



Neighborhood Open House; February 19, 2009 @ 6:00-7:00pm
The Skating Center; Fireside Room
The Orchard Senior Active Living Development

Open House / Meeting Notes (2-19-09):

Representatives from Station 19 Architects (Tim Johnson and Richard Brownlee) and Art Mueller were present. The approximate attendance was 20 neighbors from the Midland Grove and the Ferriswood neighborhoods.

Staff from Station 19 Architects and Art Mueller were available and answered questions regarding the revised project, but initially focused on letting people know the basics of the revised proposal. The 4th floor has been eliminated to allow 3-stories, the unit count has been reduced from 77 to 55 units, and the building ends on the south and west sides have shifted in to meet the required multi-family setbacks.

Easel boards were used to show site plans, elevations, aerial representations; and residents were engaged as they entered the room. The open house dialogue was very civil and respectful. Informal discussion focused on various aspects of the project, and ranged from traffic impacts, revised unit count, height reduction, density and revised building setbacks.

Informal discussion with various neighbors indicated concerns about:

- Treating the east side of the building with special features to mitigate visual impacts
- Colors and materials
- Blending in more with adjacent residential
- Request for additional signage to reduce speeds
- Traffic increase along Midland Grove Rd
- Request for landscaping to increase screening on NE and East sides
- Transplant evergreens
- Discussion about keeping 2nd drive on Midland Grove Road
- Discussion about access to site from County Rd B
- Fire/Safety aspects of building; clearance on north side of bldg
- Balcony usage

Neighbor Steve Enzler and another adjacent neighbor remain concerned about the impact to their properties. Enzler focused on what the development will look like from his kitchen pantry, which faces toward the west. The 1-story height reduction and the 97-foot distance were discussed and whether or not this mitigated his concerns about sunlight, building mass, etc.

Discussion about traffic impacts were discussed by several parties, and the Architects conveyed that the additional development would generate 1 car every 4-5 minutes during peak usage. Some residents still indicated their concern for traffic and high speeds at the intersections.

Density was discussed and it was conveyed to some residents that the revised Orchard density at 24.5 units/acre was actually less than four recent senior developments which were all between 25-28 units/acre. Further discussion was minimal. Height reduction was also addressed and further discussion about overall building height took place. The height of the Midland Grove building and it's relationship to the proposed site was discussed; over 200 feet from building to building; Existing trees and landscape to remain along property line.

There was also discussion on the demographic data concerning marketability of the project. It was conveyed that Roseville along with Edina and St. Anthony had the highest % of seniors in the metro area. Twenty-one + % of Roseville's population is over 65 years old.

Several residents indicated at the end of the open house that they'd be supportive of additional stories if it meant more greenspace for the overall development.

The Open House ended at about 7:15 pm.

Submitted by:
Tim Johnson
Station 19 Architects, Inc.



ORCHARD

MAY 16, 2009

TO: ROSEVILLE CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM BOB OLSEN, (2170 FERRIS LANE)

I HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO ATTEND THE MAY 11TH CITY COUNCIL MEETING AND LISTEN TO THE DISCUSSION OF THE MERITS AND DEMERITS OF THE PROPOSED REZONING AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE ORCHARD PROJECT BY ART MUELLER AND ASSOCIATES. THANK YOU FOR THE VERY COURTEOUS TREATMENT OF THE ISSUES AND THE INDIVIDUALS WHO MADE PRESENTATIONS ABOUT THIS PROJECT AND THE OPENNESS AND WILLINGNESS TO HEAR THE VARIOUS SPEAKERS.

MY WIFE AND I BUILT OUR FIRST ROSEVILLE HOUSE IN 1960 AND THE CURRENT RESIDENCE AT 2170 FERRIS LANE IN 1988. THIS IS A BEAUTIFUL COMMUNITY AND REFLECTS THE GREEN AREAS AND UNIT SPACING THAT ART INSISTED ON FOR THAT DEVELOPMENT. ROSEVILLE HAS ALWAYS BEEN A GREAT PLACE TO LIVE AND OUR INTERESTS ARE THAT IT CONTINUES TO BE A GREAT PLACE TO LIVE.

THE ISSUES ABOUT POTENTIAL TRAFFIC PROBLEMS, DRAINAGE ISSUES AND THE QUESTIONS ABOUT THE OVERALL FIT OF THAT PROJECT AT THAT LOCATION WERE DISCUSSED AT LENGTH AND I HAVE LITTLE NEW TO ADD TO THAT.

THE CONCERN THAT I HAVE GOES BACK TO MY PRE-RETIREMENT YEARS WHEN AS A PRACTICING CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANT, WE PREPARED MANY CASH FLOW AND FINANCING PROJECTIONS. WHENEVER THERE WAS A CHANGE IN THE PARAMETERS OF ONE OF THOSE PROJECTS, ALL KINDS OF NEW PROBLEMS AROSE. THIS MAY APPLY TO THIS PROJECT WHEN IT WAS DOWNSIZED FROM THE ORIGINAL 78 UNITS TO THE PRESENT 55 UNITS. AT THE \$150,000 LEVEL THAT ART INDICATED WOULD BE CHARGED TO THE RESIDENTS MOVING INTO THE PROJECT, \$11,700,000 WOULD BE THE HIGH SIDE MONEY GENERATION WHICH SHOULD HAVE BEEN IN THE ORIGINAL PROJECTION. THAT CHANGES TO \$8,250,000 WITH THE REVISED 55 UNITS PROPOSED BY THE LAST SET OF PAPERS. A SECOND ISSUE WOULD BE THE FIXED OPERATING COSTS AND EXPENSES WOULD NOW HAVE FEWER UNITS AND THE PROPOSED MONTHLY RENTALS MIGHT HAVE TO BE REVISED UPWARD. DOES THIS HAVE AN EFFECT ON THE FLOW OF NEW RESIDENTS? FRANKLY, I DO NOT KNOW. IF THE NEW NUMBERS ARE NOT WORKABLE, DOES THIS LEAVE THE PROPERTY AS A POTENTIAL PROBLEM FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS OF THE ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES OF ROSEVILLE AS AN ECONOMICS DRIVEN FAILURE?

ON THE SURFACE, IT WOULD SEEM TO ME THE DISCOMFORT OF THAT TYPE OF BUILDING BEING CONSTRUCTED ON THAT SITE MIGHT INDICATE THE DEVELOPERS WOULD BE WELL ADVISED TO GO BACK TO THE ORIGINAL 78 UNITS AT A DIFFERENT SITE.

I WILL SEND THIS NOTE TO THE CITY MANAGER AND REQUEST THAT COPIES BE DISTRIBUTED TO THE MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL AND THE PLANNING COMMISSION. THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.

STEVE AND KATHY ENZLER

June 2, 2009

Mr. Thomas Paschke
Roseville City Planner
City of Roseville
2660 Civic Center Drive
Roseville, MN 55113-5446
Email: thomas.paschke@ci.roseville.mn.us

Re: 2025 County Road B Orchard project revision #3

Dear Mr. Paschke,

This serves as a letter voicing our continued concerns regarding the proposed land use amendment and revised general concept planned unit development of a 55-unit, 3-story Active Senior Living Community Building at 2025 Count Road B. Our concerns and opposition continue to fall into three areas:

1. The Proposed Land Use Amendment

While the Planning Department has instructed the Planning Commission to ignore this aspect of the upcoming meeting, the record needs to be corrected both in the minutes and in forwarding any new proposal to the City Council. Specifically, the Roseville Planning Commission, per City Code Section 201.07 has recommended to the City Council to TURN DOWN the Comprehensive Plan change requested by the Planning Department and Mr. Mueller as the vote does not meet the required 5/7s threshold. The Planning Commission vote was 4 to 3. A copy of the code is highlighted here:

201.07: PROCEDURE FOR ADOPTION OF CITY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:

The Planning Commission may, at any time, recommend to the City Council, the adoption of the City Comprehensive Plan, any section of it or any *substantial amendment* thereof. Before making such recommendation to the City Council, the Planning Commission shall hold at least one public hearing, as provided for in Chapter 108 of this Code. The recommendation by the Planning Commission to the City Council shall be by a resolution of the Commission, *approved by the affirmative votes of not less than 5/7ths of its total membership.*

We agree with the Planning Commission's vote that a 2-step increase in the Comprehensive Plan requested by a Developer is inappropriate for this parcel. Financial gain at the expense of its neighbors lacks good planning principals and does not adequately address other possible, better use.

Where are the parks "planned" for our area of Roseville?

Was medium density considered for this parcel?

Who contacted the Roseville Historical Society about the heritage aspect of this property?

As currently configured our area of Roseville is a model blend of medium density, high density and single residence. Any substantial change proposed by a developer, in place of proper planning, should only be done if there is overwhelming consensus that the project as proposed has merit to all interested parties.

The medium density designation of our property at 1995 West County Road B in the Comprehensive Plan is ill placed and is being used by the Planning Department to help justify this project. Through research, the only reason for this designation was to facilitate Mr. Mueller's acquisition of land to build the Ferriswood Association in the 1980s. While the Planning Department has informed us that they would not support our initial inquiries to return our property to low density because of planning principals (busy street etc.) subsequent inquiries by us to qualified developers suggest our lot could not economically be used to house a medium density project. So the neighboring "reality" is single resident, not medium density.

2. The proposed project

- **This project remains massive for the site and could impact our air, light and view.** This 45-foot plus high structure has not changed materially in height or setback from our house from the proposal voted down by our Planning Commission 6 to 1. Comparisons to other senior building emphasize our point. In virtually ALL examples presented by your Department, the bordering land is either parking lot, road, or commercial. When single residences are present there is substantial distance between the larger development and the single residence structure. Why are you recommending departure here?
- **The proposed senior living business model is more of a senior “country club” than true senior living.** We do not see the value of having a senior citizen plo down \$150,000 to 200,000 for the “right” to rent a condominium. As we understand it, the person receives their “membership” payment back when they wish to move. BUT they receive no return on their funds AND any appreciation/interest goes to the developer. Does this kind of senior living really meet the long-term senior living needs of Roseville? We believe a better project for Roseville would be senior subsidized living sponsored by a credible agency (like Presbyterian Homes) that is smaller in scope ...2 story 30 units...
- **There is little to no useable green space in this plan.** When looking at the surface coverage calculations one wonders if the parking lots are included? Run off and other environmental concerns have only been minimally addressed. Why is the City approving such a dramatic change without more research and appropriate environmental signoff? We are especially concerned about ground water runoff.

3. The Developer

• As we understand it, this Developer’s LLC consists of two members; Mr. Mueller and his son, who is in the insurance business. Mr. Mueller acknowledges he is in his 80s. We believe the city should be reasonably concerned that what they think will be here, will not be what is on this land in the next 5 to 10 years.

• As developer of Ferriswood, Mr. Mueller left a boundary mess that our family is still struggling to clean up. One of the units behind our home was built violating setback rules. Survey errors have our pre-existing sidewalk on both our and Ferriswood property. Mr. Mueller, via the association, built a retaining wall that is currently in dispute as to who is responsible for it. It was built by him as part of the Ferriswood development on city property, our property and the Ferriswood property. It does not match the as-built provided to us by the city. Currently, no one is accepting ownership and responsibility for the wall. The city believes one thing, the Ferriswood Association assumes another, and we have a third opinion. The point of this is that most of this problem was caused by construction directed by Mr. Mueller.

What will the city do when Mr. Mueller once again begs forgiveness versus asking permission on code violations? What will the city do when the business proposal doesn’t work because seniors aren’t willing to put \$100’s of thousands of dollars down for no return, the project fails and remains partially finished?

Summary

We believe the city needs to address senior needs in our community. We also believe either a medium density designation or a reasonable R-3 structure that does not hide behind a PUD could work next door. We simply believe this project is too massive and inappropriate for this location.

Requesting a two-step jump in the Comprehensive Plan then requesting a PUD so an R-7 structure can be placed on this low-density parcel does not pass a reasonableness test.

Sincerely,

Steve and Kathy Enzler

Thomas Paschke

From: Jim & Nancy Doherty [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 03, 2009 10:50 AM
To: Thomas Paschke
Subject: Re: Submissions

Thomas, here they are.

Jim

No. 1

From: <support@civicplus.com>
To: <planning.commission@ci.roseville.mn.us>
Sent: Monday, June 01, 2009 2:11 PM
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Contact Planning Commission

The following form was submitted via your website: Contact Planning Commission

Name:: Scott Roste

Address:: 2220 Midland Grove Rd. #211

City:: Roseville

State: : MN

Zip:: 55113

Home Phone Number:: [REDACTED]

Daytime Phone Number:: [REDACTED]

Email Address:: [REDACTED]

Please Share Your Comment, Question or Concern: Dear Members of the Planning Commission: My name is Scott Roste and I am the current president of the Midland Grove Condo Association. I am contacting you in regard to Planning File 09-002, the request by developer Art Mueller to construct "The Orchard", a complex at 2025 County Road B consisting of 55 units. The Orchard site lies directly south of Midland Grove Condominiums and many of our residents object to the project and I am contacting you as their representative.

As you are aware, in order for Mr. Mueller to move forward, he is seeking 3 accommodations from the City of Roseville. (1) He needs the Roseville Comprehensive Land Use Plan to be modified to change the site from a low density residential classification to a high density residential classification. (2) He needs the site to then be rezoned from single family residence status to a PUD (Planned Unit Development) status because his current proposal does not meet certain city code requirements. (3) Finally, he wants his specific 3-story, 55 unit proposal to be approved for development.

Back in February, Mr. Mueller originally proposed a 4-story, 77 unit complex to the Roseville Planning

Commission. Due to the opposition from residents at Midland Grove, neighboring Ferriswood residents and the neighbor to the East, Steve Enzler, Mr. Mueller withdrew his proposal. He then attended the March Planning Commission meeting and proposed a 3-story, 55 unit complex. Again, neighbors from Midland Grove, Ferriswood and Steve Enzler opposed the project due to concerns about the size and scale of the project, the volume of additional traffic, the impairment of sightlines and other issues. Due to these concerns, the Planning Commission denied approval for the Orchard project. Despite this denial, Mr. Mueller brought his proposal to the May Roseville City Council meeting. At this meeting, a petition of 107 Midland Grove residents was presented opposing the project, residents of Ferriswood were also in opposition to the project as was the neighbor to the east, Steve Enzler. Based on these concerns, the City Council remanded the Orchard proposal back to the Planning Commission for further investigation.

Because the Orchard project has been remanded back to the Planning Commission, please allow me to repeat the concerns of our residents for your review.

(1) The first issue is the size of the proposed site. As noted in the original proposal, the site at 2025 County Road B consists of 2.23 useable acres. You may notice in the more recent packet that Mr. Mueller states that the site also includes an additional parcel of land to the west of Midland Grove Road granted to him by MNDOT which raises the acreage up to 2.61 acres. Please do not be misled by this information. Ownership of the land to the west of Midland Grove Road is not clear at this time and this land may be owned by Midland Grove Condominiums. If the land was owned or operated by MNDOT during this time, then ownership cannot merely be handed back to Mr. Mueller. Residents of Midland Grove have been tending to that parcel of property for over 20 years and we dispute MNDOT's ability to hand the land over to Mr. Mueller.

PLEASE NOTE, that regardless of the ownership of this parcel, it is meaningless as to the scope and size of the Orchard project because nothing will be built on this strip of land. The entirety of the Orchard project will be built on the main site which is merely 2.23 useable acres. Therefore this additional parcel should have no bearing on how the project is reviewed. If the Planning Commission or the City Council are going to include this parcel in the density and city code calculations of the site, then Midland Grove hereby requests the city to review the true ownership of this parcel and make a determination on whether this land belongs to Midland Grove.

(2) The second issue is the density of the proposed project. The Orchard projects to have a density level of over 24 units per acre. While this may seem compatible with other senior housing projects in Roseville, all but one of those other senior housing projects have at least 3.4 acres of land to soften the impact to surrounding neighbors. The Orchard site is so small, that the building will abut its neighbors to the east and west and significantly impair their sightlines. This density level does not fit into the overall neighborhood. Despite having 174 units, Midland Grove has a density level of 18.8 units/acre because it is located on almost 10 acres in a park-like setting. The neighboring townhomes of Ferriswood have a much lower density level. Thus cramming a high density project into this small piece of land just isn't appropriate for the surrounding area.

PLEASE NOTE: Most residents of Midland Grove agree that the property site is not conducive to single family homes, however switching from low density to high density is inappropriate. Many Midland Grove residents would likely support some type of medium density project at that location (4-12 units per acre would equal 9-27 units). However the Orchard project is more than double that amount. We recognize that Mr. Mueller has made some cosmetic adjustments to his project since the March Planning Commission meeting, but these changes are merely cosmetic and do not affect the issues raised by our residents.

(3) The third issue is the scale of the project related to the small size of the proposed site. The Orchard project is seeking a PUD exemption because it will not meet certain city code requirements. Specifically, the Orchard project will not meet city code height limitations, lot space per unit requirements or floor area ratio requirements. In the March packet, the Orchard project was seeking 29% variance on the city code height requirement, a 50% variance for lot space per unit requirements and a 90% variance for floor area ratio requirements. Adding these variances together results in a project that is out of scope for the size of the property site and is a signal to the Planning Commission and the City Council that the site is more appropriate for medium density use.

For example, city code requires 2,000 square feet (sf) of lot space for each 1-bedroom unit and 2,800 sf for 2, 3 or 4-bedroom units. As currently proposed, the Orchard would require 146,000 sf in lot space (3.35 acres). Yet the site in question only has 97,000 sf (2.23 acres). Thus Mr. Mueller needs a variance of 50%. Another example is that city code requires a floor area ratio of .5 or 50% in order to preserve sufficient green space. This would limit the size of the project to half of the existing 97,000 sf and contain the project at 48,500 sf. Yet the Orchard proposes a structure of 92,500 sf. This represents a floor area ratio of .95 or 95% and would be a 90% variance from city code. These significant disparities show that the project is overbuilding the site in question and thus a PUD should not be granted for this project.

PLEASE NOTE: Our residents recognize that a PUD is appropriate when minor variances to city code requirements are needed, but that is not the situation here. In this case, the PUD would essentially be gutting the city code requirements which are supposed to be designed to keep high density projects from overbuilding and preserve green space in Roseville. For this reason, our residents are opposed to the Orchard project.

(4) Another issue is water drainage. As a point of reference, Mr. Mueller was also the developer for the Midland Grove Condominiums which were built in 1969. Over the past 40 years, several water drainage problems have persisted at our complex resulting in water seeping into the foundation and the underground garages. Just last year, our complex approved a \$600,000 special assessment to be paid by our residents to dig up and redesign water drainage along all of our buildings. I do not know if these problems could have been prevented during the design of the complex in the 1960's, but it concerns me that the Orchard proposal lies on land that is lower than the land to the East and North. Therefore the site will be subject to significant water runoff. Mr. Mueller's project will have over 50% surface are coverage, meaning over half the lot will be covered by either the building structure or impervious parking lot surfacing. Where will this water go?

Just to the east, County Road B dips down into a valley in front of the Fairview Community Center and this location has been the site of flash flooding in the past. By allowing a high density project on a small property site adjacent to County Road B, our residents are concerned that this problem will be exacerbated. Another reason to limit the property site to something smaller in scope and scale.

(5) The next concern is related to traffic. Midland Grove is a short, curved road which essentially dead ends at our complex. The road entrance is within 100 feet of the Cleveland and County Road B intersection which is a high traffic intersection. To leave Midland Grove Road, a driver must negotiate traffic turning from Cleveland as well as high-speed traffic coming from the east on County Road B. Because County Road B dips to the east (as mentioned above), cars are sometimes not visible until the last moment. The Orchard project would add a driveway from Midland Grove Road to the Orchard site. This would increase traffic significantly and many of our residents are concerned about accidents and safety. There is also no sidewalk from the Midland Grove complex out to the street, meaning all walkers (including many of our senior residents) must walk in the street during both summer and winter months. Adding traffic from a high density site to this situation is not conducive for maintaining safety. Again, a medium density or smaller project would alleviate these concerns.

(6) The final topic is financing. I don't know if the Planning Commission or the City Council typically discuss developer financing in these proposals, but it should be a topic of concern in this instance. Mr. Mueller has identified the project as an active senior living complex which will be a hybrid between ownership and renting. In theory, residents will pay a large down payment of cash (\$150,000 or more) to move in to a unit. However they won't own the unit. The residents will still pay a monthly association fee to liver there (similar to rent) and then when the resident wants to move out or dies, their large down payment will be refunded to them (without any accumulated interest, I assume this goes to the developer/land owner). While this protects the resident from losing value on their condo asset, it also prevents the resident from gaining any appreciation in value from the condo asset. This raises several issues for the Commission and the Council to consider.

Are there really enough potential residents who will want to buy in to this situation? In this economy, how many seniors will legitimately be able to move in with this down payment requirement? The last thing the city and the neighborhood want is a building site which is either vacant or sitting half-empty due to a lack of

demand for its units. And what are the consequences of a proposal whereby the residents won't actually own their units. Will they upgrade their units and maintain good property values if they have no incentive to appreciate their units in value? And what consequence will this design have to the city? If there is no actual sale of units, will the city lose out on potential tax revenues? Finally, who will manage this project going forward? With all due respect to Mr. Mueller, I believe he is listed at age 84 and will not realistically be able to manage this project for many years, however it is unclear who will manage this project going forward. He has mentioned his son, yet he has not spoken at any of the presentations.

To conclude, 107 residents from Midland Grove have signed a petition opposing the Orchard project and at this time, we see no reason to change our current stance. Due to the concerns and issues above, we ask and expect the Planning Commission to deny approval for this project and to wait until a more appropriate plan of use for the property site is presented. Thank you for your time and effort in this manner, please contact me with any questions.

-Scott Roste

Additional Information:

Form submitted on: 6/1/2009 2:11:37 PM

Submitted from IP Address: [REDACTED]

Form Address: <http://www.ci.roseville.mn.us/forms.aspx?FID=136>

No. 2

The following form was submitted via your website: Contact Planning Commission

Name:: Ann M. Bursch

Address:: 2220 Midland Grove Rd. #201

City:: Roseville

State: : MN

Zip:: 55113

Home Phone Number:: [REDACTED]

Daytime Phone Number::

Email Address: [REDACTED]

Please Share Your Comment, Question or Concern:

To: Members of Roseville City Planning Commission

From: Ann Bursch Resident and Treasurer of the Board at Midland Grove Association

Re: Proposed Orchard Project at 2025 County Road B.

07/07/2009

There is a sign advertising Applewood Pointe Cooperative at Langton Lake that has been placed on Cleveland Ave. N. near County Road D along with boarded up homes for some time. This area is surrounded by more commercial properties than the proposed ‘Orchard Site’ Plans for the Second Applewood Pointe Cooperative in Roseville located at Langton Lake began in 2007 – they have not begun to build as of 5/25/09 – their information states they hope to begin breaking ground in late 2009. We do not want a similar sign and a boarded up home on the corner of Midland Grove Road and County Road B!

Following are excerpts from an editorial in the March 26, 2009 Minneapolis Star Tribune, an April 2009 ARRP Newsletter and an article in the May 18, 2009 Star Tribune.

Editorial: Ghost Developments Thursday, March 26. Star Tribune.

“A ground breaking story by the Star Tribune’s Chris Serres on Sunday March 22 revealed that the landscape of Minnesota is littered with the consequences of reckless lending. Developments that city leaders hoped would become thriving new neighborhoods are now messes of weeds, buckled roads, construction debris and towering piles of dirt. Serres’ story should sound the alarm for growing communities in Minnesota and across the nation . City officials regularly evaluate proposals for new housing developments and decide whether to approve them. illustrates the need for more local scrutiny of developers’ financing arrangements. Its and unfortunate but important lesson for years ahead and a task that both regulators and organizations such as the League of Minnesota Cities should assist cities in performing to require that developers put cash in an account as a guarantee that projects get done. Those are worthwhile steps to consider. The League of Minnesota Cities is also considering new educational programs to help city officials evaluate developers’ finances, or to help cities find experts to do so. The league’s initiative is welcome and the programs it is considering are badly needed. They merit swift implementation.”

ARRP Bulletin April. 2009 “Age Restricted Housing Becomes Ageless. The market for age-restricted housing has gone bust as the economic downturn prompts many boomers, unable to sell their homes, to age in place instead. many developers have asked to lift the age restrictions – typically requiring residents to be 55 – plus Local officials have often granted the requests rather than have near-vacant complexes. It’s an ‘issue that’s going on across the country,’ says Jennifer Raitt, chairwoman of the housing and community development division of the American Planning Association.”

Star Tribune – Monday, May 18 2009.

“Recession delays, derails area redevelopment projects.” To summarize this article .

- Arden Hills withdrew its offer to purchase a 774 acre tract formerly occupied by the Twin Cities Army Ammunition Plant after Ryan Companies ended its agreement to develop the site.
- Late in 2008 developers pulled out of the 100 acre NW Quadrant Project in New Brighton
- In Minnetonka financing difficulties led Glen Lake developers to scrap a plan to build 40 high end condos.
- In downtown St. Paul, an ambitious redevelopment project at the riverfront jails site has been withdrawn.”

These are a few of the examples of projects that have been approved and are at a standstill during these difficult times.

You have heard the arguments that Mr. Mueller’s plans for an Active Senior Living Complex is too dense for the small parcel – very little green space, safety concerns etc.

I would like to make a correction to Station Nineteen Architects, Inc Narrative 4/29/09 page 3 Development densities for other senior housing projects in Roseville are as follows:

Rose Pointe is on 10 acres not 5 acres as stated in the narrative. There is a total of 190 units on that 10 acres making that 19 unit per acre. Also Midland Grove is not a senior housing project!

Yes, Roseville may have one of the highest Senior population in the Twin City Area but is that in part because we already have many active Senior Living complexes which are having difficulty selling or renting, because seniors can not afford to make the move and are 'staying in place' with help in their own home?

I am asking you to consider carefully this proposal – is this something you would want in your residential neighborhood?

Additional Information:

Form submitted on: 6/1/2009 11:41:50 AM

Submitted from IP Address: [REDACTED]

Form Address: <http://www.cityofroseville.com/forms.aspx?FID=136>

----- Original Message -----

From: [Thomas Paschke](#)

To: [James Doherty](#)

Sent: Wednesday, June 03, 2009 10:39 AM

Subject: Submissions

Jim;

In some cases we do and in other cases we do not. If possible forward so that copies can be made and available at the meeting. THANKS

THOMAS PASCHKE
CITY PLANNER
City of Roseville
2660 Civic Center Drive, MN 55113
Direct # 651-792-7074

Confidentiality Statement: The documents accompanying this transmission contain confidential information that is legally privileged. This information is intended only for the use of the individuals or entities listed above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or action taken in reliance on the contents of these documents is strictly prohibited. If you have received this information in error, please notify the sender immediately and arrange for the return or destruction of these documents.

Confidentiality Statement: The documents accompanying this transmission contain confidential information that is legally privileged. This information is intended only for the use of the individuals or entities listed above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or action taken in reliance on the contents of these documents is strictly prohibited. If you have received this information in error, please notify the sender immediately and arrange for the return or destruction of these documents.

From: Gertrude Coad [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, July 08, 2009 11:18 AM
To: *RVCouncil
Subject: Fw: Orchard

I am requesting a three-dimensional mockup of the proposed ORCHARD BUILDING be made in scale to show the effect that it will have on Midland Grove Condominiums, Ferriswood and the single family homes on County Road B and adjoining areas. I can understand why Art Mueller did not include this information. But our planning division of the city of Roseville should have seen the need for it.

This will seriously affect the health of our two maple trees that are at our property line and the lack of sunlight will kill the blooming plants in our flower garden which is just north of our property line.

We had another meeting yesterday at Midland Condos and people are very unhappy with the threat of the Orchard or whatever he decided to build closing us off from view. In addition to the problems with their inability to have their own entrance and exit roads. The rest of the homeowners in the area have been good taxpaying citizens. Why are we getting dumped on in this manner?

Gertrude Coad
[REDACTED]

----- Original Message -----

From: Thomas Paschke
To: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 29, 2009 12:27 PM
Subject: Orchard

Gertrude;

I received your voice mail as well as email request regarding additional information regarding the Orchard.

Your first request was for clarification on the building setback from the property line adjacent to Midland Grove Condos - the building has a varying setback of 21 feet to 36.9 feet adjacent the north property line and will lie approximately 180 feet from the Midland Grove building.

The second question was interest in knowing whether a three dimensional drawing has been created for the proposal - the answer is NO the applicants nor the City has created such an illustration.

Should you have further questions or comments, please feel free to call or email me.

THOMAS PASCHKE
CITY PLANNER
City of Roseville
2660 Civic Center Drive, MN 55113
Direct # 651-792-7074

7/9/2009