AGENDA PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING CITY OF SHOREVIEW

DATE: May 22, 2018 TIME: 7:00 PM PLACE: SHOREVIEW CITY HALL LOCATION: 4600 NORTH VICTORIA

- 1. CALL TO ORDER ROLL CALL APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES April 24, 2018
- 3. REPORT ON CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS Meeting Date: May 7, 2018 and May 21, 2018 Brief Description of Meeting process- Chair John Doan

4. OLD BUSINESS

A. PUBLIC HEARING - PRELIMINARY PLAT* FILE NO: 2689-18-9 APPLICANT: Sean Keatts LOCATION: 4140 Hodgson

5. NEW BUSINESS

A. MINOR SUBDIVISION* - STANDARD VARIANCES FILE NO: 2691-18-11 APPLICANT: Scott Deming LOCATION: 821 Tanglewood

6. MISCELLANEOUS

- **A.** City Council Meeting Assignments
 - June 4, 2018 Peterson
 - June 18, 2018 Yarusso
- **B.** Pet boarding/kennels in the Industrial Zoning District

7. ADJOURNMENT

* These agenda items require City Council review or action. The Planning Commission will hold a hearing, obtain public comment, discuss the application and forward the application to City Council. The City Council will consider these items at their regular meetings which are held on the 1st or 3rd Monday of each month. For confirmation when an item is scheduled at City Council, please check the City's website at <u>www.shoreviewmn.gov</u> or contact the Planning Department at 651-490-4682 or 651-490-4680

SHOREVIEW PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES April 24, 2018

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Doan called the April 24, 2018 Shoreview Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

ROLL CALL

The following Commissioners were present: Chair Doan; Commissioners Anderson, Peterson, Riechers, Solomonson, and Yarusso.

Commissioner Wolfe was absent.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

- **MOTION:** by Commissioner Peterson, seconded by Commissioner Riechers to approve the April 24, 2018 Planning Commission meeting agenda as submitted.
- VOTE: AYES: Anderson, Peterson, Riechers, Solomonson, Yarusso, Doan NAYS: None ABSENT: Wolfe

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of March 27, 2018 Commission Meeting Minutes

Page 1: Commissioner Solomonson should not be listed as voting approval of the January 9, 2018 Planning Commission workshop minutes. He abstained.

- Page 3: Third paragraph should read: "...conflicts regarding the retaining wall should..."
- MOTION: by Commissioner Solomonson, seconded by Commissioner Anderson to approve the March 27, 2018 Planning Commission meeting minutes as corrected.
- VOTE: AYES: Anderson, Peterson, Riechers, Solomonson, Yarusso, Doan NAYS: None ABSENT: Wolfe

REPORT ON CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS

City Planner Castle reported that the City Council approved the following at its April 16th meeting as recommended by the Planning Commission:

- Minor Subdivision at 5885 Oxford Street submitted by Paul Elgersma
- Ordinances 961 and 962, Text Amendment: Chapter 200, Refuse Containers and Administrative Citations

NEW BUSINESS

PUBLIC HEARING - VARIANCE, PRELIMINARY PLAT*

FILE NO:	2689-18-09
APPLICANT:	SEAN KEATTS
LOCATION:	4140 HODGSON ROAD

Presentation by Aaron Sedey

The property is located between Hawes and Demar and consists of 3.67 acres. It is currently developed with two single family homes and numerous accessory structures. The application is to split the parcel into eight single family residential lots. A variance is requested for key lot standards on Lots 4 and 5. The property is zoned R1, Detached Residential. All adjacent properties are zoned R1 with single family homes and designated for low density residential.

Access is provided by a public street extending east from Hodgson Road and lines up with Floral Drive to the west. The access road is approximately 306 feet long and terminates in a cul-de-sac. Hodgson Road is a minor arterial road under Ramsey County jurisdiction.

The proposed lots meet the City's minimum standards for the R1 District. Lots 4 and 5 are considered key lots because the side lot lines abut the rear lot line of the adjoining parcels to the east. A variance is required because the lots do not meet the minimum 90-foot width required for a key lot. A minimum 20-foot side yard structure setback is imposed on the key lots.

Storm water flows north. The Stormwater Management Plan was reviewed by the Ramsey-Washington Metro Watershed District. The existing infiltration basin does not have an outlet and is a significant concern of the City and Watershed District. The City would assume ownership of this basin after development. Since there is no outlet, the City would need to adopt an emergency response plan to address potential flooding of adjacent homes. The City's Public Works Department does not support the proposed Storm Water Management Plan because of the potential flooding liability.

The density allowed in the R1 District is 4 units per acre. The proposed density is 2.18 units per acre.

There are an estimated 30 landmark trees that will be removed. Removal of landmark trees requires a replacement ratio of 6 replacement trees for every 1 landmark tree removed.

Staff believes the proposed single family residential subdivision is a reasonable use of the property, but there are concerns with the design and key lot width variances for Lots 4 and 5.

There may be unique circumstances related to the land—shape, size, surrounding development pattern—but the need for the variance is tied to the subdivision design an number of parcels. If the variance is granted, the character of the neighborhood will not be changed.

Notice of the public hearing was published in the City's legal newspaper and mailed to property owners within 350 feet. Two resident comments were received opposing the subdivision and citing concerns about drainage and concerns about the key lots 4 and 5. The Watershed District expressed concern about the proposed infiltration basin with no outlet that would require an emergency response plan to be adopted by the City. The City Department of Public Works agrees with the Watershed District. Ramsey County supports the road placement. A 50-foot right-of-way is required. Permits will be needed for any improvements in the right-of-way.

Staff finds that the proposal generally complies with the zoning and subdivision. Staff supports the proposed investment and redevelopment of the property for detached residential homes. However, given the concerns of the Watershed District and Public Works Department regarding the issues with the potential key Lots 4 and 5, staff is does not support the plan at this time.

Staff recommends this matter be tabled to allow the applicant time to address stormwater issues.

Commissioner Riechers asked if staff has a preferred plan for drainage. Mr. Sedey responded that the applicant is working with the Watershed District on the issue.

Commissioner Solomonson asked if Lot 5 would be buildable with the required 20-foot setback. Mr. Sedey explained that there are many house designs that could be used in the allowed buildable area.

Mr. Sean Keatts, 1475 18th Avenue NW, New Brighton, stated he will answer any questions. He stated that he believes Lot 5 is buildable with the setbacks.

Commissioner Peterson asked if there would be options to move lot lines to widen Lots 4 and 5. **Mr. Keatts** answered that the surveyor worked to make sure all the lots met the required 75-foot width. Commissioner Peterson asked about an outlet for the storm water basin. **Mr. Keatts** stated that his consultant is working with the Watershed District. There will be a meeting with the City and Watershed District to work out this issue. Commissioner Peterson noted the removal of landmark trees and asked if additional trees can be preserved. **Mr. Keatts** stated that the trees marked for removal are based on the survey. Depending on how plans are designed, he anticipates saving as many trees as possible.

Chair Doan asked the time line for this project and size of homes. **Mr. Keatts** answered that it depends on working out the issues with the City. He would hope that construction could begin within a couple months. The square footage of the homes would be approximately 3500 square feet. The houses will fit in the neighborhood with nice curb appeal that people would like. He also worked on the development at 1075 Sherwood.

Commissioner Peterson referred to the soil borings and asked if storm water will have to sit a period of time or infiltrate quickly. **Mr. Keatts** responded that it is his understanding that the soil is more sand than clay.

City Attorney Kelly stated that proper notice was given for the public hearing.

Chair Doan opened the public hearing.

Mr. Ryan Olson, 4141 Rustic Place, stated that he understands change will come and he is not opposed to the development. His concern is the key lots. Under City Code, key lots are discouraged. Builders should stay within City guidelines. If Lots 4 and 5 don't fit, they do not fit. The City website indicates the new homes will sell in the \$600,000 range. People who buy those lots will want larger yards. Six lots will fit. It does not make sense to squeeze more houses in.

Mr. Steve Kerrigan stated that he owns the property at 238 Hawes. It is a rental property now, but he plans to move in and use it for a retirement home. A primary concern is the water issue. There will be a tremendous amount of fill brought in. His property on Hawes sits at the lowest elevation in the neighborhood and will be more so with the basin that does not drain. He has already experienced flooding on his driveway. There has also been pooling in front of his house at least three times in the last 10 years with water at 2 and 3 feet. Whose responsibility is it if flooding occurs? He is pleased to see single family residential development, but his lot will suffer.

MOTION: by Commissioner Solomonson, seconded by Commissioner Riechers to close the public hearing at 7:35 p.m.

VOTE: AYES: Anderson, Peterson, Riechers, Solomonson, Yarusso, Doan NAYS: None ABSENT: Wolfe

Commissioner Peterson noted that the flooding referred to by Mr. Kerrigan is since the reconstruction of Hawes. He asked if the City has any reports of flooding on Hawes. Mr. Sedey explained that there used to be a storm water sewer pipe along property lines, but the City did not have easement access to it so it was taken out. When the pipe was removed, water began to pool. Drains can clog which is also an issue. He will refer it to Public Works to review the drainage again.

Commissioner Anderson asked if there is a workable solution. Mr. Sedey answered that is what the Watershed District and the developer are looking into.

Commissioner Peterson noted that in another development credit was given for the size tree planted. There is little buffering to the north and east. He asked if the location of tree planting can be stipulated. Ms. Castle stated that a condition can be included as to where more landscaping should be added. At this time Landscape Plan has not been submitted.

Commissioner Solomonson stated that with the fill being brought in the front will be 924 and the back at 916, an 8 foot difference. He asked if the building height would be based on the front yard elevation. Ms. Castle answered, yes, from the front to the midpoint of the roof. Commissioner Solomonson stated that the back will appear higher from neighboring rambler homes. He asked if there is any concern about the placement of homes in relation to future County road and trail improvements. Mr. Sedey stated that the County does not have plans at this time. The County made no comments about house and building pad locations.

Commissioner Solomonson stated that Lot 5 is the smallest lot with the biggest need for additional setback from neighbors. He would like to see Lot 5 reconfigured to not need a

variance. The homes could appear to be 43 feet in height from the back and very high being adjacent to surrounding 1950s ramblers. He is concerned about potential flooding.

Commissioner Yarusso stated that she understands the economic incentive to develop eight lots rather than six. But creating eight lots raises problems the Commission is asked to solve. If there were six lots, there would be no need for a variance, more trees might be saved, and possibly a location for the outlet to solve the drainage problem could be found. She supports tabling this matter to try to solve these problems.

Commissioner Riechers stated that her concerns, too, are density, the size of Lot 5 and drainage. Work needs to be done with the Watershed District to find a suitable outlet for drainage.

Commissioner Peterson stated that there are a number of options and he would not be inclined to support a variance. There could be smaller lots with smaller homes. The height of the new homes will be substantially different which creates a need for additional setback.

Commissioner Anderson agreed with other Commissioner comments. He questioned whether Lot 5 would be a viable lot with a 20-foot setback and only one variance. He would anticipate the need for another variance in the future.

Chair Doan stated he would also be open to more creativity to make sure this plan fits as closely as possible within City guidelines. He would accept staff's recommendation to table this item for further analysis and work and extend the review period from 60 to 120 days.

MOTION: by Commissioner Solomonson, seconded by Commissioner Yarusso to table the Preliminary Plat and variances submitted by Sean Keatts and Builders, 4140 Hodgson Road to a future Planning Commission meeting to allow time for the applicant to review possibilities to alter the storm water issues and potential key lots for a Planning Commission decision, and the review period shall be extended from 60 to 120 days.

VOTE: AYES: Anderson, Peterson, Riechers, Solomonson, Yarusso, Doan NAYS: None ABSENT: Wolfe

City Attorney Kelly asked if this item will be brought to the next Planning Commission meeting. Ms. Castle stated that she expects this plan will be revised and when next reviewed, new notices will be sent and published for the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING - COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT, PRELIMINARY PLAT, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT-DEVELOPMENT STAGE*

FILE NO:	2690-18-10
APPLICANT:	JPL Development
LOCATION:	0 Rice Creek Parkway – PIN: 043023230002

Presentation by Niki Hill, AICP, Economic Development and Planning Associate

The Comprehensive Plan Amendment application is to change the land use from O, Office to MU, Mixed Use with residential and commercial uses. The Preliminary Plat divides the property

into four parcels to be developed in two phases with multi-family residential apartments, townhomes and an outlet for future commercial development. Two parcels will be for the apartment complex. One parcel is for townhomes and the fourth parcel will be held vacant for future commercial development. The proposed Preliminary Plat complies with the City's subdivision standards.

The property consists of 18.54 acres and is the final vacant parcel in the Rice Creek Corporate Park, which was developed by Wispark as a mixed use PUD that includes residential, retail, business park and office uses. This parcel is designated for office use, which was anticipated when the PUD for the corporate park was approved in 1999.

Concept plans were reviewed by the Planning Commission and City Council. At that time a number of items were requested to be addressed, including parking, development density, traffic, buffer from traffic noise, proximity to services and site design. The land use change to residential would mean medium density residential across from existing medium density residential. This would have the least impact to adjacent properties. The underlying zoning within the PUD shows Lot 1 as Medium Density Residential, Lots 2 and 3 as High Density Residential and Lot 4 as Commercial.

Staff believes this development will help meet the goals of the Housing Chapter 7 of the Comprehensive Plan. The Economic Development Authority (EDA) has identified this parcel in their 2016/2017 work plan and calls for continued efforts to determine future development options. Shoreview's Housing Action Plan recognizes the need for new rental housing opportunities to expand housing choice in the City and attract younger households.

This proposal meets PUD objectives of high quality building design, improved storm water management, housing choice and land use compatibility. Code flexibility is required for the proposed apartments in regard to building height, structure setbacks and parking. Lot 1 with townhome development meets height and setback requirements. The apartment buildings on Lots 2 and 3 are designed as 4 stories at a height of 48.9 feet. The maximum height allowed is 35 feet. The maximum heigh allowed can be exceeded if there is firefighting capability, and if an additional 1 foot of setback is provided for every additional foot of height over 35 feet. Heights of other apartment complexes in the City range from 41.5 feet to 78.5 feet. Country Inn Suites, located in the northwest corner of the Corporate Park, has a height of 56 feet.

The proposed height of 48.9 feet requires a setback of 43.9 feet on all sides. Staff believes that reduced building setbacks are appropriate given adjoining land uses and cross use easements for the areas where the deviations occur. The proposed deviations will not negatively impact views from public streets or adjoining properties.

There are some concerns about the parcel for commercial use. The centralized location of the parcel along Rice Creek Parkway may not be an ideal location for all types of commercial uses allowed by Code. Allowable uses will be defined in the Development Agreement to ensure that the future use of the parcel is compatible with the residential uses.

Parking exceeds the requirement by 37 stalls for Lot 1, Medium Density townhomes. Underground parking is provided for Lots 2 and 3 with 57 surface parking stalls in Phase 1 and 44 surface parking stalls in Phase 2. The total number is 517 parking stalls, a ratio of 1.65 stalls per unit, which is less than the ratio of 2.5 stalls per unit required by the City. The City's ratio requires a total of 780 parking stalls with 312 stalls enclosed. Shared parking is expected with the cross easements on the development. There are 48 stalls shown in proof of parking with 24 future surface stalls on each of Lots 2 and 3, if needed.

Separate clubhouses are proposed for both the townhomes and apartments. Both will have pools. A playground structure is planned as well as a dog park and walkways. Under zoning codes of R2 and R3, accessory structures except garages are not allowed. Staff believes the deviations are acceptable. Other residential developments have clubhouses, and they will enhance the development.

Impervious surface coverage is limited to 65% for multi-family residential use and commercial park use. Medium density is limited to 55%. Proposed impervious surface on all lots is less than the maximum allowed. The project is located within the Rice Creek Watershed District. A regional stormwater basin was sized to handle runoff from the site. Stormwater service stubs are located at the property line in various locations. On-site stormwater treatment must meet the requirements of Rice Creek Watershed District. The Public Works Department has submitted comments on the Watershed District permits required, stormwater, utilities and traffic.

The architectural design for the apartments is two 4-story buildings at a height of 48.9 feet. The townhomes are two stories with attached garages. Garden units are two stories with garages underneath. The back side of the garage on garden units will have window/false windows to help break up the visual wall appearance to the freeway. Exterior building materials include brick, centurion stone, James Hardie lap siding and panels.

The site requires an Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) because over 150 units are proposed, and a Comprehensive Plan Amendment is requested. The developer will complete the EAW and submit it to the Environmental Quality Board for review, after which the City will determine whether or not an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is required.

One written comment was received expressing concerns about how this development will impact their property, the Rice Creek Waterway and trail access. These concerns include stormwater drainage management of the site.

The Building Official has concerns about the clubhouse for the apartments being located on the property line because of possible building code implications. This must be addressed prior to the final PUD application.

Lake Johanna Fire Department has stated that the developer should verify fire apparatus access roads, turning radius of cul-de-sacs, and that roads meet minimum standards of the Minnesota Fire Code.

Staff finds that the proposed development is consistent with Shoreview's land use and housing policies and meets the criteria for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Preliminary Plat and PUD. Medium and high density multi-family residential will benefit the community and nearby employment centers. Staff is recommending the Planning Commission hold the public hearing and forward a recommendation to the City Council for approval of the applications with the conditions listed.

Commissioner Solomonson referred to a letter received from the Mn/DOT regarding noise standards and residential development possibly too close to the freeway.

Commissioner Yarusso noted that the noise studies by the stated have been done along this area of the freeway, and this portion is not part of a noise wall project. There are insufficient funds to build noise walls in the places identified. The rule is to avoid creating a situation that does not now exist. The noise issue will have to be addressed on the property because it will not be addressed by Mn/DOT. Ms. Castle noted that noise is part of the EAW that must be completed. Commissioner Yarusso stated that she will be looking to see if the EAW differentiates noise as a result of the development and noise coming into the development from the freeway.

Commissioner Peterson stated that the watershed permit process and EAW may bring up additional issues. His concern is whether the Planning Commission would be able to review revisions that are required. Ms. Hill responded that the conditions of approval include being able to obtain a watershed permit. If revisions have to be made to get the permit, the plan would come back to the Planning Commission. Ms. Castle stated that a condition can be added that the EAW must be submitted according to state rules. If issues arise from the EAW, which requires an EIS, those issues must be resolved prior to final approval action by the City.

Commissioner Riechers asked if other developments have had similar parking constraints and fewer parking stalls allowed than required by Code. Ms. Hill answered that the two most recent apartment developments were approved without meeting the City's parking standard. The City's requirement of 2.5 parking stalls per unit is a high standard in comparison to other communities.

Commissioner Solomonson asked how this site would be connected to the trail and the location of crosswalks. Ms. Hill showed a pathways that along the southern border of the site and along Rice Creek Parkway that connect to trails and two existing crosswalks. No additional crosswalks are planned.

Mr. El Tinklenberg, Representative for JPL, thanked the owners of Children's Hospital who have conscientiously studied the issues raised at the Concept Stage Review. Two neighborhood meetings have been held, which are extremely important to build a relationship. Two further meetings are planned, one for the construction schedule and one to know who contact people are after the project is built. JPL builds the project to own and manage it. He introduced the development team: Brian Wood, Civil Engineer with Westood; John Porta, JPL; Rod Jones, JPL; Mike Lang, JPL; Chuck Rietzel, Architect; Tom

Mr. Wood noted the addition of carriage houses to provide more of a buffer from the freeway, and the density of the townhomes has been reduced. The parking ramp was removed and

underground parking added. A trail was added along the perimeter of the development. The townhomes are closer to Rice Creek Parkway and a street in front of the twonhomes removed. The apartment buildings are separated. There are carriage homes on that site as well.

Mr. Wood stated that the downstream regional pond was constructed to handle runoff from this site. However, since the rules have changed, there may be mitigation that has to be done on-site to handle water. A meeting was held with Mn/DOT, when berms and fencing were discussed. There is no anticipation of a noise wall.

Commissioner Anderson asked the reason there are two parcels for the apartment buildings. **Mr. Tinklenberg** answered that the lot lines were placed in order to finance each part of the project separately. If there is an issue, it can be adjusted.

Chair Doan asked if the clubhouse and pool would be built with the first apartment building or second one. **Mr. Porta** answered that the clubhouse will mainly serve the townhomes. The clubhouse for apartments will be in each building. The pool will be built with the first phase. **Mr. Tinklenberg** added that all utility work will be done in the first phase.

Commissioner Riechers asked if affordable housing units are being considered. **Mr. Tinklenberg** stated that there are discussions with staff. Ramsey County was approached for funding, but the affordable housing funding provided by the County has already been used for 2018. JPL has committed to providing affordable units on their own. Rents for affordable units have not yet been set.

Commissioner Anderson asked if more than four affordable units could be added by applying for County funds in 2019. **Mr. Tinklenberg** explained by 2019, financing will be set. JPL is offering to equal what would have been provided by Ramsey County. **Mr. Lang** noted that the total project value is approximately \$90 million, and the County's \$300,000 would dominate. It is more efficient to dedicate four units at 75% of market rate rent.

Commissioner Solomonson asked if there are trees or other features in the courtyard. **Mr. Porta** stated that there will be astro turf, plantings, fire pits, gazebos and seating areas. Planters may be provided for tenants to grow their own gardens.

Chair Doan noted the good improvements made with trails and green space. He appreciates the fact that JPL is willing to provide four affordable units. However, four units out of 368 total, is only 1%. He asked if it would be possible to stretch that further to more units. This is the largest site left in Shoreview and there is concern that every factor be considered. **Mr. Tinklenberg** stated that there is an openness on the part of JPL to consider more affordable units.

Chair Doan asked if other state funding has been explored for affordable units. **Mr. Tinklenberg** answered, no, but JPL is open to doing that. Ms. Castle commented that in discussions with the County staff was advised that this project would have a difficult time accessing state funding for affordable units. She further noted that because there is no public financing, the City has no authority to attach conditions regarding affordable units, although JPL is certainly aware that this is an important factor for the City. Commissioner Peterson asked how snow removal and storage will be handled. **Mr. Wood** answered that the specific areas will be delineated with the Final Plat. There are perimeter areas that can be used.

Chair Doan stated that the number of affordable units is a sticking point for him, but he will vote to move the project forward.

MOTION: by Commissioner Peterson, seconded by Commissioner Solomonson to recommend the City Council approve the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Preliminary Plat, and PUD – Development Stage applications submitted by JPL Development, LLC for the 0 Rice Creek Parkway. The proposal includes the development of 68 townhomes, 300 apartment units and a future commercial lot. Said approvals are subject to the following conditions:

Comprehensive Plan Amendment

- 1. The amendment changes the land use designation from O, Office to MU, Mixed Use.
- 2. Environmental Assessment Worksheet must be completed. After their review, the City will then make a determination as to whether or not an Environmental Impact Statement is required.
- 3. Review and approval of the amendment by the Metropolitan Council.
- 4. The amendment will not be effective until the City grants approval of the Final Plat and PUD Final Stage requests and the development agreements are executed.

Preliminary Plat

- 1. A public use dedication fee shall be submitted as required by ordinance prior to release of the final plat by the City.
- 2. The Final Plat shall be submitted to the City for approval with the Final Stage PUD application.
- 3. The Declaration of Easements, Restrictions, Covenants and Conditions shall be amended to reflect the changes in land use, parking and impervious surface coverage for each lot within the Plat. This Declaration shall be submitted to the City Attorney for review and approval prior to the release of the Final Plat. Executed and recorded copies of the Declaration shall be submitted to the City.
- 4. Drainage and Utility Easements shall be dedicated over the stormwater ponding areas. Other drainage and utility easements shall be provided over the proposed stormwater management areas, infiltration basins and as required by the Public Works Director.

Planned Unit Development – Development Stage

 This approval permits the development of a townhome development on Lot 1, a multifamily residential apartment complex that will be constructed in two phases on Lots 2 and 3, and a future commercial use on Lot 4. The apartment complex will consist of 2 separate apartment buildings and 12 garden units; each apartment building will be 4stories in height with about 150 apartment units between the two buildings. Parking shall be provided on-site in an underground parking structure and surface parking lot.

- 2. The items identified in the City Engineer's memo dated April 16 shall be addressed in the Final PUD submittal.
- 3. A Phasing Plan shall be submitted with the Final PUD application and shall include the construction schedule and development activities for each phase.
- 4. Approval of the final grading, drainage, utility, and erosion control plans by the Public Works Director is required, prior to submittal to the issuance of a building permit. Final plans shall identify site construction limits and the treatment of work (i.e. driveways, parking areas, grading, etc.) at the periphery of these construction limits.
- 5. The developer shall secure a permit from the Rice Creek Watershed District prior to commencing any grading on the property.
- 6. Declaration of Easements, Restrictions, Covenants and Conditions are required and shall identify the permitted land uses and shared parking within the PUD. This Declaration shall be submitted to the City Attorney for review and approval prior to the release of the Final Plat. Executed and recorded copies of the Declaration shall be submitted to the City.
- 7. The proposed apartment housing structures shall be of a 4-story design and include the architectural enhancements and high-quality building materials as identified as depicted on the plans submitted with this application. The structure shall not exceed the 48'9"-foot height as identified in this report and on the submitted plans.
- 8. The applicant is required to enter into agreements related to the subdivision, site development and erosion control. Said agreements shall be executed prior to the issuance of any permits for this project. The agreement shall address:
 - a) Construction management and nuisances that may occur during the construction process, including on-site parking for contractors. No parking is permitted on Rice Creek Parkway or the adjacent neighborhood streets of Bluestem and Prairie Ridge Drive.
 - b) Landscape maintenance
 - c) Maintenance of stormwater management facilities
- 9. This approval shall expire after two months if the Planned Unit Development Final Stage application has not been submitted for City review and approval, as per Section 203.060 (C)(6).

This approval is based on the following findings:

- 1. The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment changing the land use to MU, Mixed Use in order to permit a mixed use development, primarily residential is consistent with the policies of the Comprehensive Plan related to land use and housing.
- 2. The proposed development of the site will not adversely impact the planned land use of the surrounding property.
- 3. The development supports the City's goals for creating and maintaining a well-balanced community that provides life-cycle and affordable housing with a diverse mix of housing types and values.

Discussion:

Chair Doan asked if there should be a condition related to state noise standards and appropriate mitigations measures are included. City Attorney Kelly responded that condition is not

necessary because the state rules require the local municipality to insure that developments not compatible with noise rules are placed in violation of those rules.

Commissioner Solomonson asked if the Planning Commission will review the future proposal for the commercial site. Ms. Castle explained that the Development Agreement will specify uses for Lot 4. When development plans are submitted, there will a Planning Commission review.

VOTE: AYES: Anderson, Peterson, Riechers, Solomonson, Yarusso, Doan NAYS: None ABSENT: Wolfe

MISCELLANEOUS

Council Meetings: Commissioner Anderson will attend the May 7, 2018 City Council meeting, when planning items will be considered. Commissioner Peterson will attend the June meeting in place of Chair Doan.

Workshops: Planning Commission workshops are scheduled for May 1st and May 8th.

Training: Ms. Castle reported contact with the Government Training Service who would be willing to do a customized training program in June or July. No specific date or topic has been set. The subject will have to do with the Planning Commission's role in processing land use applications.

Chair Doan also asked for better understand the public engagement process. Ms. Castle suggested a second training on teamwork, when public engagement can be considered.

ADJOURNMENT

- **MOTION:** by Commissioner Yarusso, seconded by Commissioner Anderson to adjourn the meeting at 9:14 p.m.
- VOTE: AYES: Anderson, Peterson, Riechers, Solomonson, Yarusso, Doan NAYS: None ABSENT: Wolfe

ATTEST:

Kathleen Castle City Planner

TO:	Planning Commission
FROM:	Aaron Sedey, Associate Planner
DATE:	May 17, 2018

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plat (Major Subdivision), 4140 Hodgson Road, Sean Keatts, File No. 2689-18-09

INTRODUCTION

This is a continuation from the April 24, 2018 Planning Commission. Sean Keatts of Cara Builders LLC submitted a Preliminary Plat (Major Subdivision) application to subdivide and develop the property at 4140 Hodgson Road into 8 lots for single-family detached homes. Variances are no longer requested for two key lots that are lacked the required width since they now meet the required width.

A proposed public street that terminates in a cul-de-sac will be constructed to provide access. There are two existing single family homes that will be removed along with numerous accessory structures. Stormwater runoff is proposed to be managed with an infiltration basin. Municipal water and sewer will be installed by the applicant and provide services to each parcel.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS

The property has an area of 3.6 acres and is located on the east side of Hodgson Road. The property is currently developed with two legal nonconforming single-family homes with detached garage, and accessory structures. Access to the property is from Hodgson Road. Vegetation on the site consists of open areas with grasses and wooded areas with heavy tree coverage on the western and southern property lines. The property is currently served by a septic system.

The surrounding property is developed with detached single family dwellings that are generally onestory in height. The area was principally developed in the 1950's.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The property is guided for Low Density Residential (0 to 4 units per acre) as are the adjoining properties to the north, west, east and south which are developed for single-family residential use.

DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE REQUIREMENTS

Preliminary Plats require the Planning Commission to hold a public hearing, review the application and forward a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council then takes final action on the application. After the preliminary plat is approved, the applicant will need to submit a Final Plat application which is reviewed and acted on by the City Council.

Preliminary Plats are reviewed in accordance with subdivision and zoning district standards in the Development Regulations.

The City's subdivision standards (Sec. 204) require all lots to have frontage on a public right-of-way. Municipal sanitary sewer and water service must be provided to the new lots. The standards also require 5-foot public drainage and utility easements along side property lines, and 10-feet along front and rear lines. Public drainage easements are also required over watercourses, drainages or floodways, as necessary.

The property is located in the R1, Detached Residential as are the adjoining properties to the north, west, east and south. In the R1 district, minimum lot standards (Sec. 205.082 (D)(1)) require a lot area of 10,000 square feet, a width of 75 feet and a depth of 125 feet. Corner lots must have a minimum width of 90 feet along the front property line.

Principal structure setbacks are required to be a minimum of 25 feet from a front property line, 10-feet from a side lot line and 30-feet from a rear property line (Sec. 205.082 (D)(2)). Attached accessory structures must be setback a minimum of 5-feet from a side property line. The minimum structure setback required from a minor arterial roadway is 40-feet.

Key lots are any lots, which the rear of which abuts the side lot line of an adjoining lot, or any lot, the side lot line of which abuts the rear lot line. These types of parcels are discouraged, however, when they are adjacent to an existing parcel, additional width and setback restrictions are imposed to minimize the development impacts on the existing property (Section 204.030 C.9). In this case, a minimum 90-foot width is required for the key lots. Key Lots also require a minimum 20-foot structure setback (Section 205.080 D.1.f) from the side property line.

APRIL 2018 PLANNING COMMISSION

This case was heard at the April 24, 2018 meeting and was tabled and the review period extended by the Planning Commission. This was done for concerns from the Planning Commission relating to the key lot standards not being met and that the stormwater management plan wasn't supported by the Watershed or Public Works Department. Guidance from the Planning Commission was to figure out a suitable solution for stormwater that has the approval of the watershed and to address the needs of the key lots standards by making it work with the additional setbacks or remove lots to achieve the requirements.

STAFF REVIEW

PRELIMINARY PLAT

The preliminary plat was reviewed in accordance with the City's standards for subdivisions (Section 204) and the R1 (Section 205.080). The following outlines some of the key features of the proposed subdivision.

Street Network/Traffic. Currently, access to the property is from Hodgson Road. The proposed public street would align with Floral Drive is located in the same area as the existing driveway and will have an estimated length of about 306-feet. The street design is consistent with City design standards (Section 204.030 and 040). Hodgson Road is classified as "A" Minor Arterial.

Lot Layout. The proposed Lots 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, and 8 comply with the minimum lot standards of the R1 zoning district. The lots are required to have a minimum width of 75-feet for an interior lot, a

minimum width of 90 feet for a corner lot, a minimum depth of 125-feet, and a minimum area of 10,000 square feet (Section 205.082 D.1.f).

Two of the proposed parcels (Lots 4 and 5) are key lots, since their side lot lines abut the rear lot line of existing parcels to the east. When key lots are adjacent to an existing parcel, additional width and setback restrictions are imposed to minimize the development impacts on the existing property (Section 204.030 C.9). Both parcels comply with the key lot standards, now that the developer has shifted the lot lines of the proposed lots. On Lot 4 and 5, the building pad shows the new proposed parcels comply with the key lot 20-foot structure setback requirement (Section 205.080 D.1.f) from the side property line.

Stormwater Management. The existing drainage pattern generally flows toward the northeast where the proposed infiltration basin is located. This infiltration basin is located in the rear yards of Lots 2, 3 and 4 and is designed to capture stormwater runoff from the development. The stormwater basin will continue to take runoff from neighboring properties and the runoff of the proposed development. Please see City Engineers comments. Access to this infiltration basin would be provided by an easement that extends along the rear property line of Lots 1 and 2. This infiltration basin would be conveyed to the City at the culmination of the development.

The property is located in the Ramsey Washington Metro Watershed District. The Watershed District and Public Works Department have been working on concerns with the developer on the design of this system, it will require the developer to gain access to Hawes or Rustic to install an overflow outlet. See the attached comments from the City Engineer.

Density. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Low-Density Residential (RL), where a development density of zero to four units per acre is allowed. The proposed 2.18 units per acre density comply with the Comprehensive Plan and is consistent with the density established in this area.

Tree Preservation and Landscaping. The property contains both open and wooded areas. Tree removal and replacement plans are required prior to approval of the final plat. The submitted plans estimate that 40 landmark trees will be removed for the subdivision. These trees are located throughout the site. Trees along the western and southern boundaries will remain.

Replacement trees are required at a rate of 6 replacement trees for each landmark tree removed (Section 209.050 B.2.C.i.bb). A plan needs to be submitted that identifies the location of these replacement trees. If all of the required replacement trees cannot be planted on-site, a financial contribution to the City's forestry fund will be required.

Architectural Standards. The City does not have single family residential architectural standards in City Code to enforce and allows citizens and developers design a principal of their architectural tastes as long as it meets setbacks. Lots 2, 3 and 4 are designed as walkout lots with lowest floor elevations set at 916.2. This elevation is similar to or slightly lower than the elevation of the homes on Hawes Avenue. The proposed building pads are located an estimated 140-180 feet from the rear lot line and

are separated by the infiltration basin. Staff is recommending landscaping be installed along the north lot line of these lots to mitigate the visual impact.

Grading. The City Code states that grading shall not be altered as to direct additional surface and storm water onto adjoining properties.

PUBLIC/AGENCY COMMENT

Notice of the Public Hearing was published in the City's legal newspaper, and mailed to property owners within 350 feet of the property boundary. Several written comments from neighbors were submitted with concerns was they bought their home because it was next to the open space, drainage, trees and height of potential homes. Please see attached comments.

Nicole Soderholm of the Ramsey Washington Metro Watershed District (RWMWD) at the time of writing the report still stated they were working with the applicant on the outlet. The project is subject to the permitting requirements of the District.

City Engineer Tom Wesolowski, reviewed the proposed and stormwater calculations and is in agreement with the Watershed that the outlet and easement to make the stormwater management plan for the proposed development. Please see attached comments.

Natural Resources Coordinator Ellen Brenna recommends that an actual landscaping plan be submitted prior to the final plat application, that shows species, arrangement of plantings to scale and takes soil type and topography into account. Also tree placement should be a minimum 10 feet apart.

No further comment from Ramsey County.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff is supportive of the reuse of this property for new detached single family residential subdivision since it is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the R1 zoning and does not require any variances to be developed.

Staff has reviewed the proposal in accordance with the preliminary plat requirements. The preliminary plat complies with the City's R1, Detached Residential zoning district and subdivision standards. Staff is supportive of the Preliminary Plat as long as an overflow stormwater pipe and the required easement is obtained to address the Watershed and Public Works request. Therefore Staff recommends the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Preliminary Plat to the City Council, subject to the following conditions:

Preliminary Plat

1. The approval permits the development of a detached residential subdivision providing 8 lots for single family residential development.

- 2. Final grading, drainage and erosion control plans are subject to the review and approval by the Public Works Director prior to approval of any permits or the Final Plat. Concerns identified by the City Engineer shall be addressed with the Final Plat submittal.
- 3. Final utility plans are subject to review and approval by the Public Works Director.
- 4. The final street design is subject to review and approval of the Public Works Director.
- 5. A Development Agreement, Erosion Control Agreement shall be executed and related securities submitted prior to any work commencing on the site. A Grading Permit is required prior to commencing work on the site.
- 6. A Public Recreation Use Dedication fee shall be submitted as required by ordinance prior to release of the Final Plat.
- 7. The landscape/tree-replanting plan shall be provided in accordance with the City's Tree Protection Ordinance. Trees on the property, which are to remain, shall be protected with construction fencing placed at the tree driplines prior to grading and excavating. Said plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the City Planner prior to submitted of the final plat application.
- 8. The Final Plat shall include drainage and utility easements along all property lines. Drainage and utility easements along the roadways shall be 10 feet wide and 5 feet wide along the side and rear lot lines. Other drainage and utility easements shall be provided over the proposed bio-filtration area, future public infrastructure and as required by the Public Works Director.
- 9. The developer shall secure a permit from the Ramsey Washington Metro Watershed District prior to commencing any grading on the property.
- 10. The developer shall gain an easement for the storm pond outlet, prior to the City submittal of the final plat application. Said easement shall be submitted to the City Attorney for review and approval.
- 11. Lot 1 shall have a 30 foot setback on the eastern lot line as it is a rear yard and the access for the lot shall be on the cul-de-sac.
- 12. Landscaping plan be submitted prior to issuance of any permits, that shows species, arrangement of plantings to scale and takes soil type and topography into account. Landscaping shall be installed along the eastern boundary and along the northern lot lines of Lots 2, 3, and 4. Said plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the Natural Resources Coordinator prior to submittal of the final plat application.

Attachments:

- 1. Location map
- 2. Submitted plans
- 3. Comments (a) Public Comments (b)Tom Wesolowski, City Engineer
- 4. Motion to Recommend

T:/2018 Planning Case Files\2689-18-09 4140 Hodgson Rd/pcreportMAY



Date:	May 14, 2018
To:	Aaron Sedey, Associate Planner
From:	Tom Wesolowski, City Engineer
Subject:	Preliminary Plat and Plan Set – Subdivision – Revised 05-08-2018 4140 Hodgson

The City of Shoreview Engineering staff has reviewed the preliminary plat and engineering plans dated 05-08-208, submitted for the planned residential development at 4140 Hodgson Road and has the following comments:

 The developer has revised the stormwater management design to include additional underground infiltration along the west side of the site and also an underground outlet pipe from the proposed infiltration basin located on the north side of the property, that would connect to the existing City stormwater collection system on Hawes Avenue. The revisions to the design were based on a meeting between the developer, the developer's engineer, City staff, and staff from the Ramsey-Washington Metro Watershed District (RWMWD). The design does meet or exceed the requirements of the City's Surface Water Management Plan requirements. The design must also meet the requirements of the RWMWD and a permit is required.

Currently stormwater runoff from the backyards of the properties adjacent to the north and east sides of the development property drain to a low area located along the north portion of the development property. The proposed stormwater management design includes an infiltration basin that would be constructed in the low area that would continue to receive the runoff from the adjacent properties as well as runoff from the new development. The basin would be designed to store and infiltrate a 100-yr storm event, which meets the requirements of the City and RWMWD. The proposed outlet from the basin would serve as an emergency overflow and direct runoff in excess of a 100-yr event to the City's stormwater collection system on Hawes Avenue. Emergency overflows that direct excess runoff to City streets and stormwater collection systems are typical throughout the City.

Installation of the underground pipe would require the developer to obtain easements from the existing property owners.

As is typical with residential developments, the City would assume ownership of the public infrastructure once it is constructed and accepted by the City.

- 2. Staff supports the width and location of the proposed right of way for the road and culde-sac.
- 3. Street
 - a. The proposed street width of 29-feet from back of curb to back of curb and the diameter of the cul-de-sac is acceptable. The width and diameter is consistent with City standards and similar neighborhoods in the City.
 - b. Location of the access point is acceptable, is located in line with access point on the west side of Hodgson Road.

Page 2

- c. Surmountable concrete curb gutter is an acceptable style and is consistent with similar neighborhoods in the City. A detail of the style of surmountable curb and gutter required by the City will be supplied to the engineer working with the developer.
- d. A typical pavement cross-section will be supplied to the engineer working with the developer.
- e. The City requires joints to be cut into the wear course of the asphalt and sealed. The specifications of the saw and seal will be supplied to the engineering working with the developer.
- 4. Water and Sanitary Sewer
 - a. City water and sanitary sewer is available to the site.
 - b. Materials and location shown for the water main is acceptable.
 - c. Materials and location shown for the sanitary sewer is acceptable. Clean-outs are required to be installed at the property line on all sanitary sewer services.
 - d. Standard details for water and sanitary sewer infrastructure will be supplied to the engineering working with the developer.
- 5. Two street lights with underground conduit and power will need to be installed as part of the project. One located at the intersection with Hodgson Road and the other located at the end of the cul-de-sac.

STORMWATER DRAINAGE REPORT

WHISTLER PINES

SHOREVIEW, MN (Plowe #18-1749)

REV: MAY 14, 2018

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PLAN WAS PREPARED BY ME OR UNDER MY DIRECT SUPERVISION AND THAT I AM A DULY LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA.

> ADAM GINKEL, P.E. MN LIC. NO. 43963





6776 Lake Drive, Suite 110 Lino Lakes, Minnesota 55014 Office (651) 361-8210 Fax (651) 361-8701

28-1749 WHISTLEP PINES

Site Drainage Narrative & Storm Water Calculations

REV.: May 14, 2018

This project proposes the subdivision of a 3.67-acre parcel into (8) single-family residential lots. The site is located at 4140 Hodgson Rd in Shoreview.

This project falls within Ramsey Washington Metro Watershed District (RWMWD).

Existing Conditions

The existing site has one single-family residence with several outbuildings and light tree coverage. The terrain is generally sloped internally to an isolated low area. This low area captures the run-off from many of the surrounding lots (backyards and rear-roof areas).

Proposed Conditions

The proposed development will include construction of a public street, installation of sanitary sewer and watermain (public), installation of storm sewer (public) and the preparation of eight (8) single-family residential lots.

Perforated pipes in a rock bed are proposed within the street to meet treatment requirements for the new impervious surface. This system outlets to an infiltration basin which in turn outlets into the public storm sewer within Hawes Avenue. A check valve is provided to ensure that backflow does not occur.

Wetlands

NWI maps indicate no wetlands on-site.

Geotechnical & Soils Info

The USDA NRCS website indicates the site is sandy, with the low area being Lino loamy fine sands and the upland areas being Zimmerman sands.

A geotechnical report was prepared by ITCO Allied Engineering Company (3-21-2018). The report included several penetration borings. The borings generally indicate varying thicknesses of topsoil over very fine sands, very fine sands with silt, and silty very fine sands.

SITE DRAINAGE NARRATIVE PAGE 1 OF 4 Groundwater was not encountered in any of the borings (to 16-ft depth).

For this report, HSG "B" soils are assumed.

RWMWD RULE C: STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

1. Runoff Rate: Runoff rates for the proposed activity shall not exceed existing runoff rates for the 2-year, 10-year, and 100-year critical storm events, using Atlas 14 precipitation depths and storm distributions or as approved by the District. Runoff rates may be restricted to less than the existing rates when the capacity of downstream conveyance systems is limited.

The perforated pipes in rock and infiltration basin have zero-run off; thus, rate control is achieved for all analyzed storm events for areas draining to these BMPs.

For the site in aggregate, including the areas draining to Hodgson:

	2-YEAR	10-YEAR	100-YEAR
	(CFS)	(CFS)	(CFS)
EXISTING	0.51	1.51	4.84
PROPOSED	0.54	1.40	4.19

Rate control is within model tolerance.

2. Runoff Volume: Stormwater runoff shall be retained onsite in the amount equivalent to 1.1 inches of runoff over the impervious surfaces of the development. The required stormwater runoff volume shall be calculated as follows:

Required Stormwater Runoff Volume (CF)	= Impervious s	urfaces (SF) x 1.1 (IN) x 1/12 (FT/IN)
Total new impervio	us surface	= 47,470 square feet
Required Stormwat Using infiltratio	er Runoff Volu n	me (CF) = (47,470 sf) x (1.1) x (1/12) = 4,351 cubic feet
Provided Stormwat Perforated pipe	er Runoff Volu in rock	me (CF) = 4,449 cubic feet = Volume within underground system below outlet

The lowest soil classification in the BMP locations is SP-SM, which corresponds to an infiltration rate of 0.45 inches per hour (per the Minnesota Storm Water Manual).

The drawdown time for the required treatment volume is:

SITE DRAINAGE NARRATIVE PAGE 2 OF 4

4,449 cf x <u>1 hr</u> x <u>12 in</u> x <u>1</u> = **25.0 hours** 0.45 in <u>1 ft</u> 4,749 sf

where 4,749 sf is the wetted surface area of the perforated pipe in rock.

Pre-treatment is provided using sump manholes: each manhole in the perforated pipe in rock system has a 4-ft sump to provide some sediment removal.

3. Water Quality: Developments shall incorporate effective non-point source pollution reduction BMPs to achieve 90% total suspended solids removal from the runoff generated by a NURP water quality storm (2.5" rainfall). Runoff volume reduction BMPs may be considered and included in the calculations showing compliance with achieving the 90% TSS removal requirement. Water quality calculations, documentation and/or water quality modeling shall be submitted to verify compliance with the standard.

The perforated pipes in rock and infiltration basin have zero outflow for the analyzed storm events and thus meets the water quality requirements.

The backyard areas that drain to Hodgson Road travel over extensive pervious surface prior to discharge into the public right-of-way.

RWMWD RULE D: FLOOD CONTROL

1. Placement of fill within the 100-year floodplain is prohibited unless compensatory storage is provided. Compensatory storage must be provided on the development or immediately adjacent to the development within the affected floodplain.

There is no floodplain on the site.

2. All habitable buildings, roads, and underground parking structures on or adjacent to a project site shall comply with the following flood control and freeboard requirements: See Table 3 (of RWMWD Rules) for freeboard requirements.

A piped outlet is provided for the infiltration basin.

Per the reference table, the infiltration basin is a "water body with a piped outlet".

SITE DRAINAGE NARRATIVE PAGE 3 OF 4

New Habitable Buildings	Low floor must be a minimum of 2 feet above the 100-year flood elevation
Existing Habitable Buildings Adjacent and Potentially Affected by Flood Waters	Low opening must be a minimum of 2 feet above the 100-year flood elevation

The HWL of the underground pipes in rock is 913.58; the adjacent proposed homes have a low floor of 915.6 or higher, meeting the freeboard requirement.

The HWL of the infiltration basin is 912.00; the adjacent proposed homes have a low floor of 916.5 or higher, meeting the freeboard requirement. Per LIDAR topo, the majority of the existing homes adjacent to the infiltration basin have a low opening significantly above the basin HWL. The lowest existing opening has been field verified at 916.94 at Lot 8 Block 6 of Windward Heights No. 2.

STORM WATER MODELING

Modeling uses HydroCAD with Atlas 14 rainfall events and MSE Type 3 storm distribution. HSG "B" type soils are assumed.

Times of concentration were based on TR-55 for both the Sheet Flow Method and Shallow Concentrated Flow Method.

MAINTENANCE

The proposed storm water management facilities will be public and will be maintained by the City of Shoreview.



Area Listing (all nodes)

Area	CN	Description
(sq-ft)		(subcatchment-numbers)
81,000	98	IMPERVIOUS - EXISTING (A, B, E1, E2)
47,470	98	IMPERVIOUS - PROPOSED (A, B, C, D)
463,026	61	PERVIOUS (A, B, C, D, E1, E2)
591,496	69	TOTAL AREA

Summary for Subcatchment A:

Runoff = 3.83 cfs @ 12.19 hrs, Volume= 11,749 cf, Depth= 0.86"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Split Pervious/Imperv., Time Span= 0.00-150.00 hrs, dt= 0.01 hrs MSE 24-hr 3 2-Year Rainfall=2.81"

	Area (sf)	CN	Description									
*	34,500	98	IMPERVIOU:	ERVIOUS - EXISTING								
*	6,000	98	IMPERVIOU:	S - PROPOS	ED							
*	123,460	61	PERVIOUS									
	163,960	70	Weighted Av	verage								
	123,460	61	75.30% Perv	/ious Area								
	40,500	98	24.70% Imp	ervious Are	a							
Т	'c Length	Slo	pe Velocity	Capacity	Description							
(mir	n) (feet)	(ft/	ft) (ft/sec)	(cfs)								
10	6 140	0.03	80 0.22		Sheet Flow,							

Grass: Short n= 0.150 P2= 2.81"

Summary for Subcatchment B: TO HODGSON

Runoff = 0.54 cfs @ 12.43 hrs, Volume= 2,886 cf, Depth= 0.59"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Split Pervious/Imperv., Time Span= 0.00-150.00 hrs, dt= 0.01 hrs MSE 24-hr 3 2-Year Rainfall=2.81"

	Area (sf)	CN	Description	escription										
*	6,000	98	IMPERVIOU	IPERVIOUS - EXISTING										
*	1,500	98	IMPERVIOU	S - PROPOS	ED									
*	51,653	61	PERVIOUS											
	59,153	66	Weighted A	verage										
	51,653	61	87.32% Pervious Area											
	7,500	98	12.68% Imp	12.68% Impervious Area										
т	c Length	Slo	pe Velocity	Capacity	Description									
(mìn) (feet)	(ft/	ft) (ft/sec)	(cfs)										
28.	3 300	0.0150 0.18		Sheet Flow,										
					Grass: Short	n= 0.150	P2≠ 2.81"							

Summary for Subcatchment C:

Runoff = 2.98 cfs @ 12.17 hrs, Volume= 8,103 cf, Depth= 1.77"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Split Pervious/Imperv., Time Span= 0.00-150.00 hrs, dt= 0.01 hrs MSE 24-hr 3 2-Year Rainfall=2.81"

	Area (sf)	CN	Description									
*	0	98	IMPERVIOU	IPERVIOUS - EXISTING								
*	35,470	98	IMPERVIOU	S - PROPOS	ED							
*	19,448	61	PERVIOUS									
	54,918	85	Weighted A	verage								
	19,448	61	35.41% Perv	ious Area								
	35,470	98	64.59% lmp	ervious Are	а							
Т	c Length	Slo	be Velocity	Capacity	Description							
_ (min	i) (feet)	(ft/	ft) (ft/sec)	(cfs)								
10.	0				Direct Entry,							

Summary for Subcatchment D:

Runoff = 0.38 cfs @ 12.22 hrs, Volume= 1,293 cf, Depth= 0.88"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Split Pervious/Imperv., Time Span= 0.00-150.00 hrs, dt= 0.01 hrs MSE 24-hr 3 2-Year Rainfall=2.81"

	A	rea (sf)	CN	Description			
*		0	98	IMPERVIOU	S - EXISTING	3	
*		4,500	98	IMPERVIOU	S - PROPOS	ED	
*		13,217	61	PERVIOUS			
		17,717	70	Weighted A	verage		
		13,217	61	74.60% Perv	ious Area		
		4,500	98	25.40% imp	ervious Are	а	
	Tc	Length	Slo	pe Velocity	Capacity	Description	
_(n	nin)	(feet)	(ft/	ft) (ft/sec)	(cfs)		
1	13.6	170	0.03	00 0.21		Sheet Flow.	

Grass: Short n= 0.150 P2= 2.81"

Summary for Subcatchment E1: EXISTING 1

Runoff = 3.71 cfs @ 12.19 hrs, Volume= 12,097 cf, Depth= 0.65"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Split Pervious/Imperv., Time Span= 0.00-150.00 hrs, dt= 0.01 hrs MSE 24-hr 3 2-Year Rainfall=2.81"

	Area (sf)	CN	Description										
*	34,500	98	IMPERVIOU	S - EXISTING	3								
*	189,866	61	PERVIOUS	OUS									
	224,366	67	Weighted A	verage									
	189,866	61	84.62% Perv	i2% Pervious Area									
	34,500	98	15.38% lmp	ervious Are	а								
To (min	: Length) (feet)	Slo (ft/	pe Velocity ft) (ft/sec)	Capacity (cfs)	Description								
10.6	5 140	0.03	80 0.22		Sheet Flow,								

Grass: Short n= 0.150 P2= 2.81"

Summary for Subcatchment E2: EXISTING 2

Runoff = 0.51 cfs @ 12.46 hrs, Volume= 2,902 cf, Depth= 0.49"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Split Pervious/Imperv., Time Span= 0.00-150.00 hrs, dt= 0.01 hrs MSE 24-hr 3 2-Year Rainfall=2.81"

	Area (sf)	CN	Description							 	
*	6,000	98	IMPERVIOU	S - EXISTING	G						
*	65,382	61	PERVIOUS							 	
	71,382	64	Weighted A	verage							
	65,382	61	91.59% Perv	/ious Area							
	6,000	98	8.41% Impe	rvious Area	I						
r	c Length	Slo	pe Velocity	Capacity	Description						
(mir	n) (feet)	(ft/	ft) (ft/sec)	(cfs)							
28.	3 300	0.01	50 0.18		Sheet Flow,						
					Grass: Short	n= 0.150	P2= 2.81"				

Summary for Pond ELA: EXISTING LOW AREA

Inflow Are	a =	224,366 s	f, 15.38% Impervious,	Inflow Depth =	0.65"	for 2-Year event
Inflow	=	3.71 cfs @	12.19 hrs, Volume=	12,097 cf		
Outflow	=	0.19 cfs @	15.04 hrs, Volume=	12,097 cf,	Atten=	95%, Lag= 170.6 min
Discarded	=	0,19 cfs @	15.04 hrs, Volume=	12,097 cf		

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-150.00 hrs, dt= 0.01 hrs Peak Elev= 909.11' @ 15.04 hrs Surf.Area= 10,368 sf Storage= 6,831 cf

Plug-Flow detention time= (not calculated: outflow precedes inflow) Center-of-Mass det. time= 419.7 min (1,228.2 - 808.5)

Volume	Invert	Avail.	Storage	Storag	e Description		
#1	908.00'	157,779 cf		Custor	n Stage Data (Pr	ismatic) Listed below	(Recalc)
Elevation	Surf.Area		Inc.Store		Cum.Store		
(feet)	(:	sq-ft)	(cubic-feet) 0		(cubic-feet)		
908.00		1, 9 61			0		
910.00	17	7,133	1	9,094	19,094		
912.00	34	4,526	5	1,659	70,753		
914.00	52	52,500		7,026	157,779		

Device	Routing	Invert	Outlet Devices
#1	Discarded	908.00'	0.800 in/hr Exfiltration over Surface area

Discarded OutFlow Max=0.19 cfs @ 15.04 hrs HW=909.11' (Free Discharge) **1=Exfiltration** (Exfiltration Controls 0.19 cfs)

Summary for Pond IB: INFILTRATION BASIN

Inflow Are	a =	236,595 s	f, 34.01% Impervic	ous, Inflow Depth =	0.77" for 2-Year event
Inflow	=	4.82 cfs @	12.28 hrs, Volume	e= 15,164 cf	
Outflow	=	0.15 cfs @	15.30 hrs, Volume	e= 15,166 cf,	, Atten= 97%, Lag= 181.0 min
Discarded		0.15 cfs @	15.30 hrs, Volume	e= 15,166 cf	
Primary	=	0.00 cfs @	0.00 hrs, Volume	e= 0 cf	

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-150.00 hrs, dt= 0.01 hrs Peak Elev= 908.71' @ 15.30 hrs Surf.Area= 14,116 sf Storage= 9,555 cf

Plug-Flow detention time= (not calculated: outflow precedes inflow) Center-of-Mass det. time= 614.7 min (1,411.6 - 797.0)

Volume	Inver	t Avail.	Storage	Storage Description	n		
#1	908.00)' 11	5,359 cf	BASIN STORAGE (Irregular) Listed be	elow (Recalc)	
Elevatio	on Si	urf.Area	Perim.	Inc.Store	Cum.Store	Wet.Area	
(fee	et)	(sq-ft)	(feet)	(cubic-feet)	(cubic-feet)	(sq-ft)	
908.0	00	12,755	475.2	0	0	12,755	-
910.0	00	16,755	526.8	29,419	29,419	16,990	
912.0	00	21,435	589.2	38,094	67,513	22,643	
914.0	00	26,500	0.0	47,846	115,359	50,275	
Device	Routing	Inve	ert Outl	et Devices			
#1	Discarded	908.0	0' 0.45	0 in/hr INFILTRATIC	ON over Wetted ar	ea	
#2	Primary	912.0	0' 10.0	" Round PIPE TO H	AWES AVE L= 152	1.0' Ke= 0.500	

Inlet / Outlet Invert= 912.00' / 911.60' S= 0.0026 '/' Cc= 0.900 n= 0.013, Flow Area= 0.55 sf

Discarded OutFlow Max=0.15 cfs @ 15.30 hrs HW=908.71' (Free Discharge) **1=INFILTRATION** (Exfiltration Controls 0.15 cfs)

Primary OutFlow Max=0.00 cfs @ 0.00 hrs HW=908.00' (Free Discharge)

Summary for Pond UG: UNDERGROUND PIPES

Inflow Are	a =	72,635 s	f, 55.03% Impervio	ous, Inflow Depth	= 1.55"	for 2-Year event
Inflow	=	3.32 cfs @	12.18 hrs, Volume	e= 9,396	cf	
Outflow	±	2.08 cfs @	12.29 hrs, Volume	9,396	cf, Atten=	= 37%, Lag= 6.8 min
Discarded	±	0.03 cfs @	12.29 hrs, Volume	e= 5,981	cf	
Primary	#	2.06 cfs @	12.29 hrs, Volume	e= 3,415	cf	

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-150.00 hrs, dt= 0.01 hrs Peak Elev= 911.66' @ 12.29 hrs Surf.Area= 1,792 sf Storage= 4,523 cf Flood Elev= 911.00' Surf.Area= 1,792 sf Storage= 4,449 cf

Plug-Flow detention time= (not calculated: outflow precedes inflow) Center-of-Mass det. time= 1,134.4 min (1,903.7 - 769.3)

Volume	Invert	Avail.St	torage	Storage	Description			
#1	906.50'	2,	074 cf	ROCK (C	onic) Listed belov	v (Recalc)		
				7,560 cf	Overall - 2,375 cf			
#2	907.50'	2,	,375 cf	36.0" R	ound PERFORATE	D PIPE Inside #1		
				L= 336.0	,			
#3	911.00'	1,	092 cf	CATCH B	ASINS (Conic) Lis	ted below (Recal	lc) x 4	
		5,	541 cf	Total Av	ailable Storage			
Elevatio	n Su	rf.Area	Inc.	Store	Cum.Store	Wet.Area		
(fee	t)	(sq-ft)	(cubic	-feet)	(cubic-feet)	(sq-ft)		
906.5	60	1,680		0	0	1,680		
911.0	ю	1,680		7,560	7,560	2,334		
Elevatio	n Su	rf.Area	Inc.	Store	Cum.Store	Wet.Area		
(fee	t)	(sq-ft)	(cubic	-feet)	(cubic-feet)	(sq-ft)		
911.0	0	28		0	0	2.8		
920.7	'5	28		273	273	211		
Device	Routing	Invert	: Outle	et Devices	;			
#1	Discarded	906.50	0.45	0 in/hr IN	FILTRATION over	Wetted area		
#2	Primary	911.00'	' 18.0'	" Round I	PIPE TO INF BASI	N L= 115.0' Ke=	: 0,500	

inlet / Outlet invert= 911.00' / 909.00' S= 0.0174 '/' Cc= 0.900 n= 0.013, Flow Area= 1.77 sf

Discarded OutFlow Max=0.03 cfs @ 12.29 hrs HW=911.66' (Free Discharge) **1=INFILTRATION** (Exfiltration Controls 0.03 cfs)

Primary OutFlow Max=2.05 cfs @ 12.29 hrs HW=911.66' TW=908.30' (Dynamic Tailwater)

Summary for Subcatchment A:

Runoff = 8.25 cfs @ 12.19 hrs, Volume= 22,719 cf, Depth= 1.66"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Split Pervious/Imperv., Time Span= 0.00-150.00 hrs, dt= 0.01 hrs MSE 24-hr 3 10-Year Rainfall=4.19"

	Area (sf)	CN	Description										
*	34,500	98	IMPERVIOUS - EXIST	VIOUS - EXISTING									
*	6,000	98	IMPERVIOUS - PROP	RVIOUS - PROPOSED									
*	123,460	61	PERVIOUS										
	163,960	70	Weighted Average										
	123,460	61	75.30% Pervious Are	.30% Pervious Area									
	40,500	98	24.70% Impervious	Area									
(mi	Tc Length n) (feet)	Slo (ft/	pe Velocity Capaci ft) (ft/sec) (c	ty Description fs)									
10	.6 140	0.03	80 0.22	Sheet Flow.									

Grass: Short n= 0.150 P2= 2.81"

Summary for Subcatchment B: TO HODGSON

Runoff = 1.40 cfs @ 12.42 hrs, Volume= 6,393 cf, Depth= 1.30"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Split Pervious/Imperv., Time Span= 0.00-150.00 hrs, dt= 0.01 hrs MSE 24-hr 3 10-Year Rainfall=4.19"

	Area (sf)	CN	Description	I									
*	6,000	98	IMPERVIOU	RVIOUS - EXISTING									
*	1,500	98	IMPERVIOU	JS - PROPOS	ED								
*	51,653	61	PERVIOUS										
	59,153	66	Weighted A	ed Average									
	51,653	61	87.32% Per	Pervious Area									
	7,500	98	12.68% Imp	pervious Are	a								
Т	c Length	Slo	pe Velocity	Capacity	Description	1							
(mir	n) (feet)	(ft/	ft) (ft/sec)	(cfs)									
28.	3 300	0.01	50 0.18		Sheet Flow,	······································							
					Grass: Short	rt n=0.150 P2=2.81"							

Summary for Subcatchment C:

Runoff = 4.88 cfs @ 12.17 hrs, Volume= 13,166 cf, Depth= 2.88"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Split Pervious/Imperv., Time Span= 0.00-150.00 hrs, dt= 0.01 hrs MSE 24-hr 3 10-Year Rainfall=4.19"

	Area (sf)	CN	Description										
*	0	98	IMPERVIOU	IVIOUS - EXISTING									
*	35,470	98	IMPERVIOU	RVIOUS - PROPOSED									
*	19,448	61	PERVIOUS	OUS									
	54,918	85	Weighted A	verage									
	19,448	61	35.41% Perv	.41% Pervious Area									
	35,470	98	64.59% imp	ervious Are									
Тс	: Length	Slo	pe Velocity	Capacity	Description								
(min	(feet)	(ft/	ft) (ft/sec)	(cfs)									
10.0)				Direct Entry,								

Summary for Subcatchment D:

Runoff = 0.81 cfs @ 12.22 hrs, Volume= 2,486 cf, Depth= 1.68"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Split Pervious/Imperv., Time Span= 0.00-150.00 hrs, dt= 0.01 hrs MSE 24-hr 3 10-Year Rainfall=4.19"

	Area (sf)	CN	Description							
*	0	98	IMPERVIOU	S - EXISTING	3					
*	4,500	98	IMPERVIOU	S - PROPOS	ED					
*	13,217	61	PERVIOUS							
	17,717	70	Weighted A	verage						
	13,217	61	74.60% Per	4.60% Pervious Area						
	4,500	98	25.40% imp	ervious Are	а					
٦ mir)	c Length 1) (feet)	Slo (ft/	pe Velocity ft) (ft/sec)	Capacity (cfs)	Description					
13.	.6 170	0.03	00 0.21		Sheet Flow,					

Grass: Short n= 0.150 P2= 2.81"

Summary for Subcatchment E1: EXISTING 1

Runoff = 9.40 cfs @ 12.19 hrs, Volume= 25,782 cf, Depth= 1.38"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Split Pervious/Imperv., Time Span= 0.00-150.00 hrs, dt= 0.01 hrs MSE 24-hr 3 10-Year Rainfall=4.19"

	Area (sf)	CN	Description			
*	34,500	98	IMPERVIOU	S - EXISTIN	G	
*	189,866	61	PERVIOUS			
	224,366	67	Weighted A	verage		
	189,866	61	84.62% Perv	vious Area		
	34,500	98	15.38% lmp	ervious Are	a	
	Tc Length	Slo	pe Velocity	Capacity	Description	
(n	nin) (feet)	(ft/	/ft) (ft/sec)	(cfs)		
1	0.6 140	0.03	80 0.22		Sheet Flow.	

Grass: Short n= 0.150 P2= 2.81"

Summary for Subcatchment E2: EXISTING 2

Runoff = 1.51 cfs @ 12.43 hrs, Volume= 6,940 cf, Depth= 1.17"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Split Pervious/Imperv., Time Span= 0.00-150.00 hrs, dt= 0.01 hrs MSE 24-hr 3 10-Year Rainfail=4.19"

	Area (sf)	CN	Description								
*	6,000	98	IMPERVIOU	S - EXISTINO	j	-					
*	65,382	61	PERVIOUS								
	71,382	64	Weighted A	verage							
	65,382	61	91.59% Per	vious Area							
	6,000	98	8.41% impe	rvious Area							
т	c Length	Sio	pe Velocity	Capacity	Description						
(min) (feet)	(ft/	ft) (ft/sec)	(cfs)				 	 	 	
28.	3 300	0.01	50 0.18		Sheet Flow,						
					Grass: Short	n= 0.150	P2= 2.81"				

Summary for Pond ELA: EXISTING LOW AREA

Inflow Are	a =	224,366 s	f, 15.38% lr	mpervious,	Inflow Depth =	1.38"	for 10-Year event
Inflow	=	9.40 cfs @	12.19 hrs,	Volume≖	25,782 cf		
Outflow	=	0.30 cfs @	15.18 hrs,	Volume=	25,783 cf,	Atten=	97%, Lag= 179.4 min
Discarded	=	0.30 cfs @	15.18 hrs,	Volume=	25,783 cf		

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-150.00 hrs, dt= 0.01 hrs Peak Elev= 909.85' @ 15.18 hrs Surf.Area= 16,029 sf Storage= 16,681 cf

Plug-Flow detention time= (not calculated: outflow precedes inflow) Center-of-Mass det. time= 673.2 min (1,480.5 - 807.3)

terenie internet internetere Be and Be and Brian
--

#1 908.00' 157,779 cf Custom Stage Data (Prismatic) Listed below (Recalc)

Elevation (feet)	Surf.Area (sq-ft)	Inc.Store (cubic-feet)	Cum.Store (cubic-feet)
908.00	1,961	0	0
910.00	17,133	19,094	19,094
912.00	34,526	51,659	70,753
914.00	52,500	87,026	157,779

 Device
 Routing
 Invert
 Outlet Devices

 #1
 Discarded
 908.00'
 0.800 in/hr Exfiltration over Surface area

Discarded OutFlow Max=0.30 cfs @ 15.18 hrs HW=909.85' (Free Discharge) **1=Exfiltration** (Exfiltration Controls 0.30 cfs)

Summary for Pond IB: INFILTRATION BASIN

Inflow Are	a ==	236,595 s	f, 34.01% li	mpervious,	Inflow Depth =	1.64"	for 10-Year event
Inflow	=	13.83 cfs @	12.19 hrs,	Volume=	32,239 cf		
Outflow	=	0.17 cfs @	19.10 hrs,	Volume=	32,240 cf,	Atten=	= 99%, Lag= 415.1 min
Discarded	=	0.17 cfs @	19.10 hrs,	Volume=	32,240 cf		
Primary	=	0.00 cfs @	0.00 hrs,	Volume=	0 cf		

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-150.00 hrs, dt= 0.01 hrs Peak Elev= 909.67' @ 19.10 hrs Surf.Area= 16,067 sf Storage= 24,080 cf

Plug-Flow detention time= (not calculated: outflow precedes inflow) Center-of-Mass det. time= 1,367.3 min (2,162.6 - 795.3)

Volume	inver	't Avail	Storage	Storage Description	on			
#1	908.00)' 11	15,359 cf	BASIN STORAGE	Irregular) Listed be	elow (Recalc)		
Elevatio (fee	on Si et)	urf.Area (sq-ft)	Perim. (feet)	Inc.Store (cubic-feet)	Cum.Store (cubic-feet)	Wet.Area (sq-ft)		
908.0	00	12,755	475.2	0	0	12,755		,
910.0	00	16,755	526.8	29,419	29,419	16,990		,
912.0	00	21,435	589.2	38,094	67,513	22,643		
914.0	00	26,500	0.0	47,846	115,359	50,275		
Device	Routing	Invi	ert Out	et Devices				
#1	Discarded	908.0	00' 0.45	0 in/hr INFILTRATIO	ON over Wetted an	rea		
#2	Primary	912.0	00' 10.0	" Round PIPE TO H	AWES AVE L= 152	2.0' Ke= 0.500		
			Inlet	/ Outlet Invert= 91	.2.00'/911.60' S=	0.0026 '/' Cc= 0.	900 n= 0.013, Flow Ar	rea= 0.55 sf

Discarded OutFlow Max=0.17 cfs @ 19.10 hrs HW=909.67' (Free Discharge) **1=INFILTRATION** (Exfiltration Controls 0.17 cfs)

Primary OutFlow Max=0.00 cfs @ 0.00 hrs HW=908.00' (Free Discharge)

Summary for Pond UG: UNDERGROUND PIPES

Inflow Are	a =	72,635 s	f, 55.03% In	npervious,	inflow Depth =	2.59"	for	10-Year event
Inflow	=	5.61 cfs @	12.18 hrs, \	Volume=	15,652 cf			
Outflow	=	5.61 cfs @	12.18 hrs, \	Volume=	15,652 cf,	Atten=	0%,	Lag= 0.3 min
Discarded	=	0.03 cfs @	12.18 hrs, \	Volume=	6,132 cf			
Primary	=	5.58 cfs @	12.18 hrs, \	Volume=	9,520 cf			

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-150.00 hrs, dt= 0.01 hrs Peak Elev= 912.19' @ 12.18 hrs Surf.Area= 1,792 sf Storage= 4,582 cf Flood Elev= 911.00' Surf.Area= 1,792 sf Storage= 4,449 cf

Plug-Flow detention time= (not calculated: outflow precedes inflow) Center-of-Mass det. time= 702.2 min (1,469.8 - 767.6)

Volume	Invert	Avail.Sto	orage	Storage	Description					
#1	906.50'	2,0)74 cf	ROCK (C	COCK (Conic) Listed below (Recalc)					
				7,560 cf	Overall - 2,375 c	f Embedded = 5,	185 cf x 40.0% Voids			
#2	907.50'	2,3	75 cf	36.0" R	ound PERFORATI	ED PIPE Inside #	1			
				L= 336.0) ¹					
#3	911.00'	1,0	92 cf	CATCH	BASINS (Conic) Li	sted below (Rec	aic) x 4			
		5,5	41 cf	Total Av	ailable Storage					
Flevatio	n Sur	fAres	[nc]	Store	Cum Store	Wet Area				
(feet		(ca-ft)	loubic-	feet)	(cubic-feet)	/co-ft\				
0000	-)	1 600	(cooic-		(councreet)	(54-11)				
906.5	0	1,680		U	0	1,680				
911.0	0	1,680		7,560	7,560	2,334				
Elevatio	n Sur	f.Area	Inc.	Store	Cum.Store	Wet.Area				
(feet	:}	(sq-ft)	(cubic-	feet)	(cubic-feet)	(sq-ft)				
911.0	0	28		0	0	28				
920.7	5	28		273	273	211				
Device	Routing	Invert	Outle	t Devices	i					
#1	Discarded	906.50	0.450) in/hr IN	FILTRATION over	Wetted area				

#2 Primary 911.00' 18.0" Round PIPE TO INF BASIN L= 115.0' Ke= 0.500

Inlet / Outlet Invert= 911.00' / 909.00' S= 0.0174 '/' Cc= 0.900 n= 0.013, Flow Area= 1.77 sf

Discarded OutFlow Max=0.03 cfs @ 12.18 hrs HW=912.19' (Free Discharge) **1=INFILTRATION** (Exfiltration Controls 0.03 cfs)

Primary OutFlow Max=5.57 cfs @ 12.18 hrs HW=912.19' TW=908.52' (Dynamic Tailwater)
Summary for Subcatchment A:

54,533 cf, Depth= 3.99" Runoff **m** 21.17 cfs @ 12.18 hrs, Volume=

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Split Pervious/Imperv., Time Span= 0.00-150.00 hrs, dt= 0.01 hrs MSE 24-hr 3 100-Year Rainfall=7.36"

	Area (sf)	CN	Description	۱		
*	34,500	98	IMPERVIOU	JS - EXISTIN	G	
*	6,000	98	IMPERVIOU	JS - PROPOS	ED	
*	123,460	61	PERVIOUS			
	163,960	70	Weighted /	Average		
	123,460	61	75.30% Pei	vious Area		
	40,500	98	24.70% Im	pervious Are	3	
٦	'c Length	Slo	pe Velocity	Capacity	Description	
(mir	n) (feet)	(ft/	/ft) (ft/sec	(cfs)		
10	6 140	0.03	80 0.22)	Sheet Flow,	

10.6 140 0.0380 0.22

Grass: Short n= 0.150 P2= 2.81"

Summary for Subcatchment B: TO HODGSON

17,211 cf, Depth= 3.49" Runoff = 4.19 cfs @ 12.42 hrs, Volume=

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Split Pervious/Imperv., Time Span= 0.00-150.00 hrs, dt= 0.01 hrs MSE 24-hr 3 100-Year Rainfall=7.36"

	Area (sf)	CN	Description					 			
*	6,000	98	IMPERVIOU	S ~ EXISTIN	3						
*	1,500	98	IMPERVIOU:	S - PROPOS	ED						
*	51,653	61	PERVIOUS								
	59,153	66	Weighted A	verage							
	51,653	61	87.32% Perv	vious Area							
	7,500	98	12.68% Imp	ervious Are	а						
Тс	c Length	Slo	pe Velocity	Capacity	Description						
(min) (feet)	(ft/	ft) (ft/sec)	(cfs)							
28.	300	0.01	50 0.18		Sheet Flow,						
					Grass: Short	n= 0.150	P2= 2.81"				

Summary for Subcatchment C:

Runoff 9.70 cfs @ 12.17 hrs, Volume= 25,852 cf, Depth= 5.65" =

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Split Pervious/Imperv., Time Span= 0.00-150.00 hrs, dt= 0.01 hrs MSE 24-hr 3 100-Year Rainfall=7.36"

	Area (sf)	CN	Description		
*	0	98	IMPERVIOUS - EXISTIN	G	
*	35,470	98	IMPERVIOUS - PROPOS	SED	
*	19,448	61	PERVIOUS		
	54,918	85	Weighted Average		
	19,448	61	35.41% Pervious Area		
	35,470	98	64.59% Impervious Are	ea	
T	c Length	Slo	oe Velocity Capacity	Description	
(mir	n) (feet)	(ft/	ft) (ft/sec) (cfs)		
10,	0			Direct Entry,	

Summary for Subcatchment D:

Runoff = 2.06 cfs @ 12.22 hrs, Volume= 5,935 cf, Depth= 4.02"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Split Pervious/Imperv., Time Span= 0.00-150.00 hrs, dt= 0.01 hrs MSE 24-hr 3 100-Year Rainfall=7.36"

	Area (sf)	CN	Description		
*	0	98	IMPERVIOUS - EXIST	ĩNG	
*	4,500	98	IMPERVIOUS - PROP	POSED	
*	13,217	61	PERVIOUS		
	17,717	70	Weighted Average		
	13,217	61	74.60% Pervious Are	ea	
	4,500	98	25,40% Impervious	Area	
(mi	rc Length n) (feet)	Slo (ft/	pe Velocity Capaci ft) (ft/sec) (c	ity Description fs)	
13	.6 170	0.03	00 0.21	Sheet Flow,	

Grass: Short n= 0.150 P2= 2.81"

Summary for Subcatchment E1: EXISTING 1

Runoff = 26.73 cfs @ 12.19 hrs, Volume= 67,378 cf, Depth= 3.60"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Split Pervious/Imperv., Time Span= 0.00-150.00 hrs, dt= 0.01 hrs MSE 24-hr 3 $\,$ 100-Year Rainfall=7.36"

	Area (sf)	CN	De	escription								 	
*	34,500	98	IN	1PERVIOUS	S - EXISTING	3							
*	189,866	61	PE	RVIOUS							 	 	
	224,366	67	W	eighted Av	verage								
	189,866	61	84	.62% Perv	vious Area								
	34,500	98	15	5.38% Imp	ervious Are	а							
1	c Length	Slo	pe	Velocity	Capacity	Description							
(mir	n) (feet)	(ft/	/ft}	(ft/sec)	(cfs)							 	
10	.6 140	0.03	80	0.22		Sheet Flow,							
						Grass: Short	n= 0.150	P2= 2.81"					

Summary for Subcatchment E2: EXISTING 2

Runoff = 4.84 cfs @ 12.42 hrs, Volume= 19,713 cf, Depth= 3.31"

Runoff by SCS TR-20 method, UH=SCS, Split Pervious/Imperv., Time Span= 0.00-150.00 hrs, dt= 0.01 hrs MSE 24-hr 3 100-Year Rainfall=7.36"

	Area (sf)	CN	De	scription						 				
*	6,000	98	IM	PERVIOUS	S - EXISTING	5								
*	65,382	61	PE	RVIOUS						 			 	
	71,382	64	We	eighted Av	verage									
	65,382	61	91	.59% Perv	vious Area									
	6,000	98	8.4	1% Impe	rvious Area									
Ŧ	c Length	Slo	pe	Velocity	Capacity	Description								
(mir) (feet)	(ft/	/ft)	(ft/sec)	(cts)						 			
28.	3 300	0.01	150	0.18		Sheet Flow,								
						Grass: Short	n= 0.150	P2=	2.81"					

912.00

914.00

Summary for Pond ELA: EXISTING LOW AREA

Inflow Are	a =	224,366 si	f, 15.38% Impervio	us, Inflow Depth =	3.60" for 1	.00-Year event
Inflow	=	26.73 cfs @	12.19 hrs, Volume	= 67,378 cf		
Outflow	=	0.53 cfs @	16.16 hrs, Volume	= 67,378 cf,	Atten= 98%,	Lag= 238.4 min
Discarded	=	0.53 cfs @	16.16 hrs, Volume	= 67,378 cf		

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-150.00 hrs, dt= 0.01 hrs Peak Elev= 911.31' @ 16.16 hrs Surf.Area= 28,554 sf Storage= 49,093 cf

Plug-Flow detention time= (not calculated: outflow precedes inflow) Center-of-Mass det. time= 1,131.2 min (1,930.2 - 799.0)

Volume	Invert	Avail.	Storage	Storag	e Description		
#1	908.00'	15	7,779 cf	Custor	m Stage Data (Pri	smatic) Listed below	w (Recalc)
Elevation	Surf.	Area	Inc	.Store	Cum.Store		
(feet)	(9	sq-ft)	(cubic	-feet)	(cubic-feet)		
908.00	t	l,961		0	0		
910.00	17	7,133	1	9,094	19,094		

70,753 157,779

Invert Outlet Devices Device Routing

34,526

52,500

#1 Discarded 908.00' 0.800 in/hr Exfiltration over Surface area

51,659

87,026

Discarded OutFlow Max=0.53 cfs @ 16.16 hrs HW=911.31' (Free Discharge) **1=Exfiltration** (Exfiltration Controls 0.53 cfs)

Summary for Pond IB: INFILTRATION BASIN

Inflow Are	a =	236,595 s	f, 34.01%†	mpervious,	Inflow Depth ≃	4.05"	for 100-Year event
Inflow	=	32.68 cfs @	12.19 hrs,	Volume=	79,921 cf		
Outflow	=	0.24 cfs @	21.47 hrs,	Volume=	79,922 cf,	Atten=	= 99%, Lag= 556.9 min
Discarded	=	0.24 cfs @	21.47 hrs,	Volume=	79,922 cf		
Primary	=	0.00 cfs @	0.00 hrs,	Volume=	0 cf		

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-150.00 hrs, dt= 0.01 hrs Peak Elev= 912.00' @ 21.47 hrs Surf.Area= 21,431 sf Storage= 67,481 cf

Plug-Flow detention time= (not calculated: outflow precedes inflow) Center-of-Mass det. time= 2,917.5 min (3,707.3 - 789.8)

Volume	Inver	t Avail.S	torage	Storage Description	n		
#1	908.00)' 115	,359 cf	BASIN STORAGE (Irregular) Listed b	elow (Recalc)	
Elevatio	on Si	urf.Area	Perim.	Inc.Store	Cum.Store	Wet.Area	
(fee	et)	(sq-ft)	(feet)	(cubic-feet)	(cubic-feet)	(sq-ft)	
908.	00	12,755	475.2	0	0	12,755	
910.0	00	16,755	526.8	29,419	29,419	16,990	
912.0	00	21,435	589.2	38,094	67,513	22,643	
914.0	00	26,500	0.0	47,846	115,359	50,275	
Device	Routing	Inver	t Outl	et Devices		-	
#1	Discarded	908.00)' 0.45	0 in/hr INFILTRATIC	ON over Wetted a	ea	
#2	Primary	912.00)' 10.0	" Round PIPE TO H	AWES AVE L= 152	2.0' Ke= 0.500	

Inlet / Outlet Invert= 912.00' / 911.60' S= 0.0026 '/' Cc= 0.900 n= 0.013, Flow Area= 0.55 sf

Prepared by PLOWE ENGINEERING, INC. HydroCAD® 10.00-19 s/n 01574 © 2016 HydroCAD Software Solutions LLC

Discarded OutFlow Max=0.24 cfs @ 21.47 hrs HW=912.00' (Free Discharge) **1=INFILTRATION** (Exfiltration Controls 0.24 cfs)

Primary OutFlow Max=0.00 cfs @ 0.00 hrs HW=908.00' (Free Discharge)

Summary for Pond UG: UNDERGROUND PIPES

Inflow Are	a ≕	72,635 st	f, 55.03% I	mpervious,	Inflow Depth =	5.25"	for	100-Year event
Inflow	=	11.60 cfs @	12.18 hrs,	Volume=	31,787 cf			
Outflow	æ	11.54 cfs @	12.19 hrs,	Volume=	31,788 cf,	Atten=	1%,	Lag= 0.6 min
Discarded	=	0.03 cfs @	12,19 hrs,	Volume≕	6,400 cf			
Primary	=	11.51 cfs @	12.19 hrs,	Volume=	25,388 cf			

Routing by Dyn-Stor-Ind method, Time Span= 0.00-150.00 hrs, dt= 0.01 hrs Peak Elev= 913.58' @ 12.19 hrs Surf.Area= 1,792 sf Storage= 4,738 cf Flood Elev= 911.00' Surf.Area= 1,792 sf Storage= 4,449 cf

Plug-Flow detention time= (not calculated: outflow precedes inflow) Center-of-Mass det. time= 371.8 min (1,136.4 - 764.6)

Volume	Invert	Avail.St	orage	Storage	Description		
#1	906.50	2,	074 cf	ROCK (Conic) Listed belo	w (Recalc)	
				7,560 ct	f Overall - 2,375 c	f Embedded = 5,	185 cf x 40.0% Voids
#2	907.50	' 2,	375 cf	36.0" F	tound PERFORAT	ED PIPE Inside #	1
				L= 336.0	°,		
#3	911.00	<u> </u>	092 cf	CATCH	BASINS (Conic) Li	sted below (Rec	alc) × 4
		5,	541 cf	Total Av	ailable Storage		
Elevatio	in Su	ırf.Area	Inc	.Store	Cum.Store	Wet.Area	
(fee	t)	(sq-ft)	(cubic	-feet)	(cubic-feet)	(sq-ft)	
906.5	i0	1,680		0	0	1,680	
911.0	00	1,680		7,560	7,560	2,334	
Elevatio	in Su	ırf.Area	Inc	.Store	Cum.Store	Wet.Area	
(fee	t)	(sq-ft)	(cubic	-feet)	(cubic-feet)	(sq-ft)	
911.0	00	28		0	0	28	
920.7	/5	28		273	273	211	
Device	Routing	Invert	Outi	et Device	S		
#1	Discarded	906.50	0.45	0 in/hr IM	IFILTRATION ove	r Wetted area	
#2	Primary	911.00	18.0	" Round	PIPE TO INF BAS	IN L= 115.0' Ke	= 0.500
			Inlet	/ Outlet	Invert= 911.00' /	909.00' S= 0.01	74 '/' Cc= 0.900 n= 0.013, Flow Area= 1.77 sf

Discarded OutFlow Max=0.03 cfs @ 12.19 hrs HW=913.57' (Free Discharge) **1=INFILTRATION** (Exfiltration Controls 0.03 cfs)







- THE INFORMATION SHOWN ON THESE GRAMMICS CONCEIDENCY TIPE AND LOCATION OF EXISTING URLINES IN OUT CLARANTING TO BE ACCURATE ON ALL INCLUSES IN ACCURATE ON SECOND 2011 FOR MANAGE HER OWN OF THEMMATION AS TO TIPE AND LOCATION OF UTILITIES AS INCESSARY TO AVOID OWNAME TO THESE UTILITIES.
- ATURE UNMARKE TO THESE UTLINES. LOCATIONS PRIOR TO ANY EXCAVATIONS. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL FIELD VERIFY SIZE, ELEVATION, AND LOCATION OF EXISTING UTLINES AND NOTITY ENCAUCED OF ANY DISCREPANCES PRIOR TO THE START OF INSTALLANDING.
- INTERACTIONS SHELL CONFORM TO THE CITY STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS STORE OF MATERIALS OR FOLLOWENT SHALL HOT BE ALLOWED ON ADDUC STREETS OR WITHIN PRODUC ROAT-00-WAX. HOTPY DITY A MANALAL OF 48 HOURS PROR TO THE COMMONCEMENT OF
- CONSTRUCTION ALL ELECTRONE RELEASED AND GAS EXTENSIONS INCLUDING SERVICE LINES SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED TO THE APPROPRIATE UTILITY COMPANY SPECIFICATIONS ALL UTILITY OSCIMECTIONS SHALL BE COORDINATED WITH THE APPROPRIATE UTILITY COMPANY.

CURB & BITUMINOUS NOTES

- REMOVAL AND DISPOSAL OF EXISTING STREET MATCHALS AS REQUIRED FOR CONSTRUCTION IS CONSIDERED INCIDENTIAL ALL MATCH POINTS AND PAYEMENT PATCHES TO BE SAM-OUT AT FULL
- DEFIN. RESTORE DISTURGED STREET TO COSTING OR BETTER SECTION. BACKRULING OF CURB IS INCIDENTAL TO CURB INSTALLATION

- **STORM SEIVER NOTES**

- CHURTH DESCRIPTION NOT LEAD IN THE CASE OF A CONTRACT OF THE CONTRACT OF CONTRACT ON CONTRACT ON CONTRACT OF CONTRACT ON CONTRACT ON CONTRACT OF CONTRACT OF CONTRACT ON CONTRACT OF CONTRACT OF CONTRACT OF CONTRACT OF CONTRACT OF CONTRACT ON CONTRACT ON CONTRACT OF CONTRACT OF CONTRACT OF CONTRACT OF CONTRACT OF CONTRACT OF CONTRACT ON CONTRACT ON CONTRACT OF CONTRACT ON CONTRACT OF CONTR

SANITARY SEWER NOTES

(763-765-6172)

- PROPOSED SANITARY STRER PRE SHALL BE: 1.1. 0" PRE SOR 3.5 (ASTN 03034) 1.2. 4" PRE SOR 3.5 (ASTN 0304) 1.2. 4" PRE SORCHLE AND (ASTN 03045) . FELD VERTY SIE IEVA NOH AND LOCATION OF EDIEMO SANITARY EDIER MS MORTY DIE UNGERE DE ANY OSCIDENTICE TO ANY
- DISTALLABORS. CONTRACTOR TO CONTACT CITY ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT AT LEAST 48 HOURS PROF TO CONFECTION TO EXSTING PUBLIC SAMITARY SEVER

WATERMANN NOTES

- THERE & LARGEMENT AT UP (E.) 1. PROPOSED WAICHMAN PPE SHALL (C: 1.1. (C MAD S' PVC 400 MEN (0 18 1.2.1" HOPE DIDO-FAITE PC 4710-250 PS SOR 7 (PS) 2. ALL WAITEMAN VALVES SHALL (C OFERATED ONLY OF SHORENEW PUBLIC WORKS FURCES (783-785-6172) 3. RED VDBY SUZ, ELFATION, AND LOCATION OF EDSTING WAITEMANN AND NOTIFY DEMERSE OF ANY DESCREPANCES PHOR TO ANY MISTALLATIONS 4. MARTAR A MARKING OF 32, PETC OF COVER OVER ALL WAITEMAN PPE. 5. PROVIDE (METCHICE) MISULATION, PPC FOMOLASS, CM APPROVED (COVAL WRITE SANIARY STURE OR STORM SENER CROSSES WIDHY 18" OF WAITEMANN.

LEGEND



GENERAL GRADING NOTES

- 1. PRICE TO ANY LAND-DISTURBING ACTIVITY, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL INSTALL ROCK CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE AND SILT FENCE AS SHOWN ON PLAN. ADDITIONAL SILT FENCE MAY BE NECESSARY IF LOCAL CONDITIONS REQUIRE. SILT FENCE SHALL REMAIN IN-PLACE UNTIL THE FINAL STABILIZATION HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED.
- 2. CONTACT NICOLE SODERHOLM, RAMSEY WASHINGTON METRO WATERSHED DISTRICT, AT 661-792-7976 PRIOR TO BEGINNING ANY AND ALL CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY FOR AN INITIALL SWIPP INSPECTION. SPECIFIED EROSION & SEDIMENT CONTROL MEASURES ARE MINIMUM, ADDITIONAL
- PRACTICES MAY BE REQUIRED DURING THE COURSE OF CONSTRUCTION.
- PROVIDE INLET SEDIMENT CONTROL FOR ALL PROPOSED STORM SEWER INLETS WITHIN 24 HOURS OF INSTALLATION LEAVE IN-PLACE UNTIL SITE HAS BEEN STABILIZED (TYP)
- INSTALL RIP-RAP WI GEOTEXTILE FILTER FABRIC AT ALL PIPE OUTLETS WITHIN 24 5, HOURS OF APRON INSTALLATION (TYP)
- NOTIFY NICOLE SODERHOLM, RAMSEY WASHINGTON METRO WATERSHED DISTRICT (RWMWD) AT (651)-792-7976 AT LEAST 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE CONSTRUCTION OF PERMANENT STORM WATER BMPS



Call before you dig.

NOTES:

- 1) BEE SHEET TO FOR ADDITIONAL CONSTRUCTION NOTES 2) BEE STORM WATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN FOR ADDITIONAL EROSION CONTROL NOTES, SITE SEQUENCING & EROSION AND SEDMENT CONTROL DETALS 3) TEMPORARY EROSION CONTROL DEVICES SHALL BE IN PLACE PRIOR TO START OF CONSTRUCTION
-) SPECIFIED ERDSION & SEDIMENT CONTROL MEASURES ARE MINIMUM. ADDITIONAL PRACTICES MAY BE
- REQUIRED DURING THE COURSE OF CONSTRUCTION.



CURB & BITUMINOUS NOTES REMOVAL AND DISPOSAL OF EXISTING STREET MATERIALS AS REQUIRED FOR CONSTRUCTION IS CONSIDERED INCIDENTAL. ALL MATCH POINTS AND PAVEMENT PATCHES TO BE SAW-CUT AT FULL DEFINIT RESTORE DISTURBED STREET TO EXISTING OR BETTER SECTION. BACKFILLING OF CURB IS INCIDENTAL TO CURB INSTALLATION.

- PROPOSED SANITARY SEWER PIPE SHALL BE:
 1.1.8" PVC SDR 35 (ASTM 3034)
 1.2.4" PVC SDR 35 (ASTM 3034)
 1.2.4" PVC SCHEDLLE 40 (ASTM 02665)
 reild verify SIZE, ELEVATION AND LOCATION OF EXISTING SANITARY SEWER
 AND MOTHY ENGINEER OF ANY DISCREPANCIES PRIOR TO ANY
 INSTALLATIONS.
 CONTRACTOR TO CONTACT CITY ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT AT LEAST 48
 HOURS PRIOR TO CONNECTION TO EXISTING PUBLIC SANITARY SEWER
 (78)-789-61720 (763-785-6172)

8

57

STORM SEWER NOTES

PROPOSED STORM SEWER PIPE SHALL BE: 1.1. REINFORCED CONCRETE PIPE (RCP) WITH R-4 GASKETS; AND, 1.2. WICH-DENSITY POLYENTIVENE PIPE (HOPE), HOPE PIPE SHALL MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF ASSHTO M294, TYPE S WITH WATERTIGHT CONNECTONS, USE SAND/GRANULAR MATERIAL FOR BACKFLING AND COMPACTION OF HOPE PIPE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF ASTM 2321.

INSTALLATIONS. STORM SEWER LENGTHS INCLUDE THE LAYING LENGTH OF THE FLARED-END SECTION. LAYING LENGTH OF APRON TO BE DEDUCTED FROM PAYMENT

SECTION, DATING LEWOTH OF AFRICAT TO BE DEGOLO FROM FAILENT LENGTH OF PIPE. ALL PORTIONS OF THE STORM SEWER SYSTEM LOCATED WITHIN 10 FEET OF THE BUILDING OR WATER SERVICE UNE MUST BE TESTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH MINNESOTA RULES, CHAPTER 4714, SECTION 1109.0.

SANITARY SEWER NOTES

UF ASIM 2021. 2. FIELD VERIEY SIZE, ELEVATION, AND LOCATION OF EXISTING STORM SEWER AND NOTIFY ENGINEER OF ANY DISCREPANCIES PRIOR TO ANY

WATERMAIN NOTES

- TYALLIHIMMIT ITUILD 1. PROPUSED WATERMAIN PIPE SHALL BE: 1.1.6 ° AND 8° PYC 900 WTH DN 18 1.2.1° HOPE ENDO-PURE PE 4710-250 PSI SIDR 7 (IPS) 2. ALL WATERMAIN VALVES SHALL BE OPERATED ONLY BY SHOREVIEW PUBLIC WORKS FORCES (763-785-6172) 3. FILD VERIFY SIZE, LEVATION, AND LOCATION OF EXISTING WATERMAIN AND NOTBY ENCINEER OF ANY DISCREPANCIES PRORT TO ANY INSTALLATIONS. 4. MAINTAIN A MINIMUM OF 7.5 FETO FOC GOVER OVER ALL WATERMAIN PIPE. 5. PROVIDE PREFORMED INSULATION, PPC FOAMGLASS, OR APPROVED EQUAL WHERE SANITARY SEMER OR STORM SEVER CROSSES WITHIN 18° OF WATERMAIN.







NOTES:

- SEE STORM WATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN FOR ADDITIONAL EROSION CONTROL NOTES. SITE SEQUENCING & EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL DETAILS TEMPORARY EROSION CONTROL DEVICES SHALL BE IN PLACE PRIOR TO START OF CONSTRUCTION SPECIFIED EROSION & SEDIMENT CONTROL MEASURES ARE MINIMUM. ADDITIONAL PRACTICES MAY

- BE REQUIRED DURING THE COURSE OF CONSTRUCTION.

- THE INFORMATION SHOWN ON THESE DRAWINGS CONCERNING TYPE AND LOCATION OF EXISTING UTILITIES IS NOT GUARANTEED TO BE ACCURATE OR ALL INCLUSVE. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR MANING HIS OWN DETERMINATION AS TO TYPE AND LOCATION OF UTILITIES AS NECESSARY TO AVOID DAMAGE TO THESE UTILITIES.
- AVOID DAMAGE TO THESE UTILITES. CALL "811" FOR EXSING UTILITES. LOCATIONS PRIOR TO ANY EXCAVATIONS. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL FIELD VERIFY SIZE, ELEVATION, AND LOCATION OF EXISTING UTILITES AND NOTIFY ENCINEER OF ANY DISCREPANCIES PRIOR TO THE START OF INSTALLATIONS. INSTITUTIONS BITS.

- INSTALLATIONS SHALL CONFORM TO THE CITY STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAIL PLATES. STORAGE OF MATERIALS OR COULPMENT SHALL NOT BE ALLOWED ON PUBLIC STREETS OR WITHIN PUBLIC RICHT-OF-WAY. NOTIFY CITY A MINIMUM OF 48 HOURS FRICK TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION ELEPHONE, AND GAS EXTENSIONS INCLUDING SERVICE LINES SPECIFICATIONS. ALL UTILITY DISCOMPECTIONS SHALL BE COORDINATED WITH THE APPROPRIATE UTILITY COMPANY.

CURB & BITUMINOUS NOTES

- REMOVAL AND DISPOSAL OF EXISTING STREET MATERIALS AS REQUIRED FOR CONSTRUCTION IS CONSIDERED INCIDENTAL. ALL MATCH POINTS AND PAVEMENT PATCHES TO BE SAW-CUT AT FULL
- DEPTH, RESTORE DISTURBED STREET TO EXISTING OR BETTER SECTION. BACKFILLING OF CURB IS INCIDENTAL TO CURB INSTALLATION.

PROPOSED STORM SEWER PIPE SHALL BE:
 I.I. REINFORCED CONCRETE PIPE (RCP) WITH R-4 GASKETS; AND,
 I.J. REINFORCED CONCRETE PIPE (RCP) WITH R-4 GASKETS; AND,
 I.J. HIGH-DENSITY POLITETHIENE PIPE (HDPE), HDPE PIPE SHALL MEET THE REQURREMENTS OF AASHD W294, TPE S WITH WATERIGHT CONNECTIONS, USE SAND/GRANULAR MATERIAL FOR BACKFILLING AND CONFACTION OF HDPE PIPE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF ASTM 2321.
 FIELD VERFY SIZE, ELEVATION, AND LOCATION OF EXISTING STORM SEWER AND NOTIFY ENGINEER OF ANY DISCREPANCIES PRIOR TO ANY INSTALLATIONS.

STORM SEWER NOTES

- AND NUTH EXAMPLES OF ANY DISCREPANCES FROM TO ANY INSTALLATIONS. SCITCM SEVER LINGTHS INCLUDE THE LAYING LENGTH OF THE FLARED-END SCITCM. LAYING LENGTH OF APRON TO BE DEDUCTED FROM PAYMENT LENGTH OF PROF. THE STORM SEVER SYSTEM LOCATED WITHIN 10 FEET OF THE BUILDING OR WATER SERVICE LINE MUST BE TESTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH MINKESTAR RULES, CHAPTER 4714, SECTION 1109.0.

SANITARY SEWER NOTES

- PROPOSED SANITARY SEVER PIPE SHALL BE: 1.4 PVC SDR 35 (ASTM D3034)
 2.4 PVC SDR 35 (ASTM D3034)
 FIELD VERRY SIZE, ELEVATION AND LOCATION OF EXISTING SANITARY SEVER AND NOTRY SIZE, ELEVATION AND LOCATION OF EXISTING SANITARY SEVER INSTALLATIONS.
 CONTRACTOR TO CONTACT CITY ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT AT LEAST 48 HOURS PRICE TO CONNECTION TO EDISTING PUBLIC SANITARY SEVER (741, 748, 747, 747) (763-785-6172)

WATERMAIN NOTES

- PROPOSED WATERMAIN PIPE SHALL BE:
 1.1. 5" AND &" PVC C-SOD WITH DR 18
 1.2. 1" ADPE ENDO-PURE PE 4710-256 PSI SIDR 7 (IPS)
 ALL WATERMAIN VALVES SHALL BE OPERATED ONLY BY SHOREVIEW PUBLIC WORKS FORCES (763-765-6172)
 FIELD YERIFY SIZE, ELEVATION, AND LOCATION OF EXISTING WATERMAIN AND NOTIFY UNIVER: OF ANY DISCREPANCIES PRIOR TO ANY INSTALLATIONS.
 MAINTAIN A MINIAUM OF 7.5 FEET OF COVER OVER ALL WATERMAIN AND NOTIFY UNIVER: OF ANY DISCREPANCIES PRIOR TO ANY INSTALLATIONS.
 MAINTAIN A MINIAUM OF 7.5 FEET OF COVER OVER ALL WATERMAIN PIPE.
 PROVIDE PREFORMED WSULATION, PRO FOAMGLASS, ON APPROVED EQUAL WHERE SANITARY SENER OR STORM SEWER CROSSES WITHIN 18" OF WATERMARK.



UNDERGROUND INFILTRATION

Know what's below. Call before you dig.



- NOTES:
- SEE STORM WATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN FOR ADDITIONAL EROSION CONTROL NOTES, SITE
- SEE STORM WATER FULLETION PROVENTION POW FOR JOINT OVER ENGINE CONTROL IN THE STORM WATER FULLETION OF THE STORM SEQUENCING & EROSION CONTROL DEVICES SHALL BE IN PLACE PRIOR TO START OF CONSTRUCTION SPECIFIED EROSION & SEDIMENT CONTROL MEASURES ARE MINIMUM. ADDITIONAL PRACTICES MAY

N.T.S.

BE REQUIRED DURING THE COURSE OF CONSTRUCTION.



- LIENCEMATION SHOWN ON THESE DRAWINGS CONCERNING TYPE AND LOCATION OF EXISTING UTILITIES IS NOT GUARANTEED TO BE ACCURATE OR ALL INCLUSIVE. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR MAKING HIS OWN AVOID COMMERCT ON THESE UTILITIES. CALL "311" FOR EXISTING UTILITIES. LOCATIONS OF UNITURE AS INCESSARY TO AVOID COMMERCT ON THESE UTILITIES. CALL "311" FOR EXISTING UTILITIES. LOCATIONS OF ANY DISCREPANCIES PROR TO INSTALLATIONS. IN ISTALLATIONS SHALL CONFORM TO THE CITY STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND DETAIL PLATES. SPECIFICATION FILL AND RECENTION FOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION. ALL ELECTRY A MINIMUM OF 45 HOURS PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION. ALL ELECTRY A MINIMUM OF 45 HOURS PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION. ALL ELECTRIC, TELEPHONE, AND CASE SKITHNIGHT COMMENCEMENT OF SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED TO THE APPROPRIATE UTILITY COMPANY SPECIFICATIONS. ALL UTILITY DISCONDECTIONS SHALL BE COORDINATED WITH THE APPROPRIATE UTILITY COMPANY.

CURB & BITUMINOUS NOTES REMOVAL AND DISPOSAL OF EXISTING STREET MATERIALS AS REQUIRED FOR CONSTRUCTION IS CONSIDERED INCIDENTAL. ALL MATCH POINTS AND PAVEMENT PATCHES TO BE SAW-CUT AT FULL DEPTM RESTORE DISTURBED STREET TO EXISTING OR BETTER SECTION. BACKFILLING OF CURB IS INCIDENTAL TO CURB INSTALLATION.

- (763-785-6172)

WATERMAIN NOTES



EXISTING SPOT ELEVATION

920.99

- PROPOSED WATER PIPE PROPOSED SANITARY SEWER PIPE PROPOSED STORM SEWER PIPE PROPOSED STORM MANHOLE ø PROPOSED CATCH BASIN
- ō Δ PROPOSED FLARED-END SECTION PROPOSED GATE VALVE
- PROPOSED HYDRANT
- PROPOSED SANITARY SEWER MANHOLE
- 928 930 PROPOSED CONTOUR
- PROPOSED SPOT ELEVATION ×920.60 (GUTTERLINE, BITUNINOUS SURFACE, OR GROUND SURFACE UNLESS OTHERWSE INDICATED)
- PROPOSED SILT FENCE
- 4.07 PROPOSED DIRECTION OF DRAINAGE \bigcirc
- PROPOSED INFET PROTECTION PROPOSED RIP-RAP Contract of the



. .

١Š

- 35\

۰۶

28

 $\langle x \rangle$

. O C

- 5 -

Ô

-77

WINDWARD HEIGHTS NO.3

-5



NOTES:

- SEE STORM WATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN FOR ADDITIONAL EROSION CONTROL NOTES. SITE SEQUENCING & EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL DETAILS TEMPORARY EROSION CONTROL DEVICES SHALL BE IN PLACE PRIOR TO START OF CONSTRUCTION SPECIFIED EROSION & SEDIMENT CONTROL MEASURES ARE MINIMUM. ADDITIONAL PRACTICES MAY
- BE REQUIRED DURING THE COURSE OF CONSTRUCTION.

- 4 COUR

HAWES

AVENUE

22

1

· - - - - - - 912-

- - -- -- -910. _

— .

EXISTING HOUSE

i.

ti a l

- <u>ا</u> با 1 10 10 10 10 10 3 6 BLOCK 5
 - VALINE VALATOR اسس ر 1 . 4 BLOCK 8 2 3 HOUSE EXISTING HOUSE







DETAILS WHISTLER PINES	C2	1.1
	PREPARE CA BUILDE SITE PL & ENGIN SITE PL ENGINEEI S770 LAKE SUITE 110 LINO LAKE PHONE: (651)	D FOR: RA RS, LLC ANNING VEERING DRIVE S, MN 55014 51) 361-8210 361-8701
L CONSTRUCTION ICE INSTALLATION 2. STR-4] HEYSIGN DATE MARCE 5017	WHISTLER PINES	SHOREVIEW, MN DETAILS
	I HEREBY CERTEPY THAT THIS PLAN WAS PREARED BY THAT THIS PLAN WAS SUPERVISION AND THAT I AM A DULY LUCENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA.	STREE & STREET & STREET
	DATE REVISION DESCRIPTION 5-8-18 CITY REVIEW COMMENTS 5-14-16 CITY & RIVINUD COMMENTS 5-14-16 CITY & RIVINUD COMMENTS	18-1749 ATE: 26, 2018
	DRAWN BY: A.G. CHCKD BY:	DESIGN BY: A.G. PROJ. NO.

 A. Jud. Durowski Jud. B. C. Costancity and und Orthubul 2000 to 10 of und Lots of A. Burowski to Zhanghi D. K. Judewski to Zhanghi D. K. Judewski to Zhanghi D. K. Judewski to Zhanghi Shanghi D. K. Judewski to Zhanghi Shanghi D. K. Judewski to Zhanghi D. K. Judewski J. K. Judewski	 Ne passe serii renner un şizmed tan kudunutbi viçure di kanon man ki hay-tek tiş kudu sinan man kudu adır manan bi ka kudunutbi viçure di kanon manak utsi han sinan man kudu tanın kanın kudu kudunutbi kanın markatanın kudunutbi sinan manakanın kudu kudunutbi kanın bi kanın mananın kudu kudunut sinan kudu dir. Kudunutbi kudu kudu kudu kudu kudu kudu kudu kud	AND SET A CALENDARY STATUS AND A CALENDARY STATUS AND	 PART IND - SNEPP ANE/NUMBERS PART PRIMITERS NUMERANDO DE SERVIS ALS RECESSANT TO INCLUE ADDITIONAL REQUIRING ON DOCUMENTS SITUATIONS INCLUED DUES THAT AN RECENSANT TO INCLUE ADDITIONAL REQUIRING ON DOCUMENTS SITUATIONS AND REPORT DUESTICATION, COMPLICIT INTERCLUE ADDITION ON SEASONAL COMPANY IN A SUBJECT DUESTICATION, COMPLIANCE, MELANDING, INCLUENTS IN STAFAZ MELANDING CONCINENT AND ADDITIONAL OF DESCRIPTION, MANAGEMENT, IN STAFAZ MELANDING CONCINENT AND ADDITIONAL OF DESCRIPTION OF PALLIANTS IN STAFAZ MELANDING CONCINENT AND ADDITIONAL OF DESCRIPTION ADDITIONAL SECTION OF PALLIANTS IN STAFAZE MELENCING UNDERSTOOD IN THESE ON INFLICATION IN ADDITION STAFAZE MELENCING UNDERSTOOD AND ADDITIONAL SECTIONED IN ANY IN ADDITION STAFAZE MELENCING CONCENTRATION AND ADDITIONAL SECTIONED IN ANY IN ADDITION STAFAZE MELENCING CONCENTRATION AND ADDITIONAL SECTIONED IN ANY IN ADDITIONAL ADDITIONAL AND CONCENTRATION AND ADDITIONAL SECTIONAL ADDITION IN ADDITIONAL ADDITIONAL AND CONCENTRATION AND ADDITIONAL ADDITION ADDITIONAL ADDITIONAL AND CONCENTRATION AND ADDITIONAL ADDITION ADDITIONAL ADDITIONAL AND CONCENTRATION AND ADDITIONAL ADDITION ADDITIONAL ADDITIONAL AND CONCENTRATION ADDITION AND ADDITION AND THE ADDITIONAL ADDITIONAL ADDITIONAL ADDITIONAL ADDITION ADDITION ADDITION ADDITIONAL AD	PART ILAS - TRAVENG COCUMENTATION Masses cocurentation: The potentific(s) seall cosume the potentials control in part by, have definitions of as according with the potent's Trained Provedicity. The potentiation surgers and the Trained Statement of the potential Statement construction of as scored by one with the subsociet have been defined in statement. Counsenations of as scored by one with the subsociet have been defined to de Trained and so the potential scored with the specific that are required to de Trained is ones of Trained and make of instruction(s) and DNTP Provided Trained is control of Trained and make of instruction(s) and DNTP Provided Trained is control of Trained and make of instruction(s) and DNTP Provided Trained is control of Trained and make of instruction(s) and DNTP Provided Trained is control of Trained and make of instruction(s) and DNTP Provided Trained is control of Trained and make of instruction(s) and DNTP Provided Trained is control of Trained and make of instruction(s) and DNTP Provided Trained is control of Trained and make of instruction(s) and DNTP Provided Trained is control of Trained and the objective provided the make of inducts of Trained	 A PERMITTER ALL TOMMATE REPAIR CONTRACT PROOF TO COMPLETE IN CALL CONTRICTON AND PART. IF NOT NE FOLLOWING COMPLETE INF ADVISOR TO THE TRANSPORT TO THE INFER CONTRICTON ACTIVITY HAS DECOMPLETED IN THE REPAIR CONTRICT AND INFORMATION INFER CONTRICTON ACTIVITY HAS DECOMPLETED IN THE REPAIR CONTRICT AND THE DECELOWER TO SALE WAR RESULT IN UNCOMPLETE OF ONE (1) OR HORE ACRES IN 2000 CONTRICTON ACTIVITY HAS DECOMPLETED IN THE REPAIR CONTRIPUT ON HORE ACRES IN 2000 CONTRICTON ACTIVITY HAS DECOMPLETED IN THE REPAIR CONTRIPUT ON HORE ACRES IN 2000 CONTRICTON ACTIVITY HAS DECOMPLETED IN THE REPAIR CONTRIPUT ON HORE ACRES IN 2000 CONTRICTON ACTIVITY HAS DECOMPLETED IN THOSE ACRES IN 2000 CONTRICTON ACTIVITY AND TO ALL OWNERLY PROPOSED CONTRIPUTOR ACTIVITY HAS CONTRICTON ACTIVITY AND TO ALL OWNERLY PROPOSED CONTRIBUTION ACTIVITY HAS CONTRICTON ACTIVITY AND TO ALL OWNERLY PROPOSED CONTRIBUTION ACTIVITY HAS CONTRICTON ACTIVITY AND TO ALL OWNERLY PROPOSED CONTRIBUTION ACTIVITY HAS CONTRICTON ACTIVITY AND TO ALL OWNERLY PROPOSED CONTRIBUTION ACTIVITY HAS CONTRICTON ACTIVITY AND TO ALL OWNERLY PROPOSED CONTRIBUTION ACTIVITY HAS CONTRICTON ACTIVITY AND TO ALL OWNERLY PROPOSED CONTRIBUTION ACTIVITY HAS CONTRICTON ACTIVITY AND TO ALL OWNERLY PROPOSED CONTRIBUTION ACTIVITY HAS CONTRIBUTED ACTIVITY AND TO ALL OWNERLY PROPOSED CONTRIBUTION ACTIVITY AND TACA. OR PART INC.S A PROPRIETE(S) MAY TEMMANE TO ANT INFORMATION IS APPROPORTE BECAUSE INFORMATION IS APPROPRIETE ON THE AND TO ALL OWNER AND IN SAMPHONAL BECAUSE INFORMATION IN CALCELLY. 	PART B.C TEDMINATION OF COVERACE TERMINATION OF COVERACE were construction to complete all periods in a signal a solution of intermediate request construction to complete all periods by the committee and solution of intermediate requests for the uncertainty of the committee and periods of intermediate requests for the uncertainty of the committee and requests of intermediate requests for the uncertainty of the committee and requests a not on contract many theorem of one committee and contrast a not on contract many theorem of the committee and contrast a not on a committee and the size and contrast and the committee and contrast a not on a committee and the size and contrast and the committee and contrast of a solid to another and the size and contrast and contrast and contrast of a solid to another and the size and contrast and contrast and periods of a solid to another and the committee and contrast and contrast and requests of a solid to another and the committee and requests of a solid to another and the committee and requests of a solid to another and the committee and requests of a solid to another and the committee and requests of a solid to another and the committee and requests of a solid to another and the committee and requests of a solid to another and the committee and requests of a solid to another and the committee and requests of a solid to another and the committee and requests of a solid to another and the committee and requests of a solid to another and the committee and requests of a solid to another and the committee and requests of a solid to another and the committee and requests of a solid to another and the committee and requests of a solid to another and the committee and requests of a solid to another and the committee and requests of a solid to another another another and requests of a solid to another
 J. VE, SCRANTERISS, SMALL, N.J., SCRANTER, COMMON, FANCINES, SMALL, NAVE, BELS, MANUSTER, S. M., SCRANTER, SCRANTER, S. M., SCRANTER,	 PART IV.C SEDMENT CONTROL PRACTICES I. ME PENNTELES and I LENOY SEDMENT CONTROL PRACTICES I. ME PENNTELES and I LENOY SEDMENT CONTROL PRACTICES AS INCLUSION TO MANAGE SEDMENT FOR MANAGE SEDMENT CONTROL STRUCTURE STRUCTURE SEDMENT CONTROL SEDMENT CONTROL AND SEDMENT INSUES TANL AND SEDMENT CONTROL SEDMENT CONTROL AND SEDMENT INSUES TANL AND SEDMENT CONTROL SEDMENT CONTROL AND SEDMENT INSUES TANL AND SEDMENT INSUES TANL AND SEDMENT INSUES TANL AND SEDMENT CONTROL AND SEDMENT CONTROL AND SEDMENT INSUES TANL AND SEDMENT INSUES TANLAR CONTROL SEDMENT CONTROL AND SEDMENT CONTROL AND SEDMENT INSUES TANL AND SEDMENT INSUES TANLAR CONTROL SEDMENT CONTROL AND SEDMENT INSUE SEDMENT CONTROL AND SEDMENT INSUES TANLAR CONTROL TO A LINIT SECURITY INSUES TO A LINIT SE SEDMENT CONTROL AND SED SED ON ALL DAMA SED SED ON ALL DAMA SED DAMA SED SED ON THE SEDMENT CONTROL AND SEDMENT INSUES SEDMENT CONTROL AND THE MANY AND A LINIT SE SEDMENT CONTROL AND THE MANY AND A LINIT SECURITY AND SED ON ALL DAMA SED ON ALL DAMA SED SED SED SED SED SED SED SED SED SED	 Represent or Proved of Statutor in the Annual of The Annual Control and Annual of The A	 The main field substantial for the set of the set of	IV.8. ENCORON PREVENTION PRACTICES I. The Primitical wast now include and warding and another than an antitude and antitude and antitude and antitude and and an antitude and antitude antitude and antitude and antitude and antitude antitude and antitude and antitude antiter antiter antitude antitude antitude antitude antitude antitu	 A SUNCLAUD REPAIRED BY SERVE FOR BUT PRODUCT B, BY VOLAD SURVEY AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND	PART M.E RECORD RETENTION (CONT) 4. ALL POWMENT OPENING WAR MAD MANTENANCE AND EVENTS THAT HAVE RESUMPTION RECORDER ALL BOAT-GET-MAY, CONTRACT, CONSIGNET AND CONTR MALCHONES RECORDER AND EXECUTION MANTENANCE AND 3. ALL RECORD CALCULATIONS FOR OSSON OF THE TEMPORARY AND RESUMPLY STORMANTER MANUAGEDIT STELLS DART M.E TRAVENIC REQUIREMENTS PART M.E TRAVENIC MEDIATIS TRAMENE REQUIREMENTS MANTE ALCORDING MILL DESIME THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS MANTE ALCORDING MEDIATIS TRAMENE
 E. Tapovaki v Job Prisudel I Stabilization Busids with 6 forward and the Stability of Stability of Stability output in the Stability output in the Stability of Stability output in the Stability of Stability output in the Stability of Stability	 SACKEYE COMES 19751. A. P. PORMITTE(1) BLYAR, REPORTED (19) BL, STREPTIN AND LUMITERING OF TEMPORATING OF TEMPORATING AND AN ADDRESS OF TEMPORATING AND AN ADDRESS OF TEMPORATING AND AND ADDRESS OF TEMPORATING ADDRESS OF TEMPORATING AND ADDRESS OF TEMPORATING AND ADDRE	 Senara MC RESPONDED 11. COLOR: DOOR TOURING: SETURING ON SUSPENDENT SUBJECTION AND THE SUSPENDENT STATE RECORDERS. C. MY ANDOROMONIS TO THE SUSPENDENT AND RECORDED AS A RESALT OF THE RESPECTION MATE RECORDERS AS RECORDED AS A RESALT OF THE RESPECTION AND THE RECORDER AND THE REAL STATE AND REAL STATE AND RESELVENT AND REAL STATE AND REAL	 A. THE CONSTRUCT AND DEPOCHAGE AND ALL AND AL	ACCURENCE OF INVOLVED AN INCLUSION SUPERCENT JOURGE INVERT. TO THE RELEASED S. # The PEDIFTER(S) 15/4E USING TATES with BACHWASH WATCH. THE REDARTING SHALL THE RELATES WATCH NAME TO DESCRIPTION AND THE RECOMMEND OF THE RELATIONES AND CAUSE ENCOURSE THE BACHWASH WATCH THE RECOMMEND OF THE RELATES SHALL SHOULD BE THE SALE AND THE RECOMMEND OF THE RECOMMEND INVITED OF CAUSE ENCOURSE THE BACHWASH WATCH THE RECOMMEND OF THE RELATIONES AND AND AND THE RECOMMEND OF THE RECOMMEND OF SALE AND ACCOUNTE FOR THE MAIN WATCH AND AND THE RECOMMEND TO RECTAIN ACCOUNTE FOR THE RECOMMEND OF THE RECOMMEND OF RECTAIN ACCOUNTE FOR THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE RECOMMEND TO RECTAIN ACCOUNTE FOR THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE RECOMMENDATION RECTAIN ACCOUNTE FOR THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE RECOMMENDATION PART IV.E INSPECTIONS AND MAINTENANCE	 PART I YU OCWATERNO: AND BASIN DRAINING. I. The FRMITTILIS MUST DROMART THING ON SCHMOLI-LUGIN MATERS RELATED TO KEALTING OR BASIN DRAMMER (C., PLANER) DROMARES, TRODONTOLICO UTS FOR DRAMARD, TO A TREPOLATE OF DRAMMERT, TREDONTOLIC MUST FOR DRAMARD, TO A TREPOLATE OF DRAMMERT, TREDONTOLIC MUST FOR DRAMARD, TO A DAMA TREPOLATE, THE DROMART, TREDONTOLIC CONDITIONS (DAMAFT TREPOLATE OF DRAMARD, THE DROMART, OR FEMALOT IS CONDITIONS AND STREAT MATERS AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND ALL TREPOLATE OF DRAMARD, THE DROMART, OR FEMALOT IS CONDITIONS (DAMAFT TREPOLATE OF DRAMARD, THE DROMART, OR FEMALOT IS CONDITIONS (DAMAFT TREPOLATE OF DRAMARD, THE DROMART, OR FEMALOT IS CONDITIONS (DAMAFT TREPOLATE OF DRAMARD, THE DROMART, OR FEMALOT, TREE THE CONTROL AND TREPOLATE OF DRAMARD, THE DROMART, OR FEMALOT, TREE THE CONTROL AND TREPOLATE OF DRAMART, THE FEMALET, INC. THE TAIL TO TREE THE TREPOLATE OF THE DROMART OF THE DROMART, THE TREPOLATION TREPOLATE OF THE DROMART OF THE DROMART, THE TREPOLATION TREPOLATE OF THE DROMART OF THE TREE THE TREE THAT CONTROL OF THE TREPOLATE OF THE DROMART OF THE TREE THE TREE THAT CONTROL OF THE TREPOLATE OF THE DROMART OF THE TREE THAT THE TREE TREE THE TREPOLATE OF THE TREE THE TREE THAT THE TREE TREE THE TREE THE TREE THE DROMART TREE TREE THE TREE THAT CONTROL OF THE TREE TREE TREE TREE TREE THE TREE THAT THE TREE TREE THE TREE THE TREE TREE TREE TREE TREE TREE TREE THE TREE TRE	 PART IV.C SEDMENT CONTROL PRACTICES (CONT.) A. HE FEDETITE(S) ANSI WHARE SIG, COMPACTICES (CONT.) A. HE FEDETITE(S) ANSI WHARE SIG, COMPACTION MO, WALLSS WETABOL, PRESERVE TOPSOL, MERSING SIG, COMPACTION SI NOT RECEIVED WHEN A SUFFER OF A SUFFER A RAY OF THE SITE CONTROL THE CONTROL WALLS WETER OF (IF A SUFFER SI VERSULATION) AND FREEDERS AND STORMART AND STORMART MATCHING TO THE SUFFER SITE OF THE SUFFER SITE RESIDENT CONTROLS WHEN A SUFFER OF (IF A SUFFER SI VERSULATION) AND STOREST AND STORMART MATCHING TO THE SUFFER SITE OF THE SUFFER SITE RESIDENT CONTROLS WHEN A SUFFER SITE TO SUFFER SITE OF THE SUFFER SITE RESIDENT OF THE SUFFER SITE OF THE SUFFER SITE RESIDENT OF THE SUFFER SITE OF THE SUFFER SITE RESIDENT OF T

CHARTER(S) WAST DISCOMPCT, THERE ON SCHWART-LADON WATERS FLATED TO CONTRICT PARAMER, CAS., PAREND DISCOMPCT, TRUCKAPTICO, DUTS TO DIAMAND, DIS-TI, TON PARAMERT, TERMENTAL TRUCKAPT, DISCOMPCT, DIS TO DIAMAND, DIS-TI, DESAMENT, TERMENTAL TRUCKAPT, DISCOMPCT, DISCOMPCT, DIS-TINDES, T., OSLAND, N. NE, LASS AND AND TAXANCE, CONTROL (SECURAT, DI-STATUS, SEC., TANA, THE DISCOMPCT, DISCOMPCT, DISCOMPCT, DISCOMPCT, DIS-DISCOMPCT, DISCOMPCT, DISCOMPCT, DISCOMPCT, DISCOMPCT, DISCOMPCT, DIS-DISCOMPCT, DISCOMPCT, DISCO O ANDARI OF ALL SAMPAL LYDN'S OCCUTE THAN 1/2 HON (0.5 MORES) IN 24 ADDRS MONTE MALE & COLUMN OF A CAROLEL HANNELON A MALE POSTALLE ON THE REST STE SPECIFIC RAMPAL IN ALL THAN ROADS A MALE POSTALLE ON THE REST STE SPECIFIC RAMPAL IN ALL REST AND A DATE OF ALL REST AND SPECIFIC RAMPAL IN ALL REST AND A DATE OF ALL REST AND A DATE OF ADAL AND A DATE AND A DATE OF ALL REST AND A DATE OF ADAL AND A DATE AND A DATE OF ALL REST AND A DATE OF A DATE AND A DATE AND A DATE OF A DATE OF ADAL AND A DATE AND A DATE AND A DATE OF A DATE OF ADAL AND A DATE AND A DATE AND A DATE OF A DATE AND A DATE AND AND A DATE AND A DATE OF A SACCIMED IN PART AND AND A SACRA AND A DATE. TICCS) MAST PRESERVE A 50 FOOT MAINEN, BATTER OF (# A BATTER IS METASALE ON TICCS) MAST REDUKTING COMMONS WHEN A SHEAK WAITER IS (COLDER WHEN IS PROJECTS CARENT DEMONSTORE AND OFFICER ALL TO BE SHEAK COMMTY DIFFER TOTAL ALL HAT REQUIRED ADJACON TO NAUD OTFICES, ADDIAL DIFFERSE COMMITTEE COMMON TO DEMANCE THE CAMULTY OF THE VECTIVATION HAI AUXION CARENT BATTER (COMMON TO DEMANCE THE CAMULTY OF THE VECTIVATION HAI AUXION CARENT BATTER (COMMON TO DEMANCE THE CAMULTY OF THE VECTIVATION HAI AUXION) CAREST AN AND COMMON TO DEMANCE THE CAMULTY OF THE VECTIVATION HAI AUXION CAREST AND HAIR (COMMON TO DEMANCE THE CAMULTY OF THE VECTIVATION HAI AUXION) CAREST AND HAIR (COMMON THE COMPLEX AND HAIR AUXION AND AUXION CAREST AND HAIR AUXIONAL VECTIVATION TE(S) S/AR REPORTED TO THE REPORTION HO HANTENHOL OF TENPORATY IT WERE CALLY ANNUALED TOWATTE, AS RELL AS ALL DODON REPORTED HAD THAT IS 3 ON THE PROJECT HAS UNDERCOVE THAT STABLED AND HAN HOT HAS DOTO THE MECH. - SEDWENT CONTROL PRACTICES (CONT.) TELES HAT MARKET SIL COMPACTION AND MALESS HETASARE PRESENT INSON TELES AND MOMENT MOMENT AND AND AN ANTICATE AND A THE SIL TO BE COMPACTED. האם וביאותישאים עם לוגער-ומעשיבע אביוויזינג אונין על ומסטונוגעט אין געיאנינג גערגער אוגעראינג געראינגעראין אוגעראינג אוניגעראינג אואימערומא או אביראאט'ג געראייג אנאיגעראין אטיאנגעראין אוגעראינג Ne PRETERIOS MUST DESDE TANA S COMPLET UNIT, 41. RECOMBINED OF P 1. 41. SOL DESDE ACTIVITY IN THE CONTENT OF A UNIT OF THE OWNER OF THE CONTENT OF A UNIT OF THE OWNER OF THE CONTENT OF A UNIT OF THE OWNER OF THE CONTENT OF THE OWNER OF THE OWNER OWNER AND THE CONTENT STREAM OF THE OWNER AND THE OWNER OF THE OWNER OWNER AND THE OWNER OWNER OWNER OWNER OWNER OWNER OWNER AND THE OWNER OWNER OWNER OWNER AND THE OWNER OWNER OWNER OWNER OWNER AND THE OWNER OWNER OWNER OWNER OWNER AND THE OWNER OWNER OWNER OWNER AND THE OWNER OWNER OWNER OWNER AND THE OWNER OWNER OWNER O 5 UNDER WO THEILTHAR & COMPANY COMPANY OF THE STATE OF THE COMPANY OF THE STATE OF THE COMPANY OF THE STATE OF THE AND THE STATE OF THE STATE OF THE STATE AND THE STATE OF THE STATE OF THE STATE AND THE STATE OF THE STATE OF THE STATE AND THE STATE OF THE STATE OF THE STATE AND THE STATE OF THE STATE OF THE STATE AND THE STATE OF THE STATE OF THE STATE AND THE STATE OF THE STATE OF THE STATE AND THE STATE OF THE STATE OF THE STATE AND THE STATE OF THE STATE OF THE STATE AND THE STATE OF THE STATE OF THE STATE AND THE STATE OF THE STATE OF THE STATE AND THE STATE OF THE STATE OF THE STATE AND THE STATE OF THE STATE OF THE STATE OF THE STATE AND THE STATE OF THE STATE OF THE STATE OF THE STATE AND THE STATE OF THE STATE OF THE STATE OF THE STATE OF THE STATE AND THE STATE OF THE STATE OF THE STATE OF THE STATE OF THE STATE AND THE STATE OF TH C CONCRÉT NO DUGE PRODUI PRE RESOLUCION UNI ROTRES 28 (RESOLUCIÓN DE RECORDERES 28 (RESOLUCIÓN 1. STRUCT, HANDLES, HAD DEPOSA, O PERMITTED SHALL ON DEPOSA, ON ADDRES PERMITTED SHALL ON ADDRES PERMITTED SHALL OF THE REQUESTION A BALANCE PHONE TO ALL AND THE SHALL OF THE REQUESTION OF CONTACT. WAS INFORMATION ON THE STRUCT, WAS INFORMATION THE PENNITTEES) SHALL MPLONENT C - MAJAROOS WITTAAL TORC MAS Caref SX-FERS, PETROLIM-BALO DECEMPERATING AND RECORDER STREET UNEAULAR, STREAM RECORDER STREET UNEAULAR, STREAMST AND RECORD COMPLANCE MAST RE STORED. CO. C. PORTINGET FUELTS WIST RE POSIDI DECEMPERATION OF SAMPLART MAST WIST CO. 7001. 5. FOR CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS ON PASTURE OR RANGE LAND) THE DISTU ADMICULTURAL USE PART IV.C. FINAL STABILIZATION

PART IV.F. - POLLUTION PREV

SWPPP WHISTLER PINES	 Bendamir Manageri Standart Standart	CULC, NE EXAMILIZED INNE MENORE ENVICENCE NEXT: CONSIDERTED IN NAME MENORE ENVICENCE NEXT: CONSIDERTED IN NAME MENORE ENVICENCE NEXT: CONSIDERTED IN NAME NOT CONSIDERT. NAME CONSIDERTED IN NAME NOT NAME NOT NAME NAME AND AND STATE NAME IN NOT NAME NAME AND AND STATE NAME AND AND STATE NOT NAME AND AND AND STATE NAME IN NAME IN NOT NAME NAME AND AND STATE NAME IN NAME IN NOT NAME NAME AND AND STATE NAME IN NAME IN NOT NAME NAME AND AND STATE NAME IN NA	 ALCONSTRUCT NECTORING OF ADJULTANTS OF A MARKE ORDERONS OF RECOMMENTS OF A MARKE ORDERONS OF RECOMMENTS OF ADJULTANTS OF ADJULTANTS AND ADJULT AND ADJULT AND ADJULT AND ADJULT ADJULTANTS ADJULT AND ADJULT ADJULT ADJULT AND ADJULT ADJULT ADJULTANTS OF ADJULT AND ADJULT ADJULT ADJULT ADJULT ADJULTANTS OF ADJULT ADJULT ADJULT ADJULT ADJULT ADJULT ADJULTANTS OF ADJULT ADJULT ADJULT ADJULT ADJULT ADJULT ADJULTANTS OF ADJULT ADJULT ADJULT ADJULT ADJULT ADJULTANTS OF ADJULT	NNON WANACCARNE MEASURES E FOLLOWING POLLUTION MEASURES OF CONSTRUCTOR PRODUCTS, WATHOR & ALO FASTER FOLLOWING TO MEASURE THE STOKEN TO A MARKE OF ANE OFFICIAL TO BE CONTROL TO STOKENATER A MARKE OF ANE OFFICIAL INTERNATION AND A MARKE OF ANE OFFICIAL TO ALL CONTROL TO STOKENATER AND MARKE OF ANE OFFICIAL INTERNATION AND A MARKE OF ANE OFFICIAL INTERNATION AND A MARKE OF ANE OFFICIAL INTERNATION AND A AND AND ALL AND AND AND AND AND A AND AND AND AND AND AND AND A AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND A AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND A AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND A AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND
C5.1	WHISTLER PINES SHOREVIEW, MN STORM WATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN (SWPPP)	I HEARSY CONTRY THAT THIS PLAN WAS PAPEARD BY NE OR UNDER IT YORKET SUPERVISION AND THAT I AM A DURY LICENING PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF MINNESGTA. DEFELSION ENTRY THAT THIS PLAN WAS ADAM GINKEL DATE: 06.14.2018 LIC. NO. 43903		DRAWN BY: OCENON BY A.Q. A.Q. OHCHO BY PROA NO. Q.W.P. 19740 OHCHO BY 2019

SITE SPECIFIC INFORMATION

STE NAME WHSTLER PHES

PROJECT LOCATION 4140 HODCSON RD SHOREVEN, MH 55126

LANRUDE: 45.0667 LUNGITUDE: -93.1107 P10. 24.30.23.44.00018

DEVELOPER CARA BUILDERS 1473 ISTN AVE NN NEW BRIGHTON, NN 55112

SEAN KEATTS (651) 468-5725 keetts/@pmol.com

CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

THE PROJECT PROPOSES THE SUBDIVISION OF A 3-67-ACHE PARCLL AND (8) SWELE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL LOTS. THE STE IS LOCATED AT 4140 HODGSON RD IN SHORE VEN

THIS PROJECT FALLS WITHIN RAMSEY WASHINGTON METRO WATERSHED DISTRICT (RIMIND).

EXERTING CONDITIONS THE DISTING STE HAS ONE SINCLE-FAMILY REDORNES WITH SEVERAL OUTBULGNOSS STE HAS ONE SINCLE-FAMILY REDORNES WITH SEVERALLY SLOPED INTERNALLY TO AN ISOLATED LOW AREA. THIS LOW AREA CAPTURES THE REAM-OFF FAMILY OF THE SURROUNDING LOTS (BACKYAROS AND REAR-ROOF AREAS).

PROPOSED CONTINUES THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT WILL HOLLOF CONSTRUCTION OF A PURIC STREET, HISTALLATION OF SAMIARY SENER AND WATCHAM (PUBLIC), HISTALLATION OF STORM SENER (PUBLIC) AND THE PREPARATION OF DOAT (8) SMICL-FAME VERSIONTIAL LOTS

PERFORMED PRES IN A MOCK BED ARE PROPOSED WITHIN THE STREET TO MEET TREATMENT RECOVERANTS FOR THE RET MEDINOUS SURFACE. THIS SYSTEM OUTLETS TO AN IPPENTIATION BASES MECH IN THAN OUTLETS THIS THE PUBLIC STOMM SERVICE MEMINIANTS AND ALL A DECK VALVE IS PROMOBLO TO CHAME THAT BACKTURE OCS NOT OCCUR.

SEE "STORM WATER ORAMIAGE REPORT" FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, INTOROLOGIC AND WATER QUALITY CALCULATIONS

STE AREAS

OUNSTRUCTION CONSTRUCTION
 CONSTRUCTION
 CONSTRUCTION

 "DIAL SHE AREA
 J.04 ACRES

 "D'A. ISTMATED NUMBER OF DETWODS
 LIS ACRES

 "D'A. ISTMATED PERMONS
 LIS ACRES

 APPROL Q.96 ACRE INCREASE IN IMPERIOUS

TUTA, DISTURBED ANEA 3 75 ACRES

HERE WAS BATERS WOTHIN CHE HERE

	TYPE OF BOOT	SPECIAL MARR	MPARED WATER
CITY PONDS	PONO	NO	NQ
SHALLAKE	LAKE	NO	NO
GRASS LAKE	LAKE	NO	NO
3.000 ADD NO ADD 4000 (000)	NAL WALKER W		a (

THE MAP AND DESIGN CALCULATIONS

SEE "STORM WATER DRAMACE REPORT" FOR QUANTINGATION OF STORM WATER MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS AND CRAMACE AREA MAPS.

SCILS. SLOPES. VEDETATION

STOPPE. THE STE HAS SEMPCANI MODERATE TOPOGRAPHY CHANGE BUT PROPOSED SLOPES WILL BE GENERALLY MODERATE AND ARE NOT EXPECTED TO EXCEED 3.1.

USTATION. DISTARGED AREAS HEL BE RESTORED WITH SEED & MALCH AND SOO.

PERSON WHO PREPARED SWPPP ("DESIGNER")			
adam genet.	PLONE ENGINEERING, INC. 6776 LAKE ORIVE LINO LAKES MI 55014 (851) 381-8200		

PERSON WHO WILL OVERSEE IMPLEMENTATION OF SUPPLY ("CONTRACTOR") TBD - WHEN AVAILABLE PROVIDE CONTACT BFORMATION TO NEORE SODENHOLM (REARD) AT 651-762-7578, AND CITY OF SHORENEE

 PERSON(3)
 INFO
 INFO

TRANS 200, MINIATION

DOCUMENTATION MUST ACCOMPANY THE SUPPP MORATING THAT THE NO VOLUES OPHTHER IN PART MLF. HAVE BEDI TRANED IN ACCOMPANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF PART MLF. DOCUMENTATION SHALL INCLUDE

A MAMES OF THE PERSONNEL ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PROJECT THAT ARE REQUIRED TO BE TRANED PER PART W.J.I. OF THIS PERMIT. 8. DATES OF TRANSING AND NAME OF INSTRUCTOR(S) AND ENTITY PROVODE TRANSING

C. CONTENT OF TRANSMIG COURSE OR WORKSHOP INCLUDING THE MUNIBER OF HOURS OF TRANSMIG.

SITE SEQUENCING & ESC NOTES

PROF TO ANY LAND-DISTURGING ACTIVITY, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL INSTALL SUT TENCE AS SHOWN ON PLAN - ADDITIONAL BUT PONCE LIANT DE NECESSARY F LOCAL CONDITIONS REQUIRE: SULT FENCE SHALL REDARD IN-PLACE WITH THE FINAL STADULATION HAS BEEN ESTIMUISTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH PART FILE.

THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PERFORM SITE GRADING ON AN AREA-BY-AREA BASIS TO MINIMULE UNSTABULICO AREAS AS EACH AREA IS COMPLETED, ALL DIPOSED SOLS MUST HAVE THE POLARY (ADSOLD CONTROL, PROTECTION OR PERMANENT COVER MITHIN SEVEN (7) DAYS.

SPECIFIED EROSION & SEDIMENT CONTROL MEASURES ARE MINIMUM. ADDITIONAL PRACTICES MAY BE REQUIRED DURING THE COURSE OF CONSTRUCTION.

THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROMPE ALL SOD, SEED, MALCH AND FURTURER WHICH SHALL CONFORM WITH THE FOLLOWING MODOT SPECIFICATIONS AS MODIFED BELOW.

CIEM .	NEDOT SPECIFICATION/NOTES	
\$00	3676	
500 -	3874	
 FOR TURF ESTABLISHIED/T COMMERCIAL TURF RESIDENTIAL TURF 	MHDOT MOX 25-131 (220 LBS/ACHE) MHDOT MOX 25-131 (120 LBS/ACHE)	
REMPORARY FALL COVER SPINIC/SUMMER SOL-BUILDING COVER I-2 YEARS COVER 2-5 YEARS COVER	MNDOT MIX 21-112 (100 LBS/ACRE) MNDOT MIX 21-113 (100 LBS/ACRE) MNDOT MIX 21-113 (100 LBS/ACRE) MNDOT MIX 22-113 (100 LBS/ACRE) MNDOT MIX 22-112 (40 LBS/ACRE)	
WICH	3882 (TYPE 1 - DISC ANCHORED)	
FERRUZER	3061	
1000 FIRER BLANKET	3005 (CATEGORY 2)	

MOW A MONITUM OF: RESOLVER, TARF - ONCE PER 2 WEDS COMMERCIAL TURF - ONCE PER 4 WEDS

-- SEEDED AREAS SHALL BE BITHER MULCHED OR COVERED BY POROUS BLANKETS TO PROTECT SEEDS AND LIKET EROSION.

IENDORARY OR PERMANENT MULCH MUST BE LANTORMLY APPLIED BY MECHANICAL OR HYDRALLY MEANS AND STABLIZED BY DISC-ANCHORDING OR USE OF INTERNAL'S OIL STABLIZERS.

ALL EROSON AND SEDWENT CONTROL BEASURES SHOWN ON THE PLANS OR AND LEVENTED IN THE FIELD SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITT AND HEDES PHASE I PENNT REQUIREMENTS, AND THE MEANS' PROTECTION CHATER QUALITY IN URBAN AREAS BEST NANADEMENT PRACTICES FOR MEDIESOTA."

THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PAY SPECIAL AFTENTION TO ALL ADJACENT PROPERTY LINES AND MARE SHALL PAY SPECIAL AFTENTIOL PRACTICES HEMALES IN THOSE MELSS RELYOLT MIGRATION OF SEDMACHT ON TO ADJACENT PROPERTIES.

THE CONTRACTOR SHALL MANYAM SLT FENCE, INCLUDING THE REMOVAL OF ACQUINT, ATED SEDIENT, THROUGH COMPLETION OF BULDING CONSTRUCTION, SLT FENCE TO BE REMOVED ONLY ATER COMPLETION OF BULDING CONSTRUCTION AND UPON (STABLISMENT OF VECETATION,

THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE WOOD FIBER BLANKET FOR ALL AREAS OF CONCENTRATED FLOW AND FOR ALL SLOPES 3.1 OR GREATER.

PROTECT ALL STORM MATER MANAGEMENT FACULTES FROM CONSTRUCTION RUN-OFF. CONTRACTOR TO INSTALL AND CONSTRUCT SHID FACULTES ONCE STE HAS DEEN STABLIZED

IF ANY SLOPES APPEAR TO BE FAILING. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE ADDITIONAL SUT FENCE, SHOROLLS AND EROSION CONTROL BLAMET AS HEEDED

INC CONTRACTOR SHALL FINAL GRADE SWALE AREAS UPON STABILIZATION OF UPSTREAM AREAS.

UPON GRADING COMPLETION THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE MATIVE TOPSOL. SEED, AND MALCH ANCHORED WITH A STRANGHT SET DISC HITMEN AS HOURS OF FINAL GRADING

CICESS SON, SHOULD BE THEATED LIKE OTHER EXPOSED SON, AND STABUJED WITHIN SEVEN (7) DATS ANY SON, STOCKPILES ARE TO HAVE SUIT FENCE PLACED ON COMMISTREAM SDES AND SHALL NOT BE PLACED IN SUIFACE WATERS.

ADJACENT STREETS SHALL BE KEPT CLEAN OF CONSTRUCTION WATERIALS, DRT, AND OTHER UNDERFAULT WATERIALS, WHEN WATERIALS OF DEBAS HAVE TWASHED/TUNED ONTO ADJACENT STREETS IT IS THE CONTRACTOR'S RESPONSEMENT TO SHEEP/SCRAPE STREETS AS NECESSARY OR AS DARCTED BY NEC OTY.

COORDINATE SMALL UTILITIES INSTALLATIONS (GAS. PHONE, ELECTRIC, GAS, ETC.) AFTER CURB & GUITER INSTALLATION





THERE ARE NO IMPARED/SPECIAL WATERS WITHIN ONE MILE

CONTACT NICOLE SODERHOLM, RAMSEY WASHINGTON METRO WATERSHED DISTRICT, AT 651-792-7976 PRIOR TO BEGINNING ANY AND ALL CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY FOR AN INITIALL SWPPP INSPECTION.

NOTIFY NICOLE SODERHOLM, RAMSEY WASHINGTON METRO WATERSHED DISTRICT (RWIMWD) AT (851)-792-7978 AT LEAST 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE STORMWATER BASINS

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

الاردان الاستوادية يستوجه

Adam Ginkel

III GIN

Management

The basis of this card has been tested and is centried in the state(s) shown on the newses of the card, Cardicators expre-tion dates appear after each cardication area

This law may - > Name of Street

Department of Representation and Manymers Represented Methods of Manymers 'Angelenesseen see als Cent Hanne (47.301) والمتعالية والتحسير

Design of Construction SWPPP (May 31 2020) 나는 사람이 많은 것이 같다.

Erosion and Stormwater

ESTIMATED EROSION & SEDIMENT CONTROL QUANTITIES			
TYPE	QTY	UNIT	
SUT FENCE	X	UNEAR TEL	
NP-RAP W. GEO-FABRIC	X	CUBIC YAROS	
SEDMENT CONTROL LOGS	X	UNCAR FOLT	
CATCH BASIN INLET PROTECTION	X	EACH	
STABLIZED (SODDED) OVERFLOW	×	EACH	
SED & WILCH (GDIERAL)	X	ACRE	

CRAWN OF	1 200	310	
CHCKD BY		04	NO.
C.W.P.	1 10	-1	749
MARCH	DATE: 20. 1	101	
		11	Í
Ľ	11		
N N N			
불형			
S e			
N			
Q P			
ž			
EO	μL	Ц	∐ I
별벽			
ă₹			
1 9 E	11	t	
. 6.			2
\$5255			8
SOUTH	M		ġ
		بر	ž
E SE E	N	Į,	-
2 5 5 5 5 5		ļ	
		X	ŝ
00000	2	14	1
i stat	2		8
칼칼림			Ë
35		l	٥
ល		Š	
Z	z		ş Ş İ
4	N V	ā) z
Ë	Ā	2	Į₹
늰	ų,		ξŻΙ
S	ЮН		ĔĔ
Ĩ	8	-	ĘŚ
5		5	
. <u> </u>		-	<u> </u>
PREPARE		A :	
BUILDE	RS,	LL	с
<u> </u>			
	- Sta		
		6 ^{µµ}	
	. 16	100	3.
BITE P		ING	
SITE P			
SITE PI SITE PI SIT			E E E
BITE PI A ENGI ENGINEE S775 LANG SUTE 110			E E E
BITE PI A ENDI ENGINEE S775 LAND SUTE AND SUTE AND SUTE AND SUTE AND SUTE AND SUTE AND SUTE AND SUTE AND SUTE PI SUTE PI SUT			E P E
BITE PI A ENGINEER BUTE ATTO LIVO LACE PHONE: (6 PAC: (651)	EANINI NEER DV RING DRIV R. MH B. MH B. MH B. J. DR		
BITE PI A ENGINEE S775 LAND SUMPLEATO LIND LAXE PHONE: (6 PAC (651)			
BITE PI A ENGI ENGINEE 5775 LAN UNIO UNIO PAC (851) NO			
BITE PI A ENGI ENGINEE S775 LANG S775 LANG S77			
BITE PI A ENGI ENGINEE S775 LARE S775 LA			
BITE PI A ENGI ENGINEE S775 LANG S775 LA			
BITE PI A ENDI ENDINEE S775 LAND S775 LAND S775 LAND S775 LAND PHONE: : (6 PAC: (651) NO 2 1 INCH			
BITE PI A ENGINEE BYTS LANG BUTE 100 LING LANG PHONE: 16 PAC (051) NO D LING LANG T INCH			
BITE PI A ENGINEE BYTE LAU BYTE LOO BYTE 100 LING LAU PHONE: :6 PAC (051) NO D INC			





Comments regarding 4140 Hodgson Rd subdivision

2 messages

Amanda Kohorst <agkohorst@gmail.com> To: asedey@shoreviewmn.gov Thu, May 17, 2018 at 2:11 PM

Dear Aaron,

I am writing to provide public comment on the proposed subdivision of 4140 Hodgson Rd. As a member of the community who grew up in Shoreview I have greatly valued the attention that city planning puts voter feedback. After reviewing the proposal, I do have two primary concerns.

The first concern is that of the size of homes proposed. Although the plans meet the threshold for a low density residential neighborhood, the model of home being suggested does not appear to be in keeping with that of the adjoining properties. I can appreciate that the city would like to diversify housing options, but I would caution that other communities like Shoreview are slowly seeing the availability of modest homes decrease as a result of attracting contrast between older and newer homes in a small radius. I believe that Shoreview embodies the value of being inclusive of all economic levels, and that the city planning committee can support ensuring that established neighborhoods, such as ours, are maintained as reasonable homes for first time home buyers.

My second concern relates to the environment. Shoreview is a beautiful place to live on account of the careful balancing of environment, community and economic considerations in matters such as these. At present, we have significant flooding on in the Snail Lake area, including the trail system. It appears to me that development on this scale could escalate those concerns.

Along with that, I was unable to find any consumer reviews of Cara Builders, LLC. I verified that their builder's license was just issued in January 2018. I have concerns that this company does not have a long history in the building industry and that this could result in increased risk to the environment and future costs to the community.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these comments.

Amanda Kohorst 4128 Rustic Place

Aaron Sedey <asedey@shoreviewmn.gov> To: agkohorst@gmail.com

Thu, May 17, 2018 at 2:14 PM

HI Amanda,

Thank you for the comments, I will include them with Planning Commission packet for the May 22 meeting.

Thanks Aaron Aaron Sedey Associate Planner City of Shoreview

SHOREVIEW PLANNING COMMISSION

Public notice - request for comments

I have lived here for over 40 years and have seen all the problems we have had with water getting into houses and flooding our streets. When the pipe from Hawes Ave drained into the holding area behind my house the water would get about 15 to 20 feet deep and the water table would rise so high that we would get water in our basements. Then the city closed the pipe and put a new drainage pipe system in the street and that does not work when we get heavy rain and the Hawes Ave would get 2+ feet of water in front of my driveway. My neighbors across the street gets water in there basement and garage because the system does not handle big rain storms. Now you want to put the same thing back in the new housing area in the middle of our back yards. The other problem with this it the bugs this water will draw and the smell of the sitting water and the ducks and geese using it to lay there eggs and that makes the area a pile of crap. The geese will do there shitting all over the area and stinks it up. This is not good for the area to have these problems coming back just to put one or two more houses in that area. The other problem I see is how is the contractor going to fill that hole? it will take hundreds of dump trucks to fill in that area to level it out and make it usable.

Jeffrey M. Lundquist 244 Hawes Ave. Shoreview MN, 55126



4140 Hodgson Road File # 2689-18-09

2 messages

Ryan Olson <olsondavidryan@yahoo.com> To: asedey@shoreviewmn.gov Thu, May 17, 2018 at 1:59 PM

Dear Shoreview Planning Commission,

We are emailing you with concern of the proposed development at 4140 Hodgson Road. The current homeowners on Demar, Rustic, and Hawes are very concerned regarding the proposed plans we received in the mail. Many households are not at ease.

We are concerned of water drainage issues related to this project. When our neighborhood had its road and storm sewer replaced, we quickly saw afterward that our current drainage could barely handle heavy rain fall for our neighborhood. Our neighborhood is in no way able to accommodate the proposed development's drainage, in addition to our neighborhood, nor was it designed for that. Neighbors on Hawes are worried that they would see water damage to basements and homes, should things be changed in the name of development.

We are concerned about the size of the homes planning to be built. They are very large, as well as very high not to mention the fact the foundations will be elevated above the elevations of surrounding homes adding to the already enormous height of the houses. Not only would this create an odd, distasteful appearance, but it would make current residents feel they have lost all privacy in their backgrounds, with high towering homes looking down on them like fish in a bowl.

Other concerns include the proposed holding pond. We have noticed other similar developments with holding ponds that produce an awful smell during the summer months, as well as mosquito control issues.

Last, but certainly not least, is our concern for the 30 landmark trees the devopler has planned to cut down, one of which is a perfectly shaped, majestic looking oak, that has to be at least a century in age.

The loss of such mature beautiful arbor would be tragic. Although there are 3.67 acres of land does not mean it can fit a subdivision.

Thank you for considering our concerns on these matters. Please respectfully advocate for the families whose homes and neighborhood would be directly impacted by this development.

Ryan and Julie Olson

Sent from my iPhone

Aaron Sedey <asedey@shoreviewmn.gov> To: Ryan Olson <olsondavidryan@yahoo.com> Thu, May 17, 2018 at 2:07 PM

Hi Ryan

Thank you for the comments, I will add them to the Planning Commission packet for May 22, 2018.

Thanks Aaron Aaron Sedey Associate Planner City of Shoreview 651-490-4681



comments regarding 4140 Hodgson Rd

2 messages

Jennifer Duden <brooksy@visi.com> To: asedey@shoreviewmn.gov Thu, May 17, 2018 at 1:27 PM

Dear Aaron Sedey & the Shoreview Planning Commission,

My husband, Chris Duden, and I live at 230 Hawes Ave. and we have multiple concerns about the proposed development to the plot at 4140 Hodgson Road.

Primarily we are concerned with the storm water pond/infiltration basin proposed for the area behind our home.

1) Who will be designing and building the pond area? Will it be concrete or natural?

2) Will an outside Hydrology Engineer be consulted? What about the DNR?

3) We are concerned that raising the area of the current natural basin and trying to re-route the water will be disastrous. Previous water remediation issues have not gone well on our street. In 2011, after Hawes, Rustic & Demar were re-constructed, the city wanted to install rain gardens. A rain garden was installed in our front yard and it flooded our yard and the street <u>4 times in under 90 days</u>. At first we were told these were "100 year" rains, and then that it was a filter problem, and yet flooding still kept happening. The rain garden was finally filled back in that fall, and we've had no problems since. We are concerned that raising so much of the land at 4140 Hodgson will make our lot, and the lot next door (236 Hawes Ave), as well as the lot across the street, an even lower point in the area and that we will all be flooded when it rains. Furthermore, relying on old data for "100 year water levels" Is unreliable and dangerous. See this research:

https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/the-midwest-is-getting-drenched-and-its-causing-big-problems/

4) What happens to excess water in the pond? Will there be a pump? Is there a drainage point for the pond?

5) Who will be responsible for ongoing maintenance of the pond and surrounding area?

6) Will mosquito control be applied to the pond? Who will cover that cost?

7) Will we still have access to our rear yard area? With the previous owner, we were allowed occasional access for large tree/yard maintenance.

We are also concerned about the height and size of the proposed houses. It sounds like they will be very large and loom over our neighborhood. We'd like to avoid what happened to the Mackubin/Suzanne area of Shoreview when the Snail Lake Landing addition was built. Those houses are quite large in comparison to the neighborhood, and they block and diminish many of the older homes on those streets. We understand wanting to develop this large lot, but suggest that any development should fit in better with the current homes in the neighborhood.

We do plan to attend the Planning Commission Meeting on May 22nd, and look forward to any more information that you can provide. Thank you.

Jen and Chris Duden 230 Hawes Ave



Concerns regarding new Cara Builders subdivision/Hodgson Road

2 messages

Julianne Denny <JKDenny@yahoo.com> To: asedey@shoreviewmn.gov Thu, May 17, 2018 at 11:17 AM

I live at 222 Hawes Ave, so my yard backs up to the proposed project. Specifically, directly behind my house will be the infiltration basin. This concerns me for reasons such as how it will look (will my chain link fence be bordered by waist high weeds?), the mosquito population that will definitely grow mere feet from my home and the potential for flooding. I didn't purchase my property with a pond directly behind it and I shouldn't be expected to suffer a man-made one 20 years later.

Also of concern is the value of these future homes. The builder's website says they will be in the six hundred thousands, which is two-three times the value of the homes all around it. What size will homes be at this price point? The surrounding homes are 1960 ramblers. Are we going to have to look at sky-high houses in our backyards? And I'm sure we can all expect to pay for this project in our own property taxes as this development increases our home values. Many of the home owners on these three blocks are near original owners, ie Retirees, likely not able to afford this increase in costs we did nothing to invite.

I've learned many mature trees will be cut down for the project. Homeowners in this neighborhood purchased homes surrounded by mature trees. To cut down nearly all these trees in one section of land will drastically alter the aesthetics of the neighborhood. Adding several new small trees will not make up for these losses.

I understand this land will likely be developed in some way, but I feel homes more in line with the value and size of homes around it would be better. After all, all recent sub divisions in Shoreview and the Mounds View school district have likely eliminated middle class families.

Thank you for your time, Julianne Denny

Sent from my iPad

Aaron Sedey <asedey@shoreviewmn.gov> To: JKDenny@yahoo.com Thu, May 17, 2018 at 12:07 PM

Hi Julianne,

Thank you for your comments, I will add them to the Planning Commission Report.

Thanks
Aaron
Aaron Sedey
Associate Planner
City of Shoreview
651-490-4681
asedey@shoreviewmn.gov



File #2689-18-09, 4140 Hodgson Road subdivision

2 messages

Kate Maier <maierke@yahoo.com>

Mon, May 14, 2018 at 3:49 PM

To: "asedey@shoreviewmn.gov" <asedey@shoreviewmn.gov>

Hello Aaron,

I am writing to provide a comment about the proposed major subdivision for the 4140 Road parcel. As a neighbor who would be directly affected by the division, I would respectfully request the Council consider <u>not</u> allowing the parcel's division into 8 new homes. One of the reasons I purchased my home, and continue to enjoy its location, is that I can look out of my back window or sit on my back porch and not look directly into another home. I enjoy the fact that, even though I am surrounded by neighbors on both sides and am near a major road in the city, I still have a little oasis of trees and a small field behind my home that gives me the feeling of having open space even within the city. This will be ruined if I end up with a house situated directly across my back property line.

Additionally, I can't help but wonder who will reimburse those of us who will likely see a drop in our property values when we suddenly find ourselves with 8 additional homes in our back yards. Since having an open field behind the house is one of the reasons I chose it over similar homes in the area, it's reasonable to assume that the loss of this open space, along with the additional noise we would likely experience with so many new, closely-situated neighbors, would negatively affect people's decisions as to whether or not to purchase any of our homes should we choose to sell.

Seeing as the Council rejected a similar proposal on Rice Street a few years ago that would have had a similar affect on my neighbors across the street, even when the plot size for that proposal was somewhat larger than the one in this proposal, I hope that the Council will apply the same analysis to the 4140 Hodgson Road application as that previously applied to the Rice Street application.

Thank you, Kate Maier 4127 Rustic Place

Aaron Sedey <asedey@shoreviewmn.gov> To: maierke@yahoo.com Mon, May 14, 2018 at 4:00 PM

Hi Kate,

Thanks for submitting your comments for the Planning Commission Meeting. I will get those included in the meeting packet.

Thanks Aaron

Aaron Sedey Associate Planner City of Shoreview 651-490-4681 asedey@shoreviewmn.gov

[Quoted text hidden]

Preliminary Plat - Major Subdivision 4140 Hodgson Road File No. 2689-18-09

Comments: The proposed development fits the character Neighborhood = will be a vice addition drainage & other concerns pears lot 51225 addre been 2990 to bad the access to this development couldn't have been from an interior road RS Yol SAL dreg it aveter read access But like Neet MANK INFIL relapments not every thing is Not to code, but perter

Name: 4

Address: 275

Steve Carrigan

From: Sent: To: Subject: Steve Carrigan Wednesday, May 16, 2018 2:42 PM Aaron Sedey 4140 Hodgson project - concerns of property owners at 238 Hawes Ave

RECEIVED

MAY 1 6 2018

Dear Aaron and Planning Commission,

Aaron, I sent you an email earlier requesting to meet with you but a bounce back email says you are out today. I will try you again tomorrow.

I am Steve Carrigan along with my wife Susan Carrigan we are the owners of 238 Hawes Ave. We have owned the property for 10 years and it is our intention to retire in this home.

This email voices my concerns and comments regarding the project:

-I would like to know "Who represents whom here?". Do the city employees and the planning commission represent the developer, the surrounding homeowners, or the city or? So where does the fiduciary relationship lie? Should I be hiring an attorney?

-Has anyone from the planning commission been out to see this property from the viewpoint of my lot?

-I would also like to know if the Department of Natural Resources would have a concern here? Have they been contacted? There is a low area in the middle that I have observed to hold water from time to time over the years.

-In addition I have 3 general areas of concern about this proposal and how will they affect the value and enjoyment of my property:

1) Water and where will it go 2) The water basin area proposed 3) The tremendous amount of fill that will be brought in.

- 1) Water: This proposal doesn't account for any water exit from what I can see. This was brought up at the last planning commission meeting and I would like to be sure this is considered. It only allows for seepage back into the ground via a basin. As I mentioned in my previous comments; my property is at the lowest level of all the properties that abut this project. Over the years there have been issues with flooding and water back up in front of my property at 238 Hawes Ave. The subject property is the only area lower than my property. The current low point is not where the basin proposal is. The low point is about 80 to 100 feet south of where the proposed basin is. With filling up this low area will I be subject to further and more frequent water issues?
- 2) The basin: This proposed area is right behind my home and the 2 neighbors to the east of me. A basin hole right behind us could lead to safety concerns, insects, odors and not attractive.
- 3) The amount of fill: In my opinion this will change the integrity of all the existing houses. The plan shows that they want to build up the lowest area to 922 feet at the proposed curb. The height of the low area is not given but they do provide the low point of my back yard. This area is in the southeast corner of my yard and the plan shows it at 913.9. The low point of this lot is approximately at the south portion of lot 3 in the proposal. It appears to be at least 5 feet below the low point of my lot. That would bring that elevation to approximately 909. So they are proposing to bring in at least 13 vertical feet of fill (Proposed curb of 922 minus 909 = 13 feet). This doesn't account for building up the lot and the height of a new house. This could be a very intimidating block of the existing neighboring properties.

-My choughts for an alternative: What I would like to see is to keep the level of the property approximately where it is now, don't use a basin at all and install a lift station to pump the water to the street drain on Hodgson Road.

-To Aaron or anyone of the planning commission: Please feel free to reach out to me by phone (651-402-2121) or email (<u>Steve@CAREandCARRIGAN.com</u>). In addition I would be happy to meet at the property to see things from this point of view.

Respectfully submitted, Steve Carrigan Owner of 238 Hawes Ave 651-402-2121

Below are my concerns sent before the last meeting: To Aaron Sedey and Shoreview Planning Commission,

Dear Aaron and Planning Commission,

I am Steve Carrigan along with my wife Susan Carrigan we are the owners of 238 Hawes Ave. We have owned the property for 10 years and it is our intention to retire in this home. Here are my concerns for the proposed 4140 Hodgson project,

-Are they platted for detached single family homes only? Aaron Cedey (Associate Planner for City of Shoreview) told me over the phone "yes". Is there a way to see this in writing?

-Is the basin going to be adequate? 238 Hawes (our property) is the lowest property on this side of the street. We have had street flooding in front of our home at least three times since the new street was put in. Before that I understand that there was drainage to the lot behind us.

-Does the basin drain out anywhere? Or does it end there and seep back to the ground?

-Currently this property to me seems like a low natural drainage area. The plat shows a basin planned behind my house and the 2 houses east of me. Right now that area is much higher than the current low point of this lot. The low point now is further south by at least a 100 feet or so. To do this plan I know there will need to be a lot of excavating. Meaning this property is really going to change and how will this affect the flow of water. Is this a major excavating project? How much of changing nature's flow after all these years

-Dealing with a basin. Is this a habitat for insects. Is it dangerous? Is there an odor? Will it be fenced and secure? -Elevations: The back of our back yard is currently 914.3. The plans for the house that could be built behind us (lot 2) is 923.9. This is way higher than what is there now. This is a difference of 9.6 feet between the back of our lot plus whatever the height of what the new house would be. How much light blockage will there be? To get it to this height is also going to take a lot of excavating. Our property will then really be in a hole and other than the basin will be the lowest point.

-Is there a plan for buffer landscaping between existing properties and the potential new properties?

I wanted to make the deadline and get this into the planning commissions agenda packet. I will be at the meeting on 24-April and may voice further concerns.

Respectfully submitted, Steve Carrigan Owner of 238 Hawes Ave 651-402-2121

Date:	May 22, 2018
То:	Aaron Sedey, Associate Planner
From:	Tom Wesolowski, City Engineer
Subject:	Proposed Development 4140 Hodgson – Resident Drainage Comments

The City of Shoreview Engineering staff has reviewed the comments provided by residents adjacent to the proposed development and has the following comments:

The stormwater collection and infiltration system in the Hawes, Demar, Rustic area was designed to handle the run-off from a 10-year storm event. This is the design standard for stormwater collection systems throughout the City of Shoreview as well as Cities throughout the metro area. Since the installation of the system in 2010 there have been storm events with rain intensities in excess of a 10-year event, which could have caused localized flooding in the roadway in the Hawes, Demar, Rustic area as well as other areas in the City.

The stormwater collection system for the proposed development would also be designed to handle the run-off from a 10-year storm event, but the infiltration basin would be designed to handle the run-off volume from a 100-year storm event with no outflow of water from the basin. This is the typical design standard for ponds and also required by the Ramsey-Washington Metro Watershed District (RWMWD). What that means is with a rain event in excess of a 10-year storm event there may be localized flooding in the street of the proposed development, which would drain down over time into the infiltration basin but no water would discharge from the pond unless the run-off volume exceeded the volume of a 100-year storm event.

The infiltration basin will not only collect run-off from the proposed development, but also the run-off from the rear yards of the adjacent properties on Hawes and Rustic. These properties currently drain to the low area on the property, so the historic drainage pattern will not change.

The pond is an infiltration basin and is designed and required by the RWMWD to infiltrate all of the water in the basin within 48-hours, so the basin will not permanently hold water. It will be dry a majority of time. Plants will be installed within the pond to help treat and infiltrate/bio-infiltrate the run-off.

The only outlet from the pond would be an emergency overflow and as stated above will not discharge water from the pond unless the 100-year storage level is exceeded. Emergency overflows are required by the RWMWD and are typical on storm ponds throughout the City and metro area and in many cases the emergency overflow is directed toward the street.

The stormwater infiltration basin will be designed by a professional engineering from the state of Minnesota, will need to meet the requirements of the City and the RWMWD, would be inspected by the City and RWMWD during construction, and once constructed be owned and maintained by the City of Shoreview. The DNR is not involved in the permitting process for this type of stormwater collection and treatment system.

Based on the stormwater management report submitted by the developer, the stormwater collection and treatment system meets the requirements of the City and the RWMWD.

PROPOSED MOTION

MOVED BY COMMISSION MEMBER

SECONDED BY COMMISSION MEMBER

To recommend the City Council approve preliminary plat submitted by Sean Keatts of Cara Builders LLC to subdivide and develop the property at 4140 Hodgson Road into eight lots for single-family detached homes. Said recommendation for approval is subject to the following conditions:

Preliminary Plat

- 1. The approval permits the development of a detached residential subdivision providing 8 lots for single family residential development.
- 2. Final grading, drainage and erosion control plans are subject to the review and approval by the Public Works Director prior to approval of any permits or the Final Plat. Concerns identified by the City Engineer shall be addressed with the Final Plat submittal.
- 3. Final utility plans are subject to review and approval by the Public Works Director.
- 4. The final street design is subject to review and approval of the Public Works Director.
- 5. A Development Agreement, Erosion Control Agreement shall be executed and related securities submitted prior to any work commencing on the site. A Grading Permit is required prior to commencing work on the site.
- 6. A Public Recreation Use Dedication fee shall be submitted as required by ordinance prior to release of the Final Plat.
- 7. The landscape/tree-replanting plan shall be provided in accordance with the City's Tree Protection Ordinance. Trees on the property, which are to remain, shall be protected with construction fencing placed at the tree driplines prior to grading and excavating. Said plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the City Planner prior to submittal of the final plat application.
- 8. The Final Plat shall include drainage and utility easements along all property lines. Drainage and utility easements along the roadways shall be 10 feet wide and 5 feet wide along the side and rear lot lines. Other drainage and utility easements shall be provided over the proposed bio-filtration area, future public infrastructure and as required by the Public Works Director.
- 9. The developer shall secure a permit from the Ramsey Washington Metro Watershed District prior to commencing any grading on the property.

- 10. The developer shall gain an easement for the storm pond outlet, prior to the City submittal of the final plat application. Said easement shall be submitted to the City Attorney for review and approval.
- 11. Lot 1 shall have a 30 foot setback on the eastern lot line as it is a rear yard and the access for the lot shall be on the cul-de-sac.
- 12. Landscaping plan be submitted prior to issuance of any permits, that shows species, arrangement of plantings to scale and takes soil type and topography into account. Landscaping shall be installed along the eastern boundary and along the northern lot lines of Lots 2, 3, and 4. Said plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the Natural Resources Coordinator prior to submittal of the final plat application.

This approval is based on the following findings:

- 1. The proposed development plan supports the policies stated in the Comprehensive Plan related to land use and housing.
- 2. The proposed development plan carries out the recommendations as set forth in the Housing Action Plan
- 3. The proposed development plan will not adversely impact the planned land use of the surrounding property.
- 4. The lots comply with the size standards in the Development Code.

VOTE:

AYES:

NAYS:

Regular Planning Commission Meeting May 22, 2018

TO:	Planning	Commission
~~~	1 Intitititi	Comminopion

**FROM:** Aaron Sedey, Associate Planner

**DATE:** May 17, 2018

SUBJECT: File No. 2691-18-11; Scott Deming, Minor Subdivision and Variances, 821 Tanglewood Drive

## **INTRODUCTION**

Scott and Jane Deming have submitted a minor subdivision application to adjust the property boundary between his property located at 821 Tanglewood Dr. and the neighboring property to the south at 831 Tanglewood Dr. also owned by the Deming family. The boundary adjustment will be effected by transferring the middle track of land highlighted in the plans. The boundary adjustment will transfer just over 3 acres from Parcel A (831 Tanglewood) to Parcel B (821 Tanglewood). No additional lots will be created, no trees will be removed, no buildings will be constructed, and no private driveways will be changed.

Both of the properties are developed with detached single-family uses with access off of Tanglewood Drive through a private road easement. This easement serves the six properties, 841, 825, 831, 819, 817, and 821 Tanglewood Dr. All are developed with single family dwellings with and garages.

## DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE REQUIREMENTS

Minor subdivisions require review by the Planning Commission and approval by the City Council. Minor subdivisions must be reviewed in accordance with subdivision and zoning district standards in the Development Regulations.

The City's subdivision standards require all lots to front on a publicly dedicated right-of-way. Municipal sanitary sewer and water must be provided to the resulting lots. These standards also require 5-foot public drainage and 10-foot utility easements along property lines where necessary. The lots are accessed via a private roadway easement and have no public street frontage. As such, the applicants have applied for a variance to waive the public street frontage requirement.

The City requires riparian lots to have 100 feet at the water, building pad and street access. As such 821 lacks the 100 feet at the water and having already requested a variance for the street access.

The property is located in the R-1 Detached Residential, and the Shoreland Management Overlay District on the 821 Tanglewood parcel. In the R-1 district, properties must be at least 10,000 square feet in size and have a minimum width of 75'. Riparian properties in the Shoreland District of Turtle Lake must be at least 15,000 square feet in size and have a width of at least 100' as measured at the front property line, building setback, and OHW.

## VARIANCE CRITERIA

When considering a variance request, the Commission must determine whether the ordinance causes the property owner practical difficulty and find that granting the variances is in keeping with the spirit and intent of the ordinance. Practical difficulty is defined as:

- 1. Reasonable Manner. The property owner proposes to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the Shoreview Development Regulations.
- 2. Unique Circumstances. The plight of the property owner is due to circumstances unique to the property not created by the property owner.
- 3. Character of Neighborhood. The variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood.

## APPLICANTS' STATEMENTS

The applicant states that the purpose of the subdivision request is to transfer approximately 3 acres of land from Parcel A (831) to Parcel B (821). This request will not create any new lots. The reasons for this request are outlined below:

The applicants have occupied the property for 37 years and have reached an age whereby they find it necessary as aging homeowners and are planning for the future in case anything were to happen to them. This is to lessen the burden off their children if anything would happen. They have purchased 831 Tanglewood with the idea of gaining access for a future development if desired by future owners; however at this time the Demings' have no desire to develop the land as such. It is in the Applicants' desire to maintain the pristine appearance of the land. No new lots will be created.

The applicant states that the variance is requested to waive the street frontage requirements for 821 Tanglewood Dr as they do not meet the frontage requirements. Also a variance for a reduction in the shoreline is under the allowed 100' minimum. There are unique circumstances because of the property's creation as a lot with only 81 feet on the water and the lot was created with a driveway easement for the properties on a public road is only 20 feet. The shift in property will not alter changes in physical character of the neighborhood as nothing is to be changed. No new home sites will be created. A private driveway easement would still be in place for all properties that currently use it.

## **STAFF REVIEW**

## Variance

The variance request to waive the street frontage requirement for Parcel A (831 Tanglewood) of the submitted Minor Subdivision application was reviewed by staff in accordance with the variance criteria. Also requested is a variance for width required of a 100' for a standard riparian lot. In staff's opinion, practical difficulty is present based on historical and unique circumstances.

Staff believes practical difficulty is present, based on the following findings:

- 1. Reasonable Manner. The property owner proposes to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the Shoreview Development Regulations. The applicant is proposing to use the property in a reasonable manner. Access to the current homes on the properties is via Tanglewood Drive through a private road easement and that will not change with this subdivision. Additionally the lot was created with the current 81 feet at the water and no changes are being proposed to this width. The lot will continue to use the property in reasonable manner of a single family home.
- 2. Unique Circumstances. The plight of the property owner is due to circumstances unique to the property not created by the property owner. Staff believes that unique circumstances are present due to the historical creation of the lots and several properties using one driveway easement. Keeping access via a private road easement is reasonable due to the property's characteristics of frontage on a Tanglewood Drive. It is not reasonable to require frontage on a public street at this time due to the area's characteristic and potential for future development.
- 3. Character of Neighborhood. The variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood. The character of the neighborhood will not be altered at all. The existing homes and access to them will not be changed with the minor subdivision nor will any new lots be created and the minor subdivision and variances will just be noticeable on paper rather than affect the character of the neighborhood.

## Minor Subdivision

The proposal to transfer approximately 3 acres and adjust the lot lines of 821 Tanglewood and 831 Tanglewood increase the area of 821 Tanglewood by 208,141 square feet. The increased area will be to keep the land in the Deming Family as they own 831 Tanglewood. As well as assist in the future owner's development if ever sold. No new lots or further subdivision is being proposed as this time. Any future subdivision of either lot, is subject to a new application and future public review by the City.

The proposed lot line adjustment and resulting lots shown in the following table:

	Width	Area
821 Tanglewood Dr.	81 feet Lakeside	37,072 sq. ft.* (.85 acre)
831 Tanglewood Dr.	123.63 feet at street 328.63 feet in the middle of the additional land	167,323 sq. ft. (3.84 acre)

City Requirement Riparian	100 feet	15,000 sq. ft.*
City Requirement R-1	75 feet	10,000 sq. ft

* Area is measured above the Ordinary High Water of Turtle Lake

Both of the existing homes would remain. A new private road easement will be executed for 821 Tanglewood. New drainage and utility easements are proposed for the new lot boundaries. The existing setbacks of structures on each existing lot are not affected by the boundary adjustment.

Municipal sanitary sewer and water service are provided to both existing parcels and both of the dwellings are connected to these municipal services.

The proposed subdivision complies with City requirements. No Public Recreation Use Dedication fee is required for this property boundary adjustment since no new homesites will be created as a result of this approval.

## SHORELAND MITIGATION

In accordance with the Development Code, Shoreland Mitigation is required of property owners who are seeking certain land use approvals through the City. The applicant at 821 Tanglewood has identified two practices, Architectural Mass and Impervious Surface Reduction. This proposal complies with the City's requirements. The use of Impervious Reduction will remove a patio from the lake side allowing for less runoff into the lake.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Property owners within 350 feet were notified of the applicant's request. No comments have been received.

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The minor subdivision application has been reviewed in accordance with the standards of the Development Regulations and found to be in compliance with these standards. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve Resolution 18-34, approving the variances to waive the street frontage requirement, the minimum shoreland lot width and to also recommend approval of the minor subdivision to the City Council, subject to the following conditions:

## Variances

- 1. This approval is subject to approval of the Minor Subdivision application by the City Council.
- 2. This approval will expire after one year if the subdivision has not been recorded with Ramsey County.

3. The approval is subject to a 5 day appeal period.

## **Minor Subdivision**

- 1. The minor subdivision shall be in accordance with the plans submitted.
- 2. Public drainage and utility easements with a width of 5-feet on each side of the new common property line shall be conveyed to the City. The applicant shall be responsible for providing legal descriptions for all required easements. The easements shall be conveyed before the City will endorse deeds for recording.
- 3. A private driveway easement shall be updated to reflect the 821 Tanglewood having access, shall be conveyed before the City will endorse deeds for recording.
- 4. The applicant shall enter into a Subdivision Agreement with the City. This agreement shall be executed before the City will endorse deeds for recording.
- 5. A Mitigation Affidavit is required for 821 Tanglewood Dr, this Affidavit shall be executed prior to the City's release of the deed for recording.
- 6. Approval of the Minor Subdivision is contingent upon the approval of a variance permitting waiving public street frontage requirement for 821 Tanglewood and waving of the minimum 100 feet of shoreland for 821 Tanglewood.
- 7. This approval shall expire after one year if the subdivision has not been recorded with Ramsey County.

## Attachments

- 1) Location Map
- 2) Submitted Statement and Plans
- 3) Resolution 18-34
- 4) Motions

T:\2018 Planning Cases files\2691-18-11 821 Tanglewood - Deming/PC Report.docx



# 821 Tanglewood



## April 10, 2018

Department of Community Development

Shoreview, Minnesota

RE: The intended use for subdivision of 821 Tanglewood Drive:

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN,

We are Jane and Scott Deming. We own and live at 821 Tanglewood Drive. We have owned 821 Tanglewood Drive since 1981. Recently we purchased an adjacent property at 831 Tanglewood Drive.

Currently we are seeking a subdivision of land for 821 Tanglewood Drive. The subdivision we are requesting would separate the existing parcel of land which is known as 821 Tanglewood Drive into two parcels, noted on the attached survey as Parcel A and Parcel B. The vacant land separated from 821 Tanglewood Drive would then be attached to 831 Tanglewood Drive (known as proposed Parcel B).

Parcel A would be the lot upon which our home at 821 Tanglewood currently is situated.

Parcel B is 831 Tanglewood Drive including the remainder of the subdivided land which currently comprises the property known as 821 Tanglewood Drive.

The immediate intended use is for the land to remain the same. We will continue to own both 821 Tanglewood and 831 Tanglewood and maintain them the same.

However, this subdivision would allow for potential future development of the land. As it stands now, development is not possible with the current lot lines. This could finally connect Tanglewood Drive with Lakeview Drive and still leave the option open for additional future development moving west.

The reason for the timing now is due to us, as owners are aging. We are future planning in case anything was to happen to us in the coming years. Having this completed would take the burden off our children.

Thank you for your consideration.

Scott and Jane Deming

Home: 651.483.3016 Cell: 651.338.8390 Email: <u>Deming48@comcast.net</u>

## Application for Variances:

We are seeking two variances to go along with the subdivision application for 821 Tanglewood Drive and 831 Tanglewood Drive.

The first variance is regarding the easement for 821 Tanglewood Drive. The current easement is a 20' wide dirt road that provides access from Tanglewood Drive to 6 separate residences (817, 819, 821, 825, 831, and 841 Tanglewood Drive). The dirt road easement is currently the only access for these owners to get to their respective properties. As the owners of 821 Tanglewood, we maintain the road as well as arrange for snow removal for the entire dirt road (and have done so since 1981).

If the subdivision and land transfer is approved, we are looking to have the current easement stay in place to provide access, not only for 821 Tanglewood Drive, but the other 5 properties listed above all affected by the easement.

If/when there is future development of the land, the current dirt road easement would be replaced by a paved city road and the 6 total properties referenced above would have direct access to public roads.

The second variance request is for a width variance because the shoreline is under 100' for proposed Parcel A. If the subdivision is approved, the structures on this lot are to remain the same. There is no future development plan for proposed Parcel A, nor are we looking to make any changes to current structures on proposed Parcel A.

Along with the width variance, it is our understanding there needs to be two acceptable options for Shoreline Mitigation action. Of the 5 options provided, the two that can be completed are 1) Architectural Mass and 2) Reduction of Impervious Surface Coverage.

Architectural Mass can be completed as the structures are earth tones and natural colors.

Reduction of Impervious Surface Coverage could also be completed. There is a patio by the lake that is approximately 300 square feet. It is a class 5 gravel base patio with a paver stone top. Removing said surface should allow water to soak into the ground better.

Thank you for your consideration on these two variance requests.

Scott and Jane Deming

Home: 651.483.3016 Cell: 651.338.8390 Email: <u>Deming48@comcast.net</u>



# **CERTIFICATE OF SURVEY**

~for~ SCOTT & JANE DEMING ~of~ 821 and 831 Tanglewood Drive

Shoreview, MN

## **EXISTING LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS**

821TANGLEWOOD: (Per warronty deed dated February 20th, 1987, William and Carroll Frick to Scott and Jane Deming)

The East 328.63 feet of the West 492.94 feet of Government Lot 3, Section 14, Township 30, Range 23, accepting therefrom, the following 6 parcels:

The East 328.65 feet of the West 492.94 feet of Government Lot 3, Section 14, Township 30, Range 23, excepting thereform, the following 6 parcelas: (1) The East 105 feet of the West 269,31 feet of the South 283 feet of Government Lot 3, Section 14, Township 30, Range 23, Rommey County, Minnosota, and (2) The Easterly 100 feet of the Westerly 492.94 feet of the Southerly 283 feet of Government Lot 3, Section 14, Township 30 North, Range 23 West, Romesy County, Minnesoto, and (3) The Eosterly 103.85 feet of the Westerly 372.94 feet of the Southerly 283 feet of Government Lot 3, Section 14, Township 30, Range 23, Rommey County, Minnesoto, and (4) That part of Government Lot 3, Section 14, Township 30 North, Range 23 West, Lying Westerly of a line described as follows: Beginning at a point 683 feet North and 244.31 feet East of the South and West lines respectively of sold Lot 3; thence hwatherly to a point 1,078 feet North and 264.31 feet East of the South and West lines respectively of sold Lot 3; thence continuing Northerly on the preministing of sold described line to the share of Turtle Loke and there terministing of sold described line to Morth, Kange 23 West, Lying Easterly of a line described as follows: Height Steet of sold Lot 3; thence Northerly to a point 1,078 feet North and 264.31 feet East of the South and event lines respectively of sold Lot 3; thence continuing Northerly on the prolongation of sold described line to there of Turtle Loke and there terministing, and West lines trespectively on than prolongation of sold described in the south and West lines respectively on then prolongation of sold described in the south and West lines respectively of a left North and 34.31 feet East of the South and West lines respectively of a left North and 34.31 feet East of Lows: Beginning et a point 703 feet North and 34.31 feet East of the South and West lines respectively of a left North and 34.31 feet East of the South and West lines respectively of sold Lot 3; thence Northerly to a

831TMGLEW00D: Co., Policy No. 0-9301-004159869, File No. 652256)

The easterly 103.63 fact of the westerly 372.94 fact of the southerly 283 fact of Government Lot 3, Section 14, Township 30, Ronge 23, Romsey County, Minnean Subject to Caunty Road 62 and subject to and together with o private road expension over the East 20 feel of the West 392.74 feet of the South 283 feel of sold Government Lot 3, Romsey County, Minnesolo.

## **PROPOSED LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS**

## PROPOSED PARCELA:

All that part of the west 426,94 fect of Government Lot 3, Section 14, Township 30 North, Range 23 West, Ramsey Courty, Minnesota which lies north of the south 703,00 fect throach, and seat of the following described line:

Beginning of a point 70.3.00 fest north and 314.31 east of the south and west lines respectively of solid Gowarnment Lot 3; thence northerity to a point 346.31 feat east and 1072.00 fest north of the west and south lines respectively of solid Gowarnment Lot 3; twince continuing an prolongation of solid described line to the shore of twile Loke and three terminating.

Tagether with a read easement for ingress and agress over and across the east 20.00 feet of the west 392.94 feet of the south 703.00 feet of soid Government Let 3.

### PROPOSED PARCEL B:

The East 328.63 feet of the West 492.94 feet of the South 703.0D feet of Government Lot 3, Section 14, Township 30, Ronge 23, excepting therefrom, the following 3 porcels:

(1) The East 105 feat of the West 269.31 feat of the South 283 feat of Government Lot 3, Sociion 14, Township 30, Ronge 23, Ramsey County, Minnesola, and (2) The Eastary 100 feat of the Westary 482,94 feat of the Southrafy 283 feat of Government Lot 3, Sociion 14, Township 30 North, Ronge 23 West, Ramsey County, Minnesola, and (3) That part of the North, 20 feat of South 30 feat of Government Lot 3, Section 14, Township 30 North, Ronge 23 West, Ramsey County, Minnesola, and (3) That part of the North, 20 feat of South 30 feat of Government Lot 3, Section 14, Township 30 North, Ronge L3 West, Ramsey County, Minnesola, and (3) That part of the North, 20 feat of South 30 feat of Government Lot 3, Section 14, Township 30 North, Ronge L0 West, Inter 4, Yor Line Gesched as follows: Beginning at a point 683 foot North County 10 foot 264.20 foot 264 f



## The search Sec. PONT 1078.00 FEET-HORTH AND 284.31 FEET EAST OF THE SOUTH AND JEST LINES OF COVT. LOT 3 POINT 1078 00 FT 003.05 54 0203.05 ATTA EXISTING HOLT 1997 HONE FUILT LES Q 1/2 (MC) 2011 and the second 13.37 STA STA N CARACE

PONT 703.00 FEET NORTH AND 314.31 FEET EAST OF THE SOUTH AND WEST LINES OF COVE, LOT FOUND 1/2" # 0.30" FOUND 1/2" P 0.19 FEET COURS AND 0.5 FEET NEST OF CONNE S19.35 (015 Leia al POSED DIVISION LINE N2 03 32' NB9*18*41"E 58.99 jp⁹ ⁰¹/2 218.86 211 329.00 r 112.63 1 - N89"18'41"E 20.02 JAT N8918'41"E augu 80.00 siano-213.6 P Pia 200 920-20+ 111.17 DAUDU27 --- 128.63 POINT SOLOD FEET NORTH AND 244.31 FEET EAST OF THE SOUTH AND, REST LINES OF COVE, LOT 3 - NOPES & EDEIS EXENDIT IN FAVOR OF EXENDITIONS NO. 1, 5, 6, AND PROPOSE PANOL A

DUSTRIE M

LOCATED 3-7-2016

TURTLE LAKE

-1+

. Q

RONE

CARACE

-FOUND 1/2" @ RLS 844855 0.17 FEET NORTH AND 0.44 FEET MEET OF CORMER

PERMANENT CASEMENT IN FAVOR OF THE CITY OF SHERENEW PER DOC

SOUTH 703.00 FEET OF

20.38

20,0

IN FAVOR OF THE CITY OF SIGNEVER PCR DOC. ND. 2028329

24

-928

1

-

2

N89°18'41"E

ST.S.

-

900 ... 902.

905

MALA S .91/

914.49 914.49

No A

PROPOSEL

25.8

912 .

......

380.

S0"50'24"E




Aaron Sedey <asedey@shoreviewmn.gov>

# comment on Deming property variance

1 message

oliviake@gmail.com <oliviake@gmail.com> To: kcastle@shoreviewmn.gov, asedey@shoreviewmn.gov Fri, May 18, 2018 at 10:12 AM

Hi Kathleen and Aaron,

I hope it is okay to use email to reach you since I am out of town, snail mail would be unreliable and too slow.

Below are our comments and our major concern is to preserve the character of adjacent areas of our property and our way of living in the area.

1. We do not want the new lot or lots in the neighborhood to have access to the Lake. We are against the new lot or lots to having deeded lake access.

2. We like entering from Tanglewood and we are against building an L shape road from Lakeview through to Tanglewood. We are very concerned about additional connection of Lakeview to Tanglewood because it would bring in unnecessary traffic and cost related to road construction and maintenance

3. We want the city to preserve the wooded character of the area.

4. We do not want to increase housing density because we notice that crime rate is related to density.

Thank you very much for your service to the community.

Matthew & Olivia Ke 817 Tanglewood Dr. Shoreview, MN

### **MOTION TO APPROVE**

# MOVED BY COMMISSION MEMBER

#### SECONDED BY COMMISSION MEMBER

To approve the variance request submitted by Scott and Jane Deming for their property at 821 Tanglewood Drive, waiving the public street frontage requirement and waiving the required width of a lake shore lot and also adopting Resolution No. 18-34 subject to the following conditions:

#### Variance

- 1. This approval is subject to approval of the Minor Subdivision application by the City Council.
- 2. This approval will expire after one year if the subdivision has not been recorded with Ramsey County.
- 3. The approval is subject to a 5 day appeal period.

This motion is based on the following findings:

- The applicant is proposing to use the property in a reasonable manner through a road easement. Access to the current homes on the properties is via Tanglewood Drive – through a private road easement – and that will not change with this subdivision. Additionally the lot was created with the current 81 feet at the water and no proposed changes are being propose and will continue to use the property in reasonable manner of a single family home.
- 2. Unique circumstances are present due to the historical and unique circumstances. Keeping access via a private road easement is reasonable due to the property's creation characteristics of frontage on Tanglewood Dr. Keeping access via a private road easement is reasonable due to the property's characteristics of frontage on a Tanglewood Drive. It is not reasonable to require frontage on a public street at this time due to the area's characteristic and potential for future development.
- 3. The character of the neighborhood will not be altered at all. The existing homes and access to them will not be changed with the minor subdivision nor will any new lots be created and the minor subdivision and variances will just be noticeable on paper rather than affect the character of the neighborhood.

#### **VOTE:**

AYES:

NAYS:

Regular Planning Commission Meeting May 22, 2018

#### MOTION TO RECOMMEND MINOR SUBDIVISION

#### MOVED BY COMMISSION MEMBER

#### SECONDED BY COMMISSION MEMBER

To recommend approval to the City Council of the Minor Subdivision request submitted by Scott and Jane Deming for their property at 821 Tanglewood Drive, subject to the following conditions:

#### **Minor Subdivision**

- 1. The minor subdivision shall be in accordance with the plans submitted.
- 2. Public drainage and utility easements with a width of 5-feet on each side of the new common property line shall be conveyed to the City. The applicant shall be responsible for providing legal descriptions for all required easements. The easements shall be conveyed before the City will endorse deeds for recording.
- 3. A private driveway easement shall be updated to reflect the 821 Tanglewood having access, shall be conveyed before the City will endorse deeds for recording.
- 4. The applicant shall enter into a Subdivision Agreement with the City. This agreement shall be executed before the City will endorse deeds for recording.
- 5. A Mitigation Affidavit is required for 821 Tanglewood Dr, this Affidavit shall be executed prior to the City's release of the deed for recording.
- 6. Approval of the Minor Subdivision is contingent upon the approval of a variance permitting waiving public street frontage requirement for 821 Tanglewood and waving of the minimum 100 feet of shoreland for 821 Tanglewood.
- 7. This approval shall expire after one year if the subdivision has not been recorded with Ramsey County.

VOTE:

AYES:

NAYS:

# EXTRACT OF MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF SHOREVIEW, MINNESOTA HELD MAY 22, 2018

Pursuant to due call and notice thereof, a meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Shoreview, Minnesota was duly called and held at the Shoreview City Hall in said City at 7:00 PM.

The following members were present:

And the following members were absent:

Member ______ introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption.

#### RESOLUTION NO. 18-34 FOR A VARIANCE TO WAIVE THE STREET FRONTAGE REQUIREMENT AND WAIVE THE MINIMUM 100 FEET NEEDED AT THE SHORELINE

WHEREAS, Scott and Jane Deming submitted a variance application for the following described property:

All that part of the west 426.94 of Government Lot 3 Section 14, Township 30 North, Range 23 West, Ramsey County, Minnesota which lies north of the south 703.00 feet therof, and east of the following described line: Beginning at a point 703.00 feet north and 314.31 east of the south and west lines respectively of said Government Lot 3: thence northerly to a point 346.31 feet east and 1078.00 feet north of the west and south lines respectively of said Government Lot 3; thence

continuing on prolongation of said described line to the share of Turtle Lake and there terminating. Together with a road easement for ingress and egree over and across the east 20.00 feet of the west 392.94 feet of the south 703.00 feet of said Government Lot 3.

(This property is more commonly known as 821 Tanglewood Dr. and as Parcel A in the Certificate of Survey dated 3/27/18)

Resolution 18-34 Page 2 of 4

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Development Code Section 204.030 (C)(2), the Development Regulations require all newly created parcels to have frontage on a public road; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Development Code Section 209.080 (D), the Development Regulations require parcels on general development waters to have 100 feet at the ordinary high, building setback and front lot line; and

WHEREAS, the applicant proposed to waive the frontage on a public road; and

WHEREAS, the applicant proposed a 81 foot width on the shoreline at the ordinary high water level; and

WHEREAS, the applicants have requested a variance to this requirement in order to subdivide their property to adjust the boundary lines of the two parcels; and

WHEREAS, the Shoreview Planning Commission is authorized by state law and the City of Shoreview Development Regulations to make final decisions on variance requests; and

WHEREAS, on May 22nd, 2018 the Shoreview Planning Commission made the following findings of fact:

1. Reasonable Manner. The property owner proposes to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the Shoreview Development Regulations.

The applicant is proposing to use the property in a reasonable manner. Access to the current homes on the properties is via Tanglewood Drive – through a private road easement – and that will not change with this subdivision. Additionally the lot was created with the current 81 feet at the water and no changes are being proposed to this width. The lot will continue to use the property in reasonable manner of a single family home.

2. Unique Circumstances. The plight of the property owner is due to circumstances unique to the property not created by the property owner.

Staff believes that unique circumstances are present due to the historical creation of the lots and several properties using one driveway easement. Keeping access via a private road easement is reasonable due to the property's characteristics of frontage on a Tanglewood Drive. It is not reasonable to require frontage on a public street at this time due to the area's characteristic and potential for future development.

*3. Character of Neighborhood. The variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood.* 

The character of the neighborhood will not be altered at all. The existing homes and access to them will not be changed with the minor subdivision nor will any new lots be created and the minor subdivision and variances will just be noticeable on paper rather than affect the character of the neighborhood.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE SHOREVIEW PLANNING COMMISSION, that the variances requested for property described above, 821 Tangewood Dr, be approved, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. This approval is subject to approval of the Minor Subdivision application by the City Council.
- 2. This approval will expire after one year if the subdivision has not been recorded with Ramsey County.
- 3. The approval is subject to a 5-day appeal period.

The motion was duly seconded by Member _____ and upon a vote being taken thereon, the following voted in favor thereof:

And the following voted against the same:

Adopted this 22nd day of May, 2018

John Doan, Chair Shoreview Planning Commission

ATTEST:

Aaron Sedey, Associate Planner

ACCEPTANCE OF CONDITIONS:

Scott P Deming

Jane M Deming

# STATE OF MINNESOTA) ) COUNTY OF RAMSEY ) CITY OF SHOREVIEW )

I, the undersigned, being the duly qualified and acting Manager of the City of Shoreview of Ramsey County, Minnesota, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the attached and foregoing extract of minutes of a meeting of said City of Shoreview Planning Commission held on the 22nd day of May, 2018 with the original thereof on file in my office and the same is a full, true and complete transcript therefrom insofar as the same relates to adopting Resolution 18-34.

WITNESS MY HAND officially as such Manager and the corporate seal of the City of Shoreview, Minnesota, this 22nd day of May, 2018.

Terry C. Schwerm City Manager

SEAL

Drafted by: Aaron Sedey, Ass 4600 Victoria St M

Aaron Sedey, Associate Planner 4600 Victoria St N Shoreview, MN 55126 TO: Planning Commission

**FROM:** Kathleen Castle, City Planner

**DATE:** May 15, 2018

**SUBJECT:** Pet Boarding and Daycare Facilities

The City staff has been approached by a few business owners who are interested in converting existing industrial buildings into a pet boarding and daycare facility. While this type of use is currently not allowed in the City's I, Industrial Zoning District, other nearby communities have allowed or permit this use in industrial areas. It appears that trends for pet boarding are changing and this type of use requires "industrial" type buildings with large open spaces. Prior to initiating a text amendment to the Development Code to potentially allow this type of use in the I District, Staff is interested in discussing this matter with the Planning Commission to determine if there could be support for this use in industrial areas.

#### **Industrial Zoning District**

The intent of the Industrial Zoning District is to establish appropriate locations for the manufacturing, distribution, wholesaling, or storage of raw material, partially finished products or finished products and research and development. Industrial land uses tend to have shipping facilities and require access to arterial roads or rail lines for the shipment, transfer or delivery of goods via truck or rail. These areas tend to be separated from residential uses as conflicts may occur due to air emissions, odor, noise and traffic. There are three areas in the City zoned for industrial uses; Highway 96 Industrial area (east of Milton Street), Cardigan Road Industrial Area and the Shoreview Park Road Industrial area.

There are a few uses permitted in the Industrial Zoning District that are not industrial in nature. These include clubs and lodges and gymnastic training centers, both of which require a conditional use permit. In the past, the City has also permitted school facilities through the Site and Building Plan review process.

#### Current Zoning Regulations

The Development Code does have a definition of kennels in Section 202, "Any place where four (4) or more dogs over six (6) months of age are kept for private or commercial purposes". Veterinary Clinics are also defined as "a commercial activity catering to the medical needs of animals and having no outside runs or shelters for the keeping of animals". The Code does not define pet boarding or daycare facilities

In the C1, Retail Service District, (Section 205.042), pet shops and grooming are a permitted use. Kennels are also allowed with a conditional use permit. Pet Shops and grooming are also a permitted use in the C2, General Commercial District (Section 205.043).

Veterinary clinics are permitted in the C1A, Limited Retail Service District (Section 205.041), the C1, Retail Service District, (Section 205.042), the C2, General Commercial District (Section 205.043) and the O, Office District (Section 205.044). Indoor kennels accessory to a veterinary office are permitted in the O District with a Conditional Use Permit.

#### Pet Boarding and Daycare Use

Again, staff has received a couple of inquiries from businesses interested in operating a pet boarding and daycare facility in our industrial zoned areas. This type of use tends to have pet boarding (overnight), doggie daycare, pet grooming and the retail sales of pet products. Facilities tend to include indoor kennel areas, indoor and outdoor play areas, a grooming salon and retail shop. Training classes may also be provided. Industrial buildings are suitable for this use because they have large indoor spaces. Examples of similar facilities include:

http://www.campbowwow.com/burnsville

http://stonemountainpetlodge.com/

At this time, Staff is seeking feedback from the Commission on whether or not the Commission may be supportive of this type of use in an I District. If the Commission is supportive, Staff would research this use further and potentially develop regulations for the Commission to consider.