

**INVER GROVE HEIGHTS CITY COUNCIL MEETING
MONDAY, JANUARY 26, 2015 - 8150 BARBARA AVENUE**

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL The City Council of Inver Grove Heights met in regular session on Monday, January 26, 2015, in the City Council Chambers. Mayor Tourville called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Present were Council members Bartholomew, Hark, Mueller and Piekarski Krech; City Administrator Lynch, City Attorney Kuntz, Community Development Director Link, Public Works Director Thureen, Chief Stanger, Chief Thill, City Engineer Kaldunski, Assistant City Engineer Dodge, and Deputy Clerk Kennedy

3. PRESENTATIONS:

A. Introduction of Human Resources Manager

Mr. Lynch introduced Janet Shefchick as the new Human Resources Manager and welcomed her to the City.

B. Lions Club Donation to Inver Grove Heights Fire Department

Chief Thill explained the Inver Grove Heights Lions donated money to the Fire Department to purchase three (3) first responder fire suppression kits. Each kit contained three (3) canisters with chemicals that could be used by first responders to put out fires. She stated one (1) canister had enough power to put out a fire in a typical room inside a house. The canisters would be kept in Fire officer vehicles as they typically were the first people to arrive at a scene.

Sharon Mueller, 7800 Boyd Ave. E., stated the funds were raised through events hosted by the Lions Club throughout the year. She explained Lions Club members were individuals who volunteered their time to humanitarian causes in their communities.

4. CONSENT AGENDA:

Councilmember Hark removed Item 4A from the Consent Agenda.

Mayor Tourville removed Item 4E from the Consent Agenda.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech removed Items 4G and 4H from the Consent Agenda.

B. Resolution No. 15-10 Approving Disbursements for Period Ending January 21, 2015

C. Final Compensating Change Order No. 2, Final Pay Voucher No. 3, Engineer's Report of Acceptance and **Resolution No. 15-11** Accepting Work for City Project No. 2013-06 – South Robert Trail (TH 3) Stormwater Facilities Repairs

D. Receive Quotes and Award Contract for Sanitary Sewer Lining

F. Accept Donations for Various Parks and Recreation Programs

I. Approve Golf Course Technician Job Description

J. Personnel Actions

Motion by Bartholomew, second by Hark, to approve the Consent Agenda

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

A. (i) Minutes – January 5, 2015 Special City Council Meeting

Councilmember Hark requested that the minutes be voted on separately.

Motion by Piekarski Krech, second by Mueller, to approve the minutes of the January 5, 2015 special City Council meeting

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

A. (ii) Minutes – January 12, 2015 Regular City Council Meeting

Councilmember Hark stated he would abstain because he was absent from the January 12th meeting.

Motion by Piekarski Krech, second by Mueller, to approve the minutes of the January 12, 2015 regular City Council meeting

Ayes: 4

Nays: 0

Abstain: 1 (Hark) Motion carried.

E. Resolution Receiving the Final Feasibility Report and Scheduling Public Hearing for City Project No. 2015-13, Northwest Area Trunk Utility Improvements, Argenta District (70th Street Lift Station to Blackstone Ridge Development)

Mayor Tourville stated because the City was considering receiving the feasibility report for the trunk utility project in the Argenta District he wanted to discuss the possibility of adding the 69th Street alignment alternative. He explained he understood that the Council previously took action to change the Comprehensive Sewer Plan and remove the 69th Street alignment from consideration. He opined because the preliminary cost estimates indicated the 69th Street alternative may be more cost effective than either the 70th Street or 71st Street alternatives it would be prudent to at least order an additional feasibility report to examine the 69th Street alignment. He explained the Council would then have more accurate cost estimates when voting on a final alignment. He opined it was a mistake to remove 69th Street from consideration without having a feasibility report. He stated ordering a feasibility report would not require the City to choose the 69th Street alignment.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech stated the Council voted to remove the 69th Street alternative because the residents in the neighborhood were so adamantly opposed to the utility extension. She opined she had a problem with reversing the previous action that was taken because citizens would not be able to trust the Council to abide by their decisions. She stated if the 69th Street alternative was going to be put back on the table for consideration another public hearing should be held to get the input of the neighborhood.

Mayor Tourville stated another public hearing was not needed to simply order a feasibility report to get more detailed cost estimates. He agreed another public hearing would be warranted if, after reviewing the feasibility report, the Council wanted to consider putting the 69th Street alternative back into the Comprehensive Sewer Plan. He opined the Council could not make an educated decision on the alignment alternatives without having a detailed cost feasibility for the 69th Street alternative. He clarified the extension of utilities through the 69th Street neighborhood would not force any residents to hook up to the system.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech reiterated the neighborhood opposed the 69th Street alignment.

Mayor Tourville stated some residents in the 69th Street neighborhood may feel differently after seeing the feasibility report. He explained he heard from some residents that there was a misconception that everyone would be forced to hook up if utilities were extended through the 69th Street neighborhood.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech stated if the residents wanted the Council to reconsider they needed to come to a meeting and voice their opinions. She reiterated there had been no notification to the 69th Street neighborhood that the Council was going to reconsider the issue.

Mayor Tourville questioned what would need to be done to include the 69th Street alternative in the feasibility report.

Mr. Kuntz stated in November the Council adopted the Comprehensive Sewer Plan after holding a public hearing. The adoption of the plan included the elimination of the 69th Street alternative. The Council chose to retain the 70th Street and 71st Street alignment alternatives in the plan. Subsequent to that action the Council ordered a more detailed feasibility report to consider how to extend the sewer line from the lift station to the Blackstone Ridge. The feasibility report focused on the alignment alternatives contained in the Comprehensive Sewer Plan, 70th Street and 71st Street. The current item on the agenda

dealt with receiving the feasibility report for those two routes. The resolutions were drafted to reflect staff's recommendation that Council select the 71st Street alignment and order a public hearing to invite the public to comment on the selection of 71st Street. He explained if the Council wanted to also study the 69th Street alternative the Council could not take action on Item 4E and direct staff to add 69th Street as a supplement to the feasibility report. He noted the City Council could not put the 69th Street alternative back into the Comprehensive Sewer Plan without holding another public hearing.

Councilmember Bartholomew questioned what time constraints the City would be under if no action was taken and a supplemental feasibility study was ordered.

Mr. Kaldunski stated a timeline was put together to extend utilities to the Blackstone Ridge development by 2016. He explained the plans for the Blackstone Vista development would not be able to be finalized until an alignment was selected.

Councilmember Bartholomew clarified the additional feasibility study could delay the developer's timeline for Blackstone Vista.

Mr. Kaldunski stated it could delay the approval of the developer's construction plans.

Mayor Tourville stated the engineering report indicated that the 69th Street alignment was the most favorable and cost feasible route. He questioned if the residents in the 69th Street neighborhood would be forced to hook up to the system.

Mr. Kaldunski stated it was unlikely given the depth planned for the sewer line.

Mayor Tourville questioned if the developer would object to the City studying the 69th Street alternative.

Ian Peterson, Vice President of Ryland Homes, stated the plans for Blackstone Vista had already been submitted and the engineering review was at a standstill until a decision was made regarding the final alignment. He explained the timeline that had been established would not be met if the City had to go through the process to consider another amendment to the Comprehensive Sewer Plan. He acknowledged there was definitely an economic benefit to the City with respect to the 69th Street alignment. He stated the fact that 69th Street was the less expensive alternative was discussed at the public hearing in November. He explained the developer could not afford to have a delay at this point in the process.

Mayor Tourville questioned how long it would take to prepare the supplemental feasibility report on 69th Street.

Mr. Kaldunski stated it would take approximately three (3) weeks to amend the feasibility report and it could be brought back to the Council for review in approximately one (1) month. He noted if the City was expected to hold a public hearing in April there could be time to order a supplemental feasibility study and consider an amendment to the Comprehensive Sewer Plan.

Mayor Tourville questioned what the advantages were to the 69th Street alignment beyond the cost savings.

Mr. Kaldunski stated one of the main advantages was an approximate \$350,000 savings in construction costs. He noted the right-of-way acquisition costs would need to be further refined. He explained there were fewer easements that needed to be purchased for the 69th Street alternative. He stated the 69th Street alternative would not require the pipe to be buried as deep as the 71st Street alternative which would also contribute to cheaper construction costs.

Councilmember Bartholomew agreed there was a cost advantage to the 69th Street alternative. He stated it seemed that the Council would not consider the 69th Street alternative if the neighborhood was opposed. He questioned if there would be enough support on the Council to consider changing the Comprehensive Sewer Plan again if the feasibility report showed it would be the most cost effective option. He stated he did not want to spend money on another feasibility report if there was no intention of adding 69th Street to the Comprehensive Sewer Plan because of neighborhood opposition.

Mayor Tourville stated four (4) votes would be needed change the Comprehensive Sewer Plan.

Councilmember Mueller questioned how much the feasibility study would cost.

Mr. Kaldunski estimated the supplement would cost \$10,000 or less.

Councilmember Mueller stated the City could potentially save \$350,000 if the 69th Street alternative proved to be the most feasible. He opined the Council should at least order the feasibility study to look at the numbers.

Mr. Peterson questioned how the timeline for the approval process would be impacted if the feasibility study was ordered and the Council made the decision to consider adding 69th Street to the Comprehensive Sewer Plan.

Mr. Kuntz stated a supplemental feasibility report could be brought back on February 23rd and the Council would be asked to select a route. If at that time the consensus was that the 69th Street alternative was the preferred route a public hearing could be scheduled to consider the required Comprehensive Plan amendment on March 23rd.

Mr. Peterson stated the developer would be amenable to that schedule.

Councilmember Bartholomew stated he would not support the 69th Street alternative if there was not clear support from the neighborhood. He opined he was not opposed to the feasibility study to evaluate the cost estimates for each of the three (3) alternatives.

Deborah Van, 6660 Argenta Trail, stated the Council originally removed the 69th Street alternative from the Comprehensive Sewer Plan because it was an exception neighborhood. She opined the majority of the residents in the 69th Street neighborhood did not believe that they would be forced to hook up to the system.

Pat Simon, 1636 69th St. W., reviewed all of the residents in the neighborhood that were opposed to the 69th Street alternative and stated they did not come to the meeting because they did not know the issue was going to be discussed. She clarified at the meeting in November the City was unable to answer if the residents would be forced to hook up to the system.

Mayor Tourville stated because of the depth of the utilities the residents would have to petition the City for a lateral connection to hook up to the system.

Ms. Simon questioned if the neighborhood would be assessed for the road improvements on 69th Street.

Mayor Tourville stated it would depend on what the City decided to do with the road.

Jim Deanovic opined the Council's decision to eliminate the 69th Street alternative would cost the City more money and was detrimental to all the property owners in the neighborhood who were interested in selling their property. He stated since that time he had been contacted by a broker representing up to four (4) property owners in the neighborhood who were interested in selling their property. He explained he could not consider purchasing the properties at this time because they were a part of the exception neighborhood. He opined it was a mistake not to at least study the 69th Street alternative. He stated as a taxpayer \$350,000-\$500,000 in potential savings was a lot of money.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech stated if certain property owners in the exception neighborhood had changed their minds they needed to communicate that with the City themselves. She explained she was still operating under the assumption that the neighborhood was not in favor of the 69th Street alternative.

Mr. Kuntz stated the March 23rd target for a potential public hearing to consider an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan was overly aggressive and stated April 13th was a more realistic time frame.

Jim Peltier, 7250 Argenta Trail, stated there was a lot of confusion in the neighborhood because most people did not have a clear understanding of the Council's action. He opined the discussion was very convoluted and hard to follow.

Motion by Tourville, second by Mueller, to table Item 4E and direct staff to order a supplemental feasibility report to include the 69th Street alternative

Ayes: 4

Nays: 1 (Piekarski Krech) Motion carried.

G. Approve Interim Appointment of Golf Course Superintendent

H. Approve Interim Appointment of Assistant Golf Course Superintendent

Mr. Lynch explained the City's long-time Golf Course Superintendent retired and staff would like to appoint an individual to that vacant position on an interim basis.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech opined the interim appointment should be for a six (6) month period rather than a three (3) month period. She stated she was uncomfortable with deviating from the City's standard protocol.

Matt Moynihan, Clubhouse Superintendent, explained the individual that would fill the Assistant Golf Course Superintendent position currently worked in the Parks department. He stated the three (3) month period was suggested because the Parks Superintendent could not advertise the opening in his department until the interim period was over. The intent was for the Parks department to have a replacement in place for the spring season.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech opined the City needed to be consistent in its practices. She stated a three (3) month period would not allow either of the individuals to demonstrate their performance during the golf season.

Mr. Lynch stated the Parks Maintenance department would need to fill the vacancy using part-time, seasonal employees until a full time replacement could be hired.

Motion by Piekarski Krech, second by Bartholomew, to approve interim appointment of Golf Course Superintendent and Assistant Golf Course Superintendent for a 6-month period

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. CITY OF INVER GROVE HEIGHTS: Consider Ordering the Project, Authorizing and Approving Final Plans and Specifications, Authorizing City Attorney to Complete Easement Negotiations and Authorizing Advertisement for Bids for the 2015 Improvement Program, City Project No. 2015-10, Northwest Area Trunk Utility Improvements, Argenta District (Alverno Avenue to Blackstone Vista Development)

B. CITY OF INVER GROVE HEIGHTS: Consider Ordering the Project, Authorizing and Approving Final Plans and Specifications, Authorizing City Attorney to Complete Easement Negotiations and Authorizing Advertisement for Bids for the 2015 Improvement Program, City Project No. 2015-11, Northwest Area 70th Street Lift Station, Argenta District

Motion by Mueller, second by Piekarski Krech, to open the public hearing for City Project Nos. 2015-10 and 2015-11

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

Mr. Kaldunski stated the proposed project would involve the extension of trunk sanitary sewer and trunk water main from Alverno Avenue to Argenta Trail and onto Blackstone Vista. He provided an overview of the proposed alignment. The project would generally occur on an easement negotiated across the Peltier property. He explained this was the start of the trunk sewer and water main system that would serve the Blackstone developments and ultimately the whole Northwest Area Argenta District. He noted the project would not be funded using special assessments. The project would be funded through connection fees as development occurred. He stated staff negotiated the purchase of the easement across the Peltier property and if the project was ordered staff would also move forward with the easement acquisition

process.

Mr. Kaldunski explained the lift station project would involve the construction of a submersible pump system on 70th Street. The developer of Blackstone Vista would install the trunk sewer within his development and the City would construct the lift station. The project would service the entire Argenta District. The estimated cost of construction was \$739,000 and would also be funded through connection fees collected at the time of development. He noted no special assessments would be levied for the project. No easement costs would be incurred because the developer agreed to provide the necessary right-of-way within his development and on outlots A and B.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech clarified that the lift station would go in the proposed location regardless of the final alignment chosen for the trunk sanitary sewer.

Mr. Kaldunski replied in the affirmative. He explained all three (3) alignment alternatives would bring the flow from the north to the lift station on 70th Street. From that point there would be a force main that would go through the Blackstone Vista development to the gravity sewer across the Peltier property.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech questioned what the lift station would be connected to and what it would serve at this point.

Mr. Kaldunski stated the immediate need for the lift station was to service the Blackstone Vista development.

Mr. Kuntz asked Mr. Kaldunski to review the timeframe for construction.

Mr. Kaldunski stated the lift station project would be put out for bid immediately if it was ordered by the Council and construction would start as soon as possible in the spring for a completion date in September to allow all of Blackstone Vista to be serviced. The gravity sewer segment would begin as soon as the easement was secured and bids were in place. It was anticipated that construction would start in May and would be completed in the summer.

Jim Peltier, 7250 Argenta Trail, stated it was hard to make any decisions regarding his property without knowing the alignment of Argenta Trail.

Mr. Thureen stated Mr. Peltier's comments related to the layout and development of additional properties and the construction of the collector system. He noted there was flexibility built into the City's collector street system plans so that the actual alignments could be tweaked as new developments were proposed.

Motion by Bartholomew, second by Piekarski Krech, to close the public hearing for City Project No. 2015-10

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

Motion by Bartholomew, second by Piekarski Krech, to adopt Resolution No. 15-12 Ordering the Project, Authorizing and Approving Final Plans and Specifications, Authorizing City Attorney to Complete Easement Negotiations and Authorizing Advertisement for Bids for the 2015 Improvement Program, City Project No. 2015-10, Northwest Area Trunk Utility Improvements, Argenta District (Alverno Avenue to Blackstone Vista Development)

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

Motion by Piekarski Krech, second by Bartholomew, to close the public hearing for City Project No. 2015-11

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

Motion by Mueller, second by Bartholomew, to adopt Resolution No. 15-13 Ordering the Project, Authorizing and Approving Final Plans and Specifications, Authorizing City Attorney to Complete Easement Negotiations and Authorizing Advertisement for Bids for the 2015 Improvement

Program, City Project No. 2015-11, Northwest Area 70th Street Lift Station, Argenta District**Ayes: 5****Nays: 0 Motion carried.****7. REGULAR AGENDA:****COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:**

A. IMH SPECIAL ASSET 175: Consider Resolution relating to a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to Change the Land Use Designation of a Portion of the property from MU, Mixed Use to LMDR, Low-Medium Density Residential for the property located at the Northeast Corner of Hwy 3 and County Road 26

Mr. Link reviewed the location of the 39 acre parcel. He explained the request was to amend the comprehensive plan to change the land use designation of 16 acres of the property to Low-Medium Density Residential (LMDR) to allow for single-family development. The developer's plan would create three (3) different neighborhoods including single-family, townhome, and apartments. He noted essentially three outlots would be created that would each be sold to different developers. He stated the applicant submitted a concept site plan to support the comprehensive plan amendment request. The concept plan was provided to give the City an idea of how the development could potentially be laid out on the property. The concept site plan proposed 46 single-family lots, 50 townhomes, and a 200-unit apartment building. Planning staff recommended denial of the request due to both land use and financial concerns. The viability of the concept site plan as it pertained to the townhome and apartment components was a concern as well the potential impact to surrounding properties that remained undeveloped. The financial risk was also a concern because most of the connection fees would be tied to the proposed apartment and townhome developments. He stated the Planning Commission recommended approval of the request because they wanted to spur development, take advantage of the current market, and provide support to existing and future commercial developments. The Housing Committee recommended denial of the request based on concerns related to the loss of density, questions related to the site design, and a desire to have one developer responsible for all components of the development.

Councilmember Bartholomew questioned how much revenue would be generated from connection fees for each phase of the proposed development.

Mr. Link stated the connection fees for the townhome and apartment components would be approximately \$2.6 million. The connection fees for the 46 single family lots would be approximately \$630,000. Staff had questions regarding the viability of the apartment and townhome site plans and those plans were tied to approximately \$2.6 million in revenue.

Mayor Tourville stated there were questions and concerns related to the financial aspects of the site plan, the viability of the site plan, and the fact that multiple developers would likely be involved in the process.

Tim Keenan, IMH Special Asset 175, stated his company was very invested in the project and committed to being involved in every phase of the development. He explained his company would build the apartment project and would be part of the development for the single-family project and for the townhome project. He stated the site would be a tough piece of property to develop and his company owned it. He added that he had not heard any public opposition to the project and all of the improvements would be within City easements. He explained he had interest from developers regarding both the single-family and townhome projects. He stated the apartment project could be either market rate apartments or senior housing. He noted the current request related to changing the zoning of 15.7 acres of the property. He committed to putting up signage on the property to make it clear to potential homebuyers that an apartment building would be constructed in the future.

Councilmember Mueller expressed concern about the roundabout and the proximity of the right-of-way and setbacks to the proposed site for the apartment component. He questioned if the developer would be willing to move the apartment building to where the townhomes were proposed to be located.

Mr. Keenan stated those questions had to be addressed in the next stage of the development process. He explained the onus was on him to prove to the City that the apartment and the townhome components would work in order to obtain plat approval. He noted he would also be extending the trunk utilities to the north side of the property to open up neighboring properties for future development. He stated the concept site plan incorporated the most recent information from Mn/DOT and the County.

Mayor Tourville stated a major concern was that there were no assurances that the apartment and townhome projects would be built or that the plans would not be downsized.

Mr. Keenan noted that the site plan that was provided to support the zoning amendment was not a finalized document that could not be tweaked. He reiterated the concept site plan was provided to show the City that the proposal could work within the constraints of the property. He stated the only thing that was set in stone was the density requirements that would have to be met in order for the development to be approved.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech stated she needed some assurances that all of the components would be built and the project would not be downsized.

Mr. Keenan stated he committed to building an apartment project in Apple Valley and he began construction in the fall of 2014. He reiterated the current zoning of the property required higher density development and the request was to change the zoning on 15.7 acres. He explained no other assurances could be provided at this stage of the process but he was willing to do the work necessary in the next stage to prove that each phase of the development would work.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech questioned if something could be built into the development agreement for the single-family project that would provide an assurance that the apartment and townhome projects would be built.

Mr. Kuntz stated the assurance would have to be built into a development agreement for the single-family component in the form of a cash escrow to cover the connection fees for the apartment and townhome components.

Mayor Tourville stated no developer would agree to pay \$2.6 million up front.

Mr. Keenan stated he did not believe the City had ever asked another developer to do that either.

Mayor Tourville questioned how the extension of utilities would be funded.

Mr. Link stated there had been no decision regarding payment for construction of trunk utilities and the developer submitted a petition requesting the City to install the utilities.

Tom Goodrum, Westwood Engineering, stated he met with staff from the City, County, and Mn/DOT regarding the future roundabout and the easements needed for right-of-way and ponding. He reiterated the necessary easements were incorporated into the concept site plan that was provided to support the rezoning of the 15.7 acres. He stated the next phase of the process would involve a detailed review of the site plan where the details could be further refined. He explained the trunk utilities were already stubbed across the road onto the developer's property. The City's sewer plan showed an easement going through the property to the north. He noted the two properties to the north would not have access to trunk utilities until the subject property was developed and the easements were dedicated. He explained the developer's project proposed to dedicate the easements for the extension of trunk utilities through the property and the concept site plan accounted for the easements.

Councilmember Bartholomew questioned if the site plan could be reconfigured by reducing the number of single-family homes to make the apartment and townhome projects more feasible.

Mr. Goodrum stated the proposed number of single-family lots made the development viable.

Mayor Tourville clarified the Council was being asked to approve an amendment to the comprehensive plan, not the site plan or the number of units to be included in the development.

Mr. Link replied in the affirmative. He stated comprehensive plan amendments generally pertained to determining the appropriate land use for the property and did not get into the level of detail being discussed regarding the concept site plan.

Mr. Goodrum noted the developer would have the ability to make minor changes if necessary during the site plan review and approval process.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech questioned if the single family development had to be done by PUD.

Mr. Link stated all development in the Northwest Area required a PUD.

Mr. Kuntz questioned if the developer intended at the time of single-family development to dedicate the open spaces outside of the single-family development.

Mr. Goodrum stated the developer viewed the project as three (3) development parcels controlled by IMH.

Mr. Kuntz questioned if the retention pond on Outlot B would be constructed when the single-family project was built.

Mr. Goodrum stated the developer would construct what was required by the City to meet the stormwater requirements for the entire development.

Mr. Keenan stated even though there were three (3) separate components to the development he had to plan for what would be required to develop the entire 40 acre parcel.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech questioned if the entire 40 acres could be covered by one PUD rather than having separate plans for each outlot. She opined that may provide the City with some assurance that the entire development would be constructed.

Mr. Keenan stated he would have no problem with doing that because he was willing to show all of the improvements that would be required for the entire 40 acre development.

Mr. Kuntz clarified when the developer came to the City for approval of the single-family project the Council wanted to approve a PUD plan for the development of all 40 acres. He stated the Council was asking the developer to submit a final plat at the time he requested approval for the single-family project.

Mr. Keenan stated he could not provide plans for the entire 40 acres at that point because the market demands may change and the apartment building may need to be a senior housing project rather than market-rate apartments. He reiterated he needed to put a higher density product on the property no matter what because that was how the property was currently zoned.

Mr. Goodrum stated they could have the concept site plan be a part of the PUD approval for the first phase of the project. As future phases of the project were brought forward the developer would have to come back before the Council to discuss any changes that were proposed to the master site plan. He reiterated the concept plan could be a part of the PUD for the entire 40 acres.

Mr. Link stated staff did have discussions with the developer about preparing a master plan for the entire 40 acre parcel. He questioned how much detail would be required on the master plan in order to obtain approval for the single-family project. He explained approval of the comprehensive plan amendment would establish a line between the single-family and the multi-family projects.

Mr. Keenan stated the City would receive more detail on the single-family and townhome projects right away because he had builders interested in each of the projects. He reiterated the plans for the apartment project had to meet the density requirements and could not show anything less.

Mr. Kuntz questioned if the developer was going to request that the City install the utility and road infrastructure.

Mr. Goodrum stated the developer requested a feasibility study to start the discussion regarding the City's expectation related to the installation of utilities and collector streets.

Jim Zentner, 8004 Delano Way, stated the ULI study recommended that there be a single developer for the property. He explained he had been an advocate of workforce housing for many years and this piece

of property was targeted as a viable site for higher density development. He expressed concern regarding payment of connection fees and opined that the higher density development was needed in order to meet the financial projections for the Northwest Area.

Kathleen Jesme, 7085 Allen Way, stated she would be looking at the proposed development from her property. She opined that only 30 acres of the property was developable and expressed concern that the single family component would account for half of the developable acreage.

Nicola Abbott, 6720 Argenta Trail, stated she heard a rumor that the housing on the property could be low income. She questioned what was meant by the term “affordable”.

Mayor Tourville explained workforce housing was income based.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech stated workforce housing was typically for individuals in entry-level jobs with incomes between \$30-50,000.

Mr. Keenan reiterated the apartment project would be a market-rate or senior housing project. He explained the townhome development, or a portion thereof, could be workforce housing.

Mary T’Kach, 7848 Babcock Trail, opined approval of the comprehensive plan amendment would set a precedent in the Northwest Area and could contribute to greater financial shortfalls.

Chris Becker, 1210 70th St. W., stated people had been looking for development in the area for a long time. He expressed concern that the proposed comprehensive plan amendment would create a shortfall in the number of units projected for the property. He encouraged the developer to come back with a plan that could be supported by City staff and the Housing Committee.

Councilmember Bartholomew questioned if the density projections were short.

Mr. Link stated the overall density projections for the property would work as proposed by the developer.

Mr. Hark clarified the density was slightly under the overall projections.

Mr. Goodrum stated the developer was asking for a comprehensive plan amendment for LMDR, similar to what is seen on surrounding properties. He referenced the ULI report and stated the study encouraged the type of development being proposed. He noted the developer was trying to support the City’s goals and long term vision for the Northwest Area.

Councilmember Bartholomew stated it was a risk to the City to take the developer’s assurances that the multi-family components would be constructed.

Dan Schaeffer, 7305 Argenta Trail, opined the higher density development near the single family could be detrimental to the property values of the single family lots. He stated it would make more sense to build the apartment component first and then the single family homes.

Mayor Tourville stated that would be the advantage of having a master plan in place for the entire 40 acre parcel.

Councilmember Hark questioned how long the City was going to wait to get development going. He stated the perfect plan did not exist and all developments come with some level of risk. He opined he did not want to wait another five (5) to ten (10) years for the property to develop because it would spur other development in the Northwest Area.

Mayor Tourville stated the development of the Northwest Area had always involved risk. He explained he wanted to see a master plan that would lay out development of the entire parcel and it would not be prudent to say at this point in the process that an apartment building would be the absolute best fit for the property. He noted density was an issue across the Northwest Area.

Mr. Becker stated it was possible to build affordable housing without apartments and the bigger issue was offering affordable options.

Mr. Peltier opined no developer could provide the level of assurance the Council was asking for. He stated it was not in the Council's purview to decide if a person would or would not purchase a home because of the existence of higher density development. He opined that the City was undermining development by trying to control every component of the process.

Ms. Jesme questioned how much of the property was buildable. She suggested that the developer come back with a plan that reduced the size of the single family lots and allowed more space for the higher density development.

Mr. Peltier stated there was a lot of property in the Northwest Area that would not meet density projections due to the topography of the land.

Councilmember Bartholomew expressed concern that the remnant of property after the rezoning that the multi-family projects could be built on was too small.

Mr. Link stated staff's concern was that the boundaries for the apartment and townhome components were tight when the setback and easement requirements were factored in.

Mayor Tourville stated the onus was on the developer to prove that the plans could work on the site within the constraints of the property.

Paul Mandell, 8320 Cleadis Ave., expressed concern that the Council had set a precedent for downsizing in the Northwest Area. He opined that eventually the City would reach a point where it would not be able to meet the financial obligations in the Northwest Area.

Motion by Hark, second by Tourville, to adopt Resolution No. 15-14 approving a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to Change the Land Use Designation of a Portion of the property from MU, Mixed Use to LMDR, Low-Medium Density Residential for the property located at the Northeast Corner of Hwy 3 and County Road 26

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS:

B. CITY OF INVER GROVE HEIGHTS: Consider Resolution Receiving Feasibility Report, Establishing City Project No. 2015-14, 47th Street Area Water and Sewer Improvements, Scheduling a Public Hearing and Authorizing Preparation of Plans and Specifications for the 2015 Pavement Management Program, City Project No. 2015-09E, 47th Street Area Reconstruction and for City Project No. 2015-14, 47th Street Area Water and Sewer Improvement and Rehabilitation

Mr. Dodge stated a revised assessment roll and project map were provided for incorporation into the feasibility report. He explained the project consisted of drainage improvements, utility improvements, rehabilitation and street reconstruction of the 47th Street area as well as the mill and overlay of 46th Street Court. The drainage improvements were coordinated with feasibility report for the Ullrich Addition development. The 51st Street area was reviewed and found not to be feasible to incorporate into the 2015 Pavement Management Program due to funding challenges. He noted the 51st Street area could be considered in a future project via petition and Council direction. He explained another informational meeting would be held for the public prior to the public hearing.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech questioned if the property owners in the area were aware of the proposed assessments outlined in the report.

Mr. Dodge stated the affected property owners would be notified of the public hearing and the proposed assessments if the Council received the feasibility report. He noted the proposed assessments would also be discussed at the neighborhood meeting prior to the public hearing.

Councilmember Mueller questioned if there had been any discussion with the Church regarding the project.

Mr. Dodge stated staff did provide the Church with the information from the benefit appraisal analysis.

Mayor Tourville stated residents in the 51st Street area were upset that they were removed from the project. He requested that the Council support that neighborhood being included in a feasibility study in the very near future.

The City Council agreed the 51st Street area should be incorporated into a feasibility study.

Motion by Piekarski Krech, second by Bartholomew, to adopt Resolution No. 15-15 Establishing City Project No. 2015-14, 47th Street Area Water and Sewer Improvements and Rehabilitation, Receiving Feasibility Report, Scheduling a Public Hearing and Authorizing Preparation of Plans and Specifications and Resolution No. 15-16 Receiving Feasibility Report, Scheduling Public Hearing and Authorizing Preparation of Plans and Specifications for the 2015 Pavement Management Program, City Project No. 2015-09E, 47th Street Area Reconstruction

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

C. CITY OF INVER GROVE HEIGHTS: Consider Resolutions Approving Project Labor Agreements for City Project No. 2015-10, Northwest Area Trunk Utility Improvements, Argenta District (Alverno Avenue to Blackstone Vista Development) and City Project No. 2015-11, Northwest Area 70th Street Lift Station, Argenta District

Mr. Kuntz explained the item presents the opportunity for the Council to consider whether the plans and specifications for each of the projects would require project labor agreements. He stated the City had made the decision to require project labor agreements on larger public infrastructure improvement projects in the past.

Councilmember Piekarski Krech clarified this would apply only to a city-initiated project.

Mr. Kuntz replied in the affirmative.

Motion by Mueller, second by Piekarski Krech, to adopt Resolution No. 15-17 approving a Project Labor Agreement for City Project No. 2015-10, Northwest Area Trunk Utility Improvements, Argenta District (Alverno Avenue to Blackstone Vista Development) and Resolution No. 15-18 approving a Project Labor Agreement for City Project No. 2015-11, Northwest Area 70th Street Lift Station, Argenta District

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

8. MAYOR & COUNCIL COMMENTS:

9. ADJOURN: Motion by Bartholomew, second by Hark, to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned by a unanimous vote at 10:20 pm.