If the width is changed, the front yard will be perceived to be less or smaller.

Kuitunen said that there are lots of cars on the streets, particularly in the summer, in many of the neighborhoods. He believes it will not be different in this neighborhood and where is everyone going to park.

Kuitunen asked if there is anything in Messner or Nash's comments that could change. Nash replied that nothing that would impact the streets. She continued that comments could change by decreasing the number of lots.

Armstrong said she understands the phasing which needs to include the narrow patio homes, but isn't really thrilled with three lots toward the south and believes that larger patio homes would make more sense.

An audience member asked if there were any existing developments residents could visit and see how it looks. Biren answered that at the December meeting, Roessler had provided the name of a development, Parkside North, in Blaine. Biren confirmed with Roessler that was correct.

Christenson said that he did drive over to Parkside North and did not like it. He said he saw little parking, there was rock between some houses instead of grass, the houses were built on top of one another, and the space between the houses was just enough for a utility box.

Christenson said he would like to see the 38-40 foot lots eliminated from the plan.

Schendel said that the only reason those were kept was because of the price point. He agreed with Christenson in not liking the narrower lots.

Nash reminded the Commission that they if they dislike parts of the plan, they are able to recommend denial or approval with exceptions or conditions.

Armstrong asked Roessler if the narrow lots were taken out, how many lots would be lost. Roessler said that it would be one lot for every four, so it was approximately eight to nine lots. Armstrong asked if single family homes would be possible in this area. He replied that it is nice to have the same type of housing in one area for ease of maintenance.

Kuitunen said that the Commission had made recommendations of what Paxmar was supposed to change and it was ignored. He reiterated that he is still concerned about parking.

Nash suggested walking through the PUD to help figure out recommendations.

The Commission started with street width. Nash brought up the slide which showed that the City Standard is 36 feet wide. The PUD is asking for 32 feet wide. Based on discussion, a combination of 36 foot wide streets on main thoroughfares with a few streets less traveled being 32 feet wide was reached. Jason Ver Steeg, Duinick Bros, asked if some of the streets such as the cul de sac could go down to 28 feet wide. Messner said that 28 feet wide streets are usually allowed when it is a "service" street. All parking would need to be eliminated if that happened.

Kuitunen stated that 32 feet wide was as low as he wanted to go.

The Commission moved onto the large single family lots. Armstrong commented that based on the floor plan provided, the homes are not that large. Kuitunen said that they do not meet the 1,000 square footage required. If the homes increase in size, the lots would need to increase and then lots would need to be taken out.

Christenson made the comment that he is at the point to make a recommendation and that was to deny the development.

**MOTION** by Christenson to recommend denial of the rezoning, PUD, and preliminary plat for Hanover Cove based on it having too many units; the lot size is too small; the developer's lack of compliance with recommended garage size; minimum side yard setbacks not being met; very limited parking; the street width is not in compliance with City Standards; and issues or comments of the Planner and Engineer have not been adequately addressed, seconded by Schendel.

**Motion carried with Armstrong dissenting.**

Barrett stated from the audience that residents know a development will go in at this location, but that they do not think this particular development is a good fit.

### **Reports and Announcements**

Schendel would like to see No Parking signs put up along River Road by the River Inn because people cannot see the yellow curb due to the snow. Kuitunen asked one of the Wright County deputies in attendance if tickets were being given out to people parking illegally. He replied that he had not given any parking tickets in that area.

Nash said that another concept plan had been received by the City which involved a possible annexation. It is being presented at the Council meeting on February 5<sup>th</sup> to see if there is interest in the annexation. If there is, it will come before the Planning Commission in February.

Biren said that Crow River Heights West Third has builders continuing to pull new construction permits. Current builders include Drake Construction, Homes Plus, Regency Homes and Fieldstone Family Homes.

Zajicek commented that Senator Kiffmeyer suggested Hanover request having one police/law enforcement entity that would be able to cross county lines and only be able to work within the borders of Hanover. Kiffmeyer is working on a bill that would allow cities to do this.

**Adjournment**

**MOTION** by Schedel to adjourn, seconded by Armstrong.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

Meeting adjourned at 9:18 pm.

**ATTEST:**

---

Amy L. Biren  
Administrative Assistant