

**Approved Minutes  
Planning Commission Meeting  
February 19, 2020**

4.1

Chair Anderson called a Meeting of the Plymouth Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 3400 Plymouth Boulevard, on February 19, 2020.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Marc Anderson, Commissioners Julie Witt, Justin Markell, and Michael Boo

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Commissioners Bryan Oakley, Donovan Saba and David Witte

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Manager Barbara Thomson, Senior Planner Shawn Drill, Community Development Director Steve Juetten and City Engineer Chris LaBounty

OTHERS PRESENT: Councilmember Ned Carroll

Chair Anderson led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**Plymouth Forum**

**Approval of Agenda**

Motion was made by Commissioner Markell, and seconded by Commissioner Boo, to approve the agenda. With all members voting in favor, the motion carried.

**Consent Agenda**

Motion was made by Commissioner Boo, and seconded by Commissioner Markell, to adopt the Consent Agenda that included the following item:

(4.01) Planning Commission minutes from meeting held on February 5, 2020.

With all members voting in favor, the motion carried.

**Public Hearings**

**New Business**

**(6.01) Public meeting on an environmental assessment worksheet (EAW) and sketch plan for redevelopment of the former Hollydale Golf Course site located at 4710 Holly Lane. (2019086)**

Chair Anderson opened with a background statement to help frame what will be happening next. He noted that several neighbors have spoken at recent Planning Commission public forums. He explained the nature of an EAW and a sketch plan and stated that he expected comments on both will likely be intermingled.

Senior Planner Drill gave an overview of the staff report.

Commissioner Markell asked if staff has discussed potential impacts additional homes could bring related to electrical services with Xcel.

City Engineer LaBounty stated that is an ongoing discussion with staff and Xcel and noted that an answer would be provided prior to the review by the City Council.

Commissioner Markell asked for clarification on the issue of deferred taxes.

Senior Planner Drill confirmed that the property owner would pay the difference in taxes from what has been paid and what would be owed by rezoning the property.

Commissioner Markell referenced a letter received from a resident in response to the traffic study, which states that the study did not adequately count the traffic on Comstock Lane. He asked what was studied as part of that process.

City Engineer LaBounty stated that because the comment was received in writing, it will become part of the written record, and there will be a formal response. He stated that the traffic study analyzed the four main intersections surrounding the development as well as two additional intersections.

Commissioner Boo stated that a number of comments from the community related to the current runoff conditions from the subject site onto adjacent properties. He commented that the EAW should address those existing conditions in order to determine appropriate adjustments that would be needed with development.

Senior Planner Drill explained that would be a part of the next step in the process, when a grading plan is developed for the site.

Commissioner Boo referenced the traffic study and noted there is a proposal to restrict left-hand turns onto Schmidt Lake Road from Comstock Lane. He said he did not believe the impact of that restriction was fully accounted for in the impact of traffic onto Holly Lane and the traffic that would go to the west from Holly Lane onto Old Rockford Road.

City Engineer LaBounty commented that the traffic study did take into account that restriction. He stated the EAW would require that the developer meet all the City's requirements for stormwater as part of development.

Chair Anderson noted staff stated that transportation would remain at an acceptable level and asked for further definition of that phrase.

City Engineer LaBounty explained how an acceptable level of service is determined in the metropolitan area, ranging from A to D, noting that additional detail can be found in the traffic study.

Chair Anderson asked if the projected changes in the levels of service were a part of the study.

City Engineer LaBounty displayed the table that shows the projected changes to the levels of service for the intersections. He reviewed different examples.

Chair Anderson asked if the traffic study was ordered by the City or developer and whether the City has done additional study.

City Engineer LaBounty replied that the traffic study was required from the developer as part of the process. He explained that the developer was responsible for funding the study, but the City was in charge of the study and contracted with a third party to complete it.

Chair Anderson introduced Jake Walesch, representing the applicant, who stated that the neighborhood meeting the previous week was well attended, noting that following their presentation, they offered those attending the opportunity to ask questions and make comments. He noted that the majority of the comments were related to traffic, buffers to existing homes, and drainage concerns. He noted since that meeting they have had several conversations with neighbors that immediately abut the golf course property, relating to buffers and drainage in an attempt to determine how those elements could be addressed if the development moves forward. He stated they have not developed grading or stormwater management plans at this time, but are aware of the existing problems and will design their plans in an attempt to help with the existing issues. He stated they have an interest in not just meeting the City's requirements for runoff control, but exceeding those requirements. He noted they would also work with the City to determine if something could be done on a regional basis to assist with the drainage issues that neighboring properties currently experience. He noted the sketch plan was designed for the purpose of the traffic study and EAW. He stated they would like to hear from the residents as to what is important for them and what they would like to see if this moves forward.

Commissioner Markell agreed that the sketch plan served the purposes described, but noted he was surprised that there was a proposed and alternative site plan that really did not have much difference between them. He asked what went into the design of the sketch plan and alternate plan.

Mr. Walesch replied that the alternate plan changes the route and termination of Holly Lane.

Senior Planner Drill noted that the proposed access to the site is also changed in the alternate sketch plan.

Commissioner Markell asked if the square-shaped lot near the south end of Holly Lane identifies a community amenity that would be proposed.

Mr. Walesch replied that is the location of an existing home.

Commissioner Markell stated that he appreciates the plan of the roads in the alternate plan, but was concerned that plan would lead traffic into Timbers Edge, which does not have an outlet.

Mr. Walesch stated that in the alternate plan, Timbers Edge would access through the new development.

Commissioner Markell asked if there are any other elements that would be changed between the two sketch plans.

Mr. Walesch confirmed there were no other changes. He noted the two plans were developed to be similar for the purpose of the EAW and traffic study, and therefore only the access and Holly Lane were changed.

Commissioner Markell asked the price points for the three different lot sizes.

Mr. Walesch commented that the lots identified in orange would range from \$800,000 to \$1,500,000; the purple lots from \$600,000 to \$900,000; and the villa lots from \$550,000 to \$900,000.

Commissioner Boo referenced the impact the site may have on adjacent neighbors currently and noted that a greater number of storms and greater water volume from those storms are anticipated for the future. He asked how those issues are being considered for this development.

Mr. Walesch replied that there have been significant changes to the requirements for stormwater management over the past few years and especially in the last 25 years, when some of the current developments were constructed. He noted that the most recent updates incorporated additional rainfall events and frequency.

Commissioner Boo commented about the traffic and asked how issues with traffic flow could be addressed.

Mr. Walesch replied that there are concerns with Comstock Lane and said they would like to create a more circuitous route, thus preventing an easy opportunity for a cut-through route. He noted they would take direction from the City. He stated what was studied was the largest development that could be proposed, with the idea that the actual proposal would be less than the current number of lots as they work through the site plan.

Commissioner Boo referenced the daily/typical off-peak traffic counts and noted it would be useful to have that information in order for the neighborhood to fully understand the impact, rather than only the impacts for peak times.

Chair Anderson stated it sounds like the developer has had discussions with neighbors and therefore there may be changes if this moves forward.

Mr. Walesch confirmed that they will continue to have those conversations and meet residents on-site to identify concerns and determine how the design could help with the issues residents are experiencing. He stated they will attempt to preserve trees to the extent possible and assist with drainage concerns.

Chair Anderson introduced Collette Riethmiller, 16490 45th Avenue, who stated that this is the last greenspace in Plymouth and said she believes it should remain as greenspace.

Chair Anderson introduced Diane Slayton, 4630 Xene Lane, who stated she seen the city evolve and grow and this could be an exciting time for Plymouth to be a champion for greenspace. She challenged the City to reimagine what the land could be used for rather than residential development. She read language from the City's 2040 comprehensive plan related to the environment, preservation of natural resources, golf and the availability of public golf courses, and parks and greenspace. She stated that rezoning Hollydale for another residential development is fraught with problems and is the "easy way out." She challenged the community to reimagine the greenspace to create the best suburban greenspace imaginable.

Chair Anderson introduced Ryan Kraemer, 4715 Yuma Lane, who stated he would like to provide a new perspective as a high school student who has grown with the city since the time of his birth. He stated he has watched the nature on the golf course grow as he has grown. He commented on the animals he has seen on the golf course property and believed it is important to keep this space. He stated that golf is an important part of his life and the lives of others. He commented on the congestion that would occur with many additional residents living on the golf course property, as the roads in this area are already dangerous for both drivers and pedestrians. He stated as a young person he will continue to grow with the city. He noted all of the farmland that previously existed near his home has been developed, and developing this greenspace would eliminate the last large tract of greenspace in the area. He encouraged the City to keep Hollydale as greenspace to provide a balance in the city.

Chair Anderson introduced Wayne Larson, 16715 49th Place, who stated that he purchased his home because it was on a golf course and was the only lot that had greenspace between the home and neighboring unit. He commented that he has watched many neighbors come and go, and the homes in his neighborhood sell quickly. He stated since the talk of the development of the golf course began, the homes that are listed for sale have remained for sale. He said he believed if the development continues forward, he would have a difficult time selling the home that he paid a premium for. He commented on the traffic changes that have occurred while he has lived in his home and the concern he has with safety on Schmidt Lake Road.

Chair Anderson introduced James Thompson, 16915 49th Place, who stated he is the president of his homeowners association. He commented he has been playing golf for 75 years and enjoys playing golf, but also enjoys the greenspace. He commented he has only 12 feet of yard from his deck to the property line, and therefore enjoys the greenspace provided by the golf course. He stated if this moves forward, perhaps the developer could make the greenspace/park behind the golf course homes run all the way from east to west. He commented on the traffic

congestion that would occur from an additional 300 homes. He stated if this moves forward, there are seven homes on the east side experiencing water in their backyards that runs from the golf course property. He said he would like to see the developer address that issue.

Chair Anderson introduced Derek Lash, 17420 49th Avenue, who stated he has spent 12 to 15 hours reviewing the EAW and traffic study. He provided details on both Old Rockford Road and Schmidt Lake Road, noting that the traffic is horrendous on both roads. He reviewed the speed limits on the collector roads in the area compared to the number of lanes. He stated his focus is on Old Rockford Road because he has children that attend the elementary school on that roadway. He stated that the traffic study mentioned improvements near the high school, but noted there were no improvements proposed for Old Rockford Road, with the exception of sightline improvements. He referenced the estimated September daily trips and peak trips, noting that the projected trips for Old Rockford Road are much higher than on Schmidt Lake Road. He stated the projection for traffic on Old Rockford Road would increase by 2,000 daily trips. He explained how current stormwater modeling is completed, using Atlas 14. He noted there is another eight years of rainfall data since Atlas 14 was developed that suggest a 100-year event is more likely to be considered a 20-year event in the future.

Chair Anderson introduced Dick Hommerding, 3920 Lawndale Lane, who stated that he is present as a golfer. He stated he and three of his friends play golf three to four times per week, alternating between Hollydale and Shamrock in Corcoran. He stated that Corcoran is developing, and there are rumors that course will be sold. He noted that economical public opportunities for seniors to golf will continue to be decreased. He stated if this development is approved, it would make Plymouth the only community he has lived in without a golf course. He said he did not want to see the loss of greenspace in the community.

Chair Anderson introduced Adam Hufta, 4745 Yuma Lane, who stated he is a property owner that is dissatisfied with an attempt to develop the greenspace in his backyard, but is also a lawyer working with a steering committee that is looking at the impact of these issues. He asked how much negative impact one developer should be allowed to have on so many lives. He read aloud the policy provision and rules that guide the EAW process. He referenced the mercury that was found on the golf course property during the phase one and two assessments. He said he believed that the commission should be asking for additional information on the contamination that exists on the property, regardless of the type of development that occurs. He noted that only four borings were completed, two on two different tee boxes. He commented that mercury is relatively stable when left undisturbed in the soil, but that is not true when it is disturbed. He commented on another golf course that was determined to be contaminated with mercury, and the activity that would need to occur in order to remove that contamination. He stated he is concerned that the contamination would spread out to surrounding properties. He asked the City to require an EIS to determine the extent to which mercury contamination exists on the course.

Chair Anderson introduced Paul Hillen, 16130 43th Avenue, who stated it is disappointing there is not a full commission tonight. He commented that this may be the biggest issue the City addresses in quite some time. He stated while he does not live on the golf course, many of his neighbors do and the neighborhood is adjacent to the course. He stated he would like to focus on the existing and potential future of the water management issues and the City's

. comprehensive plan, which was just adopted on July 23, 2019. He stated he is unsure whether the authors of the EAW or developers have set foot in the adjacent neighborhoods or walked the golf course, as he found statements in the EAW as factually inaccurate. He stated they are real people with real issues that live in real homes. He stated the current runoff from the Hollydale property is not mentioned in the EAW, and the author of the EAW even goes to the point of stating there are no existing runoff issues. He referenced a home neighboring the golf course that has water running into the backyard because of the increased elevation of the golf course compared to the residential property and provided additional information on the drainage problem that exists. He provided a photo from the yard of a home in another neighborhood adjacent to the golf course that experiences drainage problems from the golf course property. He commented on the inaccuracy of the information within the EAW. He stated the problem with water is not found in only one season, but throughout the year. He displayed a photo of the bottom of his driveway that collects water that freezes during the winter months. He noted that similar problems occur throughout the development from water that runs off the golf course property. He stated there is already an issue with water that exists in this area and adding over 300 homes will not improve that situation. He stated if the problem becomes worse as a result of this development, the residents will hold the City and developers responsible. He stated when he chose to purchase his home in 2001, he decided on the location because of the nice open neighborhoods, the Wayzata schools, proximity to downtown, and the location near four golf courses. He stated that the City's comprehensive plan continues to place an importance on golf and the availability of a public golf course. He stated if this development is ultimately approved, the residents will ask what else in the comprehensive plan should not be believed. He said he did not believe the City should change its comprehensive plan at the request of two parties - the landowner and the developer. He asked the commission not to approve the EAW or the development.

Chair Anderson introduced Ed Sashes, 16935 45th Avenue, who stated if four people per home move into the proposed development that would place a city with a population of 1,200 onto the golf course property. He stated it is important to consider that the world does not consist of averages, as the traffic study uses averages. He provided examples of traffic congestion that already occurs in this area and noted that would only increase with the additional homes. He stated that even cutting the proposed number of homes in half would be too many to place on the golf course property.

Chair Anderson introduced Jeff Siewert, 4335 Fountain Lane, who stated he is present representing 14 homes in his development. He asked the commission to reject the request to rezone the property, as it would be a travesty to lose the golf course and greenspace. He noted that the quality of life for the community would be diminished. He stated that he walks along Old Rockford Road and has become increasingly concerned with the speed and volume of traffic. He stated he is saddened that the City could allow over 300 homes to be developed on the golf course, which will increase traffic congestion and decrease pedestrian safety. He stated that the golf course is a jewel that should be preserved and not be turned into concrete and asphalt.

Chair Anderson introduced Douglas Parker, 14615 12th Avenue, who stated since 1977 he has watched the community grow. He stated he is a golfer and referenced two heavily wooded golf courses that have since been developed. He stated that Hollydale is a beautiful course that is

heavily wooded, and those trees and greenspace would be lost with development. He asked the City to hold back and keep the course viable as it is the only course left in Plymouth. He stated if the course cannot remain viable, it should be left as greenspace. He commented that bigger is not better, and the City should listen to the residents that live in the area.

Chair Anderson introduced Kent Johnson, 16717 49th Place, who stated there is currently a stubbed fire lane that has existed for over 20 years. He stated there is nothing that has existed showing that would be a road in the future. He stated in other instances there are barricades and signage that would signify that the stubbed road would be developed in the future. He said he believed that the residents in that neighborhood should have been notified it could become a road. He stated the City created a problem when the bridge was constructed. He stated the problem will become worse with the bottleneck that will be created. He commented that the plan for Comstock Lane is ridiculous. He asked the commission to find an example of where a quiet 20-year-old community has experienced a street going through to a huge development.

Chair Anderson introduced Alison Barrick, 4525 Merrimac Lane, who stated she would like to provide an update on the petition that was submitted earlier in this process. She stated that 1,345 Plymouth residents have signed the petition to date. She stated the area of concern extends well beyond the people that live around the golf course. She stated that 3,700 people have signed the petition in total as people who do not live in Plymouth are also concerned with this proposed development. She stated over 80 comments were also provided with the petition and submitted the petition to staff and the commission to become a part of the public record. She stated they will continue to collect signatures, but wanted to provide this snapshot of the activity that has occurred since they began in November.

Chair Anderson introduced Sherry Dewolf, 4290 Jewel Lane, who stated she was worried about traffic with the Holly Creek development and spoke when that development came forward. She stated she is still worried about traffic and is surprised to see that there are still no plans for improvement of Old Rockford Road. She stated there are pedestrian safety concerns now and would be worried about increased development. She noted there are still developments being constructed in this area that are not taken into account in the traffic study. She stated she would like to see this area remain as greenspace or park space.

Chair Anderson introduced Liz Pike, 4735 Yuma Lane, who stated she voted for the mayor because when he was asked about his priorities he stated he would like to keep the City fiscally sound, continue to keep infrastructure in first rate condition, and because the preservation of parks, trails and lakes is important to him. She asked what legacy the commission and council would like to leave. She commented that a legacy of 300 homes will be forgotten while the preservation of that greenspace would be remembered. ,

Chair Anderson introduced Elizabeth Bullis, 16615 45th Avenue, who stated that they moved to Plymouth for greenspace and park space in addition to the focus on families and schools. She commented on the path her family regularly walked and how that was disrupted because of the construction traffic that has occurred in this area. She stated they enjoy walking along the golf course and are now in a very different neighborhood than when they purchased. She stated if she wanted to live in an area where 700 homes are being constructed, she would have selected

another community. She asked the commission to reconsider adding to the existing problems with development in the community and focus on the preservation of greenspace.

Chair Anderson introduced Susan Gaither, 16500 45th Avenue, who stated that she spent many hours reviewing documents on the city website. She stated that the golf course property owner spoke at previous development meetings, complaining about water problems that he has experienced with each new development around the golf course. She commented that it seems to be that those issues continue on today with drainage. She commented that the project does not make sense. She noted there about 200 homes around the golf course, and this would add 300 homes into the middle to create a large mass of residential development. She stated that in order to change the comprehensive plan, an applicant must prove that the change has merit outside of the request. She noted that the city is almost completely built out, with most of the recent development occurring in the northwest portion of the city. She stated that the city already has some of the lowest tax rates and has no use for additional tax revenue from homes. She asked that the city keep the character that drew in so many of its residents. She stated it is no longer appropriate to build that number of homes.

Chair Anderson introduced Alicia Liddle, 4425 Jewel Court, who stated that her family moved to Plymouth and to their neighborhood because of the established neighborhood and greenspace. She stated it is clear that people will cut through her development. She stated she is also concerned with the possible redistricting that will occur with these additional homes, as that has happened three times in the past five years. She said she hoped that Plymouth is looking forward and sees the importance of greenspace and park amenities. She stated the city currently does not have enough space for sports and recreational activities.

Chair Anderson introduced Tim Schneeweis, 16907 49th Place, who stated that he read the EAW twice recently and found it to be very flawed. He noted that the document only provides a portion of the information that would be needed to make a decision. He asked the number of homeowners and golfers that were interviewed for the EAW. He said he believes an EIS would be needed as the scope of the EAW is so narrow. He noted that the words mitigate and minimize are used throughout the EAW and are words used to describe something that can be done to offset a bad situation. He referenced the contamination and noted that more information is needed on that. He commented on the water problems that exist year-round on the golf course and noted that increased rain events and volume are only going to continue to occur. He stated that the rusty patch bumble bee is mentioned in the EAW and noted that more in depth review is needed. He stated an EIS is needed, and the greenspace of Hollydale needs to be saved.

Chair Anderson introduced Bob Stem, 4700 Yuma Lane, who stated that social responsibility is an important value. He stated he attended the developer's meeting the previous week without knowing much about the issue, but left the meeting feeling upset. He expressed concern with drainage, traffic, school overcrowding, and loss of greenspace. He referenced the noise and congestion that would occur during the three to five-year timespan of construction. He also addressed the issue of resale, noting his home is still not worth what he paid for it in 2003. He noted when homes cannot be sold, people usually resort to renting the home, which is something the City should consider. He stated the builder said the property is going to be developed and they are probably the best option available. He stated when specific questions

arose, the developer could not answer, but acknowledged that it is still early in the process and not all the questions can be answered at this time. He noted one resident asked if the developer would purchase homes, which shows that these are real people with real problems. He said he believed that the older generations could learn from the millennial generation and asked the commission to ask if this is a socially responsible project, if it is the best the City can do, does this project make the community better, and is this the best option for this site.

Chair Anderson briefly recessed the meeting.

Chair Anderson reconvened the meeting.

Chair Anderson asked if the traffic study included the homes that are included in the developments still being constructed.

City Engineer LaBounty stated that full development of those neighborhoods was included in the traffic study.

Chair Anderson noted the statement has been made that the runoff rate prior to any development cannot be exceeded with the buildout of the development and asked if that is a correct statement. He also asked for details related to the volume and rate of stormwater discharge from the property.

City Engineer LaBounty reviewed details related to the city regulations for stormwater management and the different levels of storm events that are managed to.

Chair Anderson stated when he was developing in Eagan in the 1980s there were no stormwater standards, but the City required the first stormwater pond to be constructed, which they did for the development to move forward. He asked at what point the City would require a developer to go beyond the standards, as the more intense storms are occurring more frequently.

City Engineer LaBounty explained that the engineering design guidelines are reviewed on an annual basis and are approved by the City Council. He stated the standards continue to change and evolve over time, noting that the City currently uses the Atlas 14 standards, which were introduced to the metropolitan area in the past five years. He stated it would be the decision of the City Council as to whether they would require anything beyond the current standards.

Commissioner Markell referenced the scope of the environmental site assessment related to the number and variability of the soil borings that were completed and asked whether the number of borings and location were adequate for a site of this scale.

Rob Bouta, environmental consultant, stated he was involved in the bulk of writing the EAW, but was not involved in the phase one or phase two environmental site assessments. He stated he has heard that other golf courses have also tested positive for mercury because of the herbicide used to control snow mold. He commented he could not conclude whether the appropriate number of borings were completed. He stated the MPCA sets standards for the level of contaminants that would present a public risk. He stated the soils that are contaminated with mercury will be sequestered and will not be graded into the site, providing details on that

process required by the state. He stated the environmental assessments determined that the contamination existed in the top six inches of soils on the greens.

Commissioner Markell asked how many of the EAWs his firm has worked on have triggered an EIS.

Mr. Bouta stated that he personally has worked on over 100 EAWs in his time with this firm. He stated he has not worked on an EAW that was turned into an EIS with this firm. He stated in his career he has worked on two EAWs that turned into EISs, but before they were completed the decision to require those documents was changed. He explained it is not common that an EAW requires an EIS.

Commissioner Markell asked the timeframe for his firm to rework an EAW on this site.

Mr. Bouta replied that an EAW process typically takes between four and nine months. He stated the other option available would be to require more investigation without starting the process over.

Commissioner Boo stated the point was made earlier that only four soil borings were completed to test for mercury on the greens and tees, although there were other borings on the site. He asked if there was contamination found in the other borings.

Mr. Bouta stated he would be unable to answer that question as his firm did not work on the phase one or phase two assessments.

Chair Anderson referenced the possible habitat for the endangered bee and asked if staff has information on that topic.

Senior Planner Drill replied that the EAW did mention there could be habitat, but the actual species of bee was not found on the site.

Commissioner Markell read aloud language from the EAW and noted it appears there is a course of action to determine potential impact to the bee.

Chair Anderson went over the process for reviewing the EAW and for the commission to make a recommendation, recognizing that the public meeting is taking place during the 30-day comment period.

Commissioner Witt stated that the EAW has answered all of her questions.

Commissioner Boo commented that he believes there are still some unanswered questions. He stated the EAW provides most of the information that would be wanted/needed, but there are additional questions that should be answered before a definitive answer could be made: whether the soil borings were broad enough across the site to determine if the extent of contamination is accurate; a significant water problem exists in the area of this site and additional study should be done as to the extent of the capability of this site to retain water and assist in alleviating adjacent water issues; and the impact of 49th Place and its interaction with Comstock Lane.

Commissioner Markell stated he is inclined to recommend approval of the EAW, not because there are not potential environmental impacts that could be created by the project, but because he is confident that the City's standard review process would adequately address those impacts. He stated this would not be support for the project or application for amendment to the comprehensive plan, but simply determining if the EAW provided adequate information as required.

Chair Anderson stated that these opinions are based on the comments and data received to date, as the comment period remains open. He stated he shares the concerns about the soils as it appears that insufficient testing was completed. He said he recognized that many golf courses have mercury contamination, and he would be concerned with the possible mobilization that would occur through soil disturbance. He stated in terms of drainage, there is a water flow that has been represented and seems to flow toward the Yuma Lane properties, which does not appear to be addressed in sufficient detail. He stated in regard to traffic, he was unsure there was mention of the cut-through that happens and the impact that additional traffic would have on the cut-through traffic volume on 45th Avenue to Dunkirk Lane. He stated he was not satisfied with the answer to the potential endangered bee species and believed that further work should be done on that topic. He said he would recommend that these comments and public testimony be passed to the City Council, with the consultant answering the additional questions. He stated he would not believe that this would require an EIS, as Plymouth has never required such activity to be completed.

**MOTION** by Commissioner Witt, seconded by Commissioner Boo, to recommend to the City Council, based on the comments/questions received to date, that they review the environmental assessment worksheet for the redevelopment of the former Hollydale Golf Course site located at 4710 Holly Lane, including the questions raised at this meeting and request additional information as follows, prior to making a decision on the need for an EIS:

- Soil borings broad enough to determine if the extent of contaminants identified in the EAW is accurate;
- Drainage containment on-site;
- Presence of habitat favorable to the rusty patched bumble bee;
- Potential cut-through traffic on 45th Avenue to Dunkirk Lane; and
- Intersection analysis of 49th Place at Comstock Lane.

**Vote.** 4 Ayes. **MOTION** approved.

Commissioner Boo stated he in no way wants to suggest that he agrees with the proposal for the property, but is responding to the sketch plan. He stated that overall this would be a dense use of a property in a well-developed area. He explained that because the current use is greenspace, the change to this much density in housing in an area that is already dense in housing would seem to overwhelm the site. He referenced the development to the west of this site and the traffic that would exit onto 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue, which seems highly inappropriate. He stated the concerns related to stormwater would need to be addressed before the commission could consider a site plan.

Chair Anderson stated that this process seems to have started on step two. He stated a mandatory EAW is required when a development proposes over 250 homes, which then requires

a sketch plan. He stated he believes that the first step should have been whether or not to amend the comprehensive plan. He noted that the City's comprehensive plan stated that golf courses are important, but nowhere in the plan does it state whether the City wants to own a golf course. He noted that the City previously considered whether to own a golf course, when there were four courses in Plymouth, and the answer was no. He asked what the commission would do if the applicant came in without an EAW and without a sketch plan and simply came in with the request to change the comprehensive plan guiding that was just adopted in July. He stated he cannot even say that the City should amend the comprehensive plan, but yet they are on step two tonight. He said he believed this is occurring in the wrong order. He stated it is the decision of the landowner as to what to do with their property. He noted there are other uses under the P-I zoning district that the landowner could do without a rezoning/comprehensive plan amendment. He stated a golf course is an amenity for those that choose to pay to play golf, but those walking on the course are simply trespassing. He stated he does not believe that the view of the golf course for some is as attractive as it is to others. He stated he has found that golf courses only provide recreation for those that golf. He said he doubts that the developer will take his one opinion and pack up and go home. He stated there is an example of a site that handles runoff well, using the example of a site across County Road 101 that only developed one third of the site with homes and preserved the other two thirds for wildlife and natural environment. He commented that the sketch plan is much too dense, and he would not support a comprehensive plan amendment.

Commissioner Witt agreed that the density is too much for the site and is a non-starter for her.

Commissioner Markell stated that he shares the sentiment of the order of the things being discussed for this proposal. He commented that this plan is too dense. He stated while Gonyea has done some great development, perhaps this is an opportunity to work differently as this site is shoehorned into an existing community. He stated that a comprehensive plan amendment should be saved for something that is really worth it, and he does not see that in the sketch plans. He said he welcomed the residents who have spoken and signed the petition to bring forward their ideas for what could happen. He stated the property owner wants to sell, and the developer wants to buy and therefore encouraged residents to work together and bring forward something creative. He stated that currently he would be opposed to the sketch plan and comprehensive plan amendment.

Commissioner Boo stated he is new to the process and agrees that the question that should first be asked is whether the City would support a comprehensive plan amendment.

### **Adjournment**

Chair Anderson adjourned the meeting at 10:38 p.m.