

CITY OF GRANT  
MINUTES

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

- DATE** : December 4, 2018
- TIME STARTED** : 7:00 p.m.
- TIME ENDED** : 8:43 p.m.
- MEMBERS PRESENT** : Councilmember Carr, Kaup, Sederstrom, Lanoux and Mayor Huber
- MEMBERS ABSENT** : None

Staff members present: City Attorney, Dave Snyder; City Planner, Jennifer Swanson; City Treasurer, Sharon Schwarze; and Administrator/Clerk, Kim Points

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

**PUBLIC INPUT**

- (1) Ms. Tina Lobin, Irish Avenue, came forward and requested a moment of silence in honor of the passing of President Bush.
- (2) Ms. Cynthia Hammel, 8200 Jamaca, came forward requested the Council give the solar plan a fair look and expressed her support for the plan.
- (3) Mr. Blaine Erickson, 9150 64<sup>th</sup> Street N, came forward and stated he firmly believes solar farms do fit into the current Comprehensive Plan.
- (4) Mr. John Smith, 10244 67<sup>th</sup> Lane N, came forward and stated times are changing and Grant certainly is changing.
- (5) Mr. Terry Deroiser, 10596 83<sup>rd</sup> Street N, came forward and stated he is in favor of solar gardens and they are not permanent, can be torn out and are really just a modern farming practice.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**SETTING THE AGENDA**

**Council Member Carr moved to approve the agenda, as presented. Council Member Kaup seconded the motion. Motion carried with Council Member Lanoux and Sederstrom voting nay.**

**CONSENT AGENDA**

November 2018 Bill List, \$61,021.71

Approved

1 City of Mahtomedi, 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter  
2 Fire Contract, \$34,317.00 Approved

3  
4 City of Stillwater, 2<sup>nd</sup> Half Fire  
5 Contract, \$58,124.00 Approved

6  
7 **Council Member Carr moved to approve the consent agenda, as presented. Council Member**  
8 **Kaup seconded the motion. Motion carried with Lanoux and Sederstrom voting nay.**

9  
10 **STAFF AGENDA ITEMS**

11  
12 **City Engineer, Brad Reifsteck (no action items)**

13  
14 **City Planner, Jennifer Swanson**

15  
16 **Consideration of Resolution No. 2018-25, US Solar Text Amendment Application** – City  
17 Attorney Snyder advised the City received a five page letter from US Solar’s Attorney last Thursday.  
18 He has not had a chance to review or evaluate the letter. He requested the Council table the item and  
19 extend the review time by sixty days. There are a number of propositions within the letter and the  
20 letter does suggest a conflict of interest may be in place because two of the Council Members are  
21 realtors. That suggestion is a very serious allegation.

22  
23 **Council Member Kaup moved to table Resolution No. 2018-25, Use Solar Text Amendment**  
24 **Application. Council Member Carr seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:**

- 25  
26 **Council Member Sederstrom: Yay**  
27 **Council Member Lanoux: Nay**  
28 **Council Member Carr: Yay**  
29 **Council Member Kaup: Yay**  
30 **Mayor Huber: Yay**

31  
32 **Motion carried with Council Member Lanoux voting nay.**

33  
34 City Attorney Snyder advised staff will be issuing the extension letter to the applicant as soon as  
35 possible.

36  
37 **Consideration of Resolution No. 2018-26, Major Subdivision Application, The Gateway** – City  
38 Planner Swanson advised the Applicant, The Excelsior Group, and Owner, Premier Bank, are  
39 proposing to subdivide the subject property into 16 rural residential lots. City staff met with the  
40 Applicant twice prior to their Application, and most recently met with them in September to discuss  
41 the Application process. At that meeting staff discussed the City’s zoning standards including  
42 minimum lot sizes, density and other information regarding the Preliminary and Final Plat processes  
43 with the Applicant. The Applicant presented a conceptual site plan that generally showed the same lot  
44 and roadway configuration as presented within the subject application. Staff indicated to the  
45 Applicant during the meeting that the cul-de-sac lengths as depicted on the concept plan did not meet

1 the City’s ordinances. Staff urged the Applicant to connect with Washington County to determine if a  
 2 second access was viable, and if not to identify how a secondary access could be incorporated in the  
 3 future if the property to the west of the subdivision were to subdivide or change use. Depending on  
 4 the outcome of the discussion with the County, staff indicated to the Applicant that an application for  
 5 a Variance from cul-de-sac length would be required concurrently to the Preliminary Plat if no  
 6 secondary access was identified.

7  
 8 A duly noticed public hearing was held at the regular Planning Commission meeting on November  
 9 20, 2018 at 6:30 PM. Public testimony provided focused on trail access on the property (through  
 10 Outlot A) and along the ROW of CSAH 12. After the public hearing was closed, the Planning  
 11 Commission discussed the proposed Preliminary Plat and Variance. A summary of their discussion is  
 12 as follows:

- 13 • The proposed subdivision is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the desired use for  
 14 the subject site.
- 15 • The subject Variance appears warranted given the comments from Washington County  
 16 regarding accesses spacing, the Applicant’s narrative, the presence of wetland area along the  
 17 western boundary of the site, and the gas pipeline easement.
- 18 • The Planning Commission concluded that provided the fire chief/emergency services are  
 19 comfortable with the cul-de-sac length from a health, safety, welfare perspective then a  
 20 variance is reasonable given the physical constraints of the site.

21  
 22 After discussion, the Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval of the Preliminary  
 23 Plat and Variance with conditions as noted by staff, and as amended by the Planning Commission.

24  
 25 **Project Summary**

26

Applicant: The Excelsior Group	Site Size: 165.12 Acres
Owners: Premier Bank	Request: Major Subdivision, Preliminary Plat of 16 Lots Variance from maximum cul-de-sac length
Zoning & Land Use: A-2 Proposed Plat Name: The Gateway	PIDs: 2803021420003 (Parcel A) 3303021210002 (Parcel B) 2803021310003 (Parcel C) 2803021310002 (Parcel D) 2803021340001 (Parcel E)

27 The proposed Project will create 16 new rural residential lots on approximately 165 acres of land  
 28 located south of CSAH 12 lying adjacent and westerly of the Gateway Trail. The existing properties  
 29 were foreclosed and taken back by the bank and have been owned by Premier Bank for the past  
 30 several years. Premier has actively marketed the property since its acquisition, and many residents  
 31 and property owners in the City have inquired about what might happen on the property. The  
 32 following summary is provided with respect to the proposed Project:

- 1       • The proposed Project will create 16 new lots ranging in size between 5.00 and 28.34 acres.  
2       Twelve of the 16 lots range in size between 5 and 8 acres, and four (4) lots are between 16 and  
3       29 acres.
- 4       • The rural residential lots will be a part of a homeowner's association that will govern the  
5       proposed subdivision. Draft covenants, bylaws and declarations have been submitted for  
6       review by City Staff for consistency with the City's ordinances.
- 7       • The Applicant did not state whether the proposed subdivision would be phased or if it is  
8       anticipated that all lots would be platted at once. This should be clarified during the process.
- 9       • The Applicant is proposing to dedicate an Outlot, denoted as Outlot A, to provide trail access  
10      to the Gateway Trail. The trail corridor connects the southern terminus of the cul-de-sac to the  
11      Gateway Trail between Lot 10 and Lot 11 in the proposed subdivision. The Applicant  
12      indicated that the trail connection through Outlot A would be private and maintained by the  
13      Homeowners Association and would primarily be used by future residents of The Gateway.
- 14     • All 16 lots will be served with individual wells and individual septic systems. The  
15      Preliminary Plat has identified primary and secondary drainfields associated with each lot, and  
16      septic reports/boring logs for each lot were submitted with this Application. There is an  
17      existing septic system and well located on existing Parcel C. The Application does not  
18      indicate a demolition plan, and therefore it is unknown what will happen to the existing septic  
19      and well on the site. Staff assumes based on the plans that the existing septic system will be  
20      abandoned, and that all structures will be removed. The Applicant should verify the plan for  
21      the existing well and septic on site.
- 22     • The existing property is irregular in shape and is bordered by 75<sup>th</sup> Street North (CSAH 12) on  
23      the northern property line, the Gateway Trail along the east-southeast property line, and  
24      existing rural-residential lots along the westerly property line. CSAH 12 is a County Road  
25      and the proposed access will require coordination and discussion regarding access permit,  
26      right-of-way dedication and any improvements with Washington County since they will be the  
27      permitting authority for access onto their roadways.
- 28     • The lots in the proposed Project will be accessed from two cul-de-sacs with one access  
29      proposed onto CSAH 12. The cul-de-sac length of both cul-de-sacs within the preliminary plat  
30      exceed the City's standards and require a Variance from the subdivision ordinance in order to  
31      be approved in the current configuration.

- 1 • The rural residential lot sizes can accommodate a variety of housing styles and plans. As such  
2 the Applicant anticipates all homes in the subdivision will be custom built, and that lots will  
3 be custom graded once house plans are developed.

4 The proposed Project is classified as a Major Subdivision per the City of Grant's subdivision  
5 ordinance which is Chapter 30 of the City Code. The specific regulations related to the Preliminary  
6 Plat process are contained within Article II Platting Division 2 Preliminary Plat. Also relevant with  
7 respect to design standards is Article III Minimum Design Standards.

8  
9 As referenced within the Preliminary Plat requirements all created and/or new lots must comply with  
10 the current regulations which apply to the zoning district in which the Property is located. The  
11 following sections are most applicable to this request and are considered, at a minimum, in the  
12 following sections:

13  
14 32-1 Definitions

15 32-246 Minimum area, maximum height and other dimensional requirements.  
16

17 The existing site is irregular in shape and is comprised of five individual PIDs. There is an existing  
18 homestead, two barns and three sheds located near southeaster edge of Parcel C (generally at the  
19 center of the site when all parcels are considered collectively). All structures are accessed by a single  
20 driveway which is connected to CSAH 12 on the north. The site is intermittently vegetated, with some  
21 more solid vegetation at the property edges, and some pockets of vegetation near the existing  
22 homestead and structures that appear to be planted conifers and other 'screening' types of vegetation.  
23 There are several fenced in areas on the site that were presumably used for pasture areas and the  
24 keeping of horses. There are extensive wetlands on-site, particularly on the western and southern  
25 edges. A wetland delineation has been prepared that identifies approximately 45.98 acres of wetland  
26 on site. The Wetland Delineation report and application was submitted to Valley Branch Watershed  
27 District for their review and approval. A Notice of Decision (NOD) approving the wetland delineation  
28 was issued and received by staff on November 27, 2018. There is an existing 75-foot wide pipeline  
29 easement that extends generally along the westerly property line and bisects a portion of the southwest  
30 corner of the property.  
31  
32

33 The 2030 Comprehensive Plan land use designation of the subject properties designates the property  
34 as A2- Agricultural Small Scale. Properties guided as A2 are intended to be used for rural residential  
35 and small agricultural uses at densities no less than 1 Dwelling Unit per 10 Acres. The Gateway  
36 development will include 16 rural residential sized lots on approximately 165 acres and the intended  
37 use of each property is for single-family residential uses. The proposed project is consistent with the  
38 intent and guided density as identified within the adopted Comprehensive Plan.  
39

40 The subject properties are zoned A-2, and Section 32-243 defines the intent and primary use of such  
41 properties as, "...provide rural low-density housing in agricultural districts on lands not capable of  
42 supporting long-term, permanent commercial food production. A-2 district lot sizes will provide for  
43 marginal agriculture and hobby farming."

44 The proposed Project requests subdivision of approximately 165 acres into 16 lots, and is subject to

1 Chapter 30 Subdivisions and is specifically reviewed for compliance with Sections contained within  
2 Article II Platting and Article III Minimum Design Standards. Chapter 30 requires all subdivisions  
3 with newly created lots to comply with the underlying zoning district, and as such each lot was  
4 reviewed for compliance with Section 32-246 Dimensional Standards, and other applicable sections  
5 of Chapter 32.

6  
7 The subdivision ordinance requires all newly created lots to conform to the dimensional standards as  
8 identified within Chapter 32 of the zoning code. Subsequent sections of this report will provide a  
9 review of the dimensional standards and will make the appropriate cross reference to the subdivision  
10 code, where applicable. The following review relates specifically to the subdivision and/or  
11 preliminary plat requirements that are not addressed within the zoning review.

12  
13 *Section 30-105 Easements* requires newly created lots and roadways to provide easements for utilities  
14 and drainageways, as necessary. The applicable ordinance requirements are as follows:

- 15  
16 (a) Required for Utilities. Easements of at least 20 feet wide, centered on rear and other lot lines  
17 as required, shall be provided for utilities where necessary...”  
18 (b) Required for drainage. Easements shall be provided along each side of the centerline of any  
19 watercourse or drainage channel, whether or not shown on the comprehensive plan, to a  
20 sufficient width to provide property maintenance and protection and to provide for stormwater  
21 runoff and installation and maintenance of storm sewers.  
22 (c) Dedication. Utility and drainage easements shall be dedicated for the required use.

23  
24 As shown on sheets 9 through 11, drainage and utility easements are dedicated on each lot line,  
25 around all features associated with the drainage plan of the property, and all wetland areas. ***The***  
26 ***Applicant will be required to dedicate the easements to the benefit of the City at time of final plat;***  
27 ***however, staff would recommend including a condition that the maintenance, specifically of all***  
28 ***drainage easements, will be provided for and the responsibility of the HOA and must be detailed in***  
29 ***any Covenants and Development Agreement.***

30  
31 Various subsections of 30-107 apply to the proposed subdivision including the following:

- 32  
33 (a) *Side Lots. Side lot lines shall be substantially at right angles to straight street lines or radial*  
34 *to curved street lines or radial to lake or stream shores unless topographic conditions*  
35 *necessitate a different arrangement.*

36 Staff has reviewed the design and layout of all lots contained within the subdivision, and the  
37 majority of the proposed lots comply with this standard. There is a slight jog in the lot line  
38 between Lot 2 and Lot 3, and the lot lines of Lot 10 and Lot 11 bordering the trail corridor  
39 Outlot A doglegs slightly. The Applicant stated that the slight dog-leg between Lot 10 and Lot  
40 11 is due to the proposed connection with the Gateway Trail along the eastern boundary of the  
41 site, and the Planning Commission accepted this explanation and did not recommend the lot  
42 line be adjusted. ***The Planning Commission recommended that the lot line between Lot 2***

1 *and Lot 3 be straightened to meet the ordinance standards, which has been added as a*  
2 *condition of approval in the draft Resolution attached for your review and consideration.*

3  
4 (k) *Lot Remnants. All remnants of lots below minimum size left over after subdividing of a larger*  
5 *tract must be added to adjacent lots, or a plan acceptable to the city shown as to future use,*  
6 *rather than allowed to remain as unusable parcels.*

7 The proposed subdivision identifies one Outlot A which is intended to serve as a trail  
8 connection to the Gateway Trail. Staff believes that this Outlot is different than the strict  
9 interpretation of the ordinance, and therefore believes that the Outlot is acceptable; however,  
10 staff recommends that the maintenance and management of the Outlot be clearly accounted for  
11 within the Development Agreement and the HOA’s responsibilities.

12  
13 (l) *Access to major arterials. In the case where a proposed plat is adjacent to a major or minor*  
14 *arterial, there shall be no direct vehicular access from individual lots to such streets and*  
15 *roads....”*

16 The proposed subdivision includes the construction of a new local street/cul-de-sac that will  
17 connect to 75st Street North on the northeast corner. ***The new local roadway/cul-de-sac will***  
18 ***provide direct access to all lots abutting the roadway, and no new structures/lots will access***  
19 ***the County roads directly. As designed, the proposed subdivision meets this requirement.***

20  
21 The Project includes the development and construction of two new cul-de-sacs, with one access to  
22 CSAH 12. The cul-de-sac design will serve all of the new homes in the neighborhood. The  
23 Applicant’s vision for the neighborhood is to create a rural residential neighborhood, and the  
24 proposed rural section roadways and cul-de-sacs support that vision. The following standards  
25 regarding cul-de-sac streets and street design are as follows:

26  
27 30-129 Cul-de-sac streets

28 (a) *Cul-de-sac streets, temporarily or permanently designed as such, shall not exceed 1,320 feet*  
29 *in length.*

30 There are two proposed cul-de-sac streets within the subdivision, the main north-south cul-de-  
31 sac, and an east-west cul-de-sac. The north-south cul-de-sac is approximately 2,128-feet long,  
32 and the east-west cul-de-sac is approximately 1,950-feet long both exceed the ordinance  
33 standard. The Applicant has requested a variance from this standard and their narrative is  
34 provided within Attachment B of this staff report.

35  
36  
37 The Applicant’s narrative states that Washington County will not permit more than one access to the  
38 proposed site based on their access spacing guidelines. Staff had a brief discussion with Washignton  
39 County regarding access spacing which confirmed the Applicant’s statement regarding access on  
40 CSAH 12. As has been stated historically by the County, reducing access onto CSAH 12 is desirable,  
41 and the distance between two access points into the subject Project would not meet their access  
42 spacing guidelines. After discussion with he County, they also questioned how realistic it would be to  
43 construct a second access just west of the property, if the opportunity were to arise, given the location  
44 and uses of the adjacent parcels to the west of the proposed Project. Generally, Washington County

1 concluded that the proposed cul-de-sac location would be acceptable, provided proper improvements  
2 were made to ensure safe ingress and egress into the subdivision.

3  
4 The Applicant also notes the existence of the gas pipeline along the westerly property line. Staff  
5 agrees that any proposed improvements within the easement are subject to the gas line easement  
6 holder; however, it should be noted that roadway improvements within this easement already exist  
7 with the CSAH 12 crossing, as well as the northern access drive just to the west of the property.  
8 Based on the existing conditions, and the existence of roadway improvements within the easement,  
9 more information would be necessary to confirm that no additional crossing or improvement would  
10 be permitted within the easement area. However, regardless of whether any improvement would be  
11 prohibited, staff does agree with the Applicant that if crossing or encroachment into this easement can  
12 be avoided that would be best. Given Washington County's response, and their preference for a  
13 single access into the project, the easement can be entirely protected without encroachment.

14  
15 Staff agrees that the wetlands onsite do provide natural constraints due to their location and quantity,  
16 which has now been confirmed within the approved wetland delineation (NOD).

17  
18 All of these considerations were verbally updated and provided to the Planning Commission at their  
19 meeting, with the exception of the Wetland Delineation NOD which had not yet been received.  
20 Based on this information the Planning Commission determined that the requested variance is  
21 warranted given the site constraints present, provided verification that the cul-de-sac lengths are  
22 acceptable to the fire chief can be obtained. Staff agrees with the Planning Commission, and has  
23 added the condition regarding approval from the Fire Chief to the draft conditions attached in the  
24 resolution.

25  
26 *(b) Lots with frontage at the end of the cul-de-sac shall have a minimum of 60 feet of road*  
27 *frontage and meet the lot width requirement at the building setback line for the zoning district*  
28 *in which the property is located.*

29 Section 32-246 identifies the lot dimensional standards for lots zone A2. Lots on a cul-de-sac  
30 are required to have a minimum lot width of 160-feet at the building setback line. All lots  
31 appear to meet this standard, but lot dimensions should be verified by the Applicant's engineer  
32 for proposed Lot 10 and 12 to ensure the lot width is met.

33  
34 *(c) Unless future extension is clearly impractical or undesirable, the turnaround right-of-way*  
35 *shall be placed adjacent to a property line and a right--of-way of the same width as the street*  
36 *shall be carried to said property line in such a way as to permit future extension of the street*  
37 *into the adjoining tract. At such time as such a street is extended, the acreage covered by the*  
38 *turnaround outside the boundaries of the extended street shall revert in ownership to the*  
39 *owner fronting on the temporary turnaround. To ensure such streets can be constructed*  
40 *according to this code, the street shall be rough graded or typical sections shall be submitted*  
41 *and approved by the City engineer.*

42  
43 As noted in Subsection (a) above, city staff believes additional analysis and review by the Applicant  
44 should be completed regarding this item.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

30-130 Street design

(a) *Minimum width*

*Local Streets - ROW roadway width 66 feet, 28 feet including shoulders*

*Cul-de-sacs – ROW roadway width 66 feet, 48-foot turnaround radius*

The street and cul-de-sac right-of-way and design meets the City’s ordinance requirements.

(l) The city roadway standard is a rural section 28 feet wide with 22 feet of bituminous pavement surface.

Sheet 9 of 23 identifies the Typical Street Section that the Applicant is proposing to construct for the new roadway. As shown, the roadway would include 22-feet of paved surface with 3-foot shoulders and typical ditch section. All driveways serving the new homes will connect directly to the local roadway, and will cross the ditch section to connect to the paved surface. A pavement profile is not included within the plan set, but will be subject to the City’s minimum specifications. ***As proposed, the new local roadway/cul-de-sac dimensions meet the City’s standard minimum design standards. Any additional requirements or standards will be included within the City Engineer’s memo.***

The following site and zoning requirements in the A-2 district regulate the site and proposed subdivision:

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Standard</b>
Lot Size	5 acres
Lot Depth (ROW to rear lot line)	300’
Lot Width (measured at front yard setback)	300’
Lot Width on a Cul-de-sac at the setback line	160’
Frontage – public road	300’
Front Yard Setback	65’
Side Yard Setback	20’
Rear Yard Setback	50’
Height of Structure	35’
Fence	May be on property line, but not within any ROW
Driveway Setback	5’
Parking Lot setback	10’ from ROW
Wetland Setback Structure (Buffer)	75’ (50’)
Maximum Floor Area	30%

23  
24

Density/ Lot Size / Density

## Buildable Area

As proposed the density calculation is as follows:

165.12 Acres / 16 Units = 10.32 Acre average lot  
size

***As proposed, the proposed density in the Farms of Grant Project meets the City's Comprehensive Plan and zoning ordinance regulations.***

However, it should be noted that all available density has been used, and no further subdivision is permitted. ***Staff would recommend including a condition that the Development Agreement and that the HOA covenants clearly state that no further subdivision is permitted of the subject properties, and that this restriction must be recorded against all properties including those not subject to the HOA.***

Lot Size

Section 30-107 Lot Requirements, subsection (c ) Minimum area and width, states, "No lot shall have less area or width than is required by zoning regulations applying to the area in which it is located, except as here provided. Irregular-shaped lots designed for the sole purpose of attempting to meet a subdivision design or zoning regulation shall be prohibited."

As identified on the previous table, Lots in the A-2 zoning district have a minimum lot size of 5.0 Acres (Lot Width will be discussed in subsequent sections of this report). While the zoning code does not specifically define 'rural residential lots' the term is explanatory of what the Applicant has proposed for most of the lots. Of the 16 lots, 12 range in size between 5.0 acres and 7.59 acres. The four (4) remaining lots are between 16 and 29 acres, respectively. ***All of the lots meet the 5.0 acre minimum lot size as defined within the zoning ordinance.***

Buildable Area

All lots within the A2 zoning district must have a minimum of 1.0 acres of "Buildable Area" to ensure that there is adequate area on a lot to support the principal structure and septic system. This requirement can be found in Section 32-246 subsection (b)(4) Subdivision of Lots which states, "...All new lots created must have at least one (1) acre of accessible buildable land. Buildable land is defined as land with a slope of less than twenty-five (25) percent, and outside of any required setbacks, above any floodway, drainage way, or drainage easement. Property situated within shorelands or floodplains are also subject to the requirements set forth in those respective ordinances." Also, while not explicitly stated, it should be noted that the wetlands are also removed from the Buildable Area calculation.

The Applicant has graphically demonstrated where and how much Buildable Area is on each created lot on Sheets 10 and 11 of the attached

Plan Set, and a lot tabulation including Buildable Area can be found on Sheet 9. ***As shown in the Lot Area Table, all proposed lots have a minimum of 1.0 acres of buildable area with most lots exceeding 2 acres of buildable area. All lots comply with the ordinance requirements.***

Frontage Section 30-107 subsection (b) requires each lot to front on a public street, and Chapter 30 further states that all created lots must meet the standards of the underlying zoning. The Dimensional Requirements and corresponding frontage requirements are shown on the table found in Section 32-246 which requires a minimum of 300-feet of Frontage on “an Improved Public Road” for properties zoned A-2, and a minimum of 60-feet of frontage for lots abutting a cul-de-sac. Per Section 32-1, Frontage is defined as, “that boundary of a lot which abuts a public street or private road.” ***All lots as shown on the Plan Set meet the minimum frontage.***

Lot Width & Lot Depth All created lots must meet the standard for Lot Width and Lot Depth in the A-2 zoning district. The ordinance requires a minimum lot width of 300-feet for standard lots and 160-feet for lots abutting a cul-de-sac. The minimum Lot Depth of all A2 lots is 300-feet.

Section 32-1 defines Lot Width as, “the horizontal distance between the side lot lines of a lot measured at the setback line.” And Lot Depth as, “the mean horizontal distance between the front and rear lines of a lot.”

As previously noted, all lots appear to meet lot width standards, however, verification of lot width on Lot 10 and 12 should be provided as the dimension appears to be close and no dimension was provided on the plan set.

All lots meet lot depth requirements.

***As designed, all lots in the proposed subdivision meet the City’s standards for lot width and lot depth.***

Coverage (Floor Area) Sheet 9 Lot Area Table identifies the shown impervious surface coverage based on conceptual house pad and driveway. All shown coverages are between less than 1 % and 4.5%. The stormwater management plan was based on permitting up to 20,000 square feet of coverage which would be equivalent to between approximately 2% and 9%. ***As proposed, all lots and their conceptual building pads meet the City’s floor area requirements.***

Roadways & Access Section 30-58 (c )(1) requires the layout of proposed streets, showing right-of-way widths and proposed names of streets. The name of any street shall conform to the provisions of chapter 24, article III. The proposed roadway contains 66-feet of dedicated right-of-way with a 22-foot paved surface and 3-foot shoulders. The cul-de-sac contains a 48-foot diameter and 96-foot right-of-way. As previously stated, the proposed roadway meets the city’s minimum standards. The City

Engineer will provide additional comments in their memo which will be emailed under separate cover, and hard copies will be brought to the meeting. The preliminary plat does not show a proposed road name for either cul-de-sac, and a proposed road name for each cul-de-sac should be provided with the revised drawings.

Septic

Section 30-58 (9) requires that “in areas where public sewer is not available, four soil borings shall be completed on each lot with results being submitted to the city building inspector....” Sheets 9 through 11 show the location of the soil borings that were completed on each lot for purposes of determining where a primary and secondary drainfield could be located on each lot. As submitted, there are four (4) borings identified on each lot.

The Applicant also submitted a septic report that was prepared by a licensed septic installer/designer which corresponds to the completed borings and has indicated that all lots can support a standard individual septic system. Washington County is the permitting authority for septic design and installation in the City of Grant, and no correspondence was provided regarding their consideration/review of the information. Staff is in communication with Washington County and will provide a verbal update at the City Council meeting, if possible. **Regardless, staff has included a condition in the Resolution regarding the adequacy of the septic sites which must be provided prior to the recording of the Final Plat.**

Driveways:

The proposed roadway will serve the new homes in the subdivision, and each home will be connected with a single driveway as shown on sheets 9 through 11 of the Plan set. As designed, one driveway will be constructed to provide access to the principal and any accessory structures on each lot. **As designed, a single access/driveway complies with the City’s driveway standards, however, it should be noted that each lot will be required to acquire a driveway permit prior to a building permit being issued for a new home (Section 32-184).**

Stormwater/Erosion Control

The City’s Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance both require that the Applicant submit a stormwater management plan and erosion control plan. The Applicant is proposing to manage stormwater on-site through a series of ponds and infiltration basins. The Applicant is required to meet the City’s standards, but is also subject to the rules of the Valley Branch Watershed District (VBWD). The Stormwater Management Plan for the Project as currently designed was submitted and under reviewed by the City Engineer.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

The City Engineer’s memo is attached to this staff report for your review and consideration. The City Engineer has reviewed the submittal regarding Stormwater and Erosion Control, specifically addressing Sections 30-172 and 30-173 and also the Street Design Standards.

1  
2 Sheets 12-21 provide a preliminary grading plan and erosion control plans that are under review by  
3 the City Engineer. As background for the City Council, it is standard for a conceptual/preliminary  
4 grading plan to be prepared for projects of this type, particularly given that the lots will be constructed  
5 with custom houses. So, for purposes of stormwater calculations, erosion control, and other  
6 engineering items it is important to have a 'conceptual' plan of how the improvements can be  
7 accommodated on the lots while ensuring that those improvements would meet stormwater and  
8 erosion control standards.

9  
10 Staff would recommend including a condition in the Preliminary Plat approval that the  
11 Applicant/Owner must meet all conditions as stated within the City Engineer's memo dated  
12 November 13, 2018.

13  
14 The proposed Project is located within the Valley Branch Watershed District and is subject to their  
15 rules and regulations. The Applicant has submitted an application to the VBWD and has received  
16 their approvals. The Applicant will be required to continue to work with them through their  
17 permitting/review process as site work commences.

18  
19 The proposed roadway connects to CSAH 12 is under the jurisdiction of Washington County. At the  
20 time of this staff report the County had not yet provided their review. Staff is working collaboratively  
21 with the County to get feedback and comment from their staff regarding the proposed road access  
22 locations and will bring any feedback and or information to the meeting on November 20<sup>th</sup> meeting if  
23 possible.

24  
25 While the Plan set is very complete, there are some minor issues that staff would recommend  
26 resolving. Preliminarily staff would request the following updates and/or information. Depending on  
27 the comments at the public hearing and Planning Commission discussion, additional items may be  
28 requested of the Applicant and can be added to this list.

- 29
- 30 • Update the Plan set to include a proposed roadway name
  - 31 • Revise the lot line between Lot 2 and Lot 3 or compliance with the lot design standards.
  - 32 • Provide any additional information, or plan changes regarding the stormwater system as  
33 required by VBWD for review and consideration of the City Engineer.
  - 34 • Receive comment from Washington County regarding the proposed roadway, specifically the  
35 proposed access location(s) and necessary improvements to CSAH 12.
  - 36 • Provide written (email acceptable) noting review of soil borings from Washington County.

37  
38 Mr. Ben Schmidt, Applicant, came forward and stated there will be covenants within the  
39 development and no commercial activity will be allowed as it is a residential use only. There is one  
40 well and one septic system out there. The septic will be abanded and the well will be looked at to  
41 determine if it can be utilized.

42

1 Council Member Sederstrom moved to adopt Resolution No. 2018-26, as presented. Council  
2 Member Lanoux seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

3  
4 City Attorney, Dave Snyder (no action items)

5  
6 **NEW BUSINESS**

7  
8 **Consideration of Resolution No. 2018-27, 2019 Final Budget, City Treasurer Schwarze** – City  
9 Treasurer Schwarze reviewed Resolution No. 2018-27 noting the final budget amount is in the same  
10 amount as the preliminary budget at \$1,665,255.00.

11  
12 **Council Member Kaup moved to adopt Resolution No. 2018-27, as presented. Council Member**  
13 **Carr seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.**

14  
15 **Consideration of Resolution No. 2018-28, 2019 Final Levy Certification, City Treasurer**  
16 **Schwarze** – City Treasurer Schwarze reviewed Resolution No. 2018-29 noting the 2019 final levy  
17 certification for the City’s general fund is in the amount of \$1,233,814.

18  
19 **Consideration of Canvas of Election Meeting Minutes** – Council Member Carr moved to  
20 **approve the Canvas of Election Meeting Minutes, as presented. Council Member Kaup**  
21 **seconded the motion. Motion carried with Council Member Lanoux and Sederstrom**  
22 **abstaining.**

23  
24 **Consideration of Resolution No. 2018-29, Mogrow Inc. 2019 Liquor License** – Council Member  
25 **Sederstrom moving to adopt Resolution No. 2018-29, as presented. Council Member Kaup**  
26 **seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.**

27  
28 **Consideration of Resolution No. 2018-30, Schone’s Inc. 2019 Liquor License** – Council Member  
29 **Sederstrom moved to adopt Resolution No. 2018-30, as presented. Council Member Kaup**  
30 **seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.**

31  
32 **Consideration of Resolution No. 2018-31, Loggers Trail Golf Club 2019 Liquor License** –  
33 **Council Member Sederstrom moved to adopt Resolution No. 2018-31, as presented. Council**  
34 **Member Kaup seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.**

35  
36 **Consideration of Resolution No. 2018-32, Cozzie’s Tavern 2019 Liquor License** – Council  
37 **Member Sederstrom moved to adopt Resolution No. 2018-32, as presented. Council Member**  
38 **Lanoux seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.**

39  
40 **Consideration of Resolution No. 2018-33, Dellwood Barn Weddings, LLC 2019 Liquor License**  
41 **– Council Member Sederstrom moved to adopt Resolution No. 2018-33, as presented. Council**  
42 **Member Carr seconded the motion. Motion carried with Council Member Lanoux voting nay.**

1 **Consideration of Resolution No. 2018-34, Applewood Hills, LLC – Council Member Sederstrom**  
2 **moved to adopt Resolution No. 2018-34, as presented. Council Member Kaup seconded the**  
3 **motion. Motion carried unanimously.**

4  
5 **Consideration of Cable Commission and Comcast Extension Agreement – Mayor Huber advised**  
6 **an extensioin is needed to continue working on negotiations between the cable commission and**  
7 **Comcast.**

8  
9 **Council Member Carr moved to approve Cable Commission and Comcast Extension**  
10 **Agreement, as presented. Council Member kaup seconded the motion. Motion carred with**  
11 **Council Member Lanoux voting nay.**

12  
13 **Consideration of Resolution No. 2018-35, Designation of Designated Reserves, General Fund**  
14 **Special Roads Projects, City Treasurer Schwarze – City Treasurer Schwarze advised Resolution**  
15 **No. 2018-35 designates Special Roads Funds to be utilized next year to finish the guard rail project**  
16 **next year.**

17  
18 **Council Member Kaup moved to adopt Resolution No. 2018-35, as presented. Council Member**  
19 **Carr seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.**

20 **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

21  
22 There was no unfinished business.

23 **DISCUSSION ITEMS (no action taken)**

24  
25 **Staff Updates (updates from Staff, no action taken)**

26  
27 **City Council Reports/Future Agenda Items**

28  
29 No items were discussed to be placed on a future agenda.

30  
31 Mayor Huber presented Council Member Sederstrom and Lanoux with plaques for their years of  
32 service.

33  
34 **COMMUNITY CALENDAR DECEMBER 6 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2018:**

35 **Mahtomedi Public Schools Board Meeting, Thursday, December 13<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup> , Mahtomedi**  
36 **District Education Center, 7:00 p.m.**

37 **Stillwater Public Schools Board Meeting, Thursday, December 13<sup>th</sup>, Stillwater City Hall, 7:00**  
38 **p.m.**

39 **Washington County Commissioners Meeting, Tuesdays, Government Center, 9:00 a.m.**

40 **City Office Closed, Christmas Holiday, December 24<sup>th</sup> and December 25<sup>th</sup>**

41  
42

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Council Member Carr moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:43 p.m. Council Member Kaup seconded the motion. Motion carried with Council Member Lanoux and Sederstrom voting nay.**

These minutes were considered and approved at the regular Council Meeting January 2, 2019.

---

Kim Points, Administrator/Clerk

---

Jeff Huber, Mayor

