

1. Agenda

Documents:

[02-04-25-PC MTG AGENDA.PDF](#)

2. Agenda Packet

Documents:

[02-04-25-PC MTG AGENDA PACKET.PDF](#)

CITY OF SHOREWOOD
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2025 7:00 P.M.

COUNCIL CHAMBERS
5755 COUNTRY CLUB ROAD

AGENDA

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL / (LIAISON) SCHEDULE

EGGENBERGER (Feb) _____
HUSKINS (Apr) _____
HOLKER () _____
JOHNSON () _____
COUNCIL LIAISON DIGROTTOLO (Jan-June) _____
COUNCIL LIAISON MADDY (Jul-Dec) _____

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

♦ January 7, 2025

3. MATTERS FROM THE FLOOR

This is an opportunity for members of the public to bring an item, that is not on tonight's agenda, but related to the governance of the City of Shorewood, to the attention of the Planning Commission. In providing this limited public forum, the City of Shorewood expects respectful participation. We encourage all speakers to be courteous in their language and behavior, and to confine their remarks to those facts that are relevant to the question or matter under discussion. Anyone wishing to address the Commission should raise their hand and wait to be called on. Please make your comments from the podium and identify yourself by your first and last name and your address for the record. Please limit your comments to three minutes. No discussion or action will be taken by the Commission on this matter. The Commission may request the issue be forwarded to the City Council or to staff to prepare a report and place it on the next agenda.

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A) Preliminary Plat for Shorewood Meadows

Location: 25480 & 25560 Smithtown Rd

Applicant: McDonald Construction Partners

B) Minor subdivision and variance

Location: 5570/5580 Shorewood Lane

Applicant: Sharratt Design & Company, LLC and Matt Tierney

- C) Zoning amendments to implement the Comprehensive Plan's Medium Density Land Use Designation
Applicant: City Initiated

5. OTHER BUSINESS

- A) Variance for redevelopment of a non-conforming lot
Location: 20175 Manor Road
Applicant: Edward Zaret

6. REPORTS

- A) Council Meeting Report
- B) Draft Next Meeting Agenda

ADJOURNMENT

CITY OF SHOREWOOD
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2025 7:00 P.M.

COUNCIL CHAMBERS
5755 COUNTRY CLUB ROAD

AGENDA

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL / (LIAISON) SCHEDULE

EGGENBERGER (Feb) _____
HUSKINS (Apr) _____
HOLKER () _____
JOHNSON () _____
COUNCIL LIAISON DIGROTTOLO (Jan-June) _____
COUNCIL LIAISON MADDY (Jul-Dec) _____

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- January 7, 2025

3. MATTERS FROM THE FLOOR

This is an opportunity for members of the public to bring an item, that is not on tonight's agenda, but related to the governance of the City of Shorewood, to the attention of the Planning Commission. In providing this limited public forum, the City of Shorewood expects respectful participation. We encourage all speakers to be courteous in their language and behavior, and to confine their remarks to those facts that are relevant to the question or matter under discussion. Anyone wishing to address the Commission should raise their hand and wait to be called on. Please make your comments from the podium and identify yourself by your first and last name and your address for the record. Please limit your comments to three minutes. No discussion or action will be taken by the Commission on this matter. The Commission may request the issue be forwarded to the City Council or to staff to prepare a report and place it on the next agenda.

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A) Preliminary Plat for Shorewood Meadows

Location: 25480 & 25560 Smithtown Rd

Applicant: McDonald Construction Partners

B) Minor subdivision and variance

Location: 5570/5580 Shorewood Lane

Applicant: Sharratt Design & Company, LLC and Matt Tierney

- C) Zoning amendments to implement the Comprehensive Plan's Medium Density Land Use Designation
Applicant: City Initiated

5. OTHER BUSINESS

- A) Variance for redevelopment of a non-conforming lot
Location: 20175 Manor Road
Applicant: Edward Zaret

6. REPORTS

- A) Council Meeting Report
- B) Draft Next Meeting Agenda

ADJOURNMENT

**CITY OF SHOREWOOD
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
TUESDAY, JANUARY 7, 2025**

**COUNCIL CHAMBERS
5755 COUNTRY CLUB ROAD
7:00 P.M.**

DRAFT MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Eggenberger called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Eggenberger; Commissioners Huskins, Holker and Johnson; Planning Director Darling; and City Planner Griffiths

Absent: None

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Huskins moved, Holker seconded, approving the agenda for January 7, 2025, as presented. Motion passed 4/0.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- December 3, 2024

Holker moved, Johnson seconded, approving the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of December 3, 2024, as presented. Motion passed 4/0.

3. MATTERS FROM THE FLOOR

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS - NONE

5. OTHER BUSINESS –

- A. Variance from the Side Yard Abutting a Street Setback for a Proposed Portico
Location: 6040 Cajed Lane
Applicant: Eric Magistad

City Planner Griffiths reviewed the request for a variance at 6040 Cajed Lane to the side yard setback in order to construct a portico. He noted that the home was built in 1977 and was already grandfathered in and legally non-conforming and was similar to other homes in the neighborhood. He noted that the proposal would be for the portico to be constructed on the existing concrete slab and it would not increase any impervious surface on the property. He outlined the analysis staff had done on this request and explained that they were recommending approval of the variance request with the condition that the applicant obtain all necessary permits for construction by March 1, 2025 and pass all inspections.

Commissioner Huskins clarified that the variance was not due to the applicant increasing any of their existing non-conformities and was only because it was greater than 4 feet.

CITY OF SHOREWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

JANUARY 7, 2025

Page 2 of 16

1 City Planner Griffiths explained that the variance was needed because the City Code would
2 require a 50 foot setback for new improvements, but noted that this would not increase the non-
3 conformity and a variance was required because they were at 5 feet. He stated that if it were 4
4 feet or less, it would be considered a permitted encroachment and this process would not be
5 needed.

6
7 Commissioner Holker asked why the building permit had been denied in September 2024.

8
9 Planning Director Darling explained that the building permit was denied because the portico does
10 not meet the setback.

11
12 Eric Magistad, 6040 Cajed Lane, thanked the staff for the work they have done on his behalf
13 through this process. He stated that they have worked with their contractor for the last 9 years
14 and were confident in his ability to deliver on the conditions that were being recommended by City
15 staff.

16
17 Commissioner Huskins noted that the rendering submitted was very different than the existing
18 photograph.

19
20 Mr. Magistad stated that the photo that was submitted to the contractor as their 'inspiration' did
21 not really fit the façade of their house. He explained that they know what the dimensions will be,
22 but were not exactly sure what it would end up looking like in the end.

23
24 **Holker moved, Huskins seconded, to recommend approval of the variance request from**
25 **the Side Yard Abutting a Street Setback for a Proposed Portico at 6040 Cajed Lane, subject**
26 **to the conditions included in the staff report. Motion passed 4/0.**

27
28 Chair Eggenberger stated that this item would come before the City Council on January 27, 2025.

29
30 B. Discussion of Subdivision Regulations Amendments Related to Administration and
31 Enforcement Procedures
32 Applicant: City Initiated

33
34 Planning Director Darling explained that the City had hired a consultant to redraft the City's
35 subdivision ordinances and this discussion was intended to submit feedback to the consultants
36 on their initial draft and also allow them to give whatever other feedback the Commission may
37 have. She explained that the consultants were trying to get all of the administrative pieces of the
38 ordinances into one place so people would not have to skip around between applications types
39 and design standards.

40
41 Commissioner Johnson asked if there were any administrative procedures that would apply now
42 that did not before, for example, if there were zoning administrator approval of things that
43 previously would have been handled in a different manner.

44
45 Planning Director Darling stated that there were some of those differences proposed and they
46 were looking for input from the Commission on those things but explained that if the Commission
47 wasn't comfortable with those changes, they could be pulled back a bit.

48
49 Commissioner Johnson explained that she was not sure how they would know whether they were
50 comfortable with it or not because they do not know exactly what the impacts may be. She asked
51 if there was something like review by the City Attorney and asked if there was anything that would

1 highlight that this item was new to this subsection, but has been in place for another subsection.
2 She stated that the Commission did not have that information and was something that would be
3 difficult for them to be able to do on their own. She reiterated her question on whether there would
4 be City Attorney review that would be required.

5
6 Planning Director Darling stated that the City Attorney would absolutely review these changes.

7
8 Commissioner Johnson stated that she would love to see it highlighted in order to show places
9 where there would no longer be Planning Commission review or a public hearing where there
10 previously had been. She stated that from what she has seen it looks like public hearings have
11 disappeared in some cases.

12
13 Planning Director Darling suggested that they start walking through the draft information included
14 in the packet because she thinks that will make it easier for the Commission to understand. She
15 reiterated that the consultants were trying to consolidate all the procedures in one section and
16 were also trying to make it consistent how each procedures was presented. She explained that
17 one thing she liked was that they were taking all of the comment procedures across the board
18 and were putting them in one section at the beginning which she felt would be helpful because
19 there would not be repeats, but noted that in this draft she had noticed some repeats

20
21 Commissioner Huskins stated that for people looking for information, for example, for a cemetery,
22 what they were looking to do was not applicable to this section. He explained that he felt it would
23 be helpful to include direction to the portion of code that would apply for their situation.

24
25 Commissioner Johnson stated that she would also make that suggestions for items 1 and 2.

26
27 Commissioner Huskins stated that his sense of doing this work was to streamline it in order to
28 make it more readable and easier for people to use which he felt his suggestion would do.

29
30 Planning Director Darling continued review of the draft document and stated that staff could not
31 issue a building permit for any lot that was not created in compliance with the chapter.

32
33 Commissioner Huskins noted that in the building permit section of 'Common Procedures' section
34 he was expecting to see a statement that said, 'here is the process by which you can get a building
35 permit', but he felt nothing in this section told him how to do that and simply tells him what he
36 could not do.

37
38 Planning Director Darling stated that she understood his point and suggested that 1 and 2 needed
39 to go under Introductory Provisions. She moved the discussion onto the third subdivision related
40 to who would be authorized to file applications and subdivision 4 related to application fees. She
41 noted that she would like to add an additional statement that made it clear that no application
42 would be accepted without the actual application form, so people could not just simply submit
43 their documentation.

44
45 Commissioner Johnson noted that under application fees there is a statement that says that
46 escrow amounts 'may' be required and asked if that should be changed to 'will'.

47
48 Planning Director Darling suggested changing the wording to 'an escrow amount shall be required
49 by the City, subject to Chapter 1301'. She moved the discussion onto subdivision 5, pre-
50 application meetings and explained that they could come in for a meeting before they actually
51 submit their application in order to allow staff to take a look at it and give initial comments. She

CITY OF SHOREWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

JANUARY 7, 2025

Page 4 of 16

1 noted that in the current Code this seemed to be required and she would like to make this more
2 discretionary. She noted that if they come in for a pre-application meeting, she would like to
3 change the language so it is clear that they must bring in a sketch for staff to look at.
4

5 Commissioner Huskins asked if there was a charge to the applicant when there is a pre-
6 application meeting.
7

8 Planning Director Darling stated that there would not be a charge to the applicant in that situation
9 because it would be handled by staff and not consultants.
10

11 Commissioner Huskins gave the example of the City receiving an application that had many holes
12 in it which had not held a pre-application meeting.
13

14 Planning Director Darling acknowledged that was what usually happened.
15

16 Commissioner Huskins stated that he did not think the fees were structured according to how
17 much time staff spends reviewing an application. He explained that he felt that encouraging
18 applications to have the pre-application meeting would end up as a benefit to staff because it
19 would reduce the amount of time they would have to spend correcting issues. He stated that this
20 was why he was thinking, in most cases, it would be better to have a requirement for a pre-
21 application meeting.
22

23 Planning Director Darling noted that most developers come in before they submit their application
24 and meet with staff because it also saves them time and money.
25

26 Commissioner Holker asked if there were any laws that kept the City from requiring a pre-
27 application meeting.
28

29 Planning Director Darling stated that with any planning and zoning application they have the right
30 to submit the land-use applications and she did not think the City could turn it down solely because
31 they had not met with staff ahead of time.
32

33 City Planner Griffiths explained that the other thing that they would potentially run into was
34 possible litigation related to what would really be considered an application requirement. He
35 stated that as soon as you do application requirements then they start triggering review timelines
36 that are required by State statutes. He stated that if they required a pre-application meeting, that
37 would start the clock sooner.
38

39 Planning Director Darling agreed that they would have to be really careful with that timeline but
40 noted that there were cities that required fees just to have basic questions answered.
41

42 Commissioner Huskins stated that if they leave this as discretionary, he asked if there was
43 something that they could include that the procedure or process was intended to encourage this
44 type of meeting, even if it was not required.
45

46 Chair Eggenberger suggested language that simply stated that 'all applicants were encouraged
47 to meet with the Zoning Administrator'. He asked if the applicant could choose to invite additional
48 city staff to the meeting.
49

CITY OF SHOREWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

JANUARY 7, 2025

Page 5 of 16

1 Planning Director Darling explained that sometimes the applicant will say that they have more
2 questions for the engineer, for example. She clarified that she did not think language should be
3 added and should be left to her discretion on who will attend the meeting.

4
5 Commissioner Johnson asked if the Zoning Administrator was a new position.

6
7 Planning Director Darling stated that it was not and was the statutory definition of her principle job
8 duties.

9
10 Chair Eggenberger asked where an applicant would go if they have issue with the Zoning
11 Administrator.

12
13 Planning Director Darling explained that they can appeal it, but noted that in a small town such
14 as Shorewood, they will have to work with her, even if they do not like her because the City staff
15 was too small, so they do not have duplication of duties amongst staff like other cities may have.
16 She explained that the appeal process would go through the Planning Commission and then onto
17 the City Council. She moved the discussion onto subdivision 6, coordination of applications and
18 7, deadline for actions.

19
20 Commissioner Huskins stated that he felt the fees in a situation for coordination of applications
21 needed to be clearly outlined. He suggested that there be language that says that each
22 application fee would be additive and that there would not be a discount for coordination of
23 applications.

24
25 Commissioner Johnson stated that she did not fully understand the deadline for action and noted
26 that she felt it should be based on some application, but if there were a bunch of them bouncing
27 around, she questioned which application the deadline would apply to.

28
29 Planning Director Darling explained that it would be for the complete application for preliminary
30 approval.

31
32 Commissioner Huskins stated that if there were multiple applications, the clock would start ticking
33 when all of them were completed.

34
35 Commissioner Johnson cautioned that she just didn't want the City to be responsible for having
36 a deadline that was too early due to confusion about what 'delivery of an application' really was.

37
38 Planning Director Darling stated that there was a lot of case law on this topic so she did not think
39 it would be confusing for applicants but noted that she would make sure that the City Attorney
40 reviewed this language. She noted that subdivision 8 related to the premature subdivision was
41 not really common so they want to move that.

42
43 Commissioner Huskins asked if there was convention for use of the word 'premature'.

44
45 Planning Director Darling explained that it was very intentional.

46
47 Commissioner Huskins stated that from a layperson's perspective he felt that by saying something
48 was premature that meant that there was some cure in order to make it mature, but he felt some
49 of the conditions listed were not actually curable.

50

CITY OF SHOREWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

JANUARY 7, 2025

Page 6 of 16

1 Planning Director Darling stated that was correct and if the applicant cannot solve the problems
2 that were listed, then they should not submit an application for subdividing.

3
4 City Planner Griffiths stated that he felt the word 'premature' and much of this had a lot of case
5 law that goes into them. He stated that the word 'premature' had been heavily litigated and comes
6 directly from court review for subdivision ordinances.

7
8 Commissioner Huskins asked whether an incurable factor would perpetuate this to be premature
9 for eternity.

10
11 Planning Director Darling stated that was correct, until something resolved the situation and
12 explained that the City had the right to turn it down if the property was essentially not ready to be
13 subdivided.

14
15 Commissioner Huskins explained that he was fine with it but just felt it was a very strange word
16 to use.

17
18 Planning Director Darling noted that in this case, premature meant, not ready.

19
20 Commissioner Huskins stated that he felt some of the conditions were more than not ready and
21 would never be ready.

22
23 Commissioner Huskins referenced item (6) in this section regarding providing public
24 improvements.

25
26 Planning Director Darling acknowledged that she was not sure what that meant and stated that
27 she also had some questions for the consultant about this.

28
29 Commissioner Johnson referenced the language that stated that it must be provided at public
30 expense and asked if that meant that they were supposed to provide a park that was in a
31 subdivision.

32
33 Planning Director Darling stated that many subdividers do that.

34
35 Commissioner Johnson asked if that was how the City wanted it to continue and noted that she
36 felt that there ought to be very little that is actually paid by the public.

37
38 Planning Director Darling agreed that she felt that they needed to have more internal
39 conversations with the consultants about what they intended with this section. She stated that
40 she gets the impression that it was serving as more of a catch-all section, which made her a bit
41 nervous.

42
43 Commissioner Huskins stated that he also questioned the use of the word 'reasonably' and gave
44 the example of something that was aesthetically pleasing to one person would not be for another.
45 He questioned what was meant by using the word reasonably in this statement and asked whose
46 reason would take precedence.

47
48 Planning Director Darling reiterated that was something that they would have to discuss with the
49 consultants.

50

1 Commissioner Johnson asked if there was anything with a premature application that would come
2 before the Planning Commission.

3
4 Planning Director Darling stated that depending on the type of application, it may come before
5 the Planning Commission as well as the City Council. She moved the discussion onto subdivision
6 11, appeal of decisions and explained that if someone did not like something she decided would
7 be appealed directly to the City Council but noted that in the Zoning Ordinance it would go to the
8 Planning Commission first. She noted that, in this case, they could also have the Commission
9 review it and make a recommendation to the Council as well.

10
11 Chair Eggenberger asked if the 30 days in item 11.b. was statutory.

12
13 Planning Director Darling stated that she was not sure if that was exactly what it said in statute or
14 if they were just putting a time period in there.

15
16 Commissioner Johnson questioned the use of the word 'delivery' and if that meant by e-mail,
17 phone call, putting it in USPS, receipt of USPS, or by certified mail. She stated that she felt that
18 30 days was a tight timeline so she felt that there should be something that talks about specifics
19 related to delivery.

20
21 Planning Director Darling explained that typically it was the date that the Council acted on a
22 resolution, but if there was an administrative review, it may be the date that she put something in
23 writing and sent it out. She noted that e-mail had the same weight as USPS mail.

24
25 Commissioner Huskins asked if in 11.b, 'serve' was implying a subpoena.

26
27 City Planner Griffiths clarified that it would not necessarily be a subpoena but they would
28 essentially inform the City with the notice of the appeal, and there would be a signed authorization
29 by the City that it was received.

30
31 Commissioner Huskins explained that he wanted to just point this out in case it needed further
32 clarification in future drafts. He referenced subdivision 10.a where it stated, 'unless substantial
33 changes have been made which warrant reconsideration' and questioned the use of the word
34 'substantial'. He explained that he would prefer it be something more clear that remediates all
35 prior concerns that were raised.

36
37 Planning Director Darling stated that was usually her determination on whether it was substantially
38 changed and explained that this was trying to prevent nuisance subsequent applications. She
39 moved the discussion onto subdivision 12, registered land surveys and explained that she
40 recommended this be put into applications because they are a separate type of application and
41 not really a procedure. She noted that for subdivision 13, amendments, she liked having this
42 section because it essentially was saying that if they were amending their preliminary plat, for
43 example, they had to follow the same procedure that they did for the first one.

44
45 Commissioner Johnson stated that was not the way she read it and had actually thought it meant
46 that the actual subdivision had to go through this review.

47
48 Planning Director Darling stated that these were actual amendments to the code and agreed that
49 they were not appropriate for the common practices as well.

1 Commissioner Huskins referenced subdivision 12.c. and noted that he read this and was
2 surprised because he did not think the Planning Commission ever had anything to do with building
3 permits.
4

5 Planning Director Darling explained that the Planning Commission does because they review
6 preliminary plats and this was saying that the City cannot issue a building permit on registered
7 land surveys until they have actually been approved.
8

9 City Planner Griffiths noted that registered land surveys are a bit goofy because of the way they
10 are done. He explained that there may be situations where a registered land survey could get
11 approved and accepted for a property but the City may not be aware of it. He stated that this
12 section was basically saying that if this happens and the City has not seen it yet, there was not
13 an obligation to issue a building permit until they go through the whole process, as usual.
14

15 Planning Director Darling moved the discussion on the administrative adjustments and noted that
16 this was something new and reviewed various examples of the circumstances when this process
17 would be used. She asked if the Commission would want to notify people in order to let them
18 what was going on in the neighborhood. She stated that there could be a situation where they
19 are notified and the get upset because they cannot really do anything and stating their opposition
20 would not really impact the outcome.
21

22 Commissioner Johnson asked if this was already in City Code.
23

24 Planning Director Darling stated that it was not already in the City Code.
25

26 City Planner Griffiths noted that this is a process that exists in many other communities in the
27 Twin Cities area and explained that many times it is an alternative to judicial review for small
28 issues.
29

30 Commissioner Johnson stated that she felt this seemed like it was a bit more than a minor
31 adjustment and explained that she was not sure she could support it.
32

33 Commissioner Holker noted that it would still have to fall within the guidance for the zoning, so
34 the City cannot turn it down.
35

36 Commissioner Johnson referenced the administrative adjustment 1.c. where it talks about not
37 being in violation of this chapter, the Zoning Code or the building code and asked if it should also
38 include the Comprehensive Plan.
39

40 Planning Director Darling explained the division of a base lot and shared examples around the
41 City.
42

43 Commissioner Johnson asked if an administrative adjustment could be made without notifying the
44 other side.
45

46 Planning Director Darling clarified that one person would own it until it was subdivided. She noted
47 that there was one other type of subdivision that the City has no authority over which would be a
48 condo plat where they would not own the land and just owned a portion of the home. She
49 reiterated that this would be another type of subdivision but would not be under the City's purview.
50

CITY OF SHOREWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

JANUARY 7, 2025

Page 9 of 16

Commissioner Johnson stated that the question for the Commission to consider was whether they want to separate the administrative adjustments out or leave them within the minor subdivision.

There was consensus of the Commission to separate administrative adjustments from minor subdivisions.

Commissioner Johnson asked for additional context on a base lot.

Planning Director Darling gave an overview of base lots and shared an example of the lots at Lake Park Villas and explained that development was a unit lot/base lot subdivision. She moved the discussion onto minor subdivisions and noted that her recommendation was that it not be more than 2 lots and should not be on any lot that was not previously platted.

Commissioner Huskins asked about the items that referenced in the R-1D zoning district neither lot may be greater than 125% of the minimum lot size for the zoning district.

Planning Director Darling stated that she has not yet found the story for why that was included in the City's current code and had planned to ask the consultants to remove this from the code.

Commissioner Johnson noted that this language was also used in the administrative adjustment section.

Planning Director Darling explained that she felt the language should also be removed from that section.

Commissioner Johnson asked if this was something that normally the Planning Commission would have normally considered, but now it goes straight to the City Council.

Planning Director Darling explained that was what the consultant had suggested and noted that they could continue to have it go before the Planning Commission. She explained that the current procedure for a minor subdivision did not include notice to the neighborhood if it didn't require a variance and, in her opinion, if you have a public process, there should be some type of notice given.

Commissioner Johnson clarified that her question was whether it would make more sense for it to come to the Planning Commission first and make a recommendation.

Commissioner Holker stated that she keeps going back to the fact that if there are no variances, whether there would ever be a reason that the Commission wouldn't recommend approval other than their own personal preference. She noted that she wonders if it should come before the Planning Commission and would need to have a public hearing if there was actually nothing that could be done if people didn't like it, as long as it fit within the City guidelines. She stated that if there was nothing that the City can do about it she would question why they would want to just frustrate the public by coming and giving their opinion, when essentially the City would say thank you, but we cannot change anything.

Chair Eggenberger stated that he agreed with Commissioner Holker.

Commissioner Huskins stated that the issue would then become if there is a variance, it would have to come before the Planning Commission and would require a public hearing. He stated

1 that he felt that there would be people there who would pay no attention to the variance request
2 because they hate what is there.

3
4 Commissioner Johnson asked, if they made the determination that a public hearing would only
5 be necessary if there was a variance request, who would make sure that it complied with all the
6 City Code and everything.

7
8 Commissioner Holker stated that she assumed that would be handled by the Planning
9 Department.

10
11 Commissioner Johnson referenced subdivision 4b under minor subdivisions and stated that she
12 felt that this should just be for the Comprehensive Plan and not include mission, values, and
13 policies.

14
15 Commissioner Huskins stated that he felt it came back to whether the City Council would want
16 the Planning Commission to look at the cut-and-dried minor subdivisions even if there were no
17 variances and asked how the Commission felt about that approach.

18
19 Planning Director Darling confirmed that was a question that she would be asking the Council.

20
21 Chair Eggenberger noted that even if the Commission didn't review it, staff would still give the
22 Council a recommendation.

23
24 ***There was a consensus that the Commission was comfortable with no notice***
25 ***requirements.***

26
27 Commissioner Johnson suggested that wherever there was a statement that included the
28 Comprehensive Plans mission, vision and values, that they take a look at that and explained that
29 she was not sure how 'squishy' that was supposed to be.

30
31 City Planner Griffiths stated that his guess was that wording was intended to encompass the
32 entire Comprehensive Plan, but noted that they could probably say the same thing using less
33 words.

34
35 Planning Director Darling moved the discussion onto preliminary plats and noted that the proposal
36 was not very different than the current process. She noted that the things that will likely change
37 would be to modernize the submittal requirements.

38
39 City Planner Griffiths explained that preliminary and final plats have the most statutory guardrails
40 in place and can be more standardized from city to city.

41
42 Planning Director Darling explained that she would like to extend how long the application
43 approval was good for and would like to change it from 6 months to 12 months.

44
45 Commissioner Huskins noted that what had caught his eye within the summary of changes was
46 under subdivision variances where it talked about removal of the need for a public notice/hearing.

47
48 Planning Director Darling stated that she would like to change that to a public meeting because
49 the published notice in the newspaper does nothing. She stated that she thinks only once or twice
50 in her 30 years of planning has she had people come and ask about legal notices.

1 Commissioner Johnson referenced the preliminary plat requirements and asked if the third party
2 permissions for things such as trails that go through property had to be identified.

3
4 Planning Director Darling stated that it would not need to be identified and explained that it would
5 be a permit from another jurisdiction that the City would have to see before they could subdivide.

6
7 Commissioner Huskins asked if they could move onto park dedication and asked why there was
8 a difference in the park dedication calculation between residential and non-residential
9 developments.

10
11 Planning Director Darling explained that usually, commercial projects do not have to pay the same
12 rate of park dedication that residential does which was in direct proportion to the lesser use
13 generated by commercial properties which is why it was changed from 8% to 5%.

14
15 Commissioner Johnson stated that she would like to see this amount remain at 8% for both
16 commercial and residential.

17
18 Commissioner Huskins asked if a parcel had already paid park dedication at the beginning
19 whether it would be required to pay more if they subdivided.

20
21 Planning Director Darling stated that they be required to pay more, but they would get credit for
22 the amount that they had previously paid.

23
24 Commissioner Johnson asked about subdivision 2 under park dedication regarding cash in lieu
25 of land and suggested that this be struck wherever it appeared in the document because it was
26 primarily based on the value of raw land. She stated that it talks about going into the City Park
27 Fund but there isn't much said about the use of it once it goes into that fund and explained that
28 she objected because she felt there ought to be a dedication of land because that is a big part of
29 what makes Shorewood what it is today.

30
31 Planning Director Darling explained that Shorewood was a built-out City, according to the
32 Comprehensive Plan which meant that they do not acquire more land for parks unless it was
33 directly adjacent to an existing park or in an area of need, such as south of Galpin Lake. She
34 stated that what the City was looking for with each subdivision was the cash payment and noted
35 that most of the park dedication that the City receives is actually in the form of cash in lieu of land.
36 She explained that this cash goes into a special fund and are used for improvements to existing
37 parks or acquisition of park land.

38
39 Commissioner Johnson stated that this says that you cannot get any more existing land but she
40 felt that they could if they kept the existing percentages.

41
42 City Planner Griffiths stated that one thing to think about is when they talk about acquiring land, it
43 has to be within the boundary of the subdivision, if the City was going to take park land. He
44 clarified that meant that they could not go somewhere else and buy additional property but would
45 mean that if someone, for example, came forward with a 3-lot subdivision on one acre of land,
46 that parkland would have to be contained within the area and would essentially be a postage
47 stamp park. He explained that the park dedication money allows the City to accept the payment
48 and then spend the money in a location to buy land adjacent to an existing park rather than being
49 shoehorned into the exact site location.

1 Commissioner Huskins asked who made the determination about land versus money for park
2 dedication.

3
4 Planning Director Darling explained that the requests go to the Park Commission for a
5 recommendation to the City Council, but noted that it goes back to the Comprehensive Plan and
6 what it says which is that the City would prefer to have cash over having small bits of land
7 throughout the City.

8
9 Commissioner Johnson asked if trails would be considered parks.

10
11 Planning Director Darling stated that some cities do consider trails as parks, but in Shorewood,
12 they are funded through the Street Fund, except for things like the trails in Freeman Park.

13
14 Commissioner Johnson stated that she just felt that this language did not have enough meat
15 around it.

16
17 Planning Director Darling agreed that the language in this section may still need a bit of work.

18
19 Commissioner Johnson stated that she would be interested in seeing how the percentages for
20 park dedication were handled in other cities, such as for commercial properties, and reiterated
21 that she felt the language used was a bit weak. She clarified that she did not like that the City
22 could not get land.

23
24 Chair Eggenberger asked if the Commission was ready to wrap up their discussion on this agenda
25 item.

26
27 Commissioner Johnson asked if the Commission would see this document again after the
28 revisions have been made.

29
30 Planning Director Darling stated that it would come back before the Commission.

31
32 Chair Eggenberger recessed the meeting at 9:07 p.m. and reconvened at 9:11 p.m.

33
34 C. Discussion of Zoning Ordinance Amendments to the R-3A and Related Amendments
35 Needed to Implement Medium Density Land Use
36 Applicant: City Initiated

37
38 Planning Director Darling gave an overview of the Zoning Ordinance amendments to the R-3A
39 that were necessary in order to implement medium density land use that would allow 6-8 units
40 per acre. She outlined some of the amendments she was proposing including changing 'elderly
41 housing' to 'age-restricted housing'.

42
43 Commissioner Huskins asked about the use of the term subdivision and if when he sees it he
44 should be thinking about the previous agenda item.

45
46 Planning Director Darling stated that was correct but noted that there is one section that was
47 currently located in the Zoning Ordinance that she was recommending be moved to the
48 Subdivision Ordinance which was the subdivision of twin homes and townhomes into separate
49 lots for ownership.

1 Commissioner Huskins stated that he also thought it was very clear that they were cutting out
2 two-family homes from this because they cannot get the density, but in many portions of the
3 document two family homes were still included.
4

5 Planning Director Darling suggested that they go through those because in some cases there will
6 be standard conditions that apply to more than just these two zoning districts. She began the
7 overview of the proposed changes beginning with definitions and the removal of quadrominium
8 and just refer them to townhouses.
9

10 Commissioner Johnson referenced the marina property and the other properties that were
11 discussed recently, it says allows development of between 6 and 8 units per acre and asked if
12 the dredging company property, for example, would be 6 to 8 units.
13

14 Planning Director Darling clarified that the dredging company property was guided for high-density
15 development. She noted that the property they were looking at tonight was the property that has
16 the dry storage of boats for the marina and the marina itself which are separate parcels from the
17 dredging company. She noted that the parcel was a bit deceptive because the southern portion
18 of the property is all wetland.
19

20 Commissioner Johnson asked if this meant that the marina property had to have 6 to 8 residential
21 units.
22

23 Planning Director Darling stated that they can use it as a marina indefinitely, but if there was some
24 other use, without a zoning change, they could also propose to redevelop it for townhouses or
25 apartments.
26

27 Commissioner Holker stated that depending on what their overall acreage was without the
28 wetland areas, it will be more than just an overall 6 to 8 units per acre and would most likely be
29 more than that.
30

31 Planning Director Darling clarified that it would actually be less than that amount after the removal
32 of the wetlands.
33

34 Commissioner Huskins asked Planning Director Darling to review the townhouse-attached
35 definition.
36

37 Planning Director Darling reviewed examples of attached townhouses, including row homes or
38 back-to-back homes.
39

40 Commissioner Huskins noted that as stated here, a detached townhouse would not be acceptable
41 in this district.
42

43 Planning Director Darling clarified that it would not be, except through a PUD.
44

45 Commissioner Huskins explained that when he read this he understood it to be apartments or
46 townhomes, but not two-family dwellings, and reiterated that within the document he kept finding
47 references to two-family dwellings, which he found confusing.
48

49 Planning Director Darling moved the discussion onto the proposed changes in the districts.
50

CITY OF SHOREWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

JANUARY 7, 2025

Page 14 of 16

1 Commissioner Huskins referenced subdivision 4.c (1) under R-3A and asked why the required
2 side yard setbacks shall not be any greater than 30 feet.

3
4 Planning Director Darling stated that was all existing language, so she was not sure why it was
5 put in there. She noted that side yards are typically 10 or 15 feet and would rarely be more than
6 15 feet.

7
8 Commissioner Huskins stated that they have gotten used to seeing things were people are not
9 hitting what they were supposed to and essentially look the other way if someone has more of a
10 setback than the code says that they need.

11
12 Planning Director Darling stated that this caps the required setback, but noted that people can
13 still have more of a side yard setback than 30 feet, but it was not required.

14
15 Commissioner Huskins suggested that they may want to work on the wording on this item.

16
17 Planning Director Darling explained that there were very few parcels in the City that this section
18 would apply to so they could remove schools and recreational buildings in a few districts.

19
20 Commissioner Huskins clarified that he was not implying that it should be removed but just that
21 the language just be made more clear.

22
23 Commissioner Johnson stated that she wouldn't mind the removal of subdivision 4.c.

24
25 Planning Director Darling stated that it had to be included.

26
27 Commissioner Huskins reiterated that if it was kept in, he would like it to be worded a bit more
28 clearly.

29
30 Planning Director Darling reiterated that they could remove schools and recreation buildings from
31 some of the districts because everything did not need to be allowed.

32
33 Commissioner Johnson stated that the medium density requirements are for 6 to 8 units per acre
34 and asked if it could go higher than that.

35
36 Planning Director Darling stated that it could not go higher than 6 to 8 units per acre and clarified
37 that it would be capped at 8 units per acre.

38
39 Commissioner Johnson stated that she found the lot size changes to be strange.

40
41 Planning Director Darling explained that the sizes were what would be needed in order to get to
42 6 to 8 units per acre.

43
44 Commissioner Huskins asked if there was a difference between dwelling unit and unit.

45
46 Planning Director Darling stated that there was not a difference and noted that her hope was to
47 correct these references so it would be 'unit' through most of the ordinance.

48
49 Commissioner Huskins referenced Subd. 7 where the word dwelling was a new word that had
50 been added.

51

1 Planning Director Darling offered to take it out if the Commission would like.

2
3 Commissioner Huskins stated that if unit and dwelling unit were essentially the same, he would
4 think that they should all be referred to as the same thing.

5
6 Planning Director Darling explained that in this reference, she had put in dwelling unit because
7 this was a unit of housing versus a unit of paper or other product.

8
9 Commissioner Huskins stated that if both commercial and residential were included in this
10 document he felt it would make sense to use dwelling unit.

11
12 Commissioner Johnson pointed out a small typographical error in Section 3, subdivision 4.c.

13
14 Commissioner Huskins referenced Section 3, subdivision 2 a. and noted that the last words in
15 this section say 'with the following standards and limitations', but then it just moves on to item b.

16
17 Planning Director Darling suggested some other language that could be used since it could not
18 just directly follow that statement.

19
20 Commissioner Huskins referenced Section 3, subdivision 3.a (2) asked how many levels there
21 could be for a clubhouse and asked if this point was predicated on something.

22
23 Planning Director Darling stated that she believed that this statement was intended to minimize
24 the size of the clubhouse so it was not a party place.

25
26 City Planner Griffiths stated that the clubhouse would be limited to 2.5 stories in this zoning district.

27
28 Planning Director Darling clarified that the height limitation was listed in subdivision 6.

29
30 Commissioner Johnson stated that in the coming sections they do use two family and townhouse
31 dwellings and asked if they wanted to continue using them that way or if they should be tied to
32 the definitions that were already prepared and shared some examples of where she found these
33 within the document.

34
35 City Planner Griffiths stated that was how they were intended to be used.

36
37 Planning Director Darling stated that those are defined terms.

38
39 Commissioner Holker noted that within Section 3 there was not a subdivision 1.

40
41 City Planner Griffiths clarified that they had simply skipped to subdivision 2 because there were
42 no changes to subdivision 1.

43
44 Commissioner Huskins referenced the table related to parking lot dimensions and asked for a
45 simple explanation of the statement delineated by an asterisk.

46
47 Planning Director Darling explained that this statement had a typographical error in it which was
48 what she was trying to correct. She stated that when they were calculating the parking space
49 dimensions, they can assume that each space includes 2 feet for vehicle overhang.

50

CITY OF SHOREWOOD PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

JANUARY 7, 2025

Page 16 of 16

Commissioner Huskins noted that in Section 10, subdivision 16, there was a reference to 'townhouse dwelling lots'. He gave the example of language throughout the document that says something like 'shall comply with the Minnesota State building code' and asked if that would be something that would be common for anyone reading this to know what it was and where they could find it.

Planning Director Darling stated that it would be something they anyone reading this would know where it could be found.

Commissioner Johnson pointed out a reference to elderly housing that still needed to be removed.

6. REPORTS

- **Council Meeting Report**

City Planner Griffiths noted that at the last Council meeting, they approved a code amendment that did not come before the Commission related to amendments to native vegetation due to a change in State law.

Planning Director Darling reviewed the agenda for the last Council meeting and gave a brief overview of what was discussed.

- **Draft Next Meeting Agenda**

City Planning Griffiths stated that the Commission can expect their next meeting to be lengthy because there are two subdivision applications, one variance, as well as the next chunk of the subdivision code that was started earlier in the meeting.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Johnson moved, Huskins seconded, adjourning the Planning Commission Meeting of January 7, 2025, at 10:20 P.M. Motion passed 4/0.



City of Shorewood

Planning Commission Meeting Item

Item
4A

Title/Subject: Preliminary Plat for Shorewood Meadow
Meeting Date: February 4, 2025
Prepared by: Jake Griffiths, City Planner
Reviewed by: Marie Darling, Planning Director
Attachments: Location Map
Applicant's Narrative & Plans
Engineer's Memo

APPLICANT: McDonald Construction Partners
LOCATION: 25480 & 25560 Smithtown Rd
REVIEW DEADLINE: May 2, 2025
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Low Density Residential
ZONING: R-1C Single Family

REQUEST

The applicant is requesting a preliminary plat known as Shorewood Meadow to subdivide their 2.33-acre properties into 3 lots. The applicant has also requested a final plat which will be concurrently reviewed by the City Council at an upcoming meeting.

Notice of the application was sent by postcard to all property owners within 750 feet of the properties and a sign was also placed in front of the properties. Notice of the public meeting was sent by US mail to all property owners within 750 feet of the properties at least 10 days prior to the meeting and published in the City's official newspaper. As of the publication of this report, no correspondence has been received from the public regarding this application.



Photo Courtesy: Hennepin County

BACKGROUND

The existing properties were created by Auditor's Subdivision No. 133 in the early 1900s, with the dwelling at 25560 Smithtown Rd being originally constructed in 1910 and the dwelling at 25480 Smithtown Rd being constructed in 1920. No portion of the property is within the floodplain or shoreland zoning district nor does the national wetland inventory indicate a wetland. However, a small wetland (approximately 0.05 acres in size) was identified as part of the applicant's wetland delineation.

The adjacent properties to the north, east and west are all zoned R-1C and the properties to the south across Smithtown Rd are zoned R-1A. The majority of the properties in the vicinity are developed with single-family homes, with the exception of one legally nonconforming commercial property to the south of the site. The Lake Minnetonka LRT Regional Trail also borders the northwest side of the site.

ANALYSIS

Comprehensive Plan: The Comprehensive Plan guides the site as Low Density Residential, with a net density range of 1 to 2 units per acre. The proposed subdivision has a net density of 1.26 units per acre which is consistent with the intent of the Comprehensive Plan.

Lot Width/Area: Section 1202.05 Subd. 2. c. of the subdivision regulations requires that all lots have adequate frontage on a city-approved street. Additionally, section 1201.12 of the zoning regulations has specific area and width requirements for newly created lots. The current and proposed lot areas and widths are shown below. All 3 lots conform to the ordinance requirements.

	Lot Area	Lot Width*
Required by R-1C	20,000 sf	100 ft.
Lot 1	35,639 sf	206 ft.
Lot 2	31,323 sf	100 ft.
Lot 3	36,935 sf	106 ft.

*As measured at the front setback

Setbacks: The lots are adequately sized to accommodate a house that would meet the R-1C setbacks.

Impervious Surface Coverage/Stormwater run-off: The applicant would provide the required storm water rate control by providing infiltration basins on each lot. The applicant indicates the subdivision would create about 24,732 square feet of impervious surface coverage and the infiltration basins are adequately sized to provide rate control for that amount of impervious surface coverage. The applicant will also be required to obtain a permit from the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District and address all comments from the City Engineer.

Easements: Section 1202.05 Subd. 6. requires 10-foot drainage and utility easements around the periphery of each lot and the applicant has shown conforming easements on their plans.

Utilities: All 3 lots have access to both municipal sewer and water. Subdivisions of four lots or greater are required to connect to city water. The applicant has to date indicated they are willing to connect to city water.

Tree Preservation: The applicant has submitted a tree inventory, and the plans show 10 mature trees would be removed as part of the subdivision. Based on the size of the property and the size of the trees removed, the applicant is required to plant 20 new trees. The applicant has provided a landscaping plan which meets this requirement.

FINDINGS/RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the preliminary plat on the finding that the subdivided lots would be consistent with the intent of the subdivision and zoning requirements, subject to the following conditions:

- Prior to recording the plat, the applicant shall complete the following:
 - Acquire all permits from other applicable jurisdictions having an interest in the site.

- Revise the plans to conform with City Code and the engineer's memo.
 - Pay required utility connection fees and park dedication for all 3 lots.
 - Submit an executed stormwater maintenance agreements for the lots.
- Prior to construction of a home on the new lot, provide the following:
 - Proof of recording for the plat, resolution, easements, and other recorded documents.
 - Proof that all existing structures have been removed in accordance with the demolition plan.
 - Proof that all existing wells have been sealed in accordance with Minnesota Department of Health requirements.

The Planning Commission is requested to hold a public hearing on the proposed preliminary plat, take any testimony provided, and make a recommendation to City Council.

25480 Smithtown Road Location Map





McDonald
CONSTRUCTION PARTNERS



Love Being Home.





Shorewood Meadow Community Narrative

Presented by: McDonald Construction Partners, LLC

About McDonald Construction Partners

Our Homes

- 2025 Parade Models
- Past Models
- Custom Plans
- Signature Homes

Our Communities

- Johnson Ridge, Eden Prairie
- Ensonced Woods, Chaska
- Twin Pine Fields, Afton
- Hampton Hills, Plymouth

Shorewood Meadow Proposed Plan

- Project Location
- Intersection of Eureka Road and Smithtown Road
- 3-Lot Subdivision with No Variance Request



McDonald
CONSTRUCTION PARTNERS

About Us



Locally owned since 1978,

- McDonald has been one of Minnesota's most respected and trusted names in the home building industry.
- Our staff and building partners are an experienced home-town team dedicated to providing the latest in innovative design and construction measures that exceed industry standards.

Difference in the details

- We believe details are what distinguish a custom home. Our in-house design team and home consultants combine their experience and creativity with the goals you have for your home.
- Unique architectural designs
- Every McDonald home is MN Green Path tested
- When site conditions allow, we build all homes to be solar ready



McDonald
CONSTRUCTION PARTNERS

2025 Parade of Homes Spring Preview Models



BIRCH MODEL
11136 Johnson Ridge
Eden Prairie, MN



WILLOW MODEL
737 Enslonced Way
Owens, MN



CUSTOM MODEL
5226 Osgood Ave S
Afton, MN



McDonald
CONSTRUCTION PARTNERS

Our Communities



LOTS AVAILABLE: Lot 1 and Lot 5

The Hills at Johnson Ridge is located in the award-winning Eden Prairie school district, this community offer privacy and wooded views. While you will feel like you are in your own private retreat, it's just minutes from all of Eden Prairie's vast amenities, including the Eden Prairie Shopping Center, Hyland Hills Ski Area, and Anderson Lakes' and Hyland Park Reserves – all while being just 25 minutes from Downtown Minneapolis and the Minneapolis-St. Paul Airport.



LOTS AVAILABLE: Block 1: Lot 1, Lot 2
Block 2: Lot 4 and 5 Block 4: Lot 6, Lot 7

Ensnorced Woods is a new community designed to connect its residents with nature and one another. Nestled among mature trees on the southwest edge of the Twin Cities metro area. The community was designed to preserve as many trees as possible and minimize disruption to the hydrology and local wildlife, yet still offer flexible options for basements and beautiful backyard views. Located in East Carver School District #112.



LOTS AVAILABLE: Lot 1, Lot 2, Lot 4, Lot 5, Lot 6

Twin Pine Fields, an exquisite new neighborhood where spaciousness and natural beauty meet to create an idyllic living experience. Nestled among rolling hills and scenic landscapes, Twin Pine Fields offers generous 2.5 acre lots that provide ample space for your dream home and outdoor aspirations. Here, you'll find tranquility and room to breathe, while still being close to many amenities, including Lake Elmo Park Preserve and downtown Stillwater.



LOTS AVAILABLE: Block 1: Lot 1, Lot 2, Lot 3 Block 2: Lot 1 Design in Process



LOTS AVAILABLE: Lot 14; Design in Process



McDonald
CONSTRUCTION PARTNERS

Past Model Homes

PAST MODEL HOMES



SERENITY MODEL



BALSAM MODEL



DREAM HOME MODEL



MAGNOLIA SPORT MODEL



McDonald Signature Plan

The Spruce

SPRUCE



McDonald Signature Plan

The Spruce



The Birch




McDonald
CONSTRUCTION PARTNERS

McDonald Signature Plan

The Birch



Proposed Development Plan



Love being home.

"Love being home" isn't just a phrase, it's a feeling. We craft homes that are architects of experiences, fostering connection, sanctuary, and the perfect melody of life's moments.



McDonald
CONSTRUCTION PARTNERS

Proposed Development Plan




SHOREWOOD MEADOW FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS

SHOREWOOD MEADOW
 1000 S. 1000 E.
 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84143
 PHONE: 801.468.1000
 FAX: 801.468.1001
 WWW: SHOREWOODMEADOW.COM

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
 KENNETH L. HARRIS
 1000 S. 1000 E.
 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84143
 PHONE: 801.468.1000
 FAX: 801.468.1001
 WWW: SHOREWOODMEADOW.COM

ARCHITECTURAL FIRM
 J. L. HARRIS & ASSOCIATES
 1000 S. 1000 E.
 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84143
 PHONE: 801.468.1000
 FAX: 801.468.1001
 WWW: SHOREWOODMEADOW.COM



Love being home.

"Love being home" isn't just a phrase, it's a feeling. We craft homes that are architects of experiences, fostering connection, sanctuary, and the perfect melody of life's moments.



McDonald
 CONSTRUCTION PARTNERS

Aerial View





Thank You!



McDonald
CONSTRUCTION PARTNERS

DESCRIPTION:

PARCEL 1:

Lot 15, Auditor's Subdivision No. 133, Hennepin County, Minnesota

Abstract Property

Property Address: 25560 Smithtown Road, Shorewood, MN 55331

PARCEL 2:

Lot 16, Auditor's Subdivision No. 133, Hennepin County, Minnesota

Torrens Property

Property Address: 25480 Smithtown Road, Shorewood, MN 55331

PROPERTY SUMMARY:

LOT 1: 35,639 SQ. FT. - 0.818 AC
LOT 2: 31,323 SQ. FT. - 0.719 AC
LOT 3: 36,935 SQ. FT. - 0.848 AC
TOTAL SITE AREA: 103,897 SQ. FT. - 2.385 AC

LOT SUMMARY:

NUMBER OF LOTS: 3
AVERAGE LOT SIZE: 34,632 SQ. FT. - 0.795 AC
MINIMUM LOT SIZE: 31,324 SQ. FT. - 0.719 AC
MAXIMUM LOT SIZE: 36,935 SQ. FT. - 0.848 AC

SITE DENSITY:

PROPOSED DENSITY: 1.26 UNITS PER ACRE


SITE SETBACK:

R 1C
MIN. LOT SIZE: 20,000 SF
MIN. LOT WIDTH: 100' AT FRONT SETBACK
MIN. LOT DEPTH: 120'
FRONT STBK (ROW): 35'
SIDE YARD STBK (ROW): 35'
SIDE YARD STBK (INT.): 10' MIN.
REAR STBK: 40'

DEVELOPMENT NOTES:


- ALL DIMENSIONS ARE ROUNDED TO THE TENTH OF A FOOT.
- ALL AREAS ARE ROUNDED TO THE NEAREST SQUARE FOOT.
- DRAINAGE AND UTILITY EASEMENTS SHALL BE PROVIDED AS REQUIRED. DRAINAGE AND UTILITY EASEMENTS WILL BE PROVIDED OVER ALL PUBLIC UTILITIES AND UP TO 1 FOOT ABOVE THE HIGH WATER LEVEL OF ALL PONDS.

VICINITY MAP




LEGEND:

- FOUND VOLUNTARY
- ⊙ FOUND CAST IRON MONUMENT
- SET VOLUNTARY MARKED IS 14891
- BOUNDARY LINE
- RIGHT OF WAY LINE
- UNDERLYING / ADJACENT LOT
- TIE LINE
- SECTION LINE
- PLAT DISTANCE / BEARING
- EAST-NORTH LINE



SUBMITTALS & REVISIONS

Rev. Date By Description
17/03/24 NHH INITIAL PRELIMINARY & TENTATIVE SUBMITTAL



ATERRA
LAND SERVICES
18219 70th Pl N, Maple Grove MN 55311
763.360.1307 | nate@aterraland.com

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PLAN, SPECIFICATION OR REPORT WAS PREPARED BY ME OR UNDER MY DIRECT SUPERVISION AND THAT I AM A DULY LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA.
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
Nathan R. Herman
LICENSE NO. 47982 DATE XX/XX/XXXX

PROJECT #: 24003
DRAWN: NRH
CHECKED: JML
PLAN DATE: XX/XX/XXXX

SHOREWOOD MEADOW
SHOREWOOD, MN
MCDONALD CONSTRUCTION PARTNERS, LLC

SHEET PAGE # REV.

SHOREWOOD MEADOW



R.T. DOC. NO. _____
C.R. DOC. NO. _____

KNOW ALL PERSONS BY THESE PRESENTS: That McDonald Construction Partners, LLC, a Minnesota limited liability company, fee owner, of the following described property situated in the County of Hennepin, State of Minnesota, to wit:

Lot 15, AUDITOR'S SUBDIVISION NO. 133

AND

Lot 16, AUDITORS SUBDIVISION NO. 133 (Torrens)

Has caused the same to be surveyed and platted as SHOREWOOD MEADOW, and does hereby grant to the City of Shorewood the easements for drainage and utility purposes as shown on this plat.

In witness whereof said McDonald Construction Partners, LLC, a Minnesota limited liability company, has caused these presents to be signed by its proper officer this _____ day of _____, 20____.

McDonald Construction Partners, LLC

SIGNED: _____
Dave Remick, Manager

By: _____, as _____

STATE OF MINNESOTA
COUNTY OF _____

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this _____ day of _____, 20____, by
Dave Remick, as Manager of McDonald Construction Partners, LLC, a Minnesota limited liability company, on behalf of the corporation.

Notary Public, _____ County, Minnesota
My Commission Expires _____ Notary Printed Name

I Robert B. Sikich do hereby certify that this plat was prepared by me or under my direct supervision; that I am a duly Licensed Land Surveyor in the State of Minnesota; that this plat is a correct representation of the boundary survey; that all mathematical data and labels are correctly designated on this plat; that all monuments depicted on this plat have been, or will be correctly set within one year; that all water boundaries and wet lands, as defined in Minnesota Statutes, Section 505.01, Subd. 3, as of the date of this certificate are shown and labeled on this Plat; and all public ways are shown and labeled on this plat.

Dated this _____ day of _____, 20____.

Robert B. Sikich, Licensed Land Surveyor,
Minnesota License No. 14891

STATE OF MINNESOTA
COUNTY OF _____

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this _____ day of _____, 20____, by Robert B. Sikich, a Licensed Land Surveyor.

Notary Public, _____ County, Minnesota
My Commission Expires _____ Notary Printed Name

SHOREWOOD, MINNESOTA

This plat of SHOREWOOD MEADOW was approved and accepted by the City Council of Shorewood, Minnesota, at a regular meeting thereof held this _____ day of 20____. If applicable, the written comments and recommendations of the Commissioner of Transportation and the County Highway Engineer have been received by the City or the prescribed 30-day period has elapsed without receipt of such comments and recommendations, as provided by Minnesota Statutes, Section 505.03, Subdivision 2.

City Council, Shorewood, Minnesota

By: _____ Mayor By: _____ Clerk

RESIDENT AND REAL ESTATE SERVICES, Hennepin County, Minnesota

I hereby certify that taxes payable in 20____ and prior years have been paid for land described on this plat, dated this _____ day of _____, 20____.

Mark V. Chapin, County Auditor By: _____, Deputy

SURVEY DIVISION, Hennepin County, Minnesota

Pursuant to Minnesota Statutes Section 383B.565 (1969), this plat has been approved this _____ day of _____, 20____.

Chris F. Mavis, County Surveyor By: _____

REGISTRAR OF TITLES, Hennepin County, Minnesota


I hereby certify that the within plat of SHOREWOOD MEADOWS was filed in this office this _____ day of _____, 20____, at _____ o'clock _____.M.

Martin McCormick, Registrar of Titles By: _____, Deputy

COUNTY RECORDER, Hennepin County, Minnesota

I hereby certify that the within plat of SHOREWOOD MEADOWS was recorded in this office this _____ day of _____, 20____, at _____ o'clock _____.M.

Martin McCormick, County Recorder By: _____, Deputy





MEMORANDUM

Date: January 13, 2025
To: Marie Darling, Planning Director
From: Andrew Budde, PE
Subject: 5755 Country Club Road
City of Shorewood
Project No.: C16.120219

The following documents were submitted for review of compliance with the City of Shorewood's City Code, Local Surface Water Management Plan, and Engineering Standards:

- Final Civil Plans & SWPPP dated 12/20/24 prepared by Aterra Land Services
- Stormwater Management Plan dated 12/20/2024 prepared by Civil Methods, Inc
- Preliminary and Final Plat prepared by Aterra Land Services

This review only included the documents listed above, primarily dealing with city infrastructure, grading, modelling, and stormwater management.

General Site:

1. The final plat should include 10-foot-wide drainage & utility easements around the perimeter of all lots.
2. The driveway of Lot 1 should not extend into the side drainage & utility easements.
3. Construct B618 concrete curb & gutter along the properties length on Smithtown Road and ensure Smithtown Road is 26 feet wide face to face. Provide a curb cut at the location where erosion control blanket is shown in the plan so that the water can drain through the onsite wetland prior to draining to the HCRRA ditch.
4. Proposed retaining walls are shown as 7 feet in height. All walls 4 feet or taller will need to be designed by a licensed engineer, protected from falls with fencing, and require a separate building permit.
5. Provide final construction plan sheets signed by engineer licensed in MN.

Drainage:

6. Consideration should be given to the staging of the overall site. It is anticipated that the developer will be required to construct any improvements that impact the street (ie: curb, utilities services, etc.) so that they can be coordinated and minimize impacts to the traveling public. However, the swales between the lots may be challenging to construct during individual home construction if not closely coordinated and staked.
7. The soil borings provided for the development only encountered water at a depth of 10 feet. However, the borings were not left open for an adequate amount of time to be able to capture a more consistent ground water depth. The USDA Soil Survey identifies L25A and L36A, both of which identify ground water to be within 12 inches to 24 inches of the surface. Since all lot are

proposed to be WO, it shall be required to provide footing drains that daylight to the existing grade. The external footing drains should be routed independently of the surface water drains so that they don't unintentionally saturate the footings.

8. Provide a calculation of existing vs proposed flows entering the onsite wetland for the 2, 10, 100 years storm event.
9. The storm water calculations included in the submittal appear to meet all of the development requirements. It is anticipated that these will be reviewed on an individual Building Permit basis as the lots will likely include additional impervious surface for back yard patios or other impervious surfaces.
10. At time of Building Permit a Storm Water Maintenance Agreement will need to be completed and recorded against the property.
11. A permit will be required with Minnehaha Creek Watershed District for Erosion and Sediment Control.

Utilities:

12. Sanitary sewer cleanouts cannot be in city right of way. They should be placed at the right of way line or on private property and try to avoid 90 degree corners.
13. The sewer service for Lot 3 is preferred to be extended to the right of way on its existing alignment and then take a more direct route to the home. It would then extend through the proposed drainage & utility easements of Lot 2 to provide for a straighter alignment.
14. The sewer services for Lot 1 appears to be approximately 162 feet upstream from the manhole at the intersection of Smithtown Road and the Lake Minnetonka Regional Trail. In the submitted plans it is shown at approximately 90 feet. City staff will look to confirm its existing location.

SHOREWOOD MEADOW

FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS

DEVELOPMENT TEAM:

DEVELOPER/OWNER
MCDONALD CONSTRUCTION PARTNERS, LLC
2570 LUDICAL ROAD, SUITE 125
BURNVILLE, MN
TEL 952.432.7501
CONTACT: DAVE REMICK
EMAIL: DAVER@MCDONALDCONSTRUCTION.COM


DEVELOPER REPRESENTATIVE
HAROLD WYORRELL
TEL 612.501.8813
EMAIL: HWYORRELL@HANNIGAN.COM

CIVIL ENGINEER / SURVEYOR
ATERRA LAND SERVICES
18219 70TH PL N
MAPLE GROVE, MN 55311
TEL 763.360.1307
ENGINEER: NATE HERMAN, PE
EMAIL: NATE@ATERRALAND.COM
SURVEYING: JASON LEIMOLA
EMAIL: JASON@ATERRALAND.COM

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
DAVIDSON GROUP
PO BOX 10
WAYzata, MN 55391
TEL 612.440.0994
CONTACT: JOSH MCKINNEY, LSA
EMAIL: JMcKINNEY@DAVIDSONGROUP.COM

STORMWATER DESIGN
CIVIL, METHODS, INC.
PO BOX 28088
ST. PAUL, MN 55128
TEL 763.210.5713
CONTACT: DAVE POGOS, PE
EMAIL: DAVE.POGOS@CIVILMETHODS.COM

LOCATION MAP



SITE DATA & ZONING NOTES

PARCEL ADDRESS: 25480 & 25560 SMITHTOWN RD, SHOREWOOD, MN
PID: 3311724230005 AND 3311723230004
EXISTING ZONING: RESIDENTIAL R-1C
CURRENT GUIDING: RESIDENTIAL R-1C
PROPOSED ZONING: RESIDENTIAL R-1C
PROPOSED LOT COUNT: 3 SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL LOTS
DENSITY CALCULATION:
GROSS PARCEL AREA: 2.385 ACRES (103,897 SF)
PROPOSED GROSS DENSITY: $1/2.4 = 1.25 \text{ UNITS/AC}$
WETLAND AREA: 0.051 AC (2,215 SF)
NET PARCEL AREA: 2.334 ACRES
PROPOSED NET DENSITY: $1/2.334 = 1.29 \text{ UNITS/AC}$

MINIMUM LOT REQUIREMENTS AND BLDG. SETBACKS R-1C

MIN. LOT SIZE: 20,000 SF
MIN. LOT WIDTH: 100 FT AT FRONT SETBACK
MIN. LOT DEPTH: 120 FT
FRONT (ROW): 35 FT
SIDE YARD(ROW): 35 FT
SIDE YARD (INTERIOR): 35 FT
REAR: 40 FT
WETLAND BUFFER: 25 FT PER MCDOW
BUFFER SETBACK: NONE

PROPOSED BUILDING PAD DEPTH: 60 FT
LOT WIDTH AT FRONT SETBACK: LOT 1 = 206 FT
LOT 2 = 100 FT
LOT 3 = 106 FT
LOT AREA: LOT 1 = 25,639 SF
LOT 2 = 81,323 SF
LOT 3 = 88,925 SF

IMPERVIOUS:
ALLOWABLE IMPERVIOUS: 93% MAXIMUM
NET AREA: 2.334 AC = 101,642 SF
ALLOWED IMPERVIOUS: 101,642 X 0.93 = 94,524 SF

PROPOSED PRIVATE LOT IMPERVIOUS:
3 UNITS @ 2,969 SF/UNIT = 8,907 SF (BACL. PORCH)
DECK/PATIO, STODP & WALK = 3,459 SF
3 DRIVEWAYS @ 1,153 SF = 3,459 SF
PROPOSED IMPERVIOUS = 12,825 SF (12.5% OF GROSS AREA)

SHEET INDEX

SHEET & PAGE	SHEET TITLE
C1.01	1. TITLE SHEET
C1.02	2. EXISTING CONDITIONS
C1.03	3. DEMOLITION PLAN
C1.04	4. FINAL GRADING PLAN
C1.05	5. FINAL EROSION PLAN
C1.06	6. FINAL UTILITY PLAN
C1.07	7. CITY DETAILS
C1.08	8. FINAL TREE PRESERVATION PLAN
C1.09	9. FINAL LANDSCAPE PLAN

SUBMITTALS & REVISIONS

Rev. Date By Description
1/20/2024 JHL INITIAL PRELIMINARY & FINAL PLAN SUBMITTAL



ATERRA
LAND SERVICES
18219 70TH PL N, Maple Grove MN 55311
763.360.1307 | nate@aterraland.com


I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PLAN, SPECIFICATION OR REPORT
WAS PREPARED BY ME OR UNDER MY DIRECT SUPERVISION
AND THAT I AM A DULY LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER
UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA.
**NOT FOR
CONSTRUCTION**
Nathan R. Herman
LICENSE NO. 47882 DATE: 10/10/2000

PROJECT #: 24003
DRAWN: NRH
CHECKED: JHL

SHOREWOOD MEADOW
SHOREWOOD, MN
MCDONALD CONSTRUCTION PARTNERS, LLC

TITLE SHEET

SHEET	PAGE #	REV.
C1.01	1	



Property Description:

PARCEL 1:

Lot 15, Auditor's Subdivision No. 133, Hennepin County, Minnesota

Abstract Property

Property Address: 25560 Smithtown Road, Shorewood, MN 55331

PARCEL 2:

Lot 16, Auditor's Subdivision No. 133, Hennepin County, Minnesota

Terrera Property

Property Address: 25480 Smithtown Road, Shorewood, MN 55331

General Notes:

- 1.) Horizontal Datum: The bearing system is based on the Hennepin County coordinate system, NAD83 (1985 Adjust), with an assumed bearing of South 00 degrees 07 minutes 08 second East for the West line of NW 1/4, Section 33, Township 117, Range 23. The originating monuments utilized to establish the horizontal position of this survey were the NW corner and the NE/R corner of said section.
- 2.) Vertical Datum: Elevations are based on MN/DOT Geodetic Station Name: 1004 N which has an elevation of 161.24 feet (NAVD83).
- 3.) Flood Zone Information: The subject property lies within Flood Plain Zone X - Area determined to be outside the 0.2% annual chance of flooding, according to FEMA per RRM Map No. 27053C0113F dated 11/04/2016.
- 4.) Parcel Area Information: The gross area of the subject property is 2.385 Acres or 103,897 Square Feet. There is 6,863 Square Feet of impervious surface on subject parcels.
- 5.) Existing utilities shown are shown in an approximate way only. The contractor shall determine the exact location of any and all existing utilities before commencing work. Contractor agrees to be fully responsible for any and all damages arising out of their failure to exactly locate and preserve any and all existing utilities. Also, please note that seasonal conditions may inhibit our ability to visibly observe all the utilities located on the subject property. Before digging, you are required by law to notify Gopher State one Call at least 48 hours in advance at 651.454.0007.
- 6.) This survey was prepared utilizing the Old Republic National Title Insurance Company (Issuing Office: Premier Title Insurance Agency, Inc.) Title Commitment No. DR4431-1, having an effective date of August 25, 2024.
- 7.) Field work was completed on November 6th, 2024.

EXISTING CONDITIONS LEGEND

	SURVEY MONUMENT SET		BITUMINOUS SURFACE
	SURVEY MONUMENT FOUND		CONCRETE SURFACE
	CAST IRON MONUMENT		GRAVEL SURFACE
	FLARED END SECTION		WOOD/DECK SURFACE
	STORM MANHOLE		BUILDING/STRUCTURE BOUNDARY
	GATE VALVE		RIGHT OF WAY
	HYDRANT		ADJACENT LOT LINE
	WELL		EASEMENT
	CURB BOX		SECTION LINE
	SANITARY MANHOLE		RESTRICTED ACCESS
	CLEANOUT		METLAND
	UTILITY POLE		CONTOUR EXISTING
	GUY WIRE		RAILROAD TRACKS
	LIGHT POLE		CONCRETE CURB
	ELECTRIC METER		UNDERGROUND ELECTRICAL LINE
	ELECTRIC MANHOLE		OVERHEAD UTILITIES
	ELECTRIC VAULT		GAS UNDERGROUND
	ELECTRIC TRANSFORMER		FIBER OPTIC UNDERGROUND
	ELECTRIC PEDESTAL		UNDERGROUND UTILITIES
	AIR CONDITIONER		FENCE CHAINLINK
	GAS VALVE		FENCE IRON
	GAS METER		RETAINING WALL
	COMMUNICATION VAULT		DRIFT LINE
	COMMUNICATION PEDESTAL		SANITARY SEWER
	COMMUNICATION MANHOLE		STORM SEWER
	UNKNOWN VAULT		WATERMAIN
	UNKNOWN PEDESTAL		DRAIN TILE
	MANHOLE		SANITARY SEWER SERVICE LINE
	VENT		WATER SERVICE LINE
	SIGHT		
	MAILBOX		
	CONTROL BOX		
	PARCEL DEED CALL		
	SPOT ELEVATION		
	HANDICAP PARKING		
	DECIDUOUS TREE		
	CONIFEROUS TREE		

SUBMITTALS & REVISIONS

Rev. Date By Description
11/20/24 NTH: INITIAL REVISIONS & FINAL PLAN SUBMITTAL



ATERRA
LAND SERVICES
18219 70th Pl N, Maple Grove, MN 55311
763.360.1307 | nate@aterraland.com

I hereby certify that this survey, plan, or report was prepared by me or under my direct supervision and that I am a duly Licensed Land Surveyor under the laws of the State of Minnesota.
Dated this 15th day of November, 2024.
Nate
Nate B. Smith
Minnesota License No. 14891

PROJECT #: 24003
DRAWN: NRH
CHECKED: JML

SHOREWOOD MEADOW
SHOREWOOD, MN
MCDONALD CONSTRUCTION PARTNERS, LLC


EXISTING CONDITIONS

SHEET	PAGE #	REV.
C2.01	2	

-  REMOVALS BY SITE CONTRACTOR
-  REMOVALS BY PRIVATE UTILITY CONTRACTOR
-  REMOVALS BY DEMO CONTRACTOR

DEMOLITION NOTES:

- ALL DEMOLITION AND TREE REMOVAL ACTIVITIES FOR THIS PROJECT SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF SHOREWOOD GENERAL SPECIFICATIONS FOR STREET AND UTILITY CONSTRUCTION.
- CONTRACTOR SHALL TAKE ALL PRECAUTIONS NECESSARY TO AVOID PROPERTY DAMAGE TO ADJACENT PROPERTIES DURING THE CONSTRUCTION PHASES OF THIS PROJECT. CONTRACTOR WILL BE HELD SOLELY RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY DAMAGES TO THE ADJACENT PROPERTIES OCCURRING DURING THE CONSTRUCTION PHASES OF THIS PROJECT.
- SAFETY NOTICE TO CONTRACTORS: IN ACCORDANCE WITH GENERALLY ACCEPTED CONSTRUCTION PRACTICES, CONTRACTOR WILL BE SOLELY AND COMPLETELY RESPONSIBLE FOR CONDITIONS ON THE JOB SITE, INCLUDING SAFETY OF ALL PERSONS AND PROPERTY DURING PERFORMANCE OF THE WORK. THIS REQUIREMENT WILL APPLY CONTINUOUSLY AND NOT BE LIMITED TO NORMAL WORKING HOURS. THE DUTY OF THE ENGINEER OR THE DEVELOPER TO CONDUCT CONSTRUCTION REVIEW OF CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE IS NOT INTENDED TO INCLUDE REVIEW OF THE ADEQUACY OF CONTRACTOR'S SAFETY MEASURES IN, ON OR NEAR THE CONSTRUCTION SITE. CONTRACTOR SHALL INSTALL CONSTRUCTION ZONE SIGNAGE AS REQUIRED.
- CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PROVIDING AND MAINTAINING VEHICULAR AND PEDESTRIAN TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES SUCH AS BARRICADES, WARNING SIGNS, DIRECTIONAL SIGNS, AND FLAGMEN TO CONTROL THE MOVEMENT OF TRAFFIC WHERE NECESSARY. TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES SHALL CONFORM TO APPROPRIATE MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STANDARDS.
- EXISTING UTILITIES SHOWN ARE SHOWN IN AN APPROXIMATE WAY ONLY. THE CONTRACTOR AND/OR SUBCONTRACTORS SHALL DETERMINE THE EXACT LOCATION OF ALL EXISTING UTILITIES BEFORE COMMENCING WORK, BY CONTACTING THE NOTIFICATION CENTER (Gopher State One for Minnesota). THE CONTRACTOR AND/OR SUBCONTRACTOR AGREE TO BE FULLY RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY AND ALL DAMAGES, WHICH MIGHT BE OCCASIONED BY HIS OR HER FAILURE TO EXACTLY LOCATE AND PRESERVE ANY AND ALL UTILITIES (UNDERGROUND AND OVERHEAD).
- THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PREVENT SOIL AND DEBRIS FROM LEAVING THE SITE BY EROSION AND VEHICLE WHEEL TRACKING. CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR CLEANING OF STREET, BOULEVARD AND UTILITY FACILITIES THAT RECEIVE ANY BROOD OR TRACKED SOIL MATERIAL OR OTHER CONSTRUCTION DEBRIS OR MATERIAL.



SUBMITTALS & REVISIONS

Rev. Date By Description

11/20/24 NRH Initial Plan/Summary & Final Plan/Summary



ATERRA
LAND SERVICES
18219 70th Pl N, Maple Grove MN 55311
763.360.1307 | nate@aterraland.com

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PLAN, SPECIFICATION OR REPORT WAS PREPARED BY ME OR UNDER MY DIRECT SUPERVISION AND THAT I AM A DULY LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA.
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
Nathan R. Herman
LICENSE NO. 47982 DATE: 06/06/2006

PROJECT #: 24003
DRAWN: NRH
CHECKED: JML

SHOREWOOD MEADOW
SHOREWOOD, MN
MCDONALD CONSTRUCTION PARTNERS, LLC

DEMOLITION PLAN

SHEET	PAGE #	REV.
C2.02	3	

SITE ELEVATION DATUM: NAVD 88

GRADING NOTES

1. ALL EXCAVATION ACTIVITIES FOR THIS PROJECT SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF SHOREWOOD GENERAL SPECIFICATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION.
2. CONTRACTOR SHALL TAKE ALL PRECAUTIONS NECESSARY TO AVOID PROPERTY DAMAGE TO ADJACENT PROPERTIES DURING THE CONSTRUCTION PHASES OF THIS PROJECT. CONTRACTOR WILL BE HELD SOLELY RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY DAMAGES TO THE ADJACENT PROPERTIES OCCURRING DURING THE CONSTRUCTION PHASES OF THIS PROJECT.
3. CONTRACTOR SHALL COMPLETE THE SITE GRADING CONSTRUCTION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEER. ALL SOIL TESTING SHALL BE COMPLETED BY THE OWNER'S GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEER. CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR COORDINATING ALL REQUIRED SOIL TESTS AND INSPECTIONS WITH THE GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEER. THE GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING SOILS REPORT HAS BEEN COMPLETED BY: **MAJAN ENGINEERS**, PHONE: 953-999-2226, DATED: JULY 01, 2024.
4. CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PROVIDING AND MAINTAINING VEHICULAR AND PEDESTRIAN TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES SUCH AS BARRICADES, WARNING SIGNS, DIRECTIONAL SIGNS, AND FLAG MEN TO CONTROL THE MOVEMENT OF TRAFFIC WHERE NECESSARY. TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES SHALL CONFORM TO APPROPRIATE MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STANDARDS.
5. EXISTING UTILITIES SHOWN ARE SHOWN IN AN APPROXIMATE WAY ONLY. THE CONTRACTOR AND/OR SUBCONTRACTORS SHALL DETERMINE THE EXACT LOCATION OF ALL EXISTING UTILITIES BEFORE COMMENCING WORK. BY CONTRACTING THE NOTIFICATION CENTER (BOTH STATE ONE FOR MINNESOTA) THE CONTRACTOR AND/OR SUBCONTRACTOR AGREE TO BE FULLY RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY AND ALL DAMAGES, WHICH MIGHT BE OCCASIONED BY HIS OR HER FAILURE TO EXACTLY LOCATE AND PRESERVE ANY AND ALL UTILITIES (UNDERGROUND AND OVERHEAD).
6. THE GRADING CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL STORM WATER INSPECTIONS ACCORDING TO THE MPCA STORM WATER PERMIT. THIS INCLUDES BOTH WEEKLY INSPECTIONS AND INSPECTIONS DONE AFTER A 0.5" RAIN EVENT. A COPY OF THE INSPECTION REPORT MUST BE EMAILED TO THE ENGINEER, DEVELOPER AND CITY ENGINEER ON A WEEKLY BASIS.
7. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PREVENT SOIL MATERIALS FROM LEAVING THE SITE BY EROSION AND VEHICLE WHEEL TRACKING. CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR CLEANING OF STREET, BOULEVARD AND UTILITY FACILITIES THAT RECEIVE ANY FROD OR TRACKED SOIL MATERIAL OR OTHER CONSTRUCTION DEBRIS OR MATERIAL.
8. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PLACE INLET PROTECTION DEVICES IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF SHOREWOOD FOR ALL STORM SEWER INLETS AND MAINTAIN THEM AS AN EFFECTIVE Silt CONTROL DEVICE. INLET PROTECTION SHALL BE REMOVED WHEN RESTORATION HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED.
9. EXCAVATE TOPSOIL AND ORGANIC MATERIAL FROM AREAS TO BE FURTHER EXCAVATED OR RE-GRADED AND STOCKPILE IN AREAS DESIGNATED ON THE SITE. CONTRACTOR SHALL SALVAGE ENOUGH TOPSOIL FOR RE-SPREADING ON THE SITE AS SPECIFIED. EXCESS TOPSOIL SHALL BE PLACED IN EMBAIKMENT AREAS, OUTSIDE OF BUILDING PADS, ROADWAYS AND PARKING AREAS. CONTRACTOR SHALL SUBCUT CUT AREAS WHERE TURF IS TO BE ESTABLISHED TO A DEPTH OF 6 INCHES. RE-SPREAD TOPSOIL IN AREAS WHERE TURF IS TO BE ESTABLISHED TO A MINIMUM DEPTH OF 6 INCHES. TOPSOIL CANNOT BE USED AS FILL UNDER TRAILS OR SIDEWALKS.
10. EXISTING TREES AND OTHER NATURAL VEGETATION WITHIN THE PROJECT AND/OR ADJACENT TO THE PROJECT ARE OF PRIME CONCERN TO THE CONTRACTOR'S OPERATIONS AND SHALL BE A RESTRICTED AREA. CONTRACTOR SHALL PROTECT TREES TO REMAIN AT ALL TIMES. EQUIPMENT SHALL NOT NEEDLESSLY BE OPERATED UNDER NEARBY TREES AND EXTREME CAUTION SHALL BE EXERCISED WHEN WORKING ADJACENT TO TREES. SHOULD ANY PORTION OF THE TREE BRANCHES REQUIRE REMOVAL TO PERMIT OPERATION OF THE CONTRACTOR'S EQUIPMENT, CONTRACTOR SHALL OBTAIN THE SERVICES OF A PROFESSIONAL TREE TRIMMING SERVICE TO TRIM THE TREES PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF OPERATION. SHOULD CONTRACTOR'S OPERATIONS RESULT IN THE BREAKING OF ANY LIMBS, THE BROKEN LIMBS SHOULD BE REMOVED IMMEDIATELY AND CUTS SHALL BE PROPERLY PROTECTED TO MINIMIZE ANY LASTING DAMAGE TO THE TREE. NO TREES SHALL BE REMOVED WITHOUT AUTHORIZATION BY THE ENGINEER. COSTS FOR TRIMMING SERVICES SHALL BE CONSIDERED INCIDENTAL TO THE GRADING CONSTRUCTION AND NO SPECIAL PAYMENT WILL BE MADE.
11. RESTRICTED AREAS SHALL INCLUDE ALL DESIGNATED TREES AND AREAS OUTSIDE OF THE DESIGNATED CONSTRUCTION ZONE. ALL VEGETATION, INCLUDING ROOT ZONES, WITHIN THE RESTRICTED AREAS SHALL REMAIN. CONTRACTOR SHALL RESTRICT ALL GRADING AND CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES TO AREAS DESIGNATED ON THE PLANS. ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE CONSTRUCTION MAY BE RESTRICTED TO A NARROWER WIDTH IN THE FIELD TO SAVE ADDITIONAL TREES AS DIRECTED BY THE OWNER. ALL RESTRICTED AREAS SHALL BE FENCED OFF WITH BRIGHT ORANGE POLYETHYLENE SAFETY NETTING AND STEEL STAKES AS SHOWN ON THE TREE PROTECTION DETAIL. AT NO TIME SHALL THIS FENCING BE REMOVED OR ACTIVITY OF ANY KIND TAKE PLACE WITHIN IT. FINAL PLACEMENT OF ALL PROTECTIVE FENCING SHALL BE COMPLETE BEFORE ANY WORK COMMENCES ON-SITE.
12. TRENCH BORROW CONSTRUCTION: IF ALLOWED BY THE OWNER, CONTRACTOR SHALL COMPLETE "TRENCH BORROW" EXCAVATION IN AREAS DIRECTED BY THE ENGINEER IN ORDER TO OBTAIN STRUCTURAL MATERIAL. TREES SHALL NOT BE REMOVED OR DAMAGED AS A RESULT OF THE EXCAVATION, UNLESS APPROVED BY THE ENGINEER. THE EXCAVATION SHALL COMMENCE A MINIMUM OF 10 FEET FROM THE LIMIT OF THE BUILDING PAD. THE EXCAVATION FROM THIS LIMIT SHALL EXTEND AT A MINIMUM SLOPE OF 1 FOOT HORIZONTAL TO 1 FOOT VERTICAL (1:1) DOWNWARD AND OUTWARD FROM THE FINISHED SURFACE GRADE ELEVATION. THE TRENCH BORROW EXCAVATION SHALL BE BACKFILLED TO THE PROPOSED FINISHED GRADE ELEVATION AND SHALL BE COMPACTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS OF THE QUALITY COMPACTION METHOD AS OUTLINED IN MINNDOT SPECIFICATION 2105.3F2. SNOW FENCE SHALL BE FURNISHED AND PLACED ALONG THE PERIMETER OF THE TRENCH BORROW AREA WHERE THE SLOPES EXCEED 2 FOOT HORIZONTAL TO 1 FOOT VERTICAL (2:1).
13. FILL PLACED WITHIN THE BUILDING PAD AREAS SHALL BE IN CONFORMANCE WITH HUD/SHA PROCEDURES AND DATA SHEET 796.
14. FINISHED GRADING SHALL BE COMPLETED. CONTRACTOR SHALL UNIFORMLY GRADE AREAS WITHIN LIMITS OF GRADING, INCLUDING ADJACENT TRANSITION AREAS. PROVIDE A SMOOTH FINISHED SURFACE WITHIN SPECIFIED TOLERANCES, WITH UNIFORM LEVELS OR SLOPES BETWEEN POINTS WHERE ELEVATIONS ARE SHOWN, OR BETWEEN SUCH POINTS AND EXISTING GRADES. AREAS THAT HAVE BEEN FINISHED GRADED SHALL BE PROTECTED FROM SUBSEQUENT CONSTRUCTION OPERATIONS, TRAFFIC AND EROSION. REPAIR ALL AREAS THAT HAVE BECOME RUTTED, ERODED OR HAS SETTLED BELOW THE CORRECT GRADE. ALL AREAS DISTURBED BY THE CONTRACTOR'S OPERATIONS SHALL BE RESTORED TO EQUAL OR BETTER THAN ORIGINAL CONDITION OR TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE NEW WORK.
15. FINISH GRADE TOLERANCES:
 - a. THE RESIDENTIAL BUILDING SURGRADE FINISHED SURFACE ELEVATION SHALL NOT VARY BY MORE THAN 0.20 FEET ABOVE OR BELOW THE PRESCRIBED ELEVATION AT ANY POINT WHERE MEASUREMENT IS MADE.
 - b. THE STREET AREA SURGRADE FINISHED SURFACE ELEVATION SHALL NOT VARY BY MORE THAN 0.1 FEET ABOVE OR BELOW THE PRESCRIBED ELEVATION OF ANY POINT WHERE MEASUREMENT IS MADE.
 - c. AREAS WHICH ARE TO RECEIVE TOPSOIL SHALL BE GRADED TO WITHIN 0.20 FEET ABOVE OR BELOW THE REQUIRED ELEVATION, UNLESS DIRECTED OTHERWISE BY THE ENGINEER.
 - d. TOPSOIL SHALL BE GRADED TO PLUS OR MINUS 1 INCH OF THE SPECIFIED DEPTH.
16. FOR NOTES ON THE FILTRATION BASINS, SEE THE DETAIL SHEET OF THIS PLAN SET.

RETAINING WALL NOTES

- GRADING CONTRACTOR
1. RETAINING WALLS TO BE BUILT DURING HOME CONSTRUCTION.
 2. GRADING CONTRACTOR SHALL SUBCUT AND CORRECT ANY UNSUITABLE SOILS FOUND BELOW RETAINING WALLS.
 3. THE RETAINING WALL CORRECTED "PAD" SHALL BE EIGHT FEET WIDE FOR THE LENGTH OF THE RETAINING WALL.
 - a. THE FRONT OF THE 8-FOOT PAD SHALL BEGIN 2 FEET IN FRONT OF THE FACE OF THE WALL AND EXTEND EIGHT FEET BACK TOWARDS THE BACK OF THE WALL.
 - b. 1:1 OVER-SLOING SHALL OCCUR FROM THE FINISH GRADE BOTTOM WALL ELEVATION.
 - c. CLOSING ELEVATIONS SHALL BE OBTAINED FOR RECORD.
 4. GRADING CONTRACTOR SHALL COMPLETE THE RETAINING WALL "PAD" CONSTRUCTION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEER. ALL SOIL TESTING SHALL BE COMPLETED BY THE OWNER'S GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEER. CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR COORDINATING ALL REQUIRED SOIL TESTS AND INSPECTIONS WITH THE GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEER.
 5. GRADING CONTRACTOR SHALL SUBCUT FROM THE FACE OF THE WALL BACK 6 FEET TO ACCOUNT FOR THE DEPTH OF THE BOLLERS AND GRADE UP A 2:1 TO THE INTO FINISHED GRADE (UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED BY WALL CONTRACTOR).
 6. GRADING CONTRACTOR SHALL COORDINATE WITH WALL CONTRACTOR REGARDING THE NEED FOR STOCKPILING EXTRA MATERIAL ABOVE THE WALLS FOR BACKFILL PURPOSES.
 7. CONTRACTOR SHALL WORK WITH WALL CONTRACTOR TO PROVIDE AN ACCESS ROUTE FOR BOLLERS/BLOCKS, SAND AND OTHER MATERIAL HAULING.
- RETAINING WALL CONTRACTOR
8. WALL CONTRACTOR SHALL COORDINATE HAUL ROUTES AND PLANNING WITH GRADING CONTRACTOR. RELOCATING MATERIALS DUE TO CONFLICTS WITH SITE GRADING SHALL BE AT THE WALL CONTRACTOR'S EXPENSE.
 9. WALL CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR RE-ESTABLISHING FINISH GRADES IF ANY TEMPORARY GRADING IS NEEDED TO CONSTRUCT RETAINING WALLS.
 10. COSTS FOR ANY ADDITIONAL WORK SHALL BE AGREED UPON IN WRITING TO BE QUALIFIED FOR PAYMENT.
 11. FINISHED GRADE AT THE TOP OF THE RETAINING WALL SHALL BE SMOOTHED OUT AND HELD DOWN 0.25" (3") FROM THE TOP ROW TO ALLOW FOR FENCING AND LANDSCAPING ROCK ALONG THE TOP OF THE WALL.
 12. WALL CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE TO MAINTAIN SWPPP COMPLIANCE. ANY EROSION CONTROL DAMAGED BY WALL CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE REPAIRED AS INCIDENTAL TO CONSTRUCTION.
 13. DEVELOPMENT RETAINING WALL MATERIALS SHALL BE COORDINATED WITH THE DEVELOPER.
 14. ALL RETAINING WALLS 4 FEET AND HIGHER, OR SUPPORTING A SURCHARGE, REQUIRE STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING AND A SEPARATE BUILDING PERMIT.
 15. CONTRACTOR SHALL COORDINATE A GEOTECH ENGINEER TO OBSERVE THE SURGRADE OF ANY WALL BEFORE PLACING ANY BOLLERS/BLOCKS.
 16. CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY AND ALL INSPECTIONS REQUIRED BY THE BUILDING PERMIT.
 17. CONTRACTOR SHALL SUBMIT TO THE ENGINEER AND HOBITY CERTIFIED ENGINEERING DRAWINGS, DESIGN CALCULATIONS AND SOIL BORINGS.
 18. THE CERTIFYING ENGINEER FOR THE RETAINING WALLS SHALL PROVIDE CONSTRUCTION OBSERVATIONS OF THE RETAINING WALL CONSTRUCTION, AND A LETTER CERTIFYING THE INSTALLATION OF THE WALL(S) WAS CONSTRUCTED IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS.
 19. PAYMENT FOR THE RETAINING WALLS WILL BE WITHHELD UNTIL THE CONFIRMATION IS RECEIVED THAT THE CITY HAS CLOSED OUT THE BUILDING PERMIT.
 20. A FENCE ALONG THE TOP OF THE WALL IS REQUIRED FOR WALLS GREATER THAN 48" IN HEIGHT FOR COMMON DEVELOPMENT WALLS.

SITE EMERGENCY OVERFLOW



HOLDDOWN DETAILS



- NOTES:
1. GRADE (XXXX) BEHIND EACH HOME SITE IS THE PROPOSED TOP OF TOPSOIL. SURGRADE SHALL BE DOWN 0.50 FEET.
 2. REAR PAD SHALL BE GRADED TO FINISH GRADE (NO HOLD DOWN AT REAR PAD).
 3. ESTABLISH FINISH GRADE TO ALL 10' FRONT YARD UTILITY EASEMENT LOCATIONS.

LEGEND:



NOTE: SPOT ELEVATIONS DENOTES NON-TYPICAL ELEVATION

TYPICAL LOT LEGEND



SUBMITTALS & REVISIONS

Rev. Date By Description
1/2/2024 NRM INITIAL PRELIMINARY & FINAL PLAN SUBMITTAL



ATERRA
LAND SERVICES
18219 70th Pl N, Maple Grove MN 55311
763.360.1307 | nate@aterraland.com

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

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

Nathan R. Herman
LICENSE NO. 47982 DATE: 10/10/2000

PROJECT #: 24003
DRAWN: NRM
CHECKED: JML


SHOREWOOD MEADOW
SHOREWOOD, MN
MCDONALD CONSTRUCTION PARTNERS, LLC

FINAL GRADING PLAN

SHEET	PAGE #	REV.
C3.01	4	


LEGEND:

PROPOSED CONTOUR			DRAINTILE	
EXISTING CONTOUR			EMERGENCY OVERFLOW	
SALT FENCE			ROCK ENTRANCE BERM	
SALT FENCE (DOUBLE ROW)			EROSION BLANKET	
SALT FENCE AFTER GRADING			PAULT PROTECTION	



1. THE STORM SEWER IMPROVEMENTS FOR THIS PROJECT SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF SHOREWOOD GENERAL SPECIFICATIONS FOR STREET AND UTILITY CONSTRUCTION.
2. EXISTING UTILITIES SHOWN ARE SHOWN IN AN APPROXIMATE WAY ONLY. THE CONTRACTOR AND/OR SUBCONTRACTORS SHALL DETERMINE THE EXACT LOCATION OF ALL EXISTING UTILITIES BEFORE COMMENCING WORK, BY CONTACTING THE NOTIFICATION CENTER (Gopher State Call For Minnesota) THE CONTRACTOR AND/OR SUBCONTRACTOR AGREE TO BE FULLY RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY AND ALL DAMAGES WHICH MIGHT BE OCCASIONED BY HIS OR HER FAILURE TO EXACTLY LOCATE AND PRESERVE ANY AND ALL UTILITIES (UNDERGROUND AND OVERHEAD).
3. CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR CONTACTING AND SCHEDULING ALL REQUIRED UTILITY INSPECTION WITH THE CITY OF SHOREWOOD AND/OR ITS CONSULTANTS WITH A 48-HOUR NOTICE.
4. THE UTILITY BACKFILL CONSTRUCTION SHALL COMPLY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEER. CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR COORDINATING ALL REQUIRED SOIL COMPACTION TESTS AND SOIL INSPECTIONS WITH THE GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEER.
5. ANY EROSION CONTROL DAMAGED BY CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE REPAIRED AS INCIDENTAL TO CONSTRUCTION.
6. STORM PIPES DISCHARGING FILTRATION BASINS SHALL BE INSTALLED DURING BASIN CONSTRUCTION.
7. STORM PIPES SUPPLYING RUNOFF TO THE BASINS SHALL BE INSTALLED DURING HOME BUILDING.

1. THE UTILITY IMPROVEMENTS FOR THIS PROJECT SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF SHOREWOOD GENERAL SPECIFICATIONS FOR STREET AND UTILITY CONSTRUCTION AND THE "STANDARD UTILITIES SPECIFICATIONS" AS PUBLISHED BY THE CITY ENGINEERS ASSOCIATION OF MINNESOTA (CEAM), EXCEPT AS MODIFIED HEREIN.
2. CONTRACTOR SHALL TAKE ALL PRECAUTIONS NECESSARY TO AVOID PROPERTY DAMAGE TO ADJACENT PROPERTIES DURING THE CONSTRUCTION PHASES OF THIS PROJECT. CONTRACTOR WILL BE HELD SOLELY RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY DAMAGES TO THE ADJACENT PROPERTIES OCCURRING DURING THE CONSTRUCTION PHASES OF THIS PROJECT.
3. SAFETY NOTICE TO CONTRACTORS: IN ACCORDANCE WITH GENERALLY ACCEPTED CONSTRUCTION PRACTICES, CONTRACTOR WILL BE SOLELY AND COMPLETELY RESPONSIBLE FOR CONDITIONS ON THE JOB SITE, INCLUDING SAFETY OF ALL PERSONS AND PROPERTY DURING PERFORMANCE OF THE WORK. THIS REQUIREMENT WILL APPLY CONTINUOUSLY AND NOT BE LIMITED TO NORMAL WORKING HOURS. THE DUTY OF THE ENGINEER OR THE DEVELOPER TO CONDUCT CONSTRUCTION REVIEW OF CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE IS NOT INTENDED TO INCLUDE REVIEW OF THE ADEQUACY OF CONTRACTOR'S SAFETY MEASURES IN, ON OR NEAR THE CONSTRUCTION SITE. CONTRACTOR SHALL INSTALL CONSTRUCTION ZONE SIGNAGE AS REQUIRED.
4. THE UTILITY BACKFILL CONSTRUCTION SHALL COMPLY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEER. CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR COORDINATING ALL REQUIRED SOIL COMPACTION TESTS AND SOIL INSPECTIONS WITH THE GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEER.
5. CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR CONTACTING AND SCHEDULING ALL REQUIRED UTILITY INSPECTION WITH THE CITY OF SHOREWOOD AND/OR ITS CONSULTANTS WITH A 48-HOUR NOTICE.
6. CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PROVIDING AND MAINTAINING TRAFFIC CONTROL SUCH AS BARRICADES, WARNING SIGNS, DIRECTIONAL SIGNS, AND FLAGMEN TO CONTROL THE MOVEMENT OF TRAFFIC WHERE NECESSARY. TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES SHALL CONFORM TO APPROPRIATE MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STANDARDS.
7. EXISTING UTILITIES SHOWN ARE SHOWN IN AN APPROXIMATE WAY ONLY. THE CONTRACTOR AND/OR SUBCONTRACTORS SHALL DETERMINE THE EXACT LOCATION OF ALL EXISTING UTILITIES BEFORE COMMENCING WORK, BY CONTACTING THE NOTIFICATION CENTER (GOPHER STATE ONE FOR MINNESOTA). THE CONTRACTOR AND/OR SUBCONTRACTOR AGREES TO BE FULLY RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY AND ALL DAMAGES, WHICH MIGHT BE OCCASIONED BY HIS OR HER FAILURE TO EXACTLY LOCATE AND PRESERVE ANY AND ALL UTILITIES (UNDERGROUND AND OVERHEAD).
8. CITY WILL OPERATE EXISTING GATE VALVES. COORDINATE SHUT OFF AT WATER CONNECTION WITH A 48 HOUR NOTICE.
9. ALL MATERIALS SHALL BE AS SPECIFIED IN CEAM SPECIFICATIONS EXCEPT AS MODIFIED HEREIN.
- 9.1. ALL MATERIALS SHALL COMPLY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE CITY.
- 9.2. ALL SANITARY SEWER TO BE PVC 600, 800, 1000, OR 1200, AS NOTED ON THE PLAN.
- 9.3. ALL SANITARY SEWER SERVICE RISERS MATERIAL SHALL MATCH THE MATERIAL OF THE MAIN, UP TO THE LATERAL BEND.
- 9.4. ALL SANITARY SEWER (LATERAL) SERVICES TO PROPERTY SHALL BE PVC 800/6.
- 9.5. ALL WATERMAIN TO HAVE 7.5-FOOT OF COVER OVER TOP OF WATERMAIN.
- 9.6. WYE LOCATIONS TO BE VERIFIED BY CONTRACTORS. WYE STATIONING SHOWN IS CALCULATED FROM THE DOWNSTREAM MANHOLES.
10. ALL SEWER SERVICES ARE LOCATED 3 FEET DOWNSTREAM OF WATER SERVICES IF SEWER AND WATER ARE IN THE SAME TRENCH.
11. ALL WATERMAIN VALVES SHALL BE POSITIONED SUCH THAT THEY ARE NOT LOCATED IN THE CURB AND GUTTER. IF SEWER SERVICE CONDUCTIVITY BOX OR WATER CURB BOX IS PLACED IN A DRIVEWAY, WALK OR TRAIL, A FORD A-1 COVER OR EQUAL MUST BE PROVIDED.
12. ALL SEWER AND WATER SERVICES SHALL BE STUBBED AS DEFINED BY THE CITY DETAILS. NEW CURB BOXES SHALL BE PLACED AT THE RIGHT-OF-WAY.
13. ANY EROSION CONTROL, DAMAGED BY CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE REPAIRED AS INCIDENTAL TO CONSTRUCTION.
14. THE DISINFECTION OF THE WATERMAIN SHALL BE PERFORMED ACCORDING TO THE CITY OF SHOREWOOD SPECIFICATIONS.



Rev.	Date	By	Description
1078	34	Wm. J. Smith	Added to file
















NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

PROJECT #: 24003
DRAWN: NRH
CHECKED: JML

SHOREWOOD MEADOW
SHOREWOOD, MN
MCDONALD CONSTRUCTION PARTNERS, LLC

FINAL UTILITY PLAN

SHEET	PAGE #	REV.
C5.01	6	



SUBMITTALS & REVISIONS
Rev. Date By Description
11/13/2019 JRM FINAL PRELIMINARY & FINAL SUBMITTAL



ATERRA
LAND SERVICES
18219 70th Pl N, Maple Grove MN 55311
763.360.1307 | nate@aterraland.com

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PLAN, SPECIFICATION OR REPORT WAS PREPARED BY ME OR UNDER MY DIRECT SUPERVISION AND THAT I AM A LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA.
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
Allyson R. Herman
LICENSE NO. 47882 DATE: 00/00/0000

PROJECT #: 24003
DRAWN: NRH
CHECKED: JRM

SHOREWOOD MEADOW
SHOREWOOD, MN
MCDONALD CONSTRUCTION PARTNERS, LLC

CITY DETAILS

SHEET **PAGE #** **REV.**
C6.01 **7**


Tag No.	Common Name	Sp. Tree	DBH	Deciduous 8"	Deciduous 12"	Coniferous 8"	Coniferous 12"	Notes
6730	White Cedar	No	2					12' in height, large shrub
6731	White Cedar	No	2.1-1.1					12' in height, large shrub
6732	White Cedar	No	2.2-2.4					12' in height, large shrub
6733	White Cedar	No	3.1-3.1.1					14' in height, large shrub
6734	White Cedar	No	3.2-3.1					12' in height, large shrub
6735	White Cedar	No	6.2					15' in height, large shrub
6736	White Cedar	No	4.2-4.1					18' in height, large shrub
6737	Silver Maple	Yes	11.11	1				
6738	Green Ash	Yes	28	2				
6739	Green Ash	Yes	26	3				
6740	Black Walnut	Yes	20					
6741	American Elm	Yes	26					
6742	Hackberry	Yes	22					
6743	Bee Elder	No	20					not considered significant
6744	Bee Elder	No	18					not considered significant
6745	Bee Elder	No	17					not considered significant
6746	Bee Elder	No	14					not considered significant
6747	Bee Elder	No	18-20					not considered significant
6748	Bee Elder	No	13.13					not considered significant
6749	Silver Maple	Yes	9	1				
6750	Silver Maple	Yes	9					
6751	Black Walnut	Yes	20					
6752	American Elm	Yes	9					
6753	Bee Elder	No	17					not considered significant
6754	Silver Maple	Yes	25					
6755	Silver Maple	Yes	17					
6756	Silver Maple	Yes	12.11.10.7					
6757	Silver Maple	Yes	25.11					
6758	Silver Maple	Yes	11					off site
6759	Silver Maple	Yes	20.13.5					
6760	Bee Elder	No	9					not considered significant
6761	Green Ash	Yes	10					
6762	Bee Elder	No	18					not considered significant
6763	Bee Elder	No	12					not considered significant
6764	Black Walnut	Yes	26					
6765	Bee Elder	No	26					not considered significant
6766	Bee Elder	No	26					not considered significant
6767	Bee Elder	No	8					not considered significant
6768	Bee Elder	No	18					not considered significant
6769	Bee Elder	No	14					not considered significant
6770	Bee Elder	No	14					not considered significant
6771	Willow	No	12					not considered significant
6772	Bee Elder	No	11					not considered significant
6773	Kentucky Coffeetree	Yes	29.20.22	4				
6774	Silver Maple	Yes	35	5				
6775	Honey Locust	Yes	21	6				
6776	White Cedar	Yes	16	7				40' in height
6777	Siberian Elm	Yes	12	8				
6778	White Cedar	No	3.2-3.1.1.1.1					12' in height, large shrub
6779	White Cedar	No	2					10' in height, large shrub
6780	White Cedar	No	4.4.4					12' in height, large shrub
6781	White Cedar	No	3.2.3					14' in height, large shrub
6782	White Cedar	No	4.3.2					14' in height, large shrub
6783	White Cedar	No	3.3.3.3					14' in height, large shrub
6784	Bee Elder	No	13.13.9					not considered significant
6785	Willow	No	10					not considered significant
6786	Black Walnut	Yes	11					off site
6800	Silver Maple	Yes	41	9				untagged

Removed Tree Count	1	9	0	0
Tree Replacement Req'd	2	3	1	2
Required Replacement per Removal	2	27	0	0

Max Tree Replacement per Acre	8	trees	TREE SAVED
Gross Site Size	2.4	ac	TREE REMOVED
	20	trees	TREE NON-SIGNIFICANT

LEGEND:

GRADE LIMIT	---
SAVED TREE	●
REMOVED TREE	●
NON-SIGNIFICANT TREE	●
REMOVED NON-SIGNIFICANT TREE	✕



SUBMITTALS & REVISIONS

Rev.	Date	By	Description
------	------	----	-------------



ATERRA
LAND SERVICES
18219 70th Pl N, Maple Grove, MN 55311
763.360.1307 | nate@aterraland.com

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

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

Nathan R. Herman
LICENSE NO. 47882 DATE: 06/06/2006

PROJECT R: 24003
DRAWN: NRH
CHECKED: JML

SHOREWOOD MEADOW
SHOREWOOD, MN
MCDONALD CONSTRUCTION PARTNERS, LLC

FINAL TREE PRESERVATION PLAN

SHEET	PAGE #	REV.
C7.01	8	



WOODLAND PRESERVATION PLAN LEGEND

— TREE PROTECTION FENCE/ LIMITS OF DISTURBANCE

✕ SIGNIFICANT TREE TO BE REMOVED

PLANTING CODE

TOTAL REPLACEMENT TREES REQUIRED:

8 TREES PER ACRE - MAXIMUM REPLACEMENT RATE

8 TREES x 2.4 ACRES = 19.2 REPLACEMENT TREES REQUIRED


PROPOSED TREES:
DECIDUOUS OVERSTORY 11
CONIFEROUS 9
TOTAL TREES PROPOSED 20

SYMBOL	KEY	COMMON NAME / SCIENTIFIC NAME	SIZE	QUANTITY	NATIVE
OVERSTORY DECIDUOUS TREES:					
ASB		FALL PISTIA SUGAR MAPLE JACER SACCHARUM (BALISTA)	3" S&B	4	YES
BPV		FRANKIE DREAM PAPER BIRCH, CLUMP (BETULA PAPPYRIFERA VAREN)	3" S&B	4	YES
GDU		TRUE NORTH COFFEE TREE, (GYMNOCLADUS DIOICUS LAMISYNERGY)	3" S&B	3	YES
CONIFEROUS TREES:					
ASB		BALSAM FIR (ABIES BALSAMEA)	6" S&B	3	YES
PNR		RED PINE (PINUS RESINOSA)	6" S&B	3	YES
PNS		WHITE PINE (PINUS STROBUS)	6" S&B	3	YES

GROUND COVER KEY & APPLICATION RATES

- SOD OR "TCS TUFF TURF" MIX (TWIN CITY SEED CO.) APPLIED AT 200 LBS PER ACRE. *HOME LANDSCAPE PLANS TBD*
- LOW MAINTENANCE TURF MIX- 75% DITCH MIX, 25% LOW GROW FESCUE MIX (TWIN CITY SEED CO.)

TREE PLANTING DETAIL





City of Shorewood

Planning Commission Meeting Item

Item
4B

Title/Subject: Minor Subdivision and Variance
Meeting Date: February 4, 2025
Prepared by: Jake Griffiths, City Planner
Reviewed by: Marie Darling, Planning Director
Attachments: Site Location Map
Applicant's Plans & Narrative
Engineer's & City Planner's Memo

APPLICANTS: Sharratt Design & Company, LLC and Matt Tierney
LOCATION: 5570/5580 Shorewood Lane
REVIEW DEADLINE: April 3, 2025
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Low to Medium Density Residential
ZONING: R-2A Single/Two Family

REQUEST

The applicants are requesting a minor subdivision to subdivide their approximately 0.92-acre property and create one additional lot. The applicants have also requested a subdivision variance to accommodate the subdivision, as both the newly created lot and existing lot would be undersized for the R-2A zoning district. It is staff's understanding that the applicants have provided conceptual plans for development of the site with a duplex, however, in the future the applicants may sell the property and the applicants could have the ability to construct something different including a single-family home.

Notice of the application was sent by postcard to all property owners within 500 feet of the properties and a sign was also placed in front of the properties. Notice of the public meeting was sent by US mail to all property owners within 500 feet of the properties at least 10 days prior to the meeting and published in the City's official newspaper. As of the publication of this report, no correspondence has been received from the public regarding this application.

BACKGROUND

The existing property was created by the Shorewood Terrace plat in 1967 and the existing duplex was constructed in 1970. No portion of the property is within the floodplain and the national wetland inventory does not indicate any wetlands on the site. The property is partially located within a Shoreland Overlay District as the site is within 1,000 ft of Lake Minnetonka. The property is currently utilized as a rental dwelling, which as of the publication of this report was operating one of its two dwelling units without a rental license due to multiple failed inspections. The surrounding properties are all zoned R-2A



Photo Courtesy Hennepin County

and the majority of the properties in the vicinity are developed with duplexes. The only exception is Excelsior Fire District Station #1, which is located west of the site.

ANALYSIS OF MINOR SUBDIVISION

Comprehensive Plan: The Comprehensive Plan guides the site as Low to Medium Density Residential, with a net density range of 3 to 6 units per acre. The proposed subdivision has a net density of 4.35 units per acre if a duplex is built and 3.26 units per acre if a single-family home is built, which are both consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan also identifies that single-family or two-family homes may be permitted in this land use.

Lot Width/Area: Section 1202.05 Subd. 2. c. of the subdivision regulations requires that all lots have adequate frontage on a city-approved street. Additionally, section 1201.14 of the zoning regulations has specific area and width requirements for newly created lots. The current and proposed lot areas and widths are shown below.

	Lot Area Single Family	Lot Area Two Family	Lot Width*
Required by R-2A	20,000 sf	30,000 sf	100 ft.
5570 Shorewood LN	16,986 sf	16,986 sf	135 ft.
5580 Shorewood LN	23,048 sf	23,048 sf	153 ft.

*As measured at the front setback

Setbacks: The proposed lots are adequately sized to accommodate a dwelling that would meet the R-2A setbacks.

Impervious Surface Coverage/Stormwater run-off: The applicant is working with the City Engineer to provide adequate stormwater management on the site. Ultimately, stormwater design will be finalized at the time of building permit submittal. The applicant has shown that they have adequate room on the site to provide the necessary rate control. The applicant will also be required to obtain all necessary permits from any outside agencies having an interest in the site and addressing City Engineer and other staff comments.

Easements: Section 1202.05 Subd. 6. requires 10-foot drainage and utility easements around the periphery of each lot. The applicant will need to provide a revised plan meeting this requirement as well as easement documents prior to recording.

Utilities: Subdivisions of four lots or greater are required to connect to city water. However, given the request for reduced lot size, City staff are recommending both the existing and newly created properties be connected to city water in the interest of public health. A watermain exists on the south end of the property that could be extended to the north end of the property and connect all four homes to municipal water. This recommendation will be discussed in more detail later in this report.

Tree Preservation: The applicant has submitted a tree inventory, and the plans show 4 mature trees would be removed as part of the subdivision. Based on the size of the property and the size of the trees removed, the applicant is required to plant 8 new trees. The applicant has provided a tree preservation plan which meets this requirement.

ANALYSIS OF SUBDIVISION VARIANCE

Section 1202.09 of the subdivision regulations contains standard criteria that all variances must be reviewed by. Similar to zoning variance criteria, these criteria are open to interpretation and have an element of subjectivity. In making its decision, Section 1202.09 of city code directs that the Planning Commission shall take into account the nature of the proposed use of land and the existing use of land in the vicinity, the number of persons to reside in the proposed subdivision and the probably effect of the proposed subdivision upon the traffic conditions in the vicinity.

In this situation, the applicant is requesting a variance to the minimum lot size requirements and lot area per unit requirements established by the R-2A zoning district.

A subdivision variance shall only be recommended when the Planning Commission finds undue hardship may result from strict compliance with the City Code and finds all the following:

- A. There are special and highly unique circumstances or conditions affecting the property that are not common to other properties in the city and that the strict application of the provisions of this chapter would deprive the applicant of reasonable and minimum use of its land.

The property is an irregularly shaped triangle with the current duplex being located very close to the north property line. While the property is currently undersized for a subdivision in the R-2A zoning district, the Comprehensive Plan would allow the proposed subdivision as it meets allowed density range of 3 – 6 units per acre. As long as the existing and proposed dwellings are connected to municipal water and sanitary sewer to mitigate its impact on public health, the request is a reasonable use of the land.

- B. That the granting of the variance will not be detrimental to the public health or welfare or injurious to other property in the vicinity in which the property is situated.

The applicants have proposed one additional lot to allow construction of either a single-family or two-family home which would not cause an overwhelming number of new residents, traffic or impact on other properties. Stormwater rate control would be provided for the site using traditional means; and by providing municipal water and sanitary sewer public health impacts will be adequately mitigated.

- C. That the variance is to correct inequities resulting from an extreme hardship limited to topography, soils or other physical factors of the land.

In this case, the extreme hardship is due to the unique triangular shape of the property as well as a significant change in grade across the site.

In recommending any subdivision variance, City Code 1202.09, Subd. 1 states that the Commission shall prescribe any conditions that it deem necessary for the public interest. In this case, City staff is recommending a condition that the applicants extend a 6" watermain from the existing hydrant on the south end of the site to the north end of the property and connect all the existing and proposed dwelling units to municipal water. All existing wells would also be required to be sealed according to

Minnesota Department of Health requirements. City staff believe this condition is necessary to mitigate the potential public health impacts caused by construction of two additional private wells on a substantially reduced lot size. Groundwater in the area is known to contain hazardous chemicals, such as arsenic, coliform and nitrates, and reducing the number of private wells helps to mitigate the spread and frequency of these chemicals. For example, rental licensing records indicate the existing private well on the site is contaminated with arsenic and on-site treatment is provided to meet required state standards.

FINDINGS/RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the minor subdivision and variance request on the finding that the proposed subdivision would be consistent with the intent of the Comprehensive Plan, the hardship created by the unique shape of the property, and the significant change in grade across the site, subject to the following conditions:

Prior to recording the minor subdivision, the applicant shall complete the following:

- Acquire all permits from other applicable jurisdictions that may have an interest in the site.
- Revise the plans consistent with City Code, the Engineer's and the City Planner's memo including:
 - Identify shoreland overlay boundary on the plans and verify impervious surface meets City Code requirements.
 - Revise plans so that roof overhangs meet all required setbacks.
 - Obtain a rental license for the existing dwelling unit at 5580 Shorewood LN.
 - Extend municipal water infrastructure subject to City Engineer's memo and connect all four dwelling units to the municipal water system.
- Execute a development agreement and provide financial surety for construction of public and private improvements. Said development agreement shall cover the extension of a 6" watermain from the existing hydrant on the south end of the site to the north end of the property and providing connections in the right-of-way for all four dwelling units to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. Said improvements shall be completed prior to recording of the minor subdivision.
- Execute drainage and utility easement documents and exhibits.
- Pay required park dedication fees for the newly created parcel as if it were constructed with a duplex in the amount of \$15,000.00. Said park dedication fees shall not be refunded if a single-family home is constructed on the property.
- Pay required utility connection fees for the existing and proposed duplex. Said fees shall be determined by the City Engineer upon completion of public improvements.
- Connect the existing duplex to municipal water and provide proof all existing wells have been sealed according to Minnesota Department of Health requirements.
- Obtain a rental license for both dwelling units in the existing duplex, including passing all required inspections and payment of any applicable fees. Should any future dwelling be rented, a rental license must be obtained prior to renting the home.

Prior to construction of any home, provide the following:


- Proof of recording for the resolution, easements, and other recorded documents.
- Provide a conforming landscaping plan with any new building permit showing the required number of trees to be replanted on the property consistent with the tree preservation plan and the City's tree preservation policy.

- Acquire all required permits for construction, said construction shall include connection of all dwelling units to municipal water and sanitary sewer.



Hennepin County Locate & Notify Map

Date: 12/30/2024



Buffer Size:

Map Comments:

0 50 100 200 Feet
|-----|-----|-----|-----|

This data (i) is furnished 'AS IS' with no representation as to completeness or accuracy; (ii) is furnished with no warranty of any kind; and (iii) is not suitable for legal, engineering or surveying purposes. Hennepin County shall not be liable for any damage, injury or loss resulting from this data.

For more information, contact Hennepin County GIS Office
300 6th Street South, Minneapolis, MN 55487 / gis.info@hennepin.us



November 27th, 2024

5580 Shorewood Lane, Shorewood MN Variance Narrative

The homeowners of 5580 Shorewood Lane want to subdivide the existing lot with an existing duplex on the North part of the lot into 2 lots. The new subdivision line would run from West to East and divide the property into a Northern section and a Southern section- see the proposed certificate of survey. The property owners are suggesting a new duplex could be built on the Southern section of the proposed subdivision. The proposed duplex, with its Craftsman Style, would have a low-pitched roof and be built into the hillside to create a smaller scale that would tie into the neighboring homes and meet the criteria for the practical difficulties described in the subsequent paragraphs.

Please note: There is no assurance or guarantee the proposed duplex example project will be built precisely as proposed. It is understood that whatever gets built on this newly subdivided lot by the current property owner or any subsequent owner, would be required to build within the property conditions defined by the pending subdivision approval.

1202.09 Variances and Appeals

"Subd. 1. Findings. The planning Commission may recommend a variance from the minimum standards of this chapter, but not procedural provisions, when in its opinion, undue hardship may result from strict compliance. In recommending any variance, the commission shall prescribe any conditions that it deem necessary to or desirable for the public interest. In making recommendations, the Planning Commission shall take into account the nature of the proposed use of land and the existing use of land in the vicinity, the number of persons to reside or work in the proposed subdivision and the probable effect of the probable subdivision upon traffic conditions in the vicinity. A variance shall only be recommended when the Planning Commission finds:"

- a. **"There are special and highly unique circumstances or condition affecting the property that are not common to other properties in the city and that the strict application of the provisions of this chapter would deprive the applicant of the reasonable and minimum use of its land."**

The most highly and unique limiting circumstance of the existing property is its dramatic triangular shape as well as the current duplex being located very close to the North property line. The property is zoned R-2A and is approximately 40, 034 square feet. Because there

**4 6 4 S e c o n d S t r e e t • S u i t e 1 0 0 • E x c e l s i o r ,
M N 5 5 3 3 1
p h o n e : 9 5 2 . 4 7 0 . 9 7 5 0 • f a x :
9 5 2 . 4 7 0 . 8 4 0 7
w e b s i t e : s h a r r a t t d e s i g n . c o m • e m a i l :
i n f o @ s h a r r a t t d e s i g n . c o m**



NOV 27 2024

already is a duplex to the North, the owners believe it makes sense to build another duplex on the Southern portion of the property, however, under the current zoning classification, the property is considered slightly small for a subdivision. City staff has communicated that this site may be considered for rezoning within about 10 months, which may assist with site size issues.

- b. "That the granting of the variance will not be detrimental to the public health or welfare or injurious to other property in the vicinity in which the property is situated."

The granting of the variance will in no way be detrimental to the public health or welfare. The proposed project will fit in with the existing duplex on the adjacent property, have a craftsman style which will fit into the surrounding neighborhood, and with its low-pitched roof will be only 24'-0" +/- from lowest level to the peak of the roof where 35'-0" is currently allowed. The homes across the street will be still able to see the wooded area hillside beyond the proposed duplex. We are proposing a narrow footprint to save as many trees on the hillside as possible, as well as to keep the mass of the building smaller and keep the hardcover well below the maximum allowed by the ordinance. We are also proposing to position the duplex into the existing hillside, so it would appear to be only one story high from the back with 2 stories to the street side entry and 2 car garages.

- c. "That the variance is to correct inequities resulting from an unusual hardship limited to topography, soils or other physical factors of the land."

This variance would correct the inequities resulting from an odd triangular shaped piece of property, as well as 15'-0" of grade change from the front to back of the property, and lastly, an existing duplex not being centered on the site.

4 6 4 S e c o n d S t r e e t • S u i t e 1 0 0 • E x c e l s i o r ,
M N 5 5 3 3 1
p h o n e : 9 5 2 . 4 7 0 . 9 7 5 0 • f a x :
9 5 2 . 4 7 0 . 8 4 0 7
w e b s i t e : s h a r r a t t d e s i g n . c o m • e m a i l :
i n f o @ s h a r r a t t d e s i g n . c o m



- A1. 1975 PLANS
- A2. PLANS PLANNED
- A3. 1970 PLANS & PROJECT SUBMISSION
- A4. 1970 PLANS SUBMITTED

ARCHITECT

Copyright © 2006 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

STRUCTURAL ENGINEER

1000

GENERAL CONTRACTOR

問題の 形式	問題の 内容
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 ㊹ ㊺ ㊻ ㊼ ㊽ ㊾ ㊿	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 ㊹ ㊺ ㊻ ㊼ ㊽ ㊾ ㊿

© 2004 Blackwell Publishing Ltd, *Journal of Internal Medicine* 255: 103–110

TERNEY

© 2005 Blackwell Publishing Ltd
Journal of Internal Medicine 258: 103–110

SHEET A1 ALPHEGA



1332 SQ. FT. AREA IN SHEDS AND PROTECTION ZONE X 10% = 133.2 SQ. FT.

17100 SQ. FT. WHEN OUTSIDE SHOULDER PROTECTION ZONE IS 33% + 5074 SQ. FT.
710 SQ. FT. + 5074 SQ. FT. = 5784 SQ. FT. MAX. ALLOWABLE IMPERVIOUS

1001. SPURTING LANE PROPOSED PARADEWAY

2579 201. FT. PROPOSED BUS/TRANS FOOTPRINT

[illegible]

488 S. J. H. PHILLIPS AND J. H. WARD

10 SQ. FT. PROPOSED STONE RET. WALL

4718 SGL FT. / 10648 SGL FT. = 36.1% PROPOSED HARDCOVER

1179 SHOREWOOD LANE

TOTAL LOT AREA 16,938 SQ. FT.

CL 130 SQ. FT. AREA IN SHOWR AND PROTECTION TONE 2 DPL + 200.0 SQ. FT.

3844 SQ. FT. AREA OUTSIDE SHORELAND PROTECTION ZONE X 100% + SITE 3 804 SQ. FT.

2882 J. Neurosci., February 22, 2006 • 26(8):2875–2882 • The Journal of Neuroscience

1179 SHOREWOOD LANE, EAST, FARMINGDALE

1528 S.Q. FT. EXIST. BUILDING FOOTPRINT

that his, if I, even, could not

INT NO. FY. EXPT. CONC. PARTIAL

20 INQ.FE.EXIST. RET. VALS

WETT EQ. FT. / HLBK EQ. FT. = 21.15, EASET. HARDCOVER


- Planned notes:**

- F. WML LIST PRICE FOR RIA IS \$2,000.00
CURRENTLY SUBCOMBOS WOULD NEED VARIANCE
- G. ALL RETRAKES SHOWN ARE FOR RIA ZENITH
CLASSIFICATION FOR CITY OF SHOREWOOD
- H. CITY STAFF COMMUNICATED THAT THIS SITE MAY BE
CONSIDERED FOR REZONING WITHIN 1 YEAR



INFORMATION ON SITE PLAN BASED ON DRAWINGS & ASSOCIATES
DATED 6-28-2004

PRELIMINARY CONCEPT A



454 SECOND STREET SUITE 100
EXCELSIOR, MN 55331

PH: 652-410-0750
FAX: 652-767-5858
info@sharrattdesign.com

SHEET INDEX

A1 SITE PLAN
A2 FLOOR PLANS
A3 ROOF PLAN & FRONT ELEVATION
A4 EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS

PROJECT TEAM

ARCHITECT

SHARRATT DESIGN & COMPANY, LLC
454 SECOND STREET SUITE 100
EXCELSIOR, MN 55331
CONTACT: PHIL SHARRATT (652-410-0750)

STRUCTURAL ENGINEER

TED

GENERAL CONTRACTOR

TED

ISSUED FOR

ISSUE DATE	PROGRESS SET	PERMIT SET	STRUCTURAL CODE	STRUCTURAL SET	MECHANICAL SET	ELECTRICAL SET	ADDITIONAL SET	CONSTRUCTION SET
08/01/24	X							
08/08/24	X							
08/01/24	X							
08/15/24	X							
10/04/24	X							
10/07/24								
11/26/24								
01/15/25								
01/22/25								

PROPOSED NAVD8 ELEVATION

TIERNEY

5015 PHARMACY LN
MINNEAPOLIS, MN

SHEET **A2** NUMBER

THESE DOCUMENTS SHALL BE REPRODUCED OR REPRODUCED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF SHARRATT DESIGN & COMPANY, LLC.
© 2024 SHARRATT DESIGN & COMPANY, LLC



400 BRIDGE STREET
SUITE 100
BURLINGTON, MA 01803
PH: 978-470-0700
FAX: 978-470-0800
info@terneydesign.com

SHEET INDEX

A1 SITE PLAN
A2 FLOOR PLANS
A3 ROOF PLANS & MEAT SUBVISION
A4 ATTACH SUBVISION

PRELIMINARY - NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

PROJECT TEAM

ARCHITECT

TERNEY DESIGN & COMPANY, LLC
400 BRIDGE STREET, SUITE 100
BURLINGTON, MA 01803
(978) 470-0700

STRUCTURAL ENGINEER

TSR

GENERAL CONTRACTOR

TSR

ISSUED FOR


NO.	DATE	REVISION	BY	CHKD
1	08-10-14	1	TSR	TSR
2	08-10-14	2	TSR	TSR
3	08-10-14	3	TSR	TSR
4	08-10-14	4	TSR	TSR
5	08-10-14	5	TSR	TSR
6	08-10-14	6	TSR	TSR
7	08-10-14	7	TSR	TSR
8	08-10-14	8	TSR	TSR
9	08-10-14	9	TSR	TSR
10	08-10-14	10	TSR	TSR
11	08-10-14	11	TSR	TSR
12	08-10-14	12	TSR	TSR
13	08-10-14	13	TSR	TSR
14	08-10-14	14	TSR	TSR
15	08-10-14	15	TSR	TSR
16	08-10-14	16	TSR	TSR
17	08-10-14	17	TSR	TSR
18	08-10-14	18	TSR	TSR
19	08-10-14	19	TSR	TSR
20	08-10-14	20	TSR	TSR

TSR

TERNEY

TERNEY DESIGN & COMPANY, LLC
400 BRIDGE STREET, SUITE 100
BURLINGTON, MA 01803

SHEET **A3** NUMBER



ROOF
1/4\"/>



FRONT ELEVATION
1/4\"/>

LEFT DOOR & SIDE DOOR

RIGHT DOOR & SIDE DOOR



A1	DATE PLANT
A2	PLANT PLANT
A3	GROUP PLANT & PROJECT (SUB-PROJECT)
A4	STATION TO STATION

A1	DATE PLANT
A2	PLANT PLANT
A3	GROUP PLANT & PROJECT (SUB-PROJECT)
A4	STATION TO STATION



PROJECT TEAM

ARCHITECT

1. 2019年12月31日
 2. 2019年12月31日
 3. 2019年12月31日
 4. 2019年12月31日

STRUCTURAL ENGINEER

55

GENERAL CONTRACTOR

1

ISSUED FOR

DATE	10/10/2018	TIME	10:00 AM
NAME	JAMES M. JONES		
ADDRESS	1000 10TH AVE N SUITE 100 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55412		
CITY	MINNEAPOLIS	STATE	MINN
ZIP	55412	COUNTRY	USA
PHONE	612-338-1000	FAX	612-338-1001
EMAIL	JAMES.M.JONES@MINNAPOLIS.MN.GOV		

© 2004 Blackwell Publishing Ltd, *Journal of Internal Medicine* 255: 101–108

TERNEY

© 2005 Blackwell Publishing Ltd
Journal of Internal Medicine 258: 105–114

SHEET	A4	NUMBER
-------	----	--------

A4

L'ESPION.

© 2000 Blackwell Science Ltd
Journal of Internal Medicine 247: 391–397

Tree Inventory performed by:
TreeBiz LLC
Stephen Nicholson CF
MN-4305A

Tree #	Species	DBH	Condition	Stem	Height	Significant	Date	Notes
1	Arborvitae	26.0	Good	1	25	Yes	Remove	
2	Elm, American	8.0	Good	1		Yes	Save	
3	Spruce, white	10.0	Good	1	40	Yes	Save	
4	Maple, silver	46.0	Good	1		Yes	Save	
5	Spruce, white	9.0	Fair	1	40	Yes	Save	
6	Maple, silver	44.0	Good	1		Yes	Save	
7	Spruce, white	7.0	Fair	1	30	Yes	Save	
8	Maple, silver	62.0	Good	1		Yes	Save	
9	Ash, green	18.0	Fair	1		Yes	Save	
10	Spruce, white	15.0	Fair	1	40	Yes	Save	
11	Spruce, white	15.0	Good	1	45	Yes	Save	
12	Spruce, white	7.0	Fair	1	35	Yes	Save	
13	Maple, Norway	59.0	Good	1		Yes	Save	
14	Spruce, white	13.0	Fair	1	40	Yes	Save	
15	Spruce, white	9.0	Poor	1	30	No	Save	missing top
16	Spruce, white	11.0	Fair	1	40	Yes	Save	
17	Spruce, white	11.0	Fair	1	40	Yes	Save	
18	Maple, Norway	26.0	Good	1		Yes	Save	
19	Maple, Norway	13.0	Good	1		Yes	Save	
20	Spruce, white	16.0	Poor	1	40	No	Remove	dissected
21	Ironwood	15.0	Good	1		Yes	Remove	
22	Ironwood	21.0	Good	1		Yes	Remove	
23	Pine, white	14.0	Good	1	40	Yes	Save	

Tree Replacement Schedule


Tree #	Species	DBH	Height	Required Replacement
1	Arborvitae	36	25	2 Conifers
20	Spruce, white	16.5	40	None-not significant
21	Ironwood	15.5		3 Trees
22	Ironwood	21		3 Trees

Replacement trees:
4 - Spruce trees, white or Black Hills
4 - Oak trees, white, red or bur


5580 SHOREWOOD LANE
TOTAL LOT AREA 23,648 SQ. FT.

5570 SHOREWOOD LANE
TOTAL LOT AREA 16,998 SQ. FT.

TREE PRESERVATION PLAN



CERTIFICATE OF SURVEY FOR
MATT TIERNEY
 OF LOT 1, BLOCK 1, SHOREWOOD TERRACE
 HENNEPIN COUNTY, MINNESOTA



NOTE: PROPERTY OF PREVIOUS
 OWNER, SHOREWOOD TERRACE

- denotes the proposed lot
- (S) denotes the south boundary line of the lot
- (N) denotes the north boundary line of the lot
- (E) denotes the east boundary line of the lot
- (W) denotes the west boundary line of the lot
- (L) denotes the lot line of the lot
- (B) denotes the boundary line of the lot

This survey was made for the purpose of the above described property, and the location of the building shown on the map is shown for the purpose of the building shown on the map. The building shown on the map is shown for the purpose of the building shown on the map. The building shown on the map is shown for the purpose of the building shown on the map.

DATE: 10/1/2010 BY: [Signature] FOR: [Signature]	THIS CERTIFICATE OF SURVEY IS A true and correct copy of the original survey as shown on the map and as shown on the map. The building shown on the map is shown for the purpose of the building shown on the map.	PROJECT: SHOREWOOD TERRACE	GRONBERG & ASSOCIATES, INC. CIVIL ENGINEERS, LAND SURVEYORS, LAND PLANNERS 441 NORTH KENYON AVENUE, SUITE 100, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55412 612-338-1111
---	---	-----------------------------------	---



MEMORANDUM

Date: January 9th, 2025
To: Marie Darling, Planning Director
From: Andrew Budde, PE
Subject: 5580 Shorewood Lane
City of Shorewood, MN 55331

Dear Mrs. Darling,

As requested, we have reviewed the information provided for the 5580 Shorewood Lane project prepared by Sharratt Design & Company LLC. The Stormwater Management Summary and Grading and Erosion Control prepared by Gronberg & Associates on 11/16/2024 was reviewed for compliance with the City Surface Water Management Plan. Below are our engineering-related comments for your consideration.

1. The applicant is proposing to add 4465 SQ FT of new impervious surface. Two retention basins with infiltration in the bottom 6 inches are proposed in the front yard. The drainage areas contributing to these basins should be modified to include the offsite water that would be routing through them as it will impact the drainage calculations including high water levels, sizing, and drawdown times. Consider routing the offsite water around the basins to reduce their size.
2. No soil borings were provided for the development. The USDA Soil Survey identifies L25A over the northern portion of the site which identifies ground water to be within 12 inches to 24 inches of the surface. The other areas of the site are identified as L22C2 and L37B which indicates ground water at 40 to 45 inches deep. Since all lot are proposed to be WO, it shall be required to provide footing drains that daylight to the existing grade. The footing drains should be routed independently of any surface water drains near the house so that they don't unintentionally saturate the footings.
3. The infiltration basins do not provide the 3 feet of vertical separation from potential ground water identified in the USDA Soil Survey. Adjust the design as necessary.
4. A drainage tile should be added in the back yard swale to address potential nuisance water from the larger watershed off site.
5. A SWPPP needs to be submitted for Erosion Control and Turf Establishment review prior to approval.
6. Provide details of outlet control structures with V-notch weirs and other details as appropriate.
7. The developer shall extend a 6" watermain from the existing hydrant on the south end of the site to the north end of the property and connect all four homes to municipal water.
8. The Grading and Erosion Control plan was marked up with comments to further explain locations for comments listed in this review.
9. Provide 10 foot wide drainage & utility easements around the perimeter of each lot.

Sincerely,

Bolton & Menk, Inc.

Andrew Budde
City Engineer

Jake Griffiths

From: Jake Griffiths
Sent: Monday, January 13, 2025 10:28 AM
To: MSharratt@sharrattdesign.com; tierney.properties@gmail.com
Cc: Marie Darling
Subject: 5570/5580 Shorewood LN - Minor Subdivision/Variance

Good morning,

I have reviewed your application and have the following comments for you. Please make necessary revisions to your application materials and provide revised copies by January 27th so they can be incorporated into the packet for the Planning Commission meeting on February 4th. I am still waiting for potential comments from other City departments and will forward those once they are available.

1. The property is partially located within a Shoreland Protection Zone, which extends 1,000 ft from the ordinary high-water level of Lake Minnetonka. Identify the Shoreland Protection Zone boundary on the site plan/survey. While there are many specific requirements relative to shoreland regulations, of most interest to your application is that areas within the Shoreland Protection Zone will be limited to 25% maximum impervious surface. For a complete listing of shoreland regulations, see the City Code on the City of Shorewood website.
2. The roof on the proposed plans appears to encroach into required setbacks by greater than 2 feet in violation of City Code requirements. Please revise plans so that roof overhangs meet all required setbacks.
3. The existing dwelling unit at 5580 Shorewood LN does not currently have a rental license due to a failed licensing inspection on 12/10/24. Please make necessary corrections and contact the City of Shorewood to schedule a reinspection.
4. Municipal water infrastructure is located in the area. Due to the variance request for reduced lot size, in the interest of public health City staff would require the municipal water infrastructure to be extended and all four dwelling units be connected to the municipal water system.
5. Additional comments pending further review.

Please contact me if you have any questions. Thanks.




5755 Country Club Road
Shorewood, MN 55331

JAKE GRIFFITHS City Planner

City Hall: 952.960.7900
Direct: 952.960.7909
jgriffiths@shorewoodmn.gov

www.shorewoodmn.gov





Planning Commission Meeting Item

Title/Subject: Amendments to Implement the Medium Density Land Use Designation
Meeting Date: February 4, 2025
Prepared by: Marie Darling, Planning Director
Attachments: Memo from January 7, 2025 planning commission meeting
Draft Ordinance

APPLICANT: City of Shorewood
LOCATION: City-Wide
REVIEW DEADLINE: NA

BACKGROUND

Attached are the proposed amendments to implement the high-density land use designation, these amendments are being considered to create a zoning district that would allow development of between six and eight units per acre.

The amendments primarily affect the R-3A and L-R zoning districts, but references and standards would be amended throughout the code.

THE AMENDMENTS:

Section 1: Amendments to the definition section. Several definitions are proposed for amendment, some minor and some substantial.

Section 2: Amendments to the R-3A district. (Substantial Amendments) This district would be changed throughout for its new purpose of allowing for the new density range.

Section 3: Amendments to the L-R district (Substantial Amendments). This district would be amended to include residential uses to be consistent with the residential designation in the Comprehensive Plan.

Section 4: Amendments to the Landscaping regulations specific to multiple family and commercial uses (Minor Amendments)

Section 5: Amendments to impervious surface coverage (Substantial Amendments) Adding the R3-A and L-R districts to the districts that allow more impervious surface by right.

Section 6: Amendments to general provisions related to efficiency apartments (Minor Amendments)

Section 7-9: Amendments to parking regulations (Minor Amendments)

Section 10-12: Amendments to sign regulations: (Minor Amendments) Removes references to quadraminiums.

Section 13: Amendments to general provisions related to subdivision of structures. (Minor Amendments). Removes references to quadraminiums.

Section 14: Amendments to general provisions related to elderly housing (Substantial Amendments). Changes the name elderly housing to age-restricted housing, removes requirement for a PUD, removes language requiring compliance with other codes that are required regardless of this section, defines usable open space and clarifies what reductions to fees are permitted.

Section 15: Amendments to PUDs (Substantial Amendments) Adds standards for subdivided townhouses and detached townhouses.

Please review the draft and let staff know if the Commission finds additional amendments are necessary or if the draft language should be amended for clarity or context.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommend approval of the attached ordinance in order to allow for the implementation of the Comprehensive Plan's Medium Density Land Use designation. Staff further recommends the Planning Commission review the ordinance amendment, conduct the public hearing and consider all public testimony before making a recommendation to the City Council.

NEXT STEPS: The affected properties along Smithtown Lane (see January 7 report) would need to be rezoned. Eventually, properties that are currently zoned R-3A, as mentioned in the January 7 report would need to be rezoned to another district that would allow low to medium land uses to be developed on the property. This rezoning may need to be delayed until the district(s) to implement the low to medium land use are amended.



City of Shorewood

Item
5C

Planning Commission Meeting Item

Title/Subject: Amendments to Implement the Medium Density Land Use Designation
Meeting Date: January 7, 2024
Prepared by: Marie Darling, Planning Director
Attachments: Draft Regulations

APPLICANT: City of Shorewood
LOCATION: City-Wide
REVIEW DEADLINE: NA

BACKGROUND

This will be the first discussion of the draft ordinance. Similar to the amendments to implement the high-density designation, these amendments are being considered to create a district that would allow development of between six and eight units per acre.

The amendments primarily affect the R-3A and L-R zoning districts.

Where are the properties that are designated Medium Density?

- 24620 Smithtown Road (1.06 acres)
- 24590 Smithtown Road (.99 acres)
- 24560 Smithtown Road (1.03 acres)
- 23500 Smithtown Road (Two parcels - 1.74 acres and 2.66 acres)



Are there currently properties that are zoned R-3A?

There are three properties that are currently zoned R-3A but are indicated in the Comprehensive Plan for low to medium density land uses rather than medium density. As a result, the properties will need to be rezoned to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The properties are not guided for medium density residential uses and the uses proposed to be permitted in this zoning district may not be appropriate for these properties. These properties include:

- 6065 and 6067 Lake Linden (a subdivided two-family home) (.32 acres and .27 acres)
- 6055 Lake Linden (a single-family home)(.66 acres)



THE AMENDMENTS:

There are several policy issues that the amendments are intended to resolve:

1. Development of these properties with between six and eight units per acre is not likely to be accomplished with two-family homes or single

family homes. Consequently, staff wrote up the district to allow only townhouses or multiple family buildings, or age-restricted housing developed with townhouses or apartments.

2. Changing elderly housing to be called and defined as age-restricted housing (as directed by the City Council). Removing the requirement for a PUD to construct age-restricted housing to encourage developers to reduce the number of applications necessary to provide this type of housing.
3. The ability to construct a single-structure townhouse development without a planned unit development. A PUD would continue to be required if a subdivision were to occur or if more than one apartment structure would be proposed.
4. Residential uses were added to the L-R district to implement the medium density land use designation in that district.
5. Adding in all the uses allowed in the district without reference to uses allowed in another district. Removing the ability to rent out garages to others not living in the unit.
6. Allowing adequate impervious surface coverage on the property to allow a townhouse or multiple family development.

Section 1: Amendments to the definition section (Substantial Amendments)

Section 2: Amendments to the R-3A district (Substantial Amendments)

Section 3: Amendments to the L-R district (Substantial Amendments)

Section 4: Amendments to the Landscaping regulations specific to multiple family and commercial uses (Minor Amendments)

Section 5: Amendments to impervious surface coverage (Substantial Amendments)

Section 6: Amendments to general provisions related to efficiency apartments (Minor Amendments)

Section 7-9: Amendments to parking regulations (Minor Amendments)

Section 10: Amendments to general provisions related to subdivision of structures. (Minor Amendments)

Section 11: Amendments to general provisions related to elderly housing (Substantial Amendments)

Section 12: Amendments to PUDs (Substantial Amendments)

Please review the draft and let staff know if the Commission finds additional amendments are necessary or if the draft language should be amended for clarity or context.

Still to be incorporated, some minor amendments are needed to the sign regulations to remove references to quadraminiums.

Staff will incorporate any recommended changes to the ordinance prior to the next meeting and will set up a public hearing to review the amendments at that meeting.

CITY OF SHOREWOOD
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN
STATE OF MINNESOTA

ORDINANCE XXX-

AMENDING SHOREWOOD CITY CODE CHAPTER 1201 TO IMPLEMENT THE COMPREHENSIVE
PLAN DIRECTION FOR MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL USES

Section 1. City Code Section 1201.02 DEFINITIONS is hereby amended as follows. Text proposed to be added is underlined; text proposed to be removed is ~~stricken~~.

...

~~**ELDERLY AGE-RESTRICTED HOUSING.**~~ A dwelling or group of dwellings where the occupancy is restricted to persons 62 years of age or older, or which qualifies as housing for older persons under the Federal Fair Housing Act.

...

LOT, BASE. A lot meeting all the lot specifications in the zoning district in which it is located prior to being subdivided into a two-family or townhouse quadraminium subdivision.

...

LOT, ~~UNIT~~. A lot created from the subdivision of a two-family or townhouse dwelling ~~or quadraminium~~, having different minimum lot size requirements than the conventional base lots within the zoning district in which it is located.

...

~~**QUADRAMINIUM.**~~ A single structure which contains four dwelling units, designed for separate ownership, all of which have individual entrances and in which each unit shares common walls with two other units.

...

~~**TOWNHOUSES, ATTACHED.**~~ Structures housing three to eight contiguous dwelling units, each having separate and individual front and rear entrances, the structures to be of row house types as contrasted to multiple dwelling apartment structures. Structures with at least three contiguous and self-contained dwelling units with no dwelling, portion of dwellings, or common area directly above or below another. Each townhouse dwelling has separate and individual entrances with the first story at or near the ground level. The term includes:

a. **BACK-TO-BACK.** A structure which may be designed with walls shared with contiguous dwellings on at least two sides.

b. **ROW.** A structure which is designed with walls shared with contiguous dwellings on no more than two sides and with openings on the main floor on two opposite sides of the dwellings.

TOWNHOUSES, DETACHED. Single-family or two-family dwellings within a unit-lot/base-lot subdivision which share common open space areas, access to public rights-of-way, other common elements, and/or storm water features with other dwellings.

Section 2. City Code Section 1201.17 is hereby amended as follows. Text proposed to be added is underlined; text proposed to be removed is ~~stricken~~.

1201.17 R-3A, MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT.

Subd. 1. *Purpose.* The R-3A District is intended to provide a greater variety in the type of housing units available within the community, while retaining the environment and character of less intensive residential areas through carefully established bulk and lot area requirements to produce developments between six and eight dwellings per acre.

Subd. 2. *Permitted uses.* The following are permitted uses in the R-3A District:

- a. ~~Two-family dwellings;~~
- b. Townhouses containing eight or fewer dwelling units, and quadraminiums, as defined by § 1201.02, subject to the regulations and requirements of § 1201.06;
- c. Multiple-family dwellings, ~~containing four or less dwelling units;~~
- d. Age-restricted housing subject to Section 1201.03. Subd. 20 of this chapter.

Subd. 3. *Permitted accessory uses.* The following are permitted accessory uses in an R-3A District:

a. Private garages, parking spaces and carports for licensed and operable passenger cars and trucks not to exceed a gross weight of 12,000 pounds, as regulated by § 1201.03, Subd. 5 (off-street parking) of this chapter. Private garages are intended for use to store the private passenger vehicles of the family or families resident upon the premises, and in which no business, service or industry is carried on. ~~The space can be rented to nonresidents of the property for private passenger vehicles and/or noncommercial vehicles, trailers or equipment if sufficient off-street parking in full compliance with this chapter is provided elsewhere on the property.~~ The garage shall not be used for the storage of more than one commercial vehicle owned or operated by a resident of the per-dwelling unit;

b. Swimming pools, tennis courts and other recreational facilities which are operated for the enjoyment and convenience of the residents of the principal use and their guests;

c. Tool houses, sheds and similar buildings for storage of domestic supplies and noncommercial recreational equipment;

d. Signs, as regulated by § 1201.03, subdivision 11 of this chapter;

e. Individual boat dock and customary beach accessories subject to § 1201.03, Subd. 14 of this chapter.

Subd. 4. *Conditional uses.* The following are conditional uses allowed in an R-3A District:
(Requires a conditional use permit based upon procedures set forth in and regulated by
§ 1201.04 of this chapter.)

a. ~~All conditional uses, subject to the same conditions, as allowed in the R-2C District;~~
Detached townhouses or subdivision of townhouses subject to Sections 1201.03 Subd. 16,
1201.06, and 1201.25 of this Chapter.

b. Governmental and public regulated utility buildings and structures necessary for the
health, safety and general welfare of the community, provided that:

(1) When abutting a residential use in a residential district, the property is screened
and landscaped in compliance with Section 1201.03 Subd. 2.g of this Chapter.

(2) The provisions of 1201.04 Subd. 3. are considered and satisfactorily met.

c. Residential planned unit development as regulated by § 1201.06, provided that:

(1) Land uses allowed in a planned unit development are limited to those land uses
listed as permitted uses, permitted accessory uses and conditional uses in this section;

(2) The proposed development complies with the development agreement as required
for planned unit developments, pursuant to § 1201.25.

~~dd.~~ Residential facilities as defined in § 1201.02 of this chapter, licensed by the state and
serving no more than 16 persons;

~~ee.~~ Nursing homes as defined in § 1201.02 of this chapter, provided that:

(1) Side yards are double the minimum requirements established for this District and are
screened in compliance with § 1201.03, Subd. 2g of this code;

(2) The ~~side~~ shall be served by an arterial or collector street of sufficient capacity to
accommodate traffic which will be generated;

(3) All signing and informational or visual communication devices shall be in compliance
with § 1201.03, Subd. 11 of this code;

(4) All state laws and statutes governing the use are strictly adhered to and all required
permits are secured;

(5) Adequate off-street parking is provided in compliance with § 1201.03, Subd. 5 of this
code;

(6) One off-street loading space in compliance with § 1201.03, Subd. 6 of this code is
provided;

(7) The provisions of § 1201.04, Subd. 4d (1) of this code have been considered and
satisfactorily met.

Subd. 5. *Lot requirements and setbacks.* The following minimum requirements shall be observed in an R-3A District, subject to additional requirements, exceptions and modifications set forth in this chapter:

a. Lot area: Not less than 20,000 square feet.

~~—(1) Two-family: Not less than 20,000 square feet;~~

~~—(2) All other: Not less than 30,000 square feet;~~

b. Lot width: Not less than 100 feet.

~~—(1) Two-family dwelling: Not less than 90 feet;~~

~~—(2) All other: Not less than 100 feet;~~

c. Lot depth: Not less than 120 feet;

d. Setbacks:

(1) Front yard: Not less than 30 feet;

(2) Rear yard: Not less than 30 feet;

(3) Side yard: Not less than 15 feet on each side nor less than 30 feet on a side yard abutting a street.

Subd. 6. *Building requirements.* Height: no structure shall exceed two and one-half stories, or 35 feet, whichever is ~~least~~less.

Subd. 7. *Lot area per unit requirement:* ~~The following minimum lot area per unit requirements shall be calculated on the basis of the total net area in the project and as controlled by an individual or joint ownership.~~ Each property may be developed with no less than 5,445 square feet of lot area per unit and no more than 7,260 square feet of lot area per unit.

~~—a. Two family dwellings: Not less than 10,000 square feet;~~

~~—b. All other dwellings: Not less than 7,000 square feet.~~

Section 3. City Code Section 1201.24 L-R, Lakeshore Recreational District is hereby amended as follows. Text proposed to be added is underlined; text proposed to be removed is ~~stricken~~.

...

Subd. 2. Permitted Uses. The following are permitted uses in the L-R District, ~~as regulated herein with special limitations and conditions attached as provided in Subd. 9. Below.~~

a. Water harboring of boats at docks attached to land, including limited related service facilities as hereinafter authorized, is subject to an annual operating license which shall be issued only in accordance with the ~~following~~ standards and limitations listed in Subds. 5-8 of this Section.

b. Townhouses (containing eight or fewer units per structure) or multiple-family housing, in accordance with the standards and limitations in City Code Section 1201.26 and subject to the density limitations indicated in the Comprehensive Plan.

c. Age-restricted housing subject to City Code Section 1201.03 Subd. 20.

Subd. 3. Permitted accessory uses. The following are permitted accessory uses in a L-R District:

a. The following are permitted accessory uses for water harboring of boats businesses:

(1) Off-street parking as regulated by § 1201.03, Subd. 5 and by § 1201.24, Subd. 8h of this section;

(2) ~~b.~~ One clubhouse building, not exceeding 2000 square feet of floor area on the first floor level. This building may be used for sale of limited items used in conjunction with boating, including fishing bait and tackle, light accessory marine-line equipment, soft drinks, prepackaged foods, shower and meeting rooms;

(3) ~~c.~~ One storage building, not exceeding 1200 square feet of floor area;

(4) ~~d.~~ Gasoline dispensing equipment (boat only) subject to design standards of the Minnesota Uniform Fire Code, approval of the State Fire Marshall, the local Fire Marshal, the Pollution Control Agency, Department of Natural Resources and other applicable agencies and if authorized by the City Council. Sale of gasoline is limited to those individuals renting or leasing dock slips, or launching boats from the subject site, or, in the case of a yacht club, to members of the yacht club;

(5) ~~e.~~ Boat rental, in compliance with LMCD regulations and as authorized by the City Council.

b. The following are permitted accessory uses to residential uses:

(1) Private garages, parking spaces and carports for licensed and operable passenger cars and trucks not to exceed a gross weight of 12,000 pounds, as regulated by § 1201.03, Subd. 5 (off-street parking) of this chapter. Private garages are intended for use to store the private passenger vehicles of the family or families resident upon the premises, and in which no business, service or industry is carried on. The garage shall not be used for the storage of more than one commercial vehicle owned or operated by a resident of the dwelling unit.

(2) Swimming pools, tennis courts and other recreational facilities which are operated for the enjoyment and convenience of the residents of the principal use and their guests.

(3) Tool houses, sheds and similar buildings for storage of domestic supplies and noncommercial recreational equipment.

(4) Signs, as regulated by § 1201.03, subdivision 11 of this chapter.

(5) Individual boat dock and customary beach accessories subject to § 1201.03, Subd. 14 of this chapter.

Subd. 4. *Conditional uses.* The following are conditional uses in a L-R District: (Requires a conditional use permit based upon procedures set forth in and regulated by § 1201.04.)

a. One single-family dwelling used as a caretaker residence accessory to a water harboring of boats uses, provided that:

—(1) ~~The~~ dwelling shall comply with the requirements of Chapter 1004 (Rental Housing) of

1 this code.

2 ~~—(2) The provisions of § 1201.04, Subd. 1d(1) are considered and satisfactorily met;~~

3 b. Open and outdoor, dry land storage of boats and boat trailers as an accessory use to a
4 water harboring of boats use, provided that:

5 (1) The area is fenced and screened from view of neighboring residential uses or if abutting
6 an R District.

7 (2) Storage is screened from view from the public street right-of-way.

8 (3) Storage is landscaped to provide a buffer from all other public rights-of-way.

9 (4) Storage area is grassed or surfaced with pavement or class V, or the equivalent, to
10 control dust.

11 (5) Landscaping is provided in compliance with § 1201.03, Subd. 2g.

12 (6) Lighting shall comply with Subd. 8k of this section.

13 (7) Except for winter storage of boats, storage area does not take up parking space as
14 required for conformity to this chapter.

15 ~~(8) The provisions of § 1201.04, Subd. 1d(1) are considered and satisfactorily met.~~

16 c. Detached townhouses or subdivision of townhouse developments subject to review under
17 Section 1201.06 and Section 1201.03 Subd. 16 and Subdivision 1201.26 of this Chapter.

18 d. Residential planned unit developments as regulated by Section 1201.06, provided that:

19 (1) The uses allowed in a planned unit development are limited to those uses listed as
20 permitted, accessory or conditional uses listed in this section.

21 (2) The proposed development complies with the development agreement as required for
22 planned unit developments, pursuant to Section 1201.25.

23 (3) The proposed development complies with the regulations in Section 1201.26 Subd. 9.

24 Subd. 5. *Lot requirements and setbacks.* The following minimum requirements shall be
25 observed in a L-R District subject to additional requirements, exceptions and modifications set
26 forth in this chapter:

27 a. Lot area: Not less than ~~60,000~~ 40,000 square feet.

28 b. Lot width: Not less than 200 feet;

29 c. Lot depth: Not less than 150 feet;

30 d. Setbacks:

31 (1) Front yard: Not less than 35 feet;

32 (2) Ordinary High Water Level or rear-yard: ~~Rear-yard:~~ Not less than 50 feet ~~(from the~~
33 ~~ordinary high water mark);~~

34 (3) Side yard (for nonresidential uses):

35 (a) From residential: Not less than 50 feet;

36 (b) From nonresidential: Not less than 15 feet;

37 (c) From ~~public right-of-way~~ trail rights of way: Not less than 10 feet ~~other than street.~~

38 (4) Side yard (for residential uses) from property lines: height of the proposed structure.

39
40 Subd. 6. *Building requirements.*

41 ~~a. Height for principal structures: 40 feet the clubhouse structure shall not exceed two and~~
42 ~~one-half stories, or 35 feet, whichever is less. Other accessory structures shall not exceed one~~
43 ~~story or 15 feet, whichever is less.~~

b. Height for accessory structures: 15 feet or one story, whichever is less.

...

Section 4. City Code Section 1201.03 Subd. 2 g. (2) *Semi-public, townhouses, multiple-family dwellings, and all commercial properties in the C-2, C-2, and L-R zoning districts* is hereby amended as follows. Text proposed to be added is underlined; text proposed to be removed is ~~stricken~~.

g. *Required screening and landscaping.*

(2) *Semi-public, townhouses, multiple-family dwellings, and all commercial uses on properties in the C-1, C-2, R-C and L-R zoning districts.* Prior to approval of a building permit, all developments of semi-public, townhouse, multiple-family dwellings, developments on all properties in the C-1 and C-2 zoning districts, and commercial uses in the R-C, L-R, and PUD zoning districts shall be subject to a mandatory Landscape Plan requirement. The Landscape Plan must be developed with emphasis on the following areas:

...

Section 5: Section 1201.03 Subd. 2. u. Impervious Surface is hereby amended as follows. Text proposed to be added is underlined; text proposed to be removed is ~~stricken~~.

u. *Impervious surface coverage.* All lots in Shorewood shall be subject to maximum ratios of impervious surface to lot area as indicated below:

(1) For all lots that are not within the "S" shoreland district and not subject to the regulations in Section 1201.26 of the zoning regulations.

(a) Residential and agricultural properties in the R-1A through R-2CR-3A zoning districts: 33%.

(b) Properties ~~with residential uses~~ in the R-3A, R-3B, zoning district; ~~properties in commercial districts (R-C, C-1, C-2, L-R) zoning districts;~~ and non-residential properties in the R-1A through R-3B zoning districts: 66%, provided that any applicable permits from other regulating jurisdictions are acquired and as follows:

(i) Improvements that will result in an increased rate of runoff directly entering a public water shall have all structures and practices in place for the collection and treatment of storm water runoff in compliance with the Shorewood Comprehensive Water Resources Management Plan, the most current version of the Minnesota Stormwater Manual guidelines, and applicable watershed rules, as may be amended.

(ii) Measures for the treatment of storm water runoff and/or prevention of storm water from directly entering a public water include such appurtenances as sediment basins (debris basins, desilting basins, or silt traps), installation of debris guards and

1 sump structures on storm water inlets, oil skimming devices, and the like.

2 (de) Properties in commercial districts (R-C, C-1, C-2, L-R) may exceed 66 %
3 with the approval of a conditional use permit subject to the requirements of Section 1201.04,
4 provided that any applicable permits from other regulating jurisdictions are acquired and as
5 follows:

6 (i) Impervious surface coverage shall not exceed 75%.

7 (ii) The standards in (1) (b) (i) and (ii) above and (2) (c) below are met.

8 (2) For all lots in the "S", shoreland zoning district and subject to the regulations in
9 Section 1201.26 of the zoning regulations: 25%, except that the following shall be allowed by
10 conditional use permit subject to the requirements of Section 1201.04 and the following:

11 (a) ~~Multiple-family~~ Residential uses in the R-3A and R-3B zoning districts
12 may be allowed to exceed 25 percent but not greater than 66%, subject to the conditions in (c)
13 and (d) below.

14 ...

15
16 **Section 6.** City Code Section 1201.03 Subd. 4. e. Efficiency Apartments is hereby amended as
17 follows. Text proposed to be added is underlined; text proposed to be removed is ~~stricken~~.

18
19 e. *Efficiency apartments.* Except for ~~elderly age-restricted~~ housing, the number of efficiency
20 apartments in a multiple dwelling shall not exceed 5% of the total number of apartments.

21
22
23 **Section 7.** City Code Section 1201.03 Subd. 5 d. (8) Stall, aisle and driveway design is hereby
24 amended as follows. Text proposed to be added is underlined; text proposed to be removed is
25 ~~stricken~~.

26
27 (8) *Stall, aisle and driveway design.*

28 (a) *Parking space size.* Each parking space shall not be less than nine feet wide and
29 20 feet in length, exclusive of access aisles. Each space shall be adequately served by access
30 aisles.

31 (b) Except in the case of single-family, two-family, and townhouse ~~and~~
32 ~~quadraminium~~ dwellings, parking areas and their aisles shall be developed in compliance with
33 the standards in the Parking Lot Dimensions Table.


1

PARKING LOT DIMENSIONS TABLE*

Angle of Parking	Stall Width	Curb Length Per Car	Stall Depth	Aisle Width	Angle of Parking	Stall Width	Curb Length Per Car	Stall Depth	Aisle Width
0°	9'0"	23'0"	9'0"	12'0"	50°	9'0"	11'9"	20'5"	12'0"
	9'6"	23'0"	9'6"	12'0"		9'6"	12'5"	20'9"	12'0"
	10'0"	23'0"	10'0"	12'0"		10'0"	13'2"	21'0"	12'0"
20°	9'0"	26'4"	15'0"	11'0"	60°	9'0"	10'5"	21'0"	18'0"
	9'6"	27'10"	15'6"	11'0"		9'6"	11'0"	21'3"	18'0"
	10'0"	29'3"	15'11"	11'0"		10'0"	11'6"	21'6"	18'0"
30°	9'0"	18'0"	17'4"	11'0"	70°	9'0"	9'8"	21'0"	19'0"
	9'6"	19'0"	17'10"	11'0"		9'6"	10'2"	21'3"	18'6"
	10'0"	20'0"	18'3"	11'0"		10'0"	10'8"	21'3"	18'0"
40°	9'0"	14'0"	19'2"	12'0"	80°	9'0"	9'2"	20'4"	24'0"
	9'6"	14'10"	19'6"	12'0"		9'6"	9'8"	20'5"	24'0"
	10'0"	15'8"	19'11"	12'0"		10'0"	10'3"	20'6"	24'0"
45°	9'0"	14'0"	19'2"	12'0"	90°	9'0"	9'0"	20'0"	22'0"
	9'6"	14'10"	19'6"	12'0"		9'6"	9'6"	20'0"	22'0"
	10'0"	15'8"	19'11"	12'0"		10'0"	10'0"	20'0"	22'0"

* This table pertains to a wall to wall situation. In calculating dimensions, two feet may be subtracted from each stall depth for ~~each~~ overhang and overlap. No subtraction for overlap is allowed for angles greater than 60 degrees.

2



3

4

(c) Within structures, the off-street parking requirements may be furnished by providing space so designed within the principal building or one accessory structure; however, unless provisions are made, no building permit shall be issued to convert the parking structure into a dwelling unit or living area or other activity until other adequate provisions are made to comply with the required off-street parking provisions of this chapter.

9

(d) Except in the case of single-family, or two-family, ~~townhouse and quadraminium~~ dwellings, parking areas shall be designed so that circulation between parking bays or aisles occurs within the designated parking lot and does not depend upon a public street or alley.

Except in the case of ~~spaces directly in front of a garage for a~~ single, two-family, or townhouse ~~and quadraminium~~ dwellings, parking area design which requires backing into the public street is prohibited.

(e) No curb cut or driveway access shall be located less than 40 feet from the intersection of two or more street rights-of-way. Minimum distance for commercial uses shall be 60 feet. This distance shall be measured from the intersection of lot lines.

(f) No curb cut or driveway access shall exceed 25 feet in width, except on the approval of the City Engineer.

(g) Curb cut or driveway openings shall be at minimum five feet, not including curb radius, from side or rear property lines. Any driveway proposed within a drainage and utility easement shall require approval by the City Engineer and shall be a minimum of ten feet from any public utility main.

(h) Driveway access or curb openings on a public street except for single, two-family, and townhouse ~~and quadraminium~~ dwellings shall not be located less than 40 feet from one another.

(i) The grade elevation of any parking area shall not exceed 5%.

(j) Each property shall be allowed one curb cut or driveway access for each 120 feet of street frontage. All property shall be entitled to at least one curb cut or driveway. Exception: two-family dwellings may have two driveways.

(k) Except in the case of single-family dwellings, all areas intended to be utilized for parking space and driveways shall be paved. Plans for surfacing and drainage of driveways and stalls for five or more vehicles shall be submitted to the City Engineer for his or her review and the final drainage plan shall be subject to his or her written approval.

(l) Curbing and landscaping:

(i) Except for parking in front of a garage for single-family, two-family, or townhouse ~~and quadraminium~~ dwellings, all open off-street parking shall have a perimeter curb barrier of continuous poured concrete around the entire parking lot. The barrier shall not be closer than five feet to any lot line. Grass, plantings or surfacing material shall be provided in all areas bordering the parking area;

(ii) All commercial parking areas shall be brought into conformance with this provision within three years of the date of enactment of this chapter.

(m) Where metal buildings exist on commercial property, a perimeter curb barrier shall be provided around the building no closer than five feet to the building wall.

(n) Except for single-family, two-family, and townhouse ~~and quadraminium~~ dwellings, all parking stalls shall be marked with white or yellow paint lines not less than four inches wide.

(o) Any lighting used to illuminate an off-street parking area shall be so arranged as to reflect the light away from adjoining property, abutting residential uses and public rights-of-way and be in compliance with subdivision 2i of this section.

(p) Surfacing, curbing and striping required by paragraphs (k), (l) and (n) above may be waived or delayed for parking lots in city parks, provided that drainage, traffic, dust control,

1 parking demand, vehicular control and proximity to residential development are taken into
2 consideration and provided that the improvements are incorporated into the city's Capital
3 Improvements Program and reviewed by the City Council annually.

4
5 **Section 8.** City Code Section 1201.03 Subd. 5. f. Setback area is hereby amended as follows.
6 Text proposed to be added is underlined; text proposed to be removed is ~~stricken~~.

7
8 f. *Setback area.* Off-street parking areas shall conform with the following setback
9 provisions:

10 (1) In residential districts, required off-street parking shall not be provided in
11 required front yards (or in required side yards abutting a street in the case of a corner lot) nor
12 within five feet of any side or rear lot line;

13 (2) In the case of single-family, two-family, and townhouse ~~and~~
14 ~~quadraminium~~ dwellings, parking shall be prohibited in any portion of the required front yard,
15 except designated driveways leading directly into a garage or one open, surfaced space located
16 on the side of a driveway, away from the principal use. The extra space shall be surfaced with
17 concrete, bituminous or crushed rock material;

18 (3) There shall be no off-street parking within 15 feet of any street surface;

19 (4) In any of the commercial districts (including the R-C District) no parking
20 space shall be located within 15 feet of any front property line or in any required side or rear
21 yard that abuts any of the classes of residential districts. In no instance shall parking space be
22 located within five feet of a side or rear property line except in the case of joint use parking
23 areas.

24
25
26 **Section 9.** City Code Section 1201.03 Subd. 5. h. Off-Street Parking Requirements is hereby
27 amended as follows. Text proposed to be added is underlined; text proposed to be removed is
28 ~~stricken~~.

29
30 h. *Number of spaces required.* The following minimum number of off-street
31 parking spaces shall be provided and maintained by ownership, easement and/or lease for and
32 during the life of the respective uses hereinafter set forth:

33 (1) Single-family, two-family, and townhouse ~~and quadraminium~~
34 units: two spaces per unit. Townhouses shall require 1 guest parking space for every ~~three~~3
35 dwellings when located adjacent to a public street where no parking is permitted;

36 ...

37 (8) Elderly Age-restricted housing: ~~two-parking-spaces-per-unit two-~~
38 ~~family or townhouses, see (1) above and multiple-family dwellings, see Section 1201.03 Subd.~~
39 20.

40 ...

41
42 **Section 10.** City Code Section 1201.03 Subd. 11 (Sign Regulations) g. (Permit Required) (9) is
43 hereby amended as follows: Text proposed to be added is underlined; text proposed to be
44 removed is ~~stricken~~.

(9) Temporary signs for properties available for sale, lease or rent. Such properties may have the following additional signs:

(a) The maximum size of signs shall not exceed six square feet for single family, two-family, ~~or townhouse or quadraminium~~ homes nor more than 20 square feet for multiple family or nonresidential uses.

Section 11. City Code Section 1201.03 Subd. 11 (Sign Regulations) h. (General Regulations) (14) is hereby amended as follows: Text proposed to be added is underlined; text proposed to be removed is ~~stricken~~.

(14) Temporary signs for properties with construction not related to subdivision. One additional temporary sign may be installed on any property where construction is occurring, but shall not exceed six square feet for single-family, two-family, ~~or townhouse~~ uses of quadraminium nor more than 20 square feet for multiple family or nonresidential uses. The sign shall be removed from the site when the construction project is finished or two years from the initial installation, whichever comes first. The maximum height of such signage is eight feet.

Section 12. City Code Section 1201.03 Subd. 11 (Sign Regulations) i. (District Regulations) is hereby amended as follows: Text proposed to be added is underlined; text proposed to be removed is ~~stricken~~.

i. District Regulations. Subject to other conditions of this subdivision, the following signs are authorized as specified below for each zoning district.

(1) Residential Districts (R-1A - R-3B and residential uses in the PUD and R-C Residential/Commercial Districts)

(a) Commercial speech signs are not allowed for single-family, two-family, ~~or townhouse, and quadraminium~~ uses, except for those authorized in Section 1201.03 Subd. 11 h. (9) and (14).

(b) Allowed area of all signage on each property in residential zoning districts:

Use	Total Area of all Signs unless specified elsewhere in this subdivision
Single-family, two-family, quadraminium , and townhouses	8 square feet
Multiple Family	50 square feet
Non-residential Uses (Not including PUD and R-C districts)	50 square feet per each 10 acres

(c) Allowed freestanding signage on each property in residential zoning districts:

Use	Maximum Sign Area of a single freestanding sign*	Maximum Height of freestanding Signs	Maximum number of signs over 8 square feet
Single-family, two-family, quadraminiums, townhouse	8	6	0
Multiple Family	20	9	1
Non-residential Uses	20	9	1 per street frontage

* sign area is subject to limitation indicated in Section 1201.03 Subd. 11 h (1)(b)

(d) Allowed wall signage on each property in residential zoning districts:

Use	Maximum area of wall signs*	Maximum number of wall signs*
Single-family, two-family, quadraminiums, townhouse	Not permitted, except as allowed by Section 1201.03 Subd. 11 h (5).	
Multiple Family	10 percent of gross silhouette	1 per property
Non-residential Uses	10 percent of gross silhouette	1 per frontage

*Sign area is subject to limitation indicated in Section 1201.03 Subd. 11 h (1) (b)

Section 13. City Code Section 1201.03 Subd. 16 Subdivision of Two-Family or Quadraminium Lots is hereby amended as follows. Text proposed to be added is underlined; text proposed to be removed is ~~stricken~~.

Subd. 16. ~~Subdivision of two-family; or quadraminium lots.~~ The subdivision of base lots containing two-family ~~dwelling or townhouse~~ dwellings ~~or quadraminiums~~ to permit individual private ownership of a single dwelling within the structure is acceptable upon the approval by the City Council. Approval of a subdivision request is contingent on the following requirements.

a. Prior to ~~a two-family dwelling or a quadraminium~~ subdivision, the base lot must meet all the requirements of the zoning district.

b. There shall be no more than one principal structure on a base lot in all residential districts. The principal structure on unit lots created in a two-family or quadraminium by the subdivision will be the portion of the attached dwelling existing or constructed on the platted unit lots.

c. Permitted accessory uses as defined by the zoning districts are acceptable, provided they meet all the zoning requirements.

1 d. A property maintenance agreement must be arranged by the applicant and
2 submitted to the City Attorney for his or her review and subject to approval. The agreement
3 shall ~~insure-ensure~~ the maintenance and upkeep of the structure and the lots to meet minimum
4 city standards ~~and provide a dispute resolution process~~. The agreement is to be filed with the
5 Hennepin County Recorder's office as a deed restriction against the title of each unit lot.

6 e. Separate public utility service shall be provided to each subdivided unit and shall
7 be subject to the review and approval of the City Engineer.

8 f. The subdivision and maintenance agreement are to be processed and recorded
9 in conformance with the requirements of the Shorewood Subdivision Ordinance, Chapter 1202.

10
11
12 **Section 14:** City Code Section 1201.03 Subd. 20 Elderly Housing is hereby amended as follows.
13 Language proposed for insertion is underlined and language proposed to be removed is
14 ~~stricken~~.

15
16 Subd. 20. ~~Elderly Age-Restricted~~ housing.

17 a. *Purpose:* The purpose of this subdivision is to provide opportunities for ~~elderly-age-~~
18 ~~restricted~~ housing within residential zoning districts and to maintain compatibility with other
19 uses within those districts.

20
21 b. ~~Conditional-Allowed~~ use. ~~Elderly Age-restricted~~ housing shall be allowed as a permitted
22 use in the L-R, R-3A and R-3B zoning districts subject to the conditions noted below and by
23 conditional use permit in the following zoning districts: R-1A, R-1B, R-1C, R-1D, R-2A, R-2B, R-
24 2C, ~~R-3A~~, and R-C subject to the requirements in 1201.04 and 1201.06 (planned unit
25 development). ~~In addition subject to the following conditions noted below shall apply:~~

26 (1) ~~Elderly Age-restricted housing projects shall be processed as planned unit~~
27 ~~developments (P.U.D.) in compliance with § 1201.06 of this code;~~

28 (2) Occupancy of each dwelling unit shall be limited to no more than two adults, 62
29 years of age or older. Occupancy of dwellings which qualify as "housing for older persons"
30 under the Federal Fair Housing Act shall be limited to two adults, 55 years of age or older. The
31 occupancy limitations shall be memorialized in restrictive covenants approved by the city and
32 filed with the Hennepin County Recorder. Exception: the occupancy limitations stated above
33 shall not apply to one adult live-in care-provider serving the needs of the primary occupant(s)
34 or dependent children, provided that if the care-provider resides on the premises for more than
35 30 days, notice must be given to the Zoning Administrator;

36 (32) To continue to qualify for the ~~elderly-age-restricted~~ housing classification, the
37 owner, homeowner's association or agency shall annually file with the City Administrator/Clerk
38 and the Zoning Administrator a certified copy of a quarterly resume of occupants of the
39 building or buildings, listing the number of tenants or occupants by age, by unit;

40 (43) Adequate off-street parking must be provided in compliance with Subd. 5 of this
41 section. Parking plans must show room on the site for at least one garage space per dwelling
42 unit;

(54) Parking areas for five or more cars must be screened and landscaped from view of surrounding residential property, in compliance with Subd. 2g of this section;

(65) All signing and informational or visual communication devices shall be in compliance with Subd. 11 of this code.

~~(7) All structures shall comply with the Minnesota State Building Code;~~

~~(86) Elderly housing~~ Parking for multiple-family age-restricted dwellings:

~~(a) Two family, quadraminium, or townhouse housing: two parking spaces per dwelling unit plus 1 guest parking space for every three dwelling units when located adjacent to a public street where no parking is permitted.~~

~~(b) Multiple family dwellings: one and one-half parking spaces per dwelling unit.~~

~~(7) Density and Lot Size:~~

~~(ae) R-3A and R-C: 12 units per acre. All other districts in the R-3B, the density shall be based on the Comprehensive Plan and the rules of the R-3B applicable zoning district.~~

~~(bd) For purposes of calculating density, assisted living dwelling units shall be counted as one-half dwelling unit.~~

~~(9) (c) The minimum site size for elderly age-restricted housing projects shall be three acres;~~

~~(108) Dwelling units may be detached or attached, multiple principal buildings shall be reviewed according to a conditional use permit subject to Section 1201.06;~~

~~(119) Building heights shall be limited to one and one-half stories in all districts except the R-3A, R-3B, L-R, and R-C zoning districts in which buildings may be three stories;~~

~~(1210) Where allowed, multiple-family elderly age-restricted housing must have elevator service to each floor;~~

~~(1311) Usable open space as defined in this chapter is equal, at a minimum, to 20% of the gross lot area. Usable open space shall mean areas under common ownership and include landscaped areas, complimentary structures and improvements, such as pools, tennis courts and the like, for the benefit and enjoyment of the residents of the development but not including parking lots and storm water ponds.~~

(14) The provisions of § 1201.04 Subd. 1d(1) where applicable, are considered and satisfactorily met.

c. *Fees reduced.*

(1) Park dedication fees as required in § 1202.07 Chapter 1202 of City Code except that assisted living dwellings shall be charged park dedication using each dwelling as .25 of a resident dwelling fee. Memory care uses or structures shall be charged according to the same rate as commercial properties.~~this code and~~

1 (2) Local sanitary sewer access charges as required in Section 904.18 Subd. 1 of
2 ~~this code~~ City Code shall be charged on the basis of total number of units proposed with credit
3 for the per unit fee previously paid.

4 (3) Water connection charges shall be as required by Section 903.04 of City Code
5 with credit for the per unit fee previously paid. ~~the development potential of property as~~
6 ~~currently zoned. Fees shall not be charged for additional residential units achieved under b (8)~~
7 ~~(b) of this subdivision.~~

8
9 **Section 15.** City Code section 1201.25 (PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT) Subd. 4
10 (General requirements and standards) I. is hereby amended as follows. Language proposed for
11 insertion is underlined and language proposed to be removed is ~~stricken~~.

12
13 I. ~~Townhouse, quadraminium, and multiple-family dwelling uses.~~

14 (1) No single townhouse structure shall contain more than six dwelling units.

15 (2) ~~Townhouses, quadraminiums, and multiple-family dwelling uses~~ shall be
16 subdivided on an individual unit basis according to the provisions of Subd. 4e(3) of this section.

17 (3) Subdivided townhouse dwellings may be accessed by private streets when the
18 street is designed to fire lane standard as indicated in Minnesota State Fire Code Appendix D as
19 may be amended from time to time.

20 (4) Multiple principal buildings, including detached townhouses, may be allowed but
21 must be separated (measured from finished wall to finished wall) as follows:

22 (a) Townhouses structures: 15 feet

23 (b) Multiple-family structures: 20 feet

24
25
26 **Section 16: Effective Date.** This Ordinance XXX shall take effect upon publication in the City's
27 official newspaper.

28
29 ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SHOREWOOD, MINNESOTA this xxth day of xx,
30 2025.

31
32
33
34 _____
JENNIFER LABADIE, MAYOR

35 ATTEST:

36
37 _____
38 SANDIE THONE, CITY CLERK
39



City of Shorewood

Planning Commission Meeting Item

Item
5A

Title/Subject: Variance to redevelop a nonconforming lot
Meeting Date: February 4, 2025
Prepared by: Marie Darling, Planning Director
Attachments: Location map
Applicant's narrative and plans

APPLICANT: Edward Zaret
LOCATION: 20175 Manor Road
REVIEW DEADLINE: April 22, 2025
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Minimum Density Residential
ZONING: R-1A Single-Family

REQUEST

The applicant requests a variance to redevelop a lot that is nonconforming to lot area as required by the R-1A zoning district. The lot has 25,726 square feet where 40,000 square feet are required. Under the plan, the applicant proposes to remove all the structures on the lot and build a new home with an attached garage. The variance is required only to redevelop the nonconforming lot not for any aspect of the new home construction.



Photo Courtesy Hennepin County

PUBLIC NOTICE

Receipt of application: Notice of the application was sent by postcard to all property owners within 500 feet of the property and by placing a sign in the right-of-way in front of the home.

Public meeting notice: Notice of the public meeting was sent by US mail to all property owners within 500 feet of the property at least 10 days prior to this meeting.

BACKGROUND

Context: The lot was created as a lot in Registered Lane Survey No. 721 which was recorded in 1957. The existing home was originally constructed in about 1955. The lot is currently legally nonconforming for lot area but is conforming to lot width requirements.

The adjacent properties to the north, south and east are all zoned R-1A and developed with single-family homes, except the southwest property owned by the City of Shorewood for open-space. To the west across Manor Road is the Amesbury PUD and subdivision.

Tree preservation will apply to the construction of the home. Staff included a condition requiring more information on the trees to be removed and a landscaping plan if restitution would be required.

Applicable Code Sections:

Section 1201.02. Subd. 2 c. (3): A lot of record existing upon the effective date of this chapter in a residential district which does not meet the requirements of this chapter as to area or width may be utilized for a single-family detached dwelling purpose, provided that:

- (a) The lot must be in separate ownership and not of continuous frontage with other lots in the same ownership;
- (b) The area and width are within 70% of the requirements of this chapter;
- (c) Setbacks and yard requirements shall be in conformance with this chapter;
- (d) The ratio of the floor area of all structures to lot area shall not exceed 30%.

Because the lot area is less than 70 percent of the requirement of the R-1A zoning district (about 64 percent) a variance is required prior to reconstruction of the house. Seventy percent of the required R-1A lot area is 28,000 square feet.

Impervious Surface Coverage:

	Required	Existing	Proposed
Impervious Surface Coverage	33% (max.)	25.2%	24.9%

Height:

	Max Allowed	Proposed
Height	35 ft.	±18ft. (as shown)

* The home may change prior to requesting a permit but must be consistent with the maximum height and other zoning requirements.

APPLICANT'S PROPOSAL

The applicant proposes to demolish all the existing structures on the lot and construct a new home. The house shown is the pre-construction concept. It conforms to all the required setbacks and maximum impervious surface coverage. Prior to issuance of a permit, the applicant would need to conform to tree preservation requirements. A condition to that effect is included in the conditions.

ANALYSIS

Section 1201.05 subd.3.a. of the zoning regulations sets forth criteria for the consideration of variance requests. These criteria are open to interpretation. Staff reviewed the request according to the criteria as follows:

Intent of comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance: The applicants propose to use the property for residential purposes, which is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the intent of the Zoning Ordinance.

Practical difficulties: Practical difficulties include three factors, all three of which must be met.

- a. *Reasonable*: The applicant has shown that they can provide a home on the lot that meets the setbacks and reasonable residential uses on the property. The property is larger than required in all but the R-1A zoning district.
- b. *Unique Situation vs. Self-Created*: The practical difficulty is unique to this property as the lot was created in 1957, prior to modern zoning regulations and they own no adjacent property to combine with this lot to bring the property in conformance. The result is a unique situation rather than being self-created.
- c. *Essential Character*: The privately-owned lots zoned R-1A on the east side of Manor Road in the vicinity of this lot vary from about 21,471 square feet to about 2 acres. Construction of a home on the subject lot is unlikely to impact the essential character of the area.

Economic Considerations: The applicant has not proposed the variance solely based on economic considerations.

Impact on Area/Public Welfare, Other Lands or Improvements: The applicant is not proposing anything that would impair an adequate supply of light and air to an adjacent property or increase the risk of fire. The applicant would be responsible for showing that the development of the property would not increase the rate of stormwater run-off from the additional impervious surface coverage, the same as any other property owner on a conforming lot.

Minimum to Alleviate Practical Difficulty: Staff finds the proposed variance is the minimum request necessary to alleviate the practical difficulty.

FINDINGS/RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the request for a variance subject to the following conditions:

- The applicant must acquire all necessary permits.
- Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant must remove the existing home and all structures.
- Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant must provide a legible survey indicating all the proposed improvements including existing and proposed contours, a tree inventory, preservation plan including information on the significant trees to be removed, and a landscaping plan indicating the number of trees to be replanted.

Staff acknowledges that the variance criteria are open to interpretation. Consequently, the Planning Commission could reasonably find otherwise.



Applicable Code Sections:

Section 1201.02. Subd. 2 c. (3): A lot of record existing upon the effective date of this chapter in a residential district which does not meet the requirements of this chapter as to area or width may be utilized for a single-family detached dwelling purpose, provided that:

- (a) The lot must be in separate ownership and not of continuous frontage with other lots in the same ownership;
- (b) The area and width are within 70% of the requirements of this chapter;
- (c) Setbacks and yard requirements shall be in conformance with this chapter;
- (d) The ratio of the floor area of all structures to lot area shall not exceed 30%.

Because the lot area is less than 70 percent of the requirement of the R-1A zoning district (about 64 percent) a variance is required prior to reconstruction of the house. Seventy percent of the required R-1A lot area is 28,000 square feet.

Impervious Surface Coverage:

	Required	Existing	Proposed
Impervious Surface Coverage	33% (max.)	25.2%	24.9%

Height:

	Max Allowed	Proposed
Height	35 ft.	±18ft. (as shown)

* The home may change prior to requesting a permit but must be consistent with the maximum height and other zoning requirements.

APPLICANT'S PROPOSAL

The applicant proposes to demolish all the existing structures on the lot and construct a new home. The house shown is the pre-construction concept. It conforms to all the required setbacks and maximum impervious surface coverage. Prior to issuance of a permit, the applicant would need to conform to tree preservation requirements. A condition to that effect is included in the conditions.

ANALYSIS

Section 1201.05 subd.3.a. of the zoning regulations sets forth criteria for the consideration of variance requests. These criteria are open to interpretation. Staff reviewed the request according to the criteria as follows:

Intent of comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance: The applicants propose to use the property for residential purposes, which is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the intent of the Zoning Ordinance.

Practical difficulties: Practical difficulties include three factors, all three of which must be met.

- a. *Reasonable*: The applicant has shown that they can provide a home on the lot that meets the setbacks and reasonable residential uses on the property. The property is larger than required in all but the R-1A zoning district.
- b. *Unique Situation vs. Self-Created*: The practical difficulty is unique to this property as the lot was created in 1957, prior to modern zoning regulations and they own no adjacent property to combine with this lot to bring the property in conformance. The result is a unique situation rather than being self-created.
- c. *Essential Character*: The privately-owned lots zoned R-1A on the east side of Manor Road in the vicinity of this lot vary from about 21,471 square feet to about 2 acres. Construction of a home on the subject lot is unlikely to impact the essential character of the area.

Economic Considerations: The applicant has not proposed the variance solely based on economic considerations.

Impact on Area/Public Welfare, Other Lands or Improvements: The applicant is not proposing anything that would impair an adequate supply of light and air to an adjacent property or increase the risk of fire. The applicant would be responsible for showing that the development of the property would not increase the rate of stormwater run-off from the additional impervious surface coverage, the same as any other property owner on a conforming lot.

Minimum to Alleviate Practical Difficulty: Staff finds the proposed variance is the minimum request necessary to alleviate the practical difficulty.

FINDINGS/RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the request for a variance subject to the following conditions:

- The applicant must acquire all necessary permits.
- Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant must remove the existing home and all structures.
- Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant must provide a legible survey indicating all the proposed improvements including existing and proposed contours, a tree inventory, preservation plan including information on the significant trees to be removed, and a landscaping plan indicating the number of trees to be replanted.

Staff acknowledges that the variance criteria are open to interpretation. Consequently, the Planning Commission could reasonably find otherwise.

Location Map



STANDARD NOTES

1. **Site Address:** 2075 Manor Road, Shorewood, MN, 55331
2. **Plat Information:** This property appears to be in Zone 2, as determined by the records of the R.P. record office (Shorewood Plat Book 2, containing Plat No. 2705/34147, effective on 11/4/2004).
3. **Parcel Area Information:** Acreage: 22.124 ± (± 0.001) Acres.
This is an estimated value for the entire lot as shown on the plat.
4. **Boundaries:** Easements are shown on the plat. The boundary between the 2705/34147 and the 2705/34148 is shown.
5. **Fencing Information:** The current fencing for the subject property is 4" x 4" (single fence) 40'00" x 146'47" (double fence) per the City of Shorewood's zoning map dated January 2007. The setback, height, and line space are consistent with the zoning regulations as follows:

Frontal Setback, Setback: Front: 30 feet (Manor Road)
Side: 15 feet (the lot less than 50 feet wide) and 10 feet (the lot less than 50 feet wide) and 10 feet (the lot less than 50 feet wide)
Rear: 30 feet
Height: 34.7 feet (the lot less than 50 feet wide) and 34 feet (the lot less than 50 feet wide)
Maximum: 35 percent of lot area

*Please note that the zoning information shown herein may have been amended through a city process. All zoning information and setbacks are for planning and design use only and should be verified by all parties involved in the design and planning process prior to any planning or construction.

We have not required the current zoning classification and building setback requirements from the owner.


6. **Utility:** We have shown the location of utilities on the subject property by observation and/or by record. There may be underground utilities not shown on the plat. Therefore, please consult with the utility companies for the location of utilities prior to any excavation or construction. Also, please note that the utility companies may not be able to locate all utilities on the subject property before digging. You are required by law to notify the utility companies at least 48 hours in advance at 414-814-0800.

Existing Elevations

Garage Floor Elevation (FFL) = 974.0
First Floor Elevation (FFL) = 974.4
Second Floor Elevation (FFL) = 987.7

Existing Improvements Surface


Lot Area = 22.124 ± A.C.
House Area = 347 ± S.F.
Garage Area = 244 ± S.F.
Overall Area = 591 ± S.F.
Compared to Plat = 176 ± S.F.
Concrete Area = 106 ± S.F.
Deck Area = 107 ± S.F.
Total Area = 213 ± S.F.
Coverage = 28.2%



AUDITOR'S SUBSCRIPTION NO. 141



Measurements are based on the Minnesota County Coordinate System (NAD 83 - 1983 AD)



SURVEY LEGEND

★ CAST IRON MONUMENT	○ PEGMETER	— B.C. WALKOUT ELEVATION
● IRON PIPE MONUMENT SET	— POWER POLE	— F.F. FIRST FLOOR ELEVATION
● IRON PIPE MONUMENT FOUND	— OUT WIRE	— F.F. SECOND FLOOR ELEVATION
● DRILL HOLE FOUND	— ROOF DRAIN	— TOP OF FOUNDATION ELEV.
✕ CHISELED "X" MONUMENT SET	— LAT. STATION	— L.S. LOWEST EXPOSURE ELEV.
✕ CHISELED "X" MONUMENT FOUND	○ SANITARY MANHOLE	— CONCRETE
● REBAR MONUMENT FOUND	○ SANITARY CLEANOUT	— BRICKMASON
△ P.V. NAIL MONUMENT SET	○ STORM MANHOLE	— ALUMINUM SETBACK LINE
▲ P.V. NAIL MONUMENT FOUND	○ STORM DRAIN	— CABLE TV
▲ P.V. NAIL NUT ALUMINUM DISC	○ CATCH BASIN	— CONCRETE SLAB
▲ SURVEY CONTROL POINT	○ FLARED END SECTION	— CONTOUR EXTERIOR
▲ A.U. UNIT	○ TREE CONTOUR	— CONTOUR PROPOSED
○ CABLE TV PEDESTAL	○ TREE DECIDUOUS	— GUARD RAIL
○ ELECTRIC TRANSFORMER	○ TREE DECIDUOUS REMOVED	— DRAIN TILE
○ ELECTRIC MANHOLE	○ TELEPHONE MANHOLE	— ELECTRIC UNDERGROUND
○ ELECTRIC METER	○ TELEPHONE PEDESTAL	— FENCE
○ ELECTRIC OUTLET	○ UTILITY MANHOLE	— FIBER OPTIC UNDERGROUND
○ LIGHT POLE	○ UTILITY PEDESTAL	— GAS UNDERGROUND
○ IRON OPTIC MANHOLE	○ UTILITY VAULT	— OVERHEAD UTILITY
○ FIRE DEPT. HOSE 1 1/2"	○ WATERING MANHOLE	— TREE LINE
○ FUEL PUMP	○ WATER METER	— SANITARY SEWER
○ FUEL TANK	○ WATER SHUT	— STORM SEWER
○ GAS METER	○ WELL	— TELEPHONE UNDERGROUND
○ GAS VALVE	○ MONITORING WELL	— RETAINING WALL
○ GENERATOR	○ SURF STOP	— UTILITY UNDERGROUND
○ GUARD POST	○ GATE VALVE	— WATERMANS
○ HAND HOLE	○ HYDRANT	— TRAFFIC SIGNAL
○ MAIL BOX	○ IRRIGATION VALVE	— RAILROAD TRACKS
	○ POST INDICATOR VALVE	— RAILROAD SIGNAL
	○ SIGN	— RAILROAD SWITCH
	○ SILL BURNING	○ SATELLITE DISH
		○ RETARD BUFFER SIGN

Variance Request

Property Address: 20175 Manor Rd. Shorewood, MN 55331

1. My intent of replacing an existing single-family home with another, more aesthetically pleasing and modern one aligns with the community's vision of maintaining residential character while improving property values. Although the lot size is 9% below the minimum, this new construction will enhance the neighborhood's appearance and maintain the residential use, which is in harmony with the zoning's purpose to foster a stable and attractive living environment.
2. The proposal to rebuild a single-family home in place of an existing one is reasonable. The variance is needed due to the lot size being slightly under the minimum requirement, not due to any intention to change the use or density of the property. The lot's non-conformance with current minimum size requirements likely predates the current zoning regulations, thus representing a unique circumstance the landowner did not create. Replacing an older home with a new one, although on a slightly smaller lot than allowed, will not change the residential nature of the area but will instead enhance it by introducing a modern home.
3. While the new home might have economic benefits, the primary motivation is to improve the property and neighborhood aesthetics, not solely financial gain. I intend to live in this home.
4. The new construction will be designed to respect existing setbacks and building codes concerning light, air, and safety. The lot size variance does not impact street congestion or public safety as it involves a single-family home replacing another.
5. The project will potentially raise property values in the neighborhood by setting an example of quality residential construction. It will not be detrimental as it maintains the residential use and improves the visual appeal.
6. This variance is the least possible deviation from the zoning code to permit the construction of a new home on a lot that is only 9% smaller than required, thus addressing the practical difficulty without setting a precedent for larger deviations from zoning standards.

Sincerely,



12-23-24

Ed Zaret






PRELIMINARY
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
(FOR RECORD PURPOSES ONLY)



1
A1
FRONT ELEVATION
1/4" = 1'-0"



2
A1
RIGHT SIDE ELEVATION
1/4" = 1'-0"


Zaret Residence
20175 Menor Rd
Shorewood, MN

DATE: 10/25/2024
DRAWN BY: BR
PROJECT FILE: 24-01
BEHR DESIGN INC.
10000 Hennepin Ave., Suite 100
Shorewood, MN 55476
Tel: 764-2701 | Fax: 764-4880
www.behrdesign.com


SHEET NO.

A1
of 5 sheets

PRELIMINARY
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
(FOR RECORD PURPOSES ONLY)



1 REAR ELEVATION
1/4" = 1'-0"



2 LEFT SIDE ELEVATION
1/4" = 1'-0"

Zaret Residence
20175 Menor Rd
Shorewood, MN

DATE: 02-20-2024
DRAWN BY: BH
PROJECT FILE: 24-CL
© 2024 BEHR DESIGN INC.
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT MAY BE REPRODUCED OR TRANSMITTED IN ANY FORM OR BY ANY MEANS, ELECTRONIC OR MECHANICAL, WITHOUT PERMISSION IN WRITING FROM BEHR DESIGN INC.

SHEET NO.
A2
1st Edition

PRELIMINARY
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
(FOR BIDDING PURPOSES ONLY)



1 BASEMENT PLAN
AS 1/4" = 1'-0"

- NOTES:
- 1) ALL BRG. HEADERS ARE TO BE DRINKS UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE (S&S)
 - 2) OWNER/CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY ALL ROOMS & DOOR SIZES.
 - 3) OWNER/CONTRACTOR TO SPEC ALL FLOORING MATERIAL.
 - 4) OWNER/CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS.
 - 5) ALL BRG. WALLS PROVIDE A DOOR OPENING HIGHER THAN 6"7" READING (2" THICKNESS MIN. VACUUM ON SIDE OF HATCH).
 - 6) FLOOR: 1" FLUSH BENCH OR DROPPED BENCH.
 - 7) ALL HEADERS ARE DROPPED UNLESS NOTED FLOOR.
 - 8) USE ENERGY RISE HEIGHT ON ROOF TRUSSES.



Zaret Residence
20175 Menor Rd
Shorewood, MN

DATE: 02-20-2024
DRAWN BY: BR
PROJECT FILE: 24-01
BY: BEHR DESIGN INC.
REVISIONS: 1.0
APPROVED BY: [Signature]
PROJECT MANAGER: [Signature]

SHEET NO.
A3
Basement Plan

BEHR
DESIGN INC.

Creating Timeless Designs

OFFICE: (952) 746-7702 | CELL: (952) 994-6682
E-MAIL: mikeb@behr-design.com

[illegible]

Zaret Residence
20175 Manor Rd
Shorewood, MN

DATE: 12/23/2024
DRAWN BY: B.K.
PROJECT FILE: 24-CL

SHEET NO.

A4

Main Floor Plan

