

PL201700276 PL2017-276

**ITEM 3**

7:06 p.m.

<b>CASE:</b>	7088A-13
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Hub Property Trust (owner) Independent School District #271 (user)
<b>LOCATION:</b>	2601 West 88 <sup>th</sup> Street
<b>REQUEST:</b>	Conditional Use Permit for a 31,643 square foot expansion to an existing Instructional Center for vocational and life skills training

Spieß stated she will abstain from participating with this item as she is employed by Independent School District #271 and left the Council Chambers.

**APPLICANT REPRESENTATIVES:**

Tom Holton, Community Service Director, Bloomington School District

**PUBLIC HEARING DISCUSSION:**

Pease identified the location of the site, the surrounding land uses and zoning of the site. He explained the site has been used as an Instructional Center for vocational and life skills training for a number of years and is requesting to expand the same use to a total of approximately 58,000 square feet of the building. Current programs offered would remain in place and the expansion would only include new programs for special education students. Instructional Centers are allowed as a Conditional Use in the B-1 zoning district. Additional parking is not being required as part of this application as the participant will be largely bussed to the site, however a Conditional of Approval (#2) has been included to ensure any change of use or use characteristic will require a parking analysis and approval by the Planning Manager.

Pease stated staff is recommending approval of the Conditional Use Permit for a 31,643 square foot expansion to an existing Instructional Center for vocational and life skills training at 2601 West 88<sup>th</sup> Street subject to 3 conditions of approval and 4 Code requirements listed in the staff report. He stated he is available for questions from the Commission.

Fischer asked for clarification from staff if there will be any exterior additions or modifications. Pease stated all modifications and changes are interior.

Holton stated he is the Bloomington School District Community Service Director. He stated he believes the use of the space has been very compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and has served the needs of the students very well. The expansion will help serve the need of some special education students and will fit in nicely at this location. He stated he is available for questions from the Commission.

Batterson asked for clarification on the times the Instructional Center will be used most heavily. Holton stated the site will be used in three shifts: morning, afternoon and evening with morning and evenings being the heaviest use.

Fischer asked for clarification on what sort of special education students and programs are being offered at this location. Holton stated the type of program is called a Transitions Program. The students are completing high school and range in age up to age 21. The students have a wide range of disabilities and receive training in life skills and occupational skills so they can be productive members of the community. Fischer asked if their on-site actions are limited and if they have access to the parking lot. Holton stated all students in the Transitions Program arrive by bus and do not have vehicles in the

**PL201700276 PL2017-276**

parking lot and their experience is there has been no history of the students creating any sort of issues in the parking lot or in the area surrounding the Center.

Nordstrom asked for clarification on where the student entrances to the Center are and how they relate to the loading and unloading of students from the busses. Holton stated there are three basic types of uses being provided at the site. In the northeast corner of the site are 18-21 year old Career Academy students, the west entrance will be the current occupants.

Willette asked if “timeout” rooms are used within the Center. Holton stated he is not aware of any “timeout” rooms within this site.

The public hearing was closed via a motion.

Batterson stated this seems like a good program and fills a need for the community.

Nordstrom stated the Planning Commission decision on this case is final unless a written appeal is received by the Planning Division by 4:30 p.m. on January 28, 2014.

**ACTIONS OF THE COMMISSION:**

**M/Willette, S/Fischer:** To close the public hearing. Motion carried 4-0. (Spiess not voting)

**M/Fischer, S/Willette:** Having been able to make the required findings in Case 7088A-13, I move the Planning Commission adopt a resolution approving a Conditional Use Permit for expansion of an existing instructional center located at 2601 West 88<sup>th</sup> Street subject to 3 conditions of approval and 4 Code requirements listed in the staff report. Motion carried 4-0. (Spiess not voting)

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION:**

- 1) Instructional Center is limited to floor plans as shown in Case File 7088A-13;
- 2) Any change of use or use characteristics to the space will require a parking analysis and approval by the Planning Manager;
- 3) Sewer Availability Charge (SAC) be paid in cash prior to issuance of a building permit;

and subject to the follow code requirements:

- 1) All trash and recyclable materials be stored inside the principal building. (Sec. 19.51);
- 2) Food service plans be approved by the Environmental Health Division (City Code Sec. 14.360);
- 3) All pickup and drop-off occur on site and off of public streets; and
- 4) Signage be in conformance with the requirements of Chapter 19, Article X of the City Code.

~~Approved Off-Sale Intoxicating Liquor Licenses Item 4.1E~~ ~~Motion made by Peterson, seconded by Ornat, to approve the following Off-Sale Intoxicating Liquor License Renewals for the period of July 1, 2001 through June 30, 2002: 7 Eights Liquors, Big Bottle, Bucks Bi-Lo Liquors, Budget Liquor, Cedar Liquor, Cellars Wines & Spirits, Cheers Wine & Spirits, Fine Wine Shop, Geerlings & Wade, Haskell's, Liquor Barrel (The), Liquor Locker, MGM Liquor Warehouse (two locations), MN Wines & Spirits, Otto's Liquors, Sid's Discount Liquors, United Penn Lake Liquor, Village Square Liquors, and Wakefield's Liquor. Motion passed 5-0-1 (Winstead abstaining).~~

~~Approved Class A Lawful Gambling License Premise Permit for Bloomington Crime Prevention Item 4.1F R-2001-45~~ ~~Motion made by Peterson, seconded by Abrams, to approve the application for a Class A Lawful Gambling Premise Permit for Bingo, Raffles, Tipboards, Paddlewheels and Pull-Tabs for Bloomington Crime Prevention at the Bloomington Crime Prevention Place, 8049 Morgan Circle. Motion passed 4-1-1 (Ornat opposing and Winstead abstaining).~~

~~Bernhardson stated that at the May 7, 2001, Council meeting, the conditional use permit was granted for this location and this is the actual application for the Bloomington Crime Prevention Association to be able to operate lawful gambling at the Bloomington Crime Prevention Place at 8049 Morgan Circle.~~

~~Approved Revised Final Site Plans and Building Plans for General Dynamics Information Systems at 2601 West 88<sup>th</sup> Street Case 7088A-01 Item 4.2~~ ~~Motion made by Ornat, seconded by Fossum, to approve the revised final site plans and building plans for parking lot additions and related improvements, including landscaping and wall change, for the property at 2601 West 88<sup>th</sup> Street, Case 7088A-01, for General Dynamics Information Systems, subject to the following 9 conditions of approval and 8 Code requirements being satisfied prior to grading, footing, and foundation permits as set forth by the Planning Division staff and the Planning Commission. Motion passed 5-1-0 (Peterson opposing).~~

1. Grading, drainage, utility and erosion control plans be approved by the City Engineer;
2. Access, circulation and parking plans be approved by the City Engineer, to include traffic control and directional signage plan;
3. Erosion control measures be in place prior to issuance of grading permits;
4. Nine Mile Creek Watershed District approval and permit be provided to the manager of Building and Inspection;
5. Developer shall be responsible for traffic improvements needed to support any additional traffic generation;
6. A SAC questionnaire be completed and submitted to the Department of Public Works;

~~and subject to the following additional conditions:~~

7. Alterations to utilities be at the developer's expense;
8. All pickup and drop-off occur on site and off of public streets; and
9. All loading and unloading occur on site and off of public streets.

~~and subject to the following Code requirements:~~

1. Three-foot high solid screening be provided along West 88<sup>th</sup> Street as approved by the Planning Manager (Sec. 19.52);
2. Five-foot high solid screening be provided along the west property line south of the public soccer fields as approved by the Planning Manager (Sec 19.52);
3. Landscape plan be approved by the Planning Manager (Sec 19.52);
4. Poured-in-place concrete curbs be provided on the perimeter of parking lots and traffic islands (Sec 19.64);
5. Fire lanes be posted as approved by the Fire Marshal ( Uniform Fire Code Sec. 901.4);
6. Parking lot and site security lighting shall satisfy the requirements of Section 19.54 of the City Code;
7. Signage be in conformance with the requirements of Chapter 19, Article X of the City Code; and
8. Unused water services to be abandoned as per City Code.

PL201700276  
PL2017-276

Clark Arneson, Senior Planner, explained that this is a requested public hearing to allow the neighbors to address the City Council on their specific concerns relating to this application. He explained that the application is for two parking lot additions to the General Dynamics site at 2601 West 88<sup>th</sup> Street. He stated that this application is to add 131 parking spaces over what was a Proof of Parking requirement for Control Data in 1984. He stated that the neighborhood concern is regarding the proposed 113 new parking spaces to be added to the north side of the property along West 88<sup>th</sup> Street and the 236 spaces to be added on the southerly portion of the site. He explained that the building footprint is not expanding, only internal remodeling and that the addition of parking is to meet the required City Code for that size of building. Arneson stated that since the time the application was recommended for approval by the Planning Commission, the architect has submitted a revised plan as a result of citizens' concerns that adds 20 conifers and a retaining wall with a 42-inch berm. He stated that the newly revised plan exceeds City Code.

Speaker #1: Larry Tritchler, 2612 West 88<sup>th</sup> Street

He stated that the neighbors were in shock when they learned about the proposed parking lot expansions. He stated that the landscaping currently on the north side of the property along West 88<sup>th</sup> Street is very nice with a green lawn and trees and that it's a shame to tear it up. He suggested the following other possibilities: locate the additional parking on the east side or purchase a portion of the large City-owned soccer field to the west of General Dynamics that is seldom used. He stated that a real estate agent told the homeowners they could expect to take a \$10,000 - \$14,000 loss on the sale of their properties. He suggested that the berm be built higher to five feet so that the cars in the parking lot addition would not be visible. He stated that the 40 trees proposed by the developer is not enough and requested that the developer consider putting in an additional 20 trees. He requested the Council delay its vote for two weeks to allow the neighbors to conduct further meetings with General Dynamics to try and reach the best solution for both the applicant and the neighbors.

Abrams inquired if the north parking could be approved as Proof of Parking or are the spaces actually needed now.

Gaylen Doyle, Planner, indicated that the applicant does plan on needing the parking and stated that the School District has an easement over the parking on the south side of the building. He stated that in 1984 when the property was rezoned, the square footage of the building required parking of 950 spaces and at that time, 747 spaces were supplied so there is only a net increase of approximately 130 spaces occurring on the site above what the Proof of Parking was 16 years ago. In addition, Doyle stated that it's the location of the parking that is anticipated on the north end of the site to accommodate the proximity of the building tenants.

Speaker #2: Bill Polta, 8943 Vincent Place

He stated that he has approximately 250 feet that border on the southwesterly portion of the applicant's property and that he has had an excellent relationship with the building owner for the past 13 years. He stated that he believes the applicant would adhere to all of the rules and regulations and would probably exceed them where possible if the plan is approved.

Speaker #3: Jennifer Vigliaturo, 8809 Penn Avenue South

She stated her main concern is the additional traffic on Penn Avenue that will be generated as a result of the additional parking spaces making it more difficult to cross Penn Avenue from her home. She stated that the traffic on Penn Avenue has increased dramatically since the site was rezoned in 1984. She stated that there is no traffic light at the intersection of 88<sup>th</sup> Street & Penn Avenue and that there are accidents all summer and winter long. She stated that because Penn Avenue is a County road, the traffic light has not been pursued. She too requested that the Council delay their decision on this for two weeks to allow for the results of the traffic signal warrant criteria to see if the traffic count is getting close to warranting the lights.

Shelly Pederson, City Engineer, stated that the applicant's consultant did perform a traffic analysis and that the intersection of 88<sup>th</sup> Street and Penn Avenue did not meet the warrants for a traffic signal. The volume of traffic in the area and the accident history are both used in determining the warrants for traffic signals. She stated that staff will continue to monitor the intersection and would inquire of the County how close the intersection is to meeting those warrants. She stated that Penn Avenue is a County road and a State Aid facility.

Item 4.2 continued

Bernhardson requested that the summary of the traffic warrants be provided to Council with the Friday Manager's Information. He added that a letter would also be sent to Ms. Vigliaturo explaining the warrant conditions and how close the current conditions are to meeting the criteria for a signal in that location.

Abrams requested from staff information regarding whether or not there are extenuating conditions for circumstances like this area where there is the existence of a public library, and if there aren't, could they be considered similar to the areas near an elementary school where a pedestrian-activated crossing light could be installed.

Speaker #4: Dave Remington, 2622 West 88<sup>th</sup> Street

He stated that a berm was previously proposed to make the parking area along the north look better but that it is a joke and now they're going through it again. He stated that the tenant that needs the additional parking along the north side should sign a 20-year lease. He also mentioned the traffic problem on Penn Avenue and how hard it is to make a left turn from either West 88<sup>th</sup> Street or a left turn off of Queen Avenue onto West 90<sup>th</sup> Street.

Fossum inquired of the property owner's representative if flexible work hours are in place for the employees so that they are all not arriving and leaving at the same time.

John Dietrich, RLK -Kuusisto, site planners, civil engineers, and architects for the project, stated that based on the current employee distribution, 7.5 percent of the employees arrive at 5:00 a.m., 27 percent arrive between 5-6:00 a.m., 4 percent from 6-7:30 a.m., and 30 percent between 7:30-8:30 a.m. He stated that the distribution numbers are comparable in the evening as the employees leave work.

Abrams inquired if the new tenants in the building would have staggered work hours similar to the employees of the main building, and if they are, how will that be enforced.

Dietrich stated that a Traffic Management Plan would be an appropriate element to put in with the lease for the new tenants on the north end of the building.

Abrams requested clarification from staff regarding condition of approval No. 5 regarding, "Developer shall be responsible for traffic improvements needed to support any additional traffic generation." He inquired what would be required of the developer.

Doyle responded that it is more of a general condition and that according to the Assistant City Traffic Engineer Paul Zager, no type of improvements were determined necessary at this time to the public streets or entryways other than the relocated driveway to West 88<sup>th</sup> Street that the applicant is proposing based on the data received. However, the possibility was left open for the future should an improvement become necessary that could reduce the impact or improve movement.

Peterson stated that the information regarding the signal warrants at the intersection of West 88<sup>th</sup> Street and Penn Avenue would be helpful to him in his decision making as he has experienced the traffic problems in the area. He compared this application to the one that was approved for the former Diversified Pharmaceuticals on 78<sup>th</sup> Street in which traffic signal improvements were required as part of the approval process.

Dietrich stated that Condition No. 5 that Abrams referred to was actually written prior to the report going to the City Planning Commission and that subsequent to the Planning Commission action on the site, as a result of the traffic analysis that the applicant submitted to the Assistant City Traffic Engineer, determined that no other off-site improvements would be needed in order to support the site plan as proposed. He stated he believed Condition No. 5 was more for the internal and egress movements and curb cuts necessary for the site plan to occur and not for off-site improvements based on Mr. Zager's determination. He requested that the Council approve the plan tonight as they have put forward extra screening on the north side of the site to appease the neighbors.

Speaker #5: Peter Packard, 2510 West 88<sup>th</sup> Street

He stated that the applicant has been a good neighbor to him and stated that the applicant has always listened to the neighbors' concerns in the past and that they have always gone beyond what was required of them. He stated that it is well within the rights of the applicant to request the additional parking and believes they will honor their plan for landscaping and screening. He added that although the traffic light at West 88<sup>th</sup> Street and Penn Avenue is probably very much needed, it shouldn't be tied to the approval of this plan and this applicant.

Mr. Tritchler reapproached to state that all the neighbors are asking for is some better screening from the cars and that they would like more trees than what was included in the applicant's latest plan. He again requested a two-week delay on the Council's decision.

Peterson inquired of staff what the policy is regarding fencing around stormwater ponds and if they are necessary.

Shelly Pederson replied that staff does not recommend fences around stormwater ponds unless it is surrounded by a retaining wall and it's a safety issue. She explained that a stormwater pond designed to look like other natural water bodies in the city with side slopes would be desired and that the State Water Resources Conference also recommends that they be unfenced.

Ornat believes the plan will be good for the neighborhood if the applicant completes the plan with the revised plantings.

Peterson stated that he could not support the plan until he has the traffic light warrant information.

Abrams added that the additional traffic information is needed in order for the Council to access whether additional requirements or conditions on tenant leases, staggered work times, or a pedestrian-activated cross-walk at 88<sup>th</sup> & Penn Avenue should be added.

A substitute motion was made by Abrams, seconded by Peterson, to continue the item until the June 4, 2001, Regular Council meeting. Motion failed 2-4-0 (Winstead, Fossum, Harden and Ornat opposing).

Winstead stated that he would not support continuing the item as the traffic study was conducted and that the Traffic Division determined that the data in the traffic analysis did not meet the warrant criteria and that if they do meet the conditions in the future, the matter will be brought forward to the County.

Ornat agreed with Winstead and encouraged staff to do an in-depth study of that neighborhood to see what can be done to assist them with the traffic problems but believes that is a separate issue from the one being considered tonight.

Peterson inquired if the issue of a fence around the stormwater pond could be an added condition subject to the approval of the City Engineer.

Dietrich stated that General Counsel was consulted to see if the site plan could go forth without a fence around the stormwater pond and he was instructed that from a liability standpoint, the pond needs to have a fence around it.

Ornstein stated that because the stormwater pond will be on private property and the owner's attorney is advising a fence, it would not be in the City's best interest for the City Council to prevent such a fence.

Abrams suggested that as a friendly amendment, a condition be added that would require potential tenants to submit a Traffic Management Plan compatible with the Traffic Management Plan of General Dynamics, as he understood Mr. Dietrich had stated earlier would be agreeable.

Dietrich withdrew the motion for future tenants to submit a Traffic Management Plan comparable to that of General Dynamics adding that he may have overstated his position.

Item 4.2 continued

Speaker #6: Jim Pierson, General Dynamics Real Estate Facilities Manager  
He stated that a flexible work schedule is in place at General Dynamics but that there is no formal traffic management plan. He does not believe such a plan could be forced upon future subtenants.

~~Adopted Ordinance  
Directing that East 105<sup>th</sup>  
Street be Renamed East  
105<sup>th</sup> Street Circle  
Item 4.3  
O-2001-17~~

~~Motion made by Fossam, seconded by Peterson, and all voting aye, to adopt an ordinance directing that East 105<sup>th</sup> Street be renamed East 105<sup>th</sup> Street Circle, modifying the City Code sections to conform with this change, and deleting No Parking restrictions on a portion of said street, thereby amending Sections 8.24(a) and 8.86(a) of the City Code.  
  
No staff report was provided.~~

Approved Two-Year  
Renewals for Temporary  
Conditional Use Permits  
for Billboards for Eller  
Media Company  
Item 5.1A-D

Motion made by Peterson, seconded by Harden, and all voting aye, to approve the renewal of the following two-year temporary conditional use permits for billboards for Eller Media Company around the city subject to the following conditions in each case.  
  
Larry Lee, Community Development Director, stated that Eller Media Company is proposing renewal of temporary conditional use permits for billboards at four sites and that they are all recommended for approval with similar conditions of approval as stated.

9600 Aldrich Avenue  
Case 652A-01  
Item 5.1A

5.1A Case 652A-01 (9600 Aldrich Avenue)  
  
1. The approved advertised copy area for each face shall consist of only the basic 14'x 48' panel with no extensions to the top, sides or bottom of either panel;  
2. All advertising copy shall be within the approved copy area;  
3. The height of the billboard shall not be increased above the survey height of 40'5"; and  
4. A summary sheet containing a description of the billboard advertiser and display dimensions, including extensions and a picture of the copy face of each billboard face, if requested by the Planning Manager, in a format approved by the Planning Manager, be submitted to the Planning Division within 15 days of the change of face.

405 East 78<sup>th</sup> Street  
Case 4234A-01  
Item 5.1B

5.1B Case 4234A-01 (405 East 78<sup>th</sup> Street)  
  
1. The approved advertising copy area for each face shall consist of only the basic 14'x 48' panel with no extensions to the top, sides or bottom of either panel;  
2. All advertising copy shall be within the approved copy area;  
3. The height of the billboard shall not be increased above the surveyed height of 39 feet; and  
4. A summary sheet containing a description of the billboard advertiser and display dimensions, including extensions and a picture of the copy face of each billboard face, if requested by the Planning Manager, in a format approved by the Planning Manager, be submitted to the Planning Division within 15 days of the change of face.

4300 West 78<sup>th</sup> Street  
Case 5029A-01  
Item 5.1C

5.1C Case 5029A-01 (4300 West 78<sup>th</sup> Street)  
  
1. The approved advertising copy area for each face shall consist of only the basic 14'x 48' panel with no extensions to the top, sides or bottom of either panel;  
2. All advertising copy shall be within the approved copy area;  
3. The height of the billboard shall not be increased above the surveyed height of 38.7 feet; and  
4. A summary sheet containing a description of the billboard advertiser and display dimensions, including extensions and a picture of the copy face of each billboard face, if requested by the Planning Manager, in a format approved by the Planning Manager, be submitted to the Planning Division within 15 days of the change of face.

The motion to amend the time period for the temporary conditional use permit to one year. The vote on the amendment was ayes, Schuler, Peterson and Blessum, and nays, Mahon and Lindau, and the motion carried 3-2. The vote on the original motion as amended as ayes, Schuler, Peterson, Blessum and Lindau, and nay, Mahon, and the motion carried 4-1.

## Declare Recess

A short recess was declared after which the meeting was reconvened by the Mayor at 9:05 p.m.

Ordinance to Rezone  
Property - 5501 Auto  
Club Road  
Item 4.10  
0-84-44

The Council was requested to consider adopting an ordinance to rezone property located at 5501 Auto Club Road from Single-Family Residential R-1 to Residential Planned Development R-1(PD), thereby amending Chapter 19 of the City Code.

The Planning Commission, at its meeting of July 26, recommended approval of the rezoning. The Director of Planning explained the proposal for the development of land at this location, using drawings posted on the wall to illustrate his remarks. Robert Hoffman, attorney for the developer of the property, said three meetings had been held with the neighborhood to explain the proposal. Following discussion, motion was made by Lindau, seconded by Blessum, and all present voting aye (5-0) to close the hearing and adopt the ordinance.

Preliminary and Final  
Development Plan for  
Property at 5501 Auto  
Club Road  
Case 9147A-84  
Item 5.1

The Council was requested by Federated Development to consider approving the preliminary and final development plan for property at 5501 Auto Club Road. The applicant proposes to erect 12 two-family dwellings with an overall density of four units per acre. Four structures would face Auto Club Road where a common private drive is proposed, and eight structures would face Normandale Boulevard to the southeast and a cul-de-sac turnaround would be provided on Normandale Boulevard.

The Planning Commission, at its meeting of July 26, recommended approval of the preliminary and final development plans, based on making the required City Code findings in Section 19.38.01(e) (5) (A) through (H) with the following conditions:

1. minimum setback of any structure from Auto Club Road be 50 feet,
2. minimum setback from Normandale Boulevard be 40 feet,
3. no construction or grading be allowed in Phases 2 and 3 of the development, except for required erosion control, until soils in the Phase 1 construction area have been stabilized,
4. berming be constructed along Normandale Boulevard to inhibit unauthorized motorized traffic in the low-lying areas, as approved by the Traffic Engineer,
5. no on-street parking be allowed on abutting public streets,
6. typical unit floor plans, building elevations, and final plans for each unit be approved by the Director of Planning.

Robert Hoffman, attorney for the applicant, reviewed the proposal, noting a number of meetings had been held with the neighborhood to explain the plans. In response to a question by the Council, he said the proposed selling price had been \$200,000 for each unit but this price may be reduced by 20% because of economies that have been realized in development. Schuler questioned the size of each unit and Mr. Hoffman said each will be about 2,000 square feet in size. Schuler proposed that condition 6 be modified to include that the size of each unit will be approximately 2,000 square feet in size.

Following discussion, motion was made by Lindau and seconded by Blessum to approve the preliminary and final development plans based on making the required City Code findings and on compliance with the conditions set forth by the Planning Commission with a modification of the sixth condition to include that each unit will be approximately 2,000 square feet in size. The vote on the motion was ayes, Schuler, Peterson, Blessum and Lindau, and nay, Mahon, and the motion carried 4-1. Mahon said he opposed the motion because of the modification of the sixth condition controlling the size of each unit because he felt there could be potential buyers who may wish a different size unit that would still meet the requirements of the City Code.

Resolution Amending  
Comprehensive Plan  
Item 4.11  
R-84-156 and  
Ordinance Rezoning  
Property at 2601 West  
88th Street  
Item 4.11A.  
0-84-45

The Council was requested to consider approving a resolution amending the Comprehensive Plan which would change the land use designation for 23 of the 48 acres of land located at 2601 West 88th Street from Public to Office. In addition, the Council was requested to consider adopting an ordinance that would rezone this property from Single-Family Residential R-1 to Limited Business B-1, thereby amending Chapter 19 of the City Code.

The Planning Commission, at its meeting of July 26, recommended approval of the amendment of the Comprehensive Plan and the rezoning of the property.

Plans were posted on the wall and were reviewed by the Director of Planning who indicated that in addition to the Planning Commission review there also has been review by the Natural Resources Commission, Traffic and Transportation Advisory Commission and the Economic Development Commission, all of whom recommended approval with certain conditions.

Robert Hoffman, attorney for the developer of the property, Control Data Corporation, reviewed the plans for the project. He said there would be little change in the exterior of the building which will be used for office and research. The interior will be remodeled and parking lots will be designed to utilize the various exits of the building. Ingress and egress to the site will be from 88th Street, Queen Avenue, and 90th Street with three entrances on the latter street. However, he noted that one entrance will be for ingress only and one will be for egress only. The entrance in the middle of the site on the 90th Street side will be for both ingress and egress.

PL201700276  
PL2017-276

Ron Cauldwell, Vice President of the Real Estate Division for CDC, said closing on the property will be this [redacted] and renovation started shortly thereafter. He said occupancy will begin in early 1985 with full occupancy in less than a year.

Speaking in opposition to the entrances on 90th Street were Emily Taylor, 2811 West 90th Street; Keith Olson, 2531 West 90th Street; and Ed Macy, 9017 Vincent Avenue South. All cited their fears of increased traffic on 90th Street if there are entrances from 90th to the site.

Mrs. Roger Hall, 9008 Vincent Avenue South, asked what was being proposed for the wooded area to the west of the site being purchased by Control Data Corporation. The Mayor said that land was not under consideration and he was not aware of what any future use would be. The City Manager said a petition has been received from the neighborhood in regard to this property and it has been forwarded to the Park and Recreation Advisory Commission for its consideration.

Following discussion, motion was made by Mahon, seconded by Peterson, and all present voting aye, to adopt a resolution amending the Comprehensive Plan. Motion was made by Lindau, seconded by Blessum, and all present voting aye (5-0) to close the hearing and to adopt an ordinance rezoning the property.

~~Amend Comprehensive  
Plan from Public  
to Office  
Case 7008AB-84  
Item 5.2~~

~~The Council was requested by Control Data Corporation to consider approving an amendment of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan to show office use for property at 2601 West 88th Street instead of public use.~~

~~The Planning Commission, at its meeting of July 26, recommended approval of the amendment. Following discussion, motion was made by Lindau, seconded by Blessum, and all present voting aye, to approve the amendment of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan. Blessum noted that the concerns of the neighborhood should be recognized in the development of the property by Control Data Corporation.~~

~~Variances for  
Metropolitan Sports  
Facilities Commission  
Case 6917CDEFGHI-84  
Item 4.12~~

~~The Council was requested by the Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission to consider approving seven variances for property at 7901 Cedar Avenue as follows:~~

- ~~(C) reduce landscaped yard along all abutting public streets from 20 feet to 0 feet,~~
- ~~(D) eliminate three-foot high screening between public streets and parking lot,~~
- ~~(E) eliminate three percent required landscaping in parking lots,~~
- ~~(F) eliminate requirement for perimeter concrete curbs,~~
- ~~(G) eliminate requirement for traffic safety islands in parking lot,~~
- ~~(H) reduce size of parking space from 300 square feet to 242 square feet,~~
- ~~(I) eliminate requirement for interior storm water collection system.~~

~~The Planning Commission, at its meeting of August 9, recommended denial of all of the variances.~~

~~The City Manager noted that in the purchase agreement the City has with the Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission for the purchase of the 99.3 acres of the stadium property, there is a paragraph concerning the City's responsibility to grant variances and permits to allow the continued use of the 47 acres north of this property by the North Stars for the Sports Center and related parking. He said there is no specification of the extent of the variances that should be granted but the number of spaces needed for the North Stars is for 6,000 cars.~~

~~David Knodell, attorney for the Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission, reviewed the history of the property and indicated control of its operation was given to the commission in 1976 by the Legislature. He said the use agreement with the North Stars obligates the commission to provide sufficient space for parking and this was defined by a court decision to be 6,000 spaces.~~

~~Richard Kenney, Chief Engineer with Walker Parking Consultants, said his company has prepared the plan proposed for parking of cars on the North Star property. He said because 40% of the cars that would be parked are small cars, the amount of space allowed for each car of eight feet will be sufficient because the smaller cars will require less space providing the additional space needed by larger cars. He said with fewer exits there may be a longer time required to get out of the parking lot but the ingress and egress will be more orderly. He noted there will be parking attendants on the lot directing patrons where to park when events are scheduled at the Sports Center. In response to a question by the City Manager, Mr. Kenney said that the parking lot will not be restriped.~~

~~Speaking in opposition to granting of the variances were the follows:~~

~~John Karr, President of the North Star Financial Corporation, objected to the variances because he said the Stadium Commission is taking advantage of the provision in the purchase agreement relating to the variances and permits rather than taking definitive steps to improve the parking situation at the Sports Center.~~

~~James Goddard, Director of Operations for Met Sports Center, said he is proud of the facility but the parking lot is a disgrace. He said the Commission's plans for the parking lot will not result in any improvement and said the only way there can be adequate parking would be for the commission to secure additional property or to construct parking structures. He said the Commission's plan for parking is inadequate particularly because the size of each parking stall has been reduced by one-half foot.~~

~~James Benschel of Benschel and Associates reviewed the plan for parking as proposed by his company.~~