

**City of Columbus**  
**Public Hearing – Thurnbeck Preserve Preliminary Plat Application (PC-16-122) and**  
**Thurnbeck Preserve CUP for PUD Application (PC-123)**  
**(Sherco Construction – applicant)**  
**October 5, 2016**

The October 5, 2016 Public Hearing to receive testimony regarding both the request for a preliminary plat, “Thurnbeck Preserve”, creating seventeen new lots, and for a conditional use permit for a planned unit development (PUD) to allow varying lot sizes averaging five acres in the “Thurnbeck Preserve” seventeen lot plat was called to order at 7:04 p.m. by Chair Garth Sternberg at the City Hall. Present were Commission members Jim Watson, Pam Wolowski, Jesse Preiner, and Jody Krebs; City Administrator Elizabeth Mursko, Planner Dean Johnson, and Recording Secretary Karen Boland.

Also in attendance were City Council members Denny Peterson, Bill Krebs, and Jeff Duraine; Shirley Miller, Pete Neumann, Nick Neumann, Joe and Sarah Bazey, Mary Tomnitz, Roy and Laurie Wold, Gary Thielen, Kris King, Paul Peskar, Glen Yakel, Ann C., Diane Rueb, Darrell Thurnbeck, Barry Peterson, Thomas Carlisle, Mary Preiner, and Pat Preiner.

**Sternberg:** Now we’re going to—actually we’re going to open both Public Hearings and dis—for the Thurnbeck Preserve preliminary plat request and the CUP. So, if you could read both notices as published, please.

Notice was read at this time.

**Sternberg:** Thank you. And, at this time, we’d like to ask the applicants to please come forward. And, if you could, just state your name and address for the record.

**Carlisle:** Tom Carlisle, 21501 Humber Street, Wyoming, Minnesota.

**Sternberg:** Thank you, sir. And then if you could just give us a little background on what it is you’re asking.

**Carlisle:** Yeah. We have, uh, 96.47 acres that we’re proposing 17 lots. The average lot size is about 5.67 acres. Um, we have four lots that are accessing Broadway –uh, six, seven, eight and nine (referring to overhead). One is accessing Furman. Um, I can’t see what the number is. I apologize. And then we have a short cul-de-sac that’s coming in for the rest of, the remainder of the lots. That pretty much summarizes the project, I think.

**Sternberg:** So, you said four of the lots are coming in off of Broadway?

**Carlisle:** Yes.

**Sternberg:** And what, wh-, did I read two of them have a common driveway?

**Carlisle:** Yeah, they have a common driveway on 6 and 7, and 8 and 9.

**Sternberg:** Eight and nine.

**Mursko:** (referring to overhead) This is 8 and 9; this is 6 and 7. On their grading plan it doesn't show common driveways, it shows them separated.

**Carlisle:** On 8 and 9, the reason, uh, I talked to Jason, our surveyor, about that, and the reason on 8 and 9 they're separated a bit, um, was because they wanted to use that existing access that was acceptable with the County. Um, so, I guess that's kind of what we've shown so far.

**Sternberg:** Do we have any questions for the applicant?

**Krebs:** Have you, um, read all the, um, findings of facts and the recommendations in both of the, um, applications?

**Carlisle:** I've read 'em. It was about a week ago, so I think I pretty much understand everything.

**Krebs:** Okay.

**Mursko:** Did you get a copy of the Engineer's report? That would've been, that would've been Tuesday; that would've been yesterday.

**Carlisle:** Where he amended it? The one that Dennis just sent over here? (Mursko handed him the report.) I did read this, yes.

**Preiner:** Dean, do you have anything for us to be . . . ?

**Johnson:** I'd be happy to answer questions. I don't think you want me to read my findings and recommendations, unless you ask. Anything specific, I'd be happy to talk to . . .

**Sternberg:** Have you, you've seen this report?

**Johnson:** Which?

**Sternberg:** The Engineer's report, with the . . .

**Johnson:** Oh, yes.

**Sternberg:** You have any opinions on that? Any . . .

**Johnson:** No. And, as is common in, in my reviews of this, we make all plat approvals subject to the Engineer's comments. And we knew some of these were pending, and we had an e-mail from the City Engineer, uh, yesterday, describing, uh, some additional piezometer readings on the property. And that is combined in his recommendations. Um, I had only one question, in one of

the comments he had, which regarded the absence of . . . let's see where it was . . . it's item number seven in his report, it regarded easements. Talked about no roadways and, as identified for the west half of Furman Street, um, in the plat dedication, the instrument will convert whatever existing easement on Broadway existed on properties, and convert that to 60 feet of right-of-way. Whatever individual easements might have existed along Furman will be replaced by a 33-foot right-of-way. That's a dedication by the plat. So, that was the only question I had. I didn't have a chance to talk to Dennis about that particular issue. But, it's customary that, um, all street rights-of-way are dedicated including on existing roads, and that is illustrated on the plat. Uh, they do identify, on the preliminary plat, right-of-way dedication, and that includes Furman, Broadway, and the new proposed cul-de-sac is 6.77 acres. Uh, so again, I'm, that was the only question I had in, in the Engineer's report. Doesn't really effect anything in this record.

**Sternberg:** Any other questions?

**Wolowski:** I'm good.

**Watson:** Just one, sir.

**Sternberg:** Go ahead.

**Watson:** On the, uh, driveway, that's farther to the east in lot 8, right? The one from Broadway?

**Carlisle:** Yup.

**Watson:** Was, were you going to break or change the, uh, line or how were we going to get . . . ?

**Carlisle:** As far as the driveway arrangement?

**Watson:** The driveway arrangement.

**Carlisle:** Again, the reason we did that was to eliminate, um, any impacts as far as wetland impacts. We were going to use the existing driveway, and, I know we've gotten, and I've got the letter in front of me that we got from Anoka County. Um, and I've read it a couple different times, and, again, I know they'll review this, depending on where we end up, but, um, so far, there was no objection, except for the trees that aren't on that property. They said that that would be nice to get some of those cut back. So . . . That's a September 16<sup>th</sup> letter.

**Mursko:** They have the, they have the letter in their agenda packet.

**Carlisle:** Yeah, okay.

**Mursko:** So, so you're saying that you've written back to them and saying that you're not going to abide by their recommendations?

**Carlisle:** No, I'm not saying that I'm not going to abide by their recommendations. I guess if it, I, I will follow their recommendations. But the only, the only thing that I saw that was a pushback is that they, they, --I can read it to you here. There's some trees on the adjacent property that could be a sightline issue, they mentioned. But, they, they also said it was -- 'It should be noted that it appears that there's deficiencies for case one intersection sight distance requirements at, at, at County Road 18, Furman Street Northeast, with obstructions of, being trees that are located outside the plat. Consequently, this is considered non-correctable. However the City and developer should still work to ensure that all applicable sight distance requirements are met to the fullest extent possible for the development. Please note that no plantings or business signs will be permitted within the right-of-way. Care should be exercised when locating private signs, building structures, plantings, berms, etcetera.' Unless there's another letter I don't have that's (unintelligible)

**Johnson:** I'd be happy to respond. Um, on the actual preliminary plat drawing, which is, uh, different than the exhibit that's shown on the wall, there is an access opening illustrated. Um, counties in Minnesota are authorized to put symbols on their roadways that say you can't have access. So there's a specific opening that's illustrated on the common lot line of lot 8 and lot 9. My interpretation of the County's letter is that there will be a shared access. Uh, but they issue these permits, not the City. And, my recommendation is that the preliminary plat approval is subject to the requirements of the Anoka County Transportation Department, and if they back off and say, well, as long as you have two driveways within the opening that's shown on the plat. That's up to them. I, I didn't take it that way. I interpret it that there's going to be a single driveway access for those two lots as would be the case on 6 and 7. But, we don't issue those permits, the County does.

**Sternberg:** Yeah. I agree.

**Watson:** Thank you.

**Sternberg:** Any other questions for the applicant? Okay, I'm going to open the, I'm going to open the hearing to the public. Anyone from the public that would like to speak on this? Anyone from the public? Okay, I'm going to close the hearing with the right to reopen if it becomes necessary.

Hearing closed at 7:17 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Karen Boland, Recording Secretary