

7.02: Review Sketch Plan for Bacon Property; Case of Bill Boyum

Presentation

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl presented the Staff Report asked the Commission to provide feedback on which concept plan to move forward with and develop a formal sketch plan application.

Commission Business

Chairperson Bauer stated that the applicant's narrative includes two cul-de-sacs, noting that one lies within Nowthen. He recognized that the comments from public safety shows that they prefer the loop but asked if a larger cul-de-sac would accomplish the same things.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated that she could bring that idea forward to public safety for review.

Chairperson Bauer stated that Commissioner Johnson stated that he preferred the 19-lot layout.

Commissioner VanScoy referenced the option which would connect to 178th and asked for additional details.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that connection would be challenging as the road would go through the park area that is mostly wetlands.

Commissioner VanScoy commented that several of the lots appear to be encumbered with floodplain and asked how the developer would intend to handle that.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated that the floodplain circles the properties and there is upland area. She commented that some fill is allowed in the floodplain with proper measures and mitigation. She stated that the lots could accommodate the area needed for a house pad and well/septic and most likely only the driveways would be within floodplain.

Councilmember Musgrove referenced the nine-lot layout and easements and asked for additional input on whether those would be for roads.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl noted that these are easements that already exist for utilities and would not be used for roads.

Commissioner Anderson referenced lots two through five, which would appear to be hard to build on because of the floodplain in that area. He commented that he does not like the 1,500-foot cul-de-sac and asked if a road could be run from the cul-de-sac bulb to 178th to provide a second access to the development. He stated that he does not prefer to have only one way in or out of a development.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl displayed a map which identifies the wetlands on site, explaining that the road connection would run entirely through wetland. She stated that the comments of the neighbors have been that they do not want the road connection or disruption to the wetlands.

Commissioner VanScoy commented that it would appear the road connection would go through tilled fields rather than wetlands and that there would be minimal wetland disruption.

Commissioner Anderson stated that he could support a connection that would move to the west to connect to 178th.

Kendra Lindahl, Landform, commented that the only request tonight is for the nine-lot subdivision and they are requesting for input on the cul-de-sac. She stated that they do not intend to include a connection to 178th as it was clear that the neighbors do not want that. She stated that they received the input from the neighbors and reduced the number of lots from the 37 which would be allowed to nine lots. She stated that the road connection to 178th would need to go through a public park and require wetland fill and would instead preserve the natural features of the site with two estate lots that backup to that area and fits the existing character of the area. She stated that they are looking for feedback on this alignment and the longer cul-de-sac before they decide whether to invest additional funds into this proposal.

Commissioner Woestehoff asked if there is an economic consideration between the different alignments and whether a cul-de-sac would support nine lots and 19 lots would be needed to support a road connection. He commented that there just seems to be a large jump between the two proposals.

Ms. Lindahl replied that the neighbors would not support the 19-lot subdivision and they do not want to present something that the neighbors would not support. She stated that the road connection would require additional road costs and process, as the road would go through public park land and impact wetlands. She commented that they believe the nine-lot proposal would be a better subdivision.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl commented that while it may appear easy to make the road connection on paper, the requirements of the City would require acquisition of the entire public park and a portion of a neighbor's property. She commented that it would be a difficult process and would not be preferred by staff as it would be very challenging.

Commissioner VanScoy commented that it would appear that the connection to 178th would occur at the cul-de-sac bulb and did not see how a neighboring property would be impacted.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated that the City only has about 40 feet of frontage on the cul-de-sac, whereas 66 feet of right-of-way is needed for a roadway.

Commissioner Gengler asked for input from the developer on perhaps making the cul-de-sac wider for more turnaround room.

Ms. Lindahl stated that the cul-de-sac proposed would meet the City standards but confirmed that if that is the desire, they could work with City staff to satisfy those concerns.

Commissioner Anderson asked whether the road would be public or private.

Ms. Lindahl stated that as drawn this would be a public street and would meet the 66-foot street right-of-way with a 28 paved rural section street.

Commissioner Anderson commented that on the drawing it is shown as 24 feet and he would have concern with the 28-foot width as well.

Ms. Lindahl confirmed that the 24-foot shown as an error and that would be 28 feet as required by City standard. She stated that if a wider road is desired, they could work with City staff.

Commissioner VanScoy stated that he would prefer not to have another cul-de-sac that is 1,500 feet in length and would prefer to see another option.

Commissioner Anderson agreed.

Chairperson Bauer asked if there would be another option for a secondary access that would not go through the park.

Senior Planner McGuire Brigl stated that the proposal from the applicant would be the only logical option as there is no development on the north or east to connect to and the other areas are surrounded by wetland.

Commissioner Gengler commented that she likes that the applicant listened to the input from the neighbors but also acknowledged the concerns of public safety. She stated that she would tend to support this layout because of the difficulties and uniqueness of the lot.

Chairperson Bauer noted that some issues and concerns have been raised and the developer should continue to work with staff in attempt to develop something more acceptable before going forward with full plan development.