WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION
Meeting Agenda

Pursuant to Minnesota Statute Sec. 13D.015, and the Executive Orders and Emergency Declarations related to the COVID19 pandemic, this Planning Commission meeting is being conducted by electronic means using the audio and video conferencing platform, Zoom. Members of the public may watch and listen to the meeting by logging into Zoom, or by calling 312-626-6799 on a phone, and entering Zoom Meeting ID 964 1984 0079 and Passcode 614130. The meeting will also be shown on Channel 8, WCTV, and streamed on the City's website at www.wayzata.org/WCTV.

To speak during the Public Forum and/or Public Hearing portions of the meeting you can use Zoom or a phone. When using Zoom, indicate you'd like to speak by using Zoom's "raise hand" function. When using a phone, press *9. In each case, you will be muted until you have been recognized and invited to speak.

The City encourages comments or questions about items on the agenda and, when possible, requests that you submit them in advance by emailing PublicComment@wayzata.org, calling City staff at 952-404-5313, or mailing Wayzata City Hall at 600 Rice St E, Wayzata, MN 55391 (Attn: Public Comment).

Monday, December 7, 2020
6:30 PM

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Roll Call**
3. **Approval of Agenda**
4. **Consent Agenda**
   a. Approval of November 16, 2020 Meeting Minutes
   b. Approval of Planning Commission Report and Recommendation for a Front Yard Accessory Structure Setback Variance at 144 Edgewood Avenue South
   c. Approval of Planning Commission Report and Recommendation for a Planned Unit Development Concept Plan and a Preliminary Plat Subdivision at 200 Lake Street East
5. **Other Items**
   a. Review of Development Activities
   b. Planning Commissioner Liaison Schedule and City Meeting Calendar
6. **Adjournment**

Upcoming Meetings:

City of Wayzata
Planning Commission
Agenda Report

MEETING DATE: December 7, 2020	**AGENDA ITEM:** 4.a
TITLE: Approval of November 16, 2020 Meeting Minutes	
PREPARED BY: Nick Kieser, Assistant Planner	
REVIEWED BY: Emily Goellner, Community Development Director	
60 DAY DEADLINE: N/A	

BACKGROUND:

N/A

ACTION REQUESTED:

Staff recommends approval of the draft minutes for the November 16, 2020 Planning Commission meeting.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Draft PC Minutes - November 16

WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
November 16, 2020

AGENDA ITEM 1. Call to Order

Chair Plantan called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Chair Plantan read the following statement:
Pursuant to Minnesota Statute Sec 13D.015 and because of the COVID-19 pandemic, this Planning Commission Meeting is being held remotely by electronic means using the audio and video conferencing platform, Zoom. Members of the Commission, City staff, and others that are a part of the meeting will be participating by video or audio connections where we can all hear each other and see the presentations being made. We have a public forum and public hearing this evening on the agenda. If you'd like to speak during these portions of the meeting you may call 1-(312) 626-6799, enter the Zoom meeting ID 99963196445, pass code 199481, and press 9 to speak. Callers will be placed on hold and muted until the appropriate time of the meeting is reached. At that time, each caller will be recognized in turn, and invited to speak. Public comments continue to be welcomed and encouraged and we ask if possible, that comments of future agenda items be submitted in advance by emailing PublicComment@wayzata.org. Please include "public comments" in the subject line, your name and address, and the agenda item that you are speaking to. Comments can also be submitted by calling City staff or mailing comments to Wayzata City Hall at 600 Rice St E, Wayzata, MN 55391 (Attn: Public Comments). The meeting will be shown on Channel 8, WCTV, and streamed on the City's website at www.wayzata.org/wctv.

AGENDA ITEM 2. Roll Call

Chair Plantan asked Director Goellner to take roll call.

Present at roll call were Commissioners: Plantan, Douglas, Merriam, Parkhill, Iverson, Bashioum, and Flannigan. Community Development Director Emily Goellner, Assistant Planner Nick Kieser, and City Attorney David Schelzel were also present.

AGENDA ITEM 3. Approval of Agenda

Chair Plantan asked for a motion to approve the agenda for the meeting.

Commissioner Douglas made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Bashioum, to approve the November 16, 2020 agenda as presented.

Director Goellner completed a roll call vote on the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

DRAFT

AGENDA ITEM 4. Consent Agenda

a.) Approval of the October 5, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Chair Plantan read the items on the consent agenda and asked if any Commissioner had questions or wished to pull an item for further discussion.

Hearing no such request, Chair Plantan asked for a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

Commissioner Merriam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Douglas, to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

Director Goellner completed a roll call vote on the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 5. Public Hearing Items

a) Consider Development Application for Front Yard Accessory Structure Setback Variance at 144 Edgewood Avenue South

Assistant Planner, Nick Kieser, stated that the owner of the property at at 144 Edgewood Avenue South, Bruce Steiner, has submitted a development application for a front yard accessory structure setback variance. He explained that the property is zoned R-1 and is surrounded by properties zoned R-1, and properties to the north and east zoned R-5. He noted that in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan, this property is designated as Estate Single Family. He stated that the variance request is for a setback of 16 feet ,which is 34 feet less than the required 50-foot setback in the R-1 district from the front property line. He explained that the applicants would like to install a ground-mounted solar array near the existing detached garage. He noted that there are other solar panels proposed with this project that would be located on the roofs of both the detached garage and the principal structure that are permitted and do not require a variance. He stated that the proposed ground-mounted solar array will be around 440 square feet, which is 40 feet long, 11 feet wide, and 8 feet high. It will create around 8,000 kilowatt hours, and the total solar panels combined would produce a total of about 21,500 kilowatt hours on the propety. He explained that the applicant has noted the practical difficulties in complying with the setback in their variance request to tree removal and the location of the conduit for the solar array. He showed pictures of the existing hedge buffer along Edgewood Avenue South and reviewed the practical difficulties. He noted that without the variance, a large number of trees would need to be removed in order to follow the setback requirements. He noted that one public comment has been provided for this application that was in support of the request and proposed location of the solar panels. He reviewed the questions that the Planning Commission should consider when considering a variance request.

At the conclusion of Mr. Kieser presentation, Chair Plantan asked if the Commission had any questions for Staff.

DRAFT

Commissioner Iverson asked if the City had standards or guidelines on placement of solar panels on the ground.

Assistant Planner Kieser stated that the City does not have anything specific in City Code to solar or other renewable energy structures. He stated that this application is just about complying with the accessory structure setbacks.

Commissioner Iverson asked if the City had considered talking about this issue, because she assumes that the City will be seeing more of this type of thing coming into the City.

Assistant Planner Kieser stated that the City's Zoning Task Force will be looking at it, along with the energy action plan that is being worked on, so there may be a new City ordinance implemented that will assist with the placement of solar panels or wind energy.

Commissioner Bashioum asked about the angle of the ground mounted array. She asked if it would tilt up during different times of the year and essentially be taller than 8 feet. She stated that she just questioned if the height in this instance would go above the screening shrubs along the street and become visible.

Assistant Planner Kieser stated that he believes that the 30-degree tilt would be the highest that it would go, so it would not exceed 8 feet in height, but asked the applicant to confirm this information.

Chair Plantan asked if the applicant was present and wished to respond.

Applicant, Bruce Steiner, 144 Edgewood Avenue S, stated that the angle of the panel would not change seasonally.

Commissioner Iverson asked if there were service vehicles that would occasionally come to service the panels.

Mr. Steiner stated that once it is installed, his understanding is that it really should require very little maintenance.

Commissioner Parkhill asked if there was a reason that Mr. Steiner needed that many kilowatt hours of electricity.

Mr. Steiner stated that they have a ground source heat pump for heating the house, so most of the heating is done electrically, which takes a lot of power. He noted that they also own 2 electric cars, which also use a fair amount of electricity. He stated that, annually, this should generate a little over half of their electrical usage needs.

Ms. Steiner stated that they are very sensitive to the neighbor's seeing what they are doing, so they are planning to plant more large evergreens to make sure that neighbors will not see the array.

DRAFT

Commissioner Douglas asked about the trees and the sight line for the apartment building behind their home.

Mr. Steiner stated that they spent a good portion of last summer removing buckthorn, which opened up the understory. He stated that they are planning to do some additional planting along the northside of their property to help screen the solar panels, but their first concern was the exposure to the west because of the proximity of their neighbors.

There being no further questions from the Commission for the applicant, Chair Plantan opened the public hearing on the application at 6:51 pm. She read aloud the instructions to join the meeting.

Director Goellner stated there were no people that called or logged in to the meeting that have asked to speak at the public hearing.

Accordingly, Chair Plantan closed the public hearing at 6:52 pm.

Chair Plantan asked for the Commission to share their questions and feedback on the application.

Commissioner Douglas stated that she is happy to see the applicant putting in solar.

Chair Plantan stated that she would also like to thank the applicant for their commitment to alternative energy sources. She stated that she believes the solar structure will be mostly hidden from the surrounding properties. She stated that if the Commission recommends approval, she would like to add a condition that there be a vegetative screen on the west side, and potentially on the north side, of the property so the neighbors' properties would be screened from this structure.

Commissioner Iverson stated that she echoes the sentiments shared by Commissioner Douglas and Chair Plantan, and thanked the Steiners for installing solar panels. She stated that she would agree with the suggestion shared by Chair Plantan for a condition addressing screening.

Commissioner Merriam also commended the applicant for pursuing the goal of solar energy, and noted that the ordinance says that practical difficulties include, but are not limited to inadequate access to direct sunlight for solar energy systems, so this applicant fits that situation. She stated that she would agree with the suggestion of a condition for additional visual buffers.

Commissioner Bashioum stated that she agreed, and likes the suggestion about adding the condition relating to the buffer. She encouraged the energy committee to get those parameters ready for others who may want to do this, so there is a straightforward plan for the City when there are other applications.

Commissioner Parkhill asked which neighbor had sent the letter of support. He noted that the neighbor to the west is the closest, so if the letter was not from them, he would like to know whether the applicant had spoken with them about the project.

Mr. Steiner stated that one of the neighbors to the west is the one who sent the letter of support. He stated that they have communicated with the neighbor that is directly to the west, and his

DRAFT

understanding is that they are trusting that they will do some additional screening, like the evergreen trees his wife mentioned, along that area. He noted that some of the hedgerow right now is buckthorn, so they would ideally like to replace some of the bushes with evergreen. He stated that the neighbors are aware of what they are planning and are okay with it.

Commissioner Parkhill asked about Commissioner Merriam's comment related to the ordinance mentioning access to sunlight.

Commissioner Merriam read aloud the portion of the ordinance again that stated, "practical difficulties include, but are not limited to, inadequate access to direct sunlight for solar energy systems."

There being no further discussion, Chair Plantan asked for a motion on the application.

Commissioner Bashioum made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Douglas, to direct staff to prepare a draft Planning Commission Report and Recommendation with appropriate findings reflecting a recommending approval for a front yard setback variance for an accessory structure of the proposed solar array at 144 Edgewood Avenue South, with a condition requiring additional screening to the north and west of the property, as discussed, for review and adoption at the next Planning Commission meeting.

Director Goellner completed a roll call vote on the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

b) Consider Development Application for a Planned Unit Development Concept Plan and a Preliminary Plat Subdivision at 200 Lake Street East

Director Goellner stated that this is an application from Lake West Development, LLC for the property owned by TCF National Bank at 200 Lake Street East. She stated that the applicant is requesting approval of a Planned Unit Development Concept Plan and a Preliminary Plat Subdivision. She noted that the property in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan is guided as Central Business District, which is a category that provides for a wide range of uses and gave some examples of possible uses. She stated that the property is currently zoned Planned Unit Development. She showed a picture of the existing 3 story TCF office building that has underground parking. She noted that the building is 52 feet tall at the top of the gable, and 60 feet tall from the top of the spire. She stated that the applicants are looking to convert this building from office use to a residential planned unit development with 10 condominium units inside. There are no significant changes planned to the exterior of the building on the Lake Street Side, but there would be some balconies or terraces added on the south side. She noted that the property is 2.27 acres in total size, and the length is 1,336 feet long from end to end. She noted that the BNSF railroad is located directly adjacent to the site. She stated that there is a paved parking lot on each side of the existing building. She explained that this is the first phase of the potential redevelopment of this site, and gave an overview of the process for future requests from the applicant as part of the second phase of review and approvals. She stated that in addition to changing the existing building from business to residential use, the applicant would also like to fill in the adjacent parking lots with new residential buildings. She stated that on the east side, they would like to build a building that will house 10 condominium units and, on the west, would

DRAFT

include 18 townhome units split between two unique buildings. She showed renderings of each of the properties, and noted that the east building would be comprised of two-bedroom, two-bedroom plus den, three-bedroom and three-bedroom plus den units. The existing building would also have the same configuration of unit options, and the west townhome buildings will consist of two-bedroom townhome units. She gave an overview of the density in the Central Business District as outlined in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. She noted that she agrees with some feedback the City received on the application, and that a Comprehensive Plan amendment would be appropriate for this project if the overall proposed density remains less than 20 units/acre at 16.7 units/acre. She noted that they have also calculated the density for each of the buildings separately because the owner is planning on splitting them and having each building operate independently. She noted that as currently proposed, the east building would be 18.1 units/acre, the existing building would be 18.4 units/acre, and the west buildings would be 13.5 units/acre. She reviewed the options for the Planning Commission to consider the proposed density as part of a Comprehensive Plan amendment for the property or some or all of the wider Central Business District. She noted that the height of the proposed east building has been reduced from what was proposed in the previous application submitted on September 21, 2020. She noted that application was withdrawn by the applicant, and they have made a number of changes before bringing a new application back to the City. She reminded the Commission that the Applicant had previously asked for a variance to the height of the east building and are now proposing to keep it at the 35 feet height maximum. She showed a rendering of what the east and west buildings would look like under the current proposal.

Assistant Planner Kieser gave an overview of possible public benefits of this project. He noted that they would infill the surface parking lots that would add new residential communities and improve the streetscape of Lake Street. He stated that there would be pocket parks to the east and the west of the buildings on the property. He noted that the eastern pocket park already exists, and would stay the same size but will have improvements. He explained that there would be a central amenity area added, and the development would have enclosed parking. He reviewed renderings of the proposed pocket parks and explained design detail plans. He stated that the central amenity area would be located between the existing building and the proposed eastern building, and would include a pool, seating area, lounge areas and landscaping for the tenants of the condominiums and a new public amenity area along the sidewalk. He stated that the public amenity area would include some additional bike racks and seating elements, and reviewed the landscaping plans. He reviewed the proposed preliminary plat, and noted that the applicant would still have to file subsequently for review and approval of a final plat by the City. He stated that the preliminary plat shows the proposed subdivision of the existing property into three separate lots. He stated that the applicant held a neighborhood meeting on October 15, 2020, and 28 people attended via Zoom. He stated that some of the major points discussed at the meeting were ADA accessibility, visitor parking, railroad noise/proximity, and preserving the small lake town feel of Wayzata. He stated there have been 6 public comments received by the City on this application that express concerns regarding density/traffic, impacts to small town feel, inconsistencies with the Comprehensive Plan, massing/scaling, and proximity to the railroad tracks. He gave a brief overview of questions for the Planning Commission to consider with the application.

Chair Plantan asked if the Commission had any questions for Staff.

DRAFT

Commissioner Douglas noted that it bothers her that the Comprehensive Plan was just approved, and the City is already talking about revising it. She stated that there were several meetings with Eric Zweber of WSB to review the Comprehensive Plan before it went to Council, and density was discussed. She stated that she thought there was a discussion that the higher density standard would apply to Wayzata Boulevard instead, because it is inconsistent with what they want for Lake Street as far as mass of buildings. She asked if any of the other Commissioners remembered this discussion, or if they can designate certain areas within the Comprehensive Plan for higher density.

Director Goellner explained that the Central Business District did not exactly have those density requirements back when the 2030 plan was written, but she thinks during that process there was a desire to try to give some numeric quality to the density for the vision for the area. She stated that recent projects in the corridor have been around 20 units/acre or just above it. She stated that Wayzata Blu is an exception which is only about 12 units/acre and also has office use on the first floor. She stated that she believes the 200 Lake St site is particularly challenging to reach 20-30 units/acre because of the small depth of the site. She stated that she does not think there was a community expectation of this site being redeveloped, and does not think it was on anyone's mind at the time the Comprehensive Plan was completed. She stated that people in the community are fond of the existing building, and the vision to fill in the parking lots was not heavily discussed. She stated that sometimes as a city starts to use the Comprehensive Plan, they realize that the vision was not quite what they thought it would be, once you are on the ground looking at development proposals.

Commissioner Douglas asked about the process to revise a Comprehensive Plan and whether it would mean getting the County involved as well.

Director Goellner explained that a Comprehensive Plan amendment would require approval by the Council and also approval by the Met Council.

Commissioner Merriam stated that she agreed with the hesitancy expressed by Commissioner Douglas. She stated that she is unsure how the higher density requirement got added to the Comp Plan, and does not think it is consistent with the City's goal of the small-town character and charm. She stated that her thought is not to amend the Comprehensive Plan just for this property, but to take a look all along Lake Street and the C4 District.

Commissioner Bashioum stated that she agrees with Commissioners Douglas and Merriam. She stated that she would also like to see the entire Lake Street corridor west of Berry treated in such a way that does maintain the small-town charm and the small node development that is referenced in the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Flannigan asked about the parking requirement in front of the proposed buildings.

Assistant Planner Kieser stated that there will be 13 street parking spots, as well as some additional spots in front of the future Ventana and Melvin's buildings. He stated that there is proposed to be a new public parking facility just north of the Wayzata Blu, Ventana and Melvin's buildings that could potentially be utilized.

DRAFT

Commissioner Flannigan stated that he can imagine that this just puts more pressure on the public parking closer to the lake near the Boatworks building. He stated that it appears as though the applicants have only addressed the requirement for their own parking. He asked what percentage of the three lots represents a building pad. He stated that he has concerns about the massing of the buildings.

Assistant Planner Kieser stated that they have done the lot coverage calculations which are essentially just the building pads, which is at a little over 44%. He noted that there is additional impervious surface which would include driveways which brings it up to 78.6%.

Commissioner Parkhill noted that someone had mentioned an easement to go into the parking lot at Boatworks, and asked if there was a walkway or tunnel in this location.

Assistant Planner Kieser stated that there is not an easement or tunnel. He stated that he knows that it has been discussed but was never implemented or put into place.

Commissioner Parkhill stated that there is 10 feet for bike trail, 12 feet for trees, 6 feet for the sidewalk, and a few more feet for the stoop and grass. He asked how much is left and questions whether there is actually enough room to build.

Assistant Planner Kieser stated that the existing 10-foot bike path and the 12-foot greenspace are not on this property, and explained that the property begins at the 6-foot sidewalk section.

Commissioner Parkhill asked if this entire property was located within the Shoreland Impact area or just a section of it.

Assistant Planner Kieser stated that this whole property is located within the Shoreland Overlay District.

Commissioner Parkhill asked about the amount of impervious surface coverage allowed in the Shoreland Overlay District.

Assistant Planner Kieser stated that they can go over 25% of a lot with impervious surface but they need to implement stormwater management techniques. He stated that if they go over 75% of a lot with impervious surface, which much of the downtown area does, they need to get a Shoreland Impact Plan CUP.

Commissioner Parkhill asked about the setbacks for the 2nd and 3rd floor that were implemented at Wayzata Blu and some of the other buildings on this end of Lake Street.

Assistant Planner Kieser stated that the upper floor setback standards are located within the City's design standards. He explained that the 3rd floor needs to be setback 25%, which includes some averaging, and the 2nd story needs to be 25% that is essentially a 6-foot minimum setback from the 2nd and 3rd floor.

DRAFT

Commissioner Parkhill stated that the renderings shown then are not really what the setbacks will be, and are just working drawings.

Assistant Planner Kieser stated that the plans did indicate that there may be a request for design deviations for these kinds of setbacks. He stated that the long, linear shape of this lot makes setbacks a bit more difficult.

Commissioner Bashioum asked about the calculations for total hard cover on the lots. She asked if the park to the east is already deeded to the City.

Assistant Planner Kieser stated that it is privately-owned and part of the ownership of this parcel, but the City has an easement over it for public access, so it is not the City's property.

Commissioner Bashioum confirmed with Planner Kieser that the east pocket park is calculated within the total hardscape coverage amounts.

Commissioner Merriam asked about a statement he made about a 11-foot setback from the sidewalk.

Assistant Planner Kieser stated that there is an 11-foot setback from the property line to the proposed building and between that, there is a 6-foot sidewalk and 5 feet of landscape buffer.

Commissioner Merriam confirmed that there is only 5 feet between the building and the sidewalk. She asked it was the condo buildings or the townhomes that will have parking on the main level.

Assistant Planner Kieser stated that the parking for the condominium buildings will be underground and the townhomes would have parking in the rear of each unit. He stated that the townhomes will essentially have a garage facing the south that would be accessed through a drive lane.

Commissioner Merriam asked how far the buildings are located from the railroad tracks.

Assistant Planner Kieser stated that he has that information but needs to dig a little for it.

Commissioner Iverson stated that she believes the answer regarding the distance from the railroad tracks is a little over 7 feet. She referenced page 42 in the staff report regarding parking. She asked if the parking was all enclosed or only one of the spots.

Assistant Planner Kieser explained that all of the parking is enclosed.

Commissioner Iverson referred to the document labeled C3.2 included in the meeting materials and noted that it looks like there is a pinch point in the sidewalk where it goes down to 3 feet near the eastern building. She asked if she was looking at this correctly.

Assistant Planner Kieser stated that, to his knowledge, the sidewalk will stay at 6 feet no matter what. He explained that what she was looking at is existing easement, so essentially part of the

DRAFT

sidewalk is on private property with an easement for the sidewalk. He clarified that there is not a pinch point on the sidewalk.

Director Goellner noted that the existing easement is only for 3 feet and the applicant is proposing a larger sidewalk, which would mean a new easement would be needed to replace the existing easement so it will match what is planned.

Commissioner Iverson referred to page 39 of the meeting materials and the areas depicted on the west side of the property. She questions whether that number of trees can actually be put into the green space, and thinks they are proposing too many for that space. She stated that she doesn't understanding how they can fit that many trees in the space, and asked what kind of trees they are proposing.

Assistant Planner Kieser stated that the trees do lay out some species such as quaking aspen, and the others are essentially listed as trees to match what is existing on the property. He stated that if the City gets to the General Plan phase with this proposal, the City's forester would have to review the landscaping plans to ensure that this number of trees would work in the space and would allow them to grow and stay healthy. He noted that the landscaping plans presented now are just preliminary to show what they are thinking.

Commissioner Iverson stated that it bothers her because it seems a bit deceptive that there will be this robust green garden, and it may not actually be that. She asked about the proposed central amenity area and stated that the renderings seems out of proportion with the reality.

Assistant Planner Kieser noted that the image shown goes out into the right-of-way, which is why there looks like there is extra room and not just the 11-foot width that they have on their property. He noted that the City will need to look at this along with the Panoway plans to ensure that this is what the City wants and that is what it wants within the right-of-way.

Commissioner Iverson asked about the plan of action to ensure that the trees along Lake Street survive the amount of construction vehicles and traffic.

Assistant Planner Kieser stated that this is something that would be put into the Development Agreement if the project is approved to lay out the specifics of what the City wants protected and saved.

Commissioner Iverson asked if the City knows what the remaining capacity is within its sewer system for the area in which the project is proposed.

Director Goellner stated that City Engineer Mike Kelly did research that after this question was raised at the September meeting. She stated that he determined that the City does have sufficient sewer capacity for 38 units of housing in this location.

Commissioner Iverson asked what the impact of those units would be on the City's capacity.

DRAFT

Director Goellner stated that she can say with confidence that the City's sewer system is designed to match the maximum densities in the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Iverson stated that she would like to be able to put a number to it and know, for example, that the City is at 80% capacity or whatever the number is. She asked staff to get City Engineer Kelly to provide the Commission with an accurate number.

There being no additional questions for staff, Chair Plantan invited the applicant to speak about the application and proposed project.

Applicant's representatives, Neil Reardon and Burt Coffin of ESG Architecture and Design, 500 S Washington Ave, Minneapolis, MN, introduced themselves.

Mr. Coffin gave a brief presentation that outlined more details regarding their plans, and noted that he believes their revised plans address the concerns raised at the September 21, 2020 meeting, as well as some of those discussed this evening.

Commissioner Douglas stated that recently the City approved a townhome project at Walker and Rice. She stated that their proposal was for a long row of townhomes, and the City asked them to split them up more. She stated that she still sees two long buildings with this proposal, and asked if there was any consideration given to putting in more green space between the buildings or perhaps guest parking.

Mr. Coffin stated that they had discussed some different iterations of the west side, and one thing they bumped up against was the size of the site and the narrowness of the lot. He noted that as mentioned by Director Goellner, their density was coming in below the 20-30 units/acre, so they had discussed how to break things up a bit differently. He stated that they would like to try to work within the existing outline to create a bit more articulation from the street front so it doesn't feel quite like such a long building.

Mr. Reardon stated that they did consider it, and are trying to meet the tight threshold of not too dense but dense enough, while also meeting the parking requirement. He stated that they will take a look at the site plan and see if any modifications can be made with her comments in mind.

Commissioner Merriam referenced the rendering on page 9 of the packet and asked for the distance between the back of the building and the railroad tracks.

Mr. Coffin stated that he does not know the number off hand, but believes it is to the property line.

Mr. Reardon stated that to the property line it is between 11 and 7 feet; however, the exact distance to the track itself is much larger. He stated that he can get this information for the Commission, but the distance from the back of the building to the track is somewhere between 7 and 11 feet.

Commissioner Merriam asked if the townhome structure would be wood frame.

DRAFT

Mr. Coffin stated that it will be a wood frame and noted that insulating this type of construction for sound can work well. He stated that they will be spending quite a bit of time looking at things like windows and other ways that they can create a living space that people can live in, despite the proximity to the railroad tracks.

Commissioner Merriam asked how they would take into account the vibration in addition to the sound generated by the trains on the railroad tracks.

Mr. Coffin stated that there are certain mitigating things that they did, in terms of the details surrounding construction, which address both those issues.

Commissioner Bashioum asked about the mitigation efforts that were used on Wayzata Blu, and how it compares with what is proposed for this project. She asked if Wayzata Blu was wood frame construction or steel and concrete.

Mr. Coffin stated that Wayzata Blu is an all concrete building, and he is not familiar with the exact sound mitigation strategies that were taken. He stated that he suspects that they would encompass the same type of strategies in this instance. He stated that he would like to get back to the Commission on this question, because he doesn't have the details yet, but can find out what was done at Wayzata Blu.

Commissioner Bashioum stated that she finds it curious that they do not have a bit more information for the Commission since to her, they are far enough along in the design process and know about the proximity of the railroad tracks.

Mr. Coffin reiterated his offer to get back to the Commission with this information. He stated that at this point, they know they will be doing sound mitigation as part of the project, but are very early in the design process.

Mr. Reardon noted that they do have a long list of strategies for sound mitigation, but don't know how many will be included at this time. He noted that answer to the earlier question regarding the dimension from the east building back to the railroad tracks, it is about 33 feet from the face of the building to the center line of the railroad track itself.

Commissioner Iverson noted that on page 23 of the rendering in the packet, there are building mechanicals in multiple places, as well as outdoor trash enclosures, and asked why those are not located within the buildings, because the City typically does not allow this.

Mr. Coffin stated that the recycling and trash will be taken care of inside of the condo buildings, but they are still working on the strategy for how it will be handled for the townhome buildings. He believes it will be the totes that are kept in their garage and are pulled out on trash day.

Mr. Reardon stated that to address the mechanicals, the previous iteration of the plans had the mechanicals located on the roof, so they have changed to them to have them screened in order to avoid the rooftop situation. He explained that it is not possible to place all the pieces of mechanical

DRAFT

equipment within the building. He noted they will minimize the amount of equipment as much as possible, and will have everything screened appropriately.

Commissioner Iverson noted that she worked on a project that is on the back side of this building and every time the train goes by you cannot have a conversation. She stated that the reality is that there will be an effect every time the train goes by, and it goes by quite frequently. She noted that she lives 4 blocks from the train and every time a train goes by, her house shakes. She asked if the City allows for exterior mechanicals.

Assistant Planner Kieser stated that mechanical equipment for the Lake Street District it is required to be off the roof, and noted that the City standards will require them to be screened.

Commissioner Iverson asked what type of screening material would be used.

Assistant Planner Kieser stated that it could be a fence, landscaping, or a combination of the two.

Commissioner Douglas stated that she lives in the townhomes that are a block over which also have wood frame construction. She stated that she can definitely feel the vibration of the train, but the noise isn't too bad. She stated that when she worked at the Depot, the building never vibrated and they hardly ever heard the trains. She asked if that was because of the construction materials used.

Mr. Coffin stated that this experience is what they would like to create for these townhomes. He added that perhaps they will go take a look at the Depot.

Commissioner Flannigan stated that of the public benefits that are listed with this project, two of them are already in place right now. He asked how the applicants view infilling open spaces as a public benefit.

Mr. Coffin stated that in their mind, this project helps complete the street. He stated that when the bank building was still operating, there were potentially 100 cars going in and out of that site on a daily basis. He stated that with 38 dwelling units, there will fewer cars there and they will all be out of site. He stated that having beautiful buildings and beautiful landscaping creates a better experience than walking by surface parking lots.

Mr. Reardon stated that they feel leveraging the Lake Street build out by doing this project actually creates what the City wants, which is a main street feel.

There being no further questions from the Commission for the applicant, Chair Plantan opened the public hearing on the application at 8:30 pm. She again explained the instructions to participate in the public hearing.

Barry Petit, 420 Peavey Lane, noted that he has looked at two core things when he looked at the Comprehensive Plan. He stated that the Comprehensive Plan is new, and the City paid money for its completion and should last a while. He stated that the two things he looked at were the ideas of walkability and charm. He stated that charm is a very abstract word, and yet it says in the

DRAFT

Comprehensive Plan that every design decision has to hover around the notion of charm. He stated that when he looks at the building presented in the renderings look more like quasi-mausoleum monumental pieces, and does not understand how they reside under the heading of "charm".

Mr. Coffin stated that in their minds, they believe scale has a lot to do with charm, and as architects believe that they can all have different opinions about style. He stated that charm is certainly generated by scale and how it is combined with the streetscape and sidewalks, as well as building materials. He stated that he thinks there may be some people that feel there are some charming elements to this building. He noted that there are several different styles of architecture in downtown Wayzata but they are a nice counterpoint to each other, which at the end of the day makes the City more interesting.

Mr. Petit stated that if he showed this slide to 30 people and gave them a prompt with charm as one of their choices, he would guess that it would not be chosen very often. He stated that he thinks this is a problem with the Comprehensive Plan, because it was a word and an idea that was put into that document that literally says everything in the City has to fall under the category of "charm", which is not an architectural term. He stated that the other thing that he feels is equally as critical is the idea of walkability. He asked for slide 19 of the presentation to be shown, and noted that the City's design standards clearly state that sidewalks are to be 12 feet wide. He stated that he and his wife frequently walk Lake Street and have to continually reorganize themselves when someone comes at them on a 6-foot-wide sidewalk. He stated that to him the notion of walkability is that he doesn't have to do that anymore. He stated that he thinks this plan is antithetical to everything that the Comprehensive Plan talks about on Lake Street. He stated that if the plan is to subdivide the land into 3 parcels, he questions whether the middle parcel still meet the F.A.R. requirements.

Chair Plantan noted that staff can address any questions that come up during the public hearing at the end of the public hearing.

Kendra Lindahl, Landform Professional Services, 105 S. 5th Avenue, Minneapolis, stated that she is here representing her clients, Brian and Sherri Heeb, 275 Lake Street East. She stated that she had submitted a lengthy letter for the Commission and would like that to be entered into the record. She asked to highlight a few points rather than reading the entire letter to the Commission. She stated that there are a few concerns they have about the development application as it stands today. She stated that they do not believe that Lake West Development is in compliance with either the vision established in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan nor with the regulations adopted in the Zoning Ordinance. She stated that she agreed that charm and small-town character are hard to define and are in the eye of the beholder; however, it seems that the flexibility needed to make this project happen suggest that this is not the right site for this project. She stated that they believe that the Comprehensive Plan not only provides a density range of 20-30 units/acre, but it also is very specific with another design standard that states that residential is only allowed on the upper floor. She noted that this standard does not anticipate or envision a fully residential project, nor does it distinguish one side of Lake Street from the other. She stated that if the vision has changed since May and the idea of a fully residential project is now part of the vision, that should also be part of the Comprehensive Plan amendment that goes through the public hearing process because that is not the vision that was adopted in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. She stated that if the City amends

DRAFT

the Comprehensive Plan to address both of those issues, she feels there are few components in the Plan and the land use goals that also need to be revised to talk about the mix of commercial and residential that was envisioned. She stated that she believes there are a number of foundational issues that need to be addressed before the City can start talking about the PUD. She stated that the PUD flexibility that is requested is a bit unclear. She appreciates that this is just the concept plan but thinks it is important that the Commission understand exactly what flexibility they are being asked to approve, which she does not feel the application clearly defines. She stated that parking is a significant issue, and the idea that the guest parking will be solved later is short-sighted and should be part of the application today. She stated that if the Comprehensive Plan is amended and the PUD does move forward, the Code suggests that it begin with the C-4 standards that the existing PUD has, and there are a number of items that will require flexibility, some of which is related to the expected commercial/residential mix. She stated that simply not wanting to do that is not a valid reason for the City to amend the Comprehensive Plan. She reiterated that this may not be the right project for this site. She stated that while there are some beautiful elements to it, there have been several Commissioners that have asked if there is enough room for things. She stated that she thinks the answer to their questions is no, and this is not the right site for this project. She noted that it will not be able to meet the 2nd and 3rd story setback standards, provide the guest parking, is pushing the boundaries of impervious surface, and is not complying with the ordinance standards for a 12-foot sidewalk. She stated that the massing has been discussed by the Commission and these are beautiful buildings, but questions if they fit the character of the City with the mass of the buildings and questions if it is furthering the Comprehensive Plan goals. She read aloud a portion of the PUD standards and noted that she believes this project is a significant departure from both the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Standards. She stated that the flexibility required just does not meet the small-town character and charm requirement. She stated that she feels that the benefits outlined are not truly benefits, and noted that she does not believe that converting 2 surface parking lots to 3 story buildings is a benefit for the larger community. She stated that she would like to make sure that the applicant is not given too much credit for the parks that already exists. She stated that she does not believe that the Code allows the City to process a concept plan at the same time as a preliminary plan. She stated that for these reasons, they are asking that the Commission deny the request for both the PUD concept plan and the preliminary plat approval.

There being no one else wishing to comment on the application, Chair Plantan closed the public hearing at 8:48 pm.

Chair Plantan asked for the Commission to share their questions and feedback on the application.

Commissioner Iverson asked to speak first because she is caring for her mother who is ill. She stated that one of the things that needed to be considered with this application is whether it meets the 2040 Comprehensive Plan vision, guidelines and principles. She stated that the plan talks about small town character and understands that this can be a subjective term, but when asking for a PUD, one of the things that the City requires is a higher design standard. She stated that she thinks the application in front of the Commission has not met the higher design standard. She stated that the new buildings presented will sit alongside one of the most beautiful buildings in the City. She stated that the brick work on the TCF building is exquisite. She feels there is an opportunity to play off of that building and incorporate that into the other buildings, and she feels that opportunity

DRAFT

has been completely missed. She stated that the plans presented feel like fast, casual architecture. She stated that this project will really increase the density, and she feels it creates less walkability because of the sidewalk issue. She stated that she also has concerns related to the parking issue. She stated that she does think the mechanicals should be allowed outside in this part of town, even if they are screened, and would like to see them be put inside buildings. She stated that she is also concerned with what is being proposed for the outdoor commons area. She stated that in the other projects in the area, the Planning Commission has recommended denial for any rooftop facilities. She stated that she is concerned about noise and light, and how it will affect the neighbors. She stated that one of the other questions the Commission is asked to consider is safety and welfare of residents. She is very concerned about the proximity to the railroad tracks, and noted that the trains carry hazardous materials on a daily basis and the idea of putting residential homes in this location scares her. She stated that another item talked about in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan is the environment, and she has not seen any discussion about using any sustainable building products or solar. She noted that these buildings will be here for a long time and will outlast most of the Commission. She stated that she feels the Commission needs to look down the road as to what they do to reduce the footprint, and noted that sustainable building materials exist and feels the City should start to utilize them as much as possible. She noted that in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan, it states that the developments that come in front of the City should provide a sense of nostalgia, and she does not see that with these buildings, as proposed. She stated that she sees it with the TCF building, but not the new buildings. She stated that it talks about walkability and vibrant parks, and noted that the City already has two public spaces and is not sure what the public benefits are with the application that is before the Commission. She stated that she feels the proposal needs to be substantially stronger. She stated that she still feels that the City is trying to put too much into that parcel of land, and feels the scale and density proposed do not fit this parcel. She stated that she feels less may be more on this site, and the City will need to be creative in how it approaches it. She suggested that there may be a way to utilize the trailhead and noted that parking is an issue and this plan reduces it more for the bikers.

Commissioner Bashioum asked for slide 12 to be shown and quoted some of the guiding principles of the Comprehensive Plan related to charm, walkability, and small-town character. She stated that when she looks at this picture, none of the guiding principles she just mentioned are brought to mind. She stated that the massing is wrong, and she agrees that this project could be someplace else but does not think it belongs on this long and narrow piece of land with the nearby cottage type homes. She stated that she thinks this project is inappropriate for this location.

Commissioner Parkhill stated that he feels there is some walkability and likes the people in their front yards with the small grass areas. He stated that he questions whether the City walks away from the 12-foot sidewalk width. He stated that he also worries about altering the Comprehensive Plan, although his personal opinion is that the Plan allows too much density in this location and feels leaning towards residential is more appropriate than leaning towards commercial or office. He stated that he appreciates some aspects of the project, such as lowering the east building, the nice use of stone and wood, and feels the density is reasonable; but he is not sure the scale and mass of the buildings are reasonable. He stated that perhaps some of the units could be slightly smaller to decrease the scale and massing. He stated that he does not think the City needs to go back to the C4 zoning. He stated that he doesn't appreciate looking at black top, and thinks looking a pretty building would be a benefit. He stated that increasing the tax base will also help the

DRAFT

community. He stated that his feelings are mixed on this application because he does see some good attributes to the project, but feels scale and mass of the building is severe for this location and do not complement the TCF building that well. He stated that he is also concerned about guest parking because there is not much parking on that end of the street.

Commissioner Flannigan stated that his fellow Commissioners have shared a lot of great points and does not need to restate them; but he thinks there is a point when the TCF building was built and a rationale for what was put on this site that the City needs to make sure is understood. He stated that the paved parking lots are there because the TCF building is massive, beautiful and softened by greenspace on either side. He stated that he thinks about the people who live on Grove Lane, and what this development would do to them with a 3-story building overlooking their homes and yards. He stated that as he looks at the PUD concept plan criteria, he is not willing to offer a recommendation of approval on this. He stated when he moves into the preliminary plat criteria, that is where it really creates a problem for offering any type of solution for the application. He stated that he doesn't know if the proposed subdivision is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. He noted that the architectural appearance, scale, massing and scale of the roofline is not similar in characteristics and quality of the existing development in the City. He stated that 3 long buildings are not consistent with what is in the City or even consistent with what is across the street or down the street. He reviewed some of the other questions that the Commission was to consider and stated that in his opinion, it comes back to the general scale of their proposal. He stated that the City hasn't even talked at length about the fact that this is all residential, and whether that makes sense for a huge piece of this side of the downtown area.

Chair Plantan stated that she wholeheartedly agreed with Commission Flannigan. She stated that she would like to ask the applicant to be more creative if they choose to come back to the City. She stated that she appreciated everything they did after listening to the neighbors, but agrees that what is being asked for in this plan does not mesh with the Comprehensive Plan because of all the things mentioned— charm, walkability, density, and site design.

Commissioner Merriam asked for clarification on the 12-foot sidewalk issue. She stated that if this is a requirement, she asked why the Panoway project only has 6-foot sidewalks.

Assistant Planner Kieser stated that the 12-foot sidewalk requirement is a standard within the City's design standards for the Lake Street Design District. He noted that this property currently has a 6-foot sidewalk, so it appears as though the applicant was just preserving the 6-foot sidewalk, but that will require a design deviation in order to not have 12-foot sidewalks. He stated that would be reviewed and brought forward at the General Plan phase because the design review takes place at that stage.

Commissioner Merriam asked how many people spoke during the public hearing and how many letters were received.

Chair Plantan stated that there were two people who spoke at the public hearing.

Assistant Planner Kieser noted that the City had received 6 letters.

DRAFT

Commissioner Merriam asked if any of the feedback was in favor of the project.

Assistant Planner Kieser stated that there were no letters in support of the project.

Commissioner Merriam stated that she agreed with everything that the other Commissioners have stated. She stated that she believes adding townhomes in this area is a nice option along Lake Street, but is concerned about it not fitting in with the multi-use guidance. She stated that she doesn't feel that residential is inappropriate except for the fact that it is so close to the railroad tracks. She stated that she also has concerns about parking, and would like to see the western pocket park be larger and more enhanced. She would also like to see the setbacks greater from the sidewalks so walking along Lake Street would be nicer, and doesn't think looking at a tall building will add benefit for walkability.

Commissioner Douglas stated that she believes there are just too many unanswered questions about the Comprehensive Plan and green space. She stated that even though the existing lots to either side of the TCF building are 2 big parking lots, she doesn't see them as that because there is so much greenery, shrubbery, trees, and the beautiful wrought iron fencing. She stated that she thinks that is more attractive than what a massive building would look like. She stated that she is not hung up on the sidewalk issue. She noted that she thinks there is enough cement on this side of town so she does not think there needs to be 12-foot sidewalks. She stated that she agrees with most of the things the other Commissioners have already shared.

Commissioner Parkhill stated that somehow the City needs to reconcile with the Comprehensive Plan because it seems to be getting in the way. He stated that the City needs to decide if it wants residential on the top floors and commercial on the first floor, and how many units/acre in this location. He stated that he feels the applicant made a valid attempt at listening to the Commission from their prior proposal. He stated that he doesn't know how to do this, but hopes the City planners do, and suggested that it start with them.

Commissioner Flannigan stated that while Commissioner Parkhill feels the applicant made a valid effort to make changes based on the Commission feedback, he does not think they did. He stated that he would respectfully disagree on that point, and does not see that enough has changed in this application from the previous application. He stated that he does agree that there needs to be some sort of guidance to the Commission on the Comprehensive Plan issue. He stated that his understanding was that west of Berry, the City had the flexibility to not have retail on the first floor. He asked if the Commission needed to have more of a conversation about that issue.

Director Goellner stated that she thinks this is where there are a lot of different documents intersecting with one another, and it is very confusing when the Commission is talking about them all at once. She stated overall, she does feel that there is some flexibility to do an all residential project here based on the Comprehensive Plan, but she welcomes input on that idea so they can guide the owner and applicant on whether that is appropriate or not. She stated that to offer her input, she thinks it is interesting that they brought up the idea of bringing in some other uses to this site to complement the residential use which may be a creative way to work with density requirements and the site, in general. She asked City Attorney Schelzel to weigh on all residential versus mixed use.

DRAFT

City Attorney Schelzel stated that he feels Director Goellner has summarized it well, and agreed that some of the confusion arises around the fact that there are a number of overlaying documents. He stated that his understanding is that the only objective requirement of the Comprehensive Plan not being met in the proposed plan is the density. He stated that the tension there is that the newly adopted Comprehensive Plan requires a density of 20-30 unit/acre which is a new requirement that the City has not had to apply before, and noted that the City had shared the concern with the applicant about there being too much density. He noted that the applicant stated they were trying to balance the Comprehensive Plan requirement to get above 20, with the Planning Commission's concern about density and keep it less than 20. He stated that the retail piece is not a requirement in this part of town, so this could be completely residential under the Comprehensive Plan, and noted that the Central Business District as a whole is to have a mixture of uses, but individual projects do not necessarily have to be mixed use projects.

Commissioner Parkhill asked what zoning this would default to if this was not a PUD.

Director Goellner stated that it has been a PUD district a long time, and there is no other default district.

Commissioner Parkhill asked what would be a normal F.A.R. for example, for a building across the street.

Director Goellner stated that those have all been PUDs, and the City does not have an F.A.R. requirement in the PUD district. She stated that, in general, our community is trying to achieve an F.A.R. between 1 and 2.

Commissioner Parkhill asked if this was zoned for high density.

Director Goellner stated that the 20-30 units/acre comes from the Central Business District for a long-term density goal for the entire downtown area.

City Attorney Schelzel added that the standard is from the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Parkhill asked what the proposed F.A.R. was for the whole site.

Director Goellner stated that she believes it is around 1.5.

Commissioner Flannigan stated that the TCF site is 1.55, the west lot is 1.02, and the east lot is 1.09.

.

Commissioner Parkhill stated that if the City stuck with the Comprehensive Plan, they could put 33% more building on this site plus another 13 units/acre.

Director Goellner stated that there would be a lot of other constraints to consider.

DRAFT

Commissioner Parkhill explained that this is why he was saying their latest proposal is somewhat reasonable. He asked what other advice the Commission can give the applicants other than just to make it cuter.

Commissioner Flannigan asked if that was a rhetorical question.

Commissioner Parkhill stated that he is trying to help the applicants figure out what the Commission is trying to stay to them.

Director Goellner stated that she believes that Commissioner Parkhill had a good idea earlier about unit size, because there are really significantly sized units here, and that does contribute to a low density.

Commissioner Parkhill stated that is not reflected in the F.A.R. because that is less than it could be.

Director Goellner reiterated that it is more complicated than that.

Commissioner Parkhill stated that he has already shared that he thinks the scale and mass is a little bit too much and questioned how it could be made more charming because you can walk right up to the units.

Commissioner Flannigan stated that he thinks more green space or more breaks between the buildings, reduce the size of the buildings and not have 3 stories, and find a way to reduce the feel of 3 huge, long buildings. He stated that he is not doing a F.A.R. calculation or even looking at pervious or impervious surface, but feels there is a way to scale the project in a different manner that would allow them to have a more acceptable application.

Commissioner Parkhill stated that he feels those are all great ideas and is just trying to weed this out for the applicant. He noted that he agreed with Commissioner Douglas that a 12-foot sidewalk probably isn't needed in this area because there is plenty of concrete.

Commissioner Iverson stated that if you look at the mass and the scaling, and the overbuilding on these little lots, she does not think the properties can handle buildings of this size which is what she thinks Commissioner Flannigan is trying to say.

Commissioner Parkhill stated that he agrees, but the current zoning allows for more.

Commissioner Iverson stated that does not mean that it is right.

Commissioner Flannigan stated that he does not want to confuse the number of people per acre with the size of the buildings. He stated that you can get more people into the buildings by having smaller units. He stated that during the Comprehensive Plan discussion there was a lot of push on increasing density in the Comprehensive Plan. He stated that the Commission did some pushing back, and feels that they need to be aware as to how the Comprehensive Plan was finalized, which to some extent was outside of this Commissions control.

DRAFT

Commissioner Iverson stated that she voted against it because of that density.

Commissioner Merriam stated that part of the PUD process is that there should be some public benefit over what could typically be done under strict zoning. She asked about the C4 zoning.

Director Goellner noted that this property has not been zoned C4 for 30 years.

Commissioner Merriam asked what the current PUD zoning says is allowed.

Director Goellner stated that this property is designed exactly as it was proposed 30 years ago according to those PUD plans to be used as an office building. She stated that if the owner would like to change that, it will require approval of a new PUD plan in line with the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Merriam stated that this PUD needs to be better than the existing PUD in order to recommend approval.

City Attorney Schelzel recommended that the way they look at it is that if someone comes asking for a change, they have that right but need to follow the process for a PUD amendment or an entirely new PUD, which is what this applicant is doing. He stated that he would not say it had to be a better one than the current one necessarily, but as a Commission they need to look at the criteria in the PUD ordinance and apply that criteria to the proposal and make a recommendation to Council.

Commissioner Bashioum noted that the Commission is being asked to approve all 3 projects when, after they are approved and built, they will be subdivided into three different entities. She asked for clarification that the Commission is being asked to approve or disapprove a three-parcel project rather than coming in one at a time.

City Attorney Schelzel stated that to be precise, the Commission is being asked to review and make a recommendation on the two requests that the applicant is making at this point in time. He stated that the applicant is requesting approval of a PUD concept plan that calls for redevelopment of the existing building and construction of two new buildings, and each of those buildings would sit on separate legal parcels. He stated that not every PUD involves a subdivision request, but many do and some also involve a common interest community. He stated that this application is at the first stage of a multi-stage process which is the concept phase, and the applicant has also elected to include a preliminary plat at this point. He stated that these are the two things the Commission is asked to look at to make a recommendation on. He stated that this is a PUD project with three elements.

Commissioner Bashioum noted that she would like to highlight #8 on page 43 of the packet, which asks the Commission to look at the architectural appearance, scale, mass, construction, proportion and scale, and the similar characteristics to the surrounding area. She stated she has reviewed the nearby properties and feels this proposal is out of character from the surrounding area.

DRAFT

Chair Plantan stated that she believes the Commission agrees that a PUD is an acceptable answer for this parcel. She stated that perhaps there is also the opportunity for a little bit of mixed use in this project. She stated that she feels that would be a healthy and vibrant solution. She stated that to give some feedback to the applicant, she can summarize that the Commission is concerned about the proposed density, and that they do not need to meet the density requirements for this particular area. She stated that they are also concerned about the scale and the massing of the buildings, and making sure that they have a bit more charm and consistency with the small town feel, and also maintain walkability.

Commissioner Flannigan stated that if you look at the TCF building, there is something that feels like it grows into its size which has been accomplished with facades and rooflines which makes the scale feel different. He stated that the buildings are added to each side and it is just straight block or cubed type of architecture, that is where his issue is with the massing and the feel, and why he feels that it is just too much.

Commissioner Douglas stated that she agrees with Commissioner Flannigan, and stated that it is the west portion that really bothers her because they are just boxes. She stated that she would like there to be more emphasis on more green in that part of town and not 12-foot sidewalks.

Commissioner Iverson stated that when you look at the renderings there was a word that came to her mind, which is deceptive. She stated that you cannot really tell what the size of the spaces are, and would like to see some that are more reflective of the true size and nature of the space. She stated that the more it can feel realistic, the better the Commission will be able to envision exactly what the building will look like.

There being no further discussion, Chair Plantan asked for a motion on the application.

Commissioner Parkhill made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Flannigan, to direct staff to prepare a draft Planning Commission Report and Recommendation with appropriate findings reflecting a recommendation of denial of the PUD Concept Plan and Preliminary Plat Subdivision at 200 Lake Street East for review and adoption at the next Planning Commission meeting.

Commissioner Douglas lost her internet connection, but was able to reconnect via telephone.

Director Goellner summarized the motion again for Commissioner Douglas.

Director Goellner completed a roll call vote on the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 6. Other Items:

a) Review of Development Activities

Assistant Planner, Nick Kieser stated there is nothing new to report on new or pending development applications. He noted that the Energy Environment Committee and the Energy Action Team will be bringing forward a draft energy action plan to the Council in December.

DRAFT

AGENDA ITEM 7. Adjournment.

There being no further business on the agenda, Chair Plantan asked for a motion to adjourn.

Commissioner Bashioum made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Douglas, to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting.

Director Goellner completed a roll call vote on the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Kayla Atkins Rokosz
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.

DRAFT

City of Wayzata
Planning Commission
Agenda Report

MEETING DATE: December 7, 2020	**AGENDA ITEM:** 4.b
TITLE: Approval of Planning Commission Report and Recommendation for a Front Yard Accessory Structure Setback Variance at 144 Edgewood Avenue South	
PREPARED BY: Nick Kieser, Assistant Planner	
REVIEWED BY: Emily Goellner, Community Development Director	
60 DAY DEADLINE: January 1, 2021	

BACKGROUND:

The owner, Bruce Steiner, and the applicant, Patrick Farnham, have submitted a development application for a front yard accessory structure variance at 144 Edgewood Ave S. The proposed project would construct a ~440 sq. ft. ground-mounted solar array in the front yard. The front yard setback for this accessory structure is 50 feet an dthe proposed project would place the solar array 16 feet from the front property line. Additional solar panels will be placed on the existing principal structure and detached garage.

A public hearing was held at the November 16, 2020 Planning Commission meeting. The Planning Commission recommended approval unanimously at this meeting.

ACTION REQUESTED:

Approval of Report and Recommendation for a Front Yard Accessory Structure Setback Variance at 144 Edgewood Avenue South.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Draft PC Report and Recommendation

WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION

December 7, 2020

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL OF SETBACK VARIANCE AT 144 EDGEWOOD AVE S

DRAFT

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

Approval* of Setback Variance

** subject to certain conditions noted in Section 4 of this Report*

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Section 1. BACKGROUND

1.1 Project. Applicant Patrick Farnham and property owners Bruce and Julie Steiner (collectively, the "Applicant") have submitted a development application for a setback variance (the "Application") for a ground-mounted solar panel array (the "Solar Array") as part of the installation and operation of a solar-powered electricity generation system on the property at 144 Edgewood Avenue (the "Property"). The solar-powered system would serve the electrical needs of the Property only.

1.2 Application Request. The Application request is for approval of a variance from the minimum 50 foot front yard setback standard for an accessory structure in the R-1 Zoning District, to allow for a 16 foot setback from the front (west) property line (the "Setback Variance").

1.3 Property. The street address, property identification number, and owner of the Property are:

144 Edgewood Ave S	06-117-22-23-0019	Bruce & Julie Steiner

1.4 Land Use. The Property is zoned R-1 Low Density Single Family Residential District and is guided Estate Single-Family under the Wayzata Comprehensive Plan.

1.5 Notice and Public Hearing. Notice of a public hearing on the Application was published in the *Sun Sailor* on November 6, 2020. A copy of the notice was mailed to all property owners located with 350 feet of the Property on November 4, 2020. The public hearing on the Application was held at the November 16, 2020 Planning Commission meeting.

Section 2. STANDARDS

2.1 Setbacks. A ground-mounted solar array installation is permitted as an accessory structure in the R-1 Zoning District. Sec. 952.04.G. The minimum front yard setback in the R-1 Zoning District for an accessory structure is 50 feet. Sec. 952.06.B.2.

2.2 Variance. The applicable criteria for granting a variance from the standards of the Zoning Ordinance under Sec. 905.1.C. are:

A. Variances shall only be permitted when they are:
(i) in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance; and
(ii) consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

B. Variances may be granted when the Applicant for the variance establishes that there are practical difficulties in complying with the Zoning Ordinance.

C. "Practical difficulties," as used in connection with the granting of a variance, means that:
(i) the property owner's proposal for the property is reasonable but not permitted by the Zoning Ordinance;
(ii) the plight of the landowner is due to circumstances unique to the property, and not created by the landowner; and
(iii) the variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality.

D. Economic considerations alone do not constitute practical difficulties. Practical difficulties include, but are not limited to, inadequate access to direct sunlight for solar energy systems.

E. The City Council shall not permit as a variance any use that is not allowed under the Zoning Ordinance for property in the zoning district where the affected person's land is located, except the City Council may permit as a variance the temporary use of a one family dwelling as a two family dwelling.

F. An application for a variance shall set forth reasons that the variance is justified under the criteria of this section in order to make reasonable use of the land, structure or building.

Section 3. FINDINGS

Based on the Application materials, staff reports, public comment presented at the public hearing, and Wayzata's Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Commission of the City of Wayzata makes the following findings of fact:

3.1 Setback Variance.

A. The Setback Variance requested is (i) in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance in that it would be used for a project that generally conforms with the existing aesthetics, styles, design and layout of the residences of the surrounding residential neighborhood, and (ii) consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's guidance for the area as Environmental Sustainability is one of five guiding principles that states green sources of energy should be encouraged (page 1-7 of Comprehensive Plan).

B. The Applicant, in the narrative of its Application and public comments before the Planning Commission, has established that there are practical difficulties in complying with the strict standards of the Zoning Ordinance as they relate to the applicable setback limit, including the location of the existing residence and accessory structure on the Property, and the desire to preserve mature trees.

C. A finding of "Practical Difficulties" is supported by the following:

(i) The Applicant's proposal for the Property is reasonable in that it (a) the request involves access to direct sunlight for a solar energy system; (b) the location of the existing and proposed vegetation buffer; and (c) will not negatively impact neighboring properties or the neighborhood.

(ii) The plight of the Applicant is due to the nature of the lot and existing buildings, trees, vegetation and natural buffers on the Property, and was not created by the Applicant.

(iii) The Setback Variance would not alter the essential character of the locality in that the Solar Array it permits will not be visible from most areas of adjacent properties, sidewalks and streets, particularly if the recommended condition of approval in Section 4 of this Report is included in an approval of the Setback Variance.

D. The practical difficulties necessitating the Setback Variance are not economic in nature and include the need for adequate access to direct sunlight for solar energy systems.

E. The proposed use for the Property is permitted within the R-1 Zoning District.

F. The conditions for granting approval of the Setback Variance listed below in Section 4 of this Report should be considered by City Council.

G. The Applicant has provided the reasons that the Setback Variance is justified under applicable criteria in order to make reasonable use of the land, structures and buildings on the Property.

Section 4. RECOMMENDATION

4.1 Planning Commission Recommendation. Based on the findings in section 3 of this Report, the Planning Commission recommends approval of the Setback Variance requested in the Application, subject to the following conditions:

A. The Applicant must secure all necessary building permits for construction, and follow all laws and regulations applicable to the Project, including building codes and land use regulations, and City Code and policies applicable to days and times of work, and construction management.

B. The Applicant must build and complete the Project in conformance, in all material respects, with the plans depicted in the Application.

C. The Applicant must maintain a natural vegetative visual buffer between the Solar Array and views from the west and north of the Property, including planting and maintaining evergreen plantings, or a similar vegetation buffer in where there are otherwise openings in the existing buffer.

D. All expenses of the City of Wayzata, including consultant, expert, legal, and planning fees incurred must be fully reimbursed by the Applicant.

Adopted by the Wayzata Planning Commission this 7th day of December 2020.

Attachments:
Attachment A: Legal Description of Property

DRAFT

Attachment A
Information and Legal Description of Property

All of Lot 1, Edgewood, EXCEPT that part thereof described as follows: Commencing at the point of intersection of the Southerly right-of-way line of U.S. Highway #12 and the East line of said Lot l; thence South along said East line, a distance of 142.91 feet; thence right with an interior angle of 79 degrees 54 minutes, a distance of 333.8 feet, more or less, to the Westerly line of said Lot l; thence Northerly along said Westerly line to its point of intersection with the Southerly right angle line of U.S. Highway #12; thence Southeasterly along said right-of-way line to the point of beginning.

ALSO all that part of Lot 2, Edgewood, described as follows: Beginning at the Southeast corner of Lot l; thence South on the East line of Edgewood 148 feet; thence Northwesterly 338.65 feet to a point in the West line of said Lot 2, said last mentioned point being Southerly 155.8 feet from the Southwest corner of said Lot l; thence Northerly along the West line of said Lot 2, 155.8 feet to the Southwest corner of said Lot l; thence Easterly along South boundary line of said Lot 1 to the Southeast corner of said Lot 1, the place of beginning.

PID No. 06-117-22-23-0019

DRAFT

City of Wayzata
Planning Commission
Agenda Report

MEETING DATE: December 7, 2020	**AGENDA ITEM:** 4.c
TITLE: Approval of Planning Commission Report and Recommendation for a Planned Unit Development Concept Plan and a Preliminary Plat Subdivision at 200 Lake Street East	
PREPARED BY: Nick Kieser, Assistant Planner	
REVIEWED BY: Emily Goellner, Community Development Director	
60 DAY DEADLINE: January 2, 2021	

BACKGROUND:

The proposed project would convert the existing building on the site to a 10-unit condominium building. Two new structures would be added to east and west of the current building. The proposed eastern building would include 10 condominiums and the proposed western building would include 18 townhomes. The redevelopment project would also include enclosed parking for the residential buildings, and two small parks on the eastern and western edges of the property. The development application requests will be held in two phases.

A public hearing was held at the November 16, 2020 Planning Commission meeting.

ACTION REQUESTED:

Approval of Report and Recommendation for a Planned Unit Development Concept Plan and a Preliminary Plat Subdivision at 200 Lake Street East.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Draft PC Report and Recommendation

WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION

December 7, 2020

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF DENIAL
OF PUD CONCEPT PLAN AND PRELIMINARY PLAT AT 200 LAKE ST E

DRAFT

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

1. Denial of Planned Unit Development (PUD) Concept Plan
2. Denial of Preliminary Plat Subdivision

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Section 1. BACKGROUND

1.1 Project. Lake West Development, LLC (the "Applicant") has submitted a development application (the "Application") for the property at 200 Lake Street East (the "Property") requesting approval of a (i) PUD concept plan and (ii) preliminary plat subdivision for a project to convert the existing office building on the Property into ten condominiums and construct two new residential buildings on either side, replacing the existing surface parking lots. (the "Project" or the "Proposed PUD"). The Project would require several stages of City review and approvals, and the Application requests represent the first stage.

1.2 Application Requests. As part of the Application, the Applicant is requesting approval of the following:

A. PUD Concept Plan: A PUD concept plan (the "PUD Concept Plan") to convert the existing TCF office building on the Property into ten condominiums and construct two new residential buildings on either side of that building, replacing the existing surface parking lots. The new building to the east would be a ten-unit condominium building, and the new building to the west would be an 18-unit, 2-building townhome development. In additional, small "pocket parks" would be built on the far east and west ends of the Property.

B. Preliminary Plat Subdivision: A preliminary plat to subdivide the Property into three lots. (the "Preliminary Plat" or "Subdivision").

1.3 Property. The Property is located on the south side of Lake Street East between Ferndale Road South and Barry Avenue South. The street address, property identification number and owner of the Property are:

200 Lake Street East	06-117-22-32-0029	TCF National Bank

1.4 Land Use. The Property is zoned PUD Planned Unit Development District and guided Central Business District under the 2040 Wayzata Comprehensive Plan. The Property also falls within the S/Shoreland Overlay District and the Lake Street Design District.

1.5 Notice and Public Hearing. Notice of a public hearing on the Application was published in the *Sun Sailor* on November 6, 2020. A copy of the notice was mailed to all property owners located with 750 feet of the Property on November 4, 2020. The public hearing on the Application was held at the November 16, 2020 Planning Commission meeting.

Section 2. STANDARDS

2.1 Planned Unit Developments (PUDs).

A. Intent and Purpose of PUDs. Chapter 933 of the Zoning Ordinance provides for the establishment of Planned Unit Developments to allow greater flexibility in the development of neighborhoods and/or non-residential areas by incorporating design modifications as part of a PUD conditional use permit or a mixture of uses when applied to a PUD District. The PUD process, by allowing deviation from the strict provisions of the Zoning Ordinance related to setbacks, lot area, width and depth, yards, etc., is intended to encourage:

1. Innovations in development to the end that the growing demands for all styles of economic expansion may be met by greater variety in type, design, and placement of structures and by the conservation and more efficient use of land in such developments.

2. Higher standards of site and building design through the use of trained and experienced land planners, architects, landscape architects, and engineers.

3. More convenience in location and design of development and service facilities.

4. The preservation and enhancement of desirable site characteristics such as natural topography and geologic features and the prevention of soil erosion.

5. A creative use of land and related physical development which allows a phased and orderly development and use pattern.

6. An efficient use of land resulting in smaller networks of utilities and streets thereby lower development costs and public investments.

7. A development pattern in harmony with the objectives of the Wayzata Comprehensive Plan. (PUD is not intended as a means to vary applicable planning and zoning principles.)

8. A more desirable and creative environment than might be possible through the strict application on zoning and subdivision regulations of the City.

B. General Standards. Section 933.02.A of the Zoning Ordinance sets forth the general standards for a PUD and review of a PUD application. These include:

1. Health Safety and Welfare; Council Discretion. In reviewing the PUD application, the Council shall consider comments on the application of those persons appearing before the Council, the report and recommendations of the Planning Commission, the recommendations on design and any staff report on the application. The Council also shall evaluate the effects of the proposed project upon the health, safety and welfare of residents of the community and the surrounding area and shall evaluate the project's conformance with the overall intent and purpose of Section 33 of the PUD Ordinance. If the Council determines that the proposed project will not be detrimental to the health, safety and welfare of residents of the community and the surrounding area and that the project does conform with the overall intent and purpose of Section 33 of the PUD Ordinance, it may approve the PUD, although it shall not be required to do so.

2. Ownership. Applicant/s must own all of the property to be included in the PUD.

3. Comprehensive Plan Consistency. The PUD project must be consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan.

4. Sanitary Sewer Plan Consistency. The PUD project must be consistent with the City's Sanitary Sewer Plan.

5. Common Open Space. The PUD project must provide common private or public open space and facilities at least sufficient enough to meet

the minimum requirements established in the Comprehensive Plan, and contain provisions to assure the continued operation and maintenance of such.

6. Operating and Maintenance Requirements. Whenever common private or public open space or service facilities are provided within a PUD, the PUD plan must contain provisions to assure the continued operation and maintenance of such open space and service facilities to a predetermined reasonable standard. Common private or public open space and service facilities within a PUD must be placed under the ownership of one of the following, as approved by the City Council: (i) dedicated to the public, where a community-wide use is anticipated, (ii) Landlord control, where only tenant use is anticipated, or (iii) Property Owners Association, provided the conditions of 933.2.A.6.c are meet.

7. Staging of Public and Common Open Space. When a PUD provides for common private or public open space, and is planned as a staged development over a period of time, the total area of common or public open space or land escrow security in any stage of development shall, at a minimum, bear the same relationship to the total open space to be provided in the entire PUD as the stages or units completed or under development bear to the entire PUD.

8. Density. The PUD project must meet the density standards agreed upon by the applicant and City, which must be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

9. Utilities. All utilities associated with the PUD must be installed underground and meet the utility connection requirements of Section 933.02.A.10.

10. Utility Connections. All utilities associated with proposed PUD must meet the utility connection requirements of Section 933.02.A.10.

11. Roadways. All roadways associated with the PUD must conform to the Design Standards and Wayzata Subdivision Regulations, unless otherwise approved by City Council.

12. Landscaping. All landscaping associated with the PUD must be according to a detailed plan approved by the City Council. In assessing the plan, the City Council shall consider the natural features of the particular site, the architectural characteristics of the proposed structure and the overall scheme of the PUD plan.

13. Setbacks. The front, rear and side yard restrictions on the periphery of the Planned Unit Development site at a minimum shall be the same as imposed in the underlying districts, if a PUD conditional use permit, or

the previous zoning district, if a PUD District. No building shall be located less than fifteen (15) feet from the back of the curb line along those roadways which are part of the internal street pattern.

14. Height. The maximum building height to be considered within a PUD District shall be thirty five (35) feet and three (3) stories, whichever is lesser. There shall be no deviation from the height standards applied within the applicable zoning districts for PUD conditional use permits. In PUD Districts for parcels that were zoned commercial prior to PUD and which exceed 13 acres, the maximum allowable height and number of floors shall be as negotiated and agreed upon between the applicant and the City.

C. Residential PUD Standards. Section 933.03 sets forth lot area, minimum frontage, municipal water and sewer availability, roadway and parking standards for PUDs which have a residential components. In addition to the standards set forth in these sections, City Council may impose such other standards for a PUD project as are reasonable and as the Council deems are necessary to protect and promote the general health, safety and welfare of the community and the surrounding area.

D. PUD Procedure.

1. Concept Plan Approval Non-Binding. Concept Plan approval is the first step in a multi-stage process of City review and approval of a PUD. Concept Plan approval in no way binds the City to subsequent approval of a General Plan of Development or other approvals that may be required. Section 933.05.B.

2. Application Contents. An application for approval of a Concept Plan of development for a PUD project must contain the information and materials listed in Section 933.05.C.

2.2 Subdivision / Preliminary Plat.

Review and approval of lot combinations and subdivisions of property are governed by the City's Subdivision Ordinance, Part X of City Code. In reviewing such requests, the Planning Commission shall consider possible adverse effects of the preliminary plat. Its judgment shall be based upon, but not limited to, the following factors found in Section 1003.02.E:

1. The proposed subdivision or lot combination shall be consistent with the Wayzata Comprehensive Plan.

2. Building pads that result from a subdivision or lot combination shall preserve sensitive areas such as lakes, streams, wetlands, wildlife habitat, trees and vegetation, scenic points, historical locations, or

similar community assets.

3. Building pads that result from subdivision or lot combination shall be selected and located with respect to natural topography to minimize filing or grading.

4. Existing stands of significant trees shall be retained where possible. Building pads that result from a subdivision or lot combination shall be sensitively integrated into existing trees.

5. The creation of a lot or lots shall not adversely impact the scale, pattern or character of the City, its neighborhoods, or its commercial areas.

6. The design of a lot, the building pad, and the site layout shall respond to and be reflective of the surrounding lots and neighborhood character.

7. The lot size that results from a subdivision or lot combination shall not be dissimilar from adjacent lots or lots found in the surrounding neighborhood or commercial area.

8. The architectural appearance, scale, mass, construction materials, proportion and scale of roof line and functional plan of a building proposed on a lot to be divided or combined shall be similar to the characteristics and quality of existing development in the City, a neighborhood or commercial area.

9. The design, scale and massing of buildings proposed on a subdivided or combined lot shall be subject to the architectural guidelines and criteria for the Downtown Architectural District, Commercial and Institutional Architectural Districts, and Residential Architectural Districts and the Design Review Board/City Council review process outline in Section 9 of the Wayzata Zoning Ordinance.

10. The proposed lot layout and building pads shall conform with all performance standards contained herein.

11. The proposed subdivision or lot combination shall not tend to or actually depreciate the values of neighboring properties in the area in which the subdivision or lot combination is proposed.

12. The proposed subdivision or lot combination shall be accommodated with existing public services, primarily related to transportation and utility systems, and will not overburden the City's service capacity.

Section 3. FINDINGS

Based on the Application materials, additional materials submitted by the Applicant, staff reports, public comment and information presented at the public hearing, and the standards of the Wayzata Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances, the Planning Commission of the City of Wayzata makes the following findings of fact:

3.1 PUD. The PUD proposed under the PUD Concept Plan ("Proposed PUD") does not meet the purpose and intent of the PUD Ordinance.

A. The Proposed PUD does not reflect higher standards of site and building design in that (i) the design, style and massing of the proposed buildings do not successfully integrate into the Lake Street location and the challenges of the long, narrow property at 1,336 feet long and ranging 33 to 88 feet in depth; (ii) the design, style and massing of the proposed buildings do not successfully reflect and compliment the design, style and massing of the existing TCF building, which includes exquisite brick detailing, a variety of pitched rooflines and façade articulations, variety of window sizes and shapes, and significant landscaped open space to balance its extraordinary height (52 feet to the top of the gable, 60 feet to the top of the spire).

B. The Proposed PUD does not meet all of the standards, goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan, including small town character and charm (*page 1-5 of 2040 Comprehensive Plan*) and the residential density requirements of 20 to 30 units/acre for the Central Business District (*page 3-14 of 2040 Comprehensive Plan*). The residential density for the Proposed PUD would be less than that required under the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. The PUD Concept Plan calls for three large new multi-family residential buildings with significant mass and scale that closely flank the tallest building on Lake Street west of Superior Boulevard. The combined effect of the proposed lot coverages, heights, building foundation setbacks, lack of sufficient second and third floor setbacks, floor area ratios, roof styles and impervious surfaces culminate to massing and scale that are inconsistent with the guiding principles of the Comprehensive Plan.

C. The Proposed PUD does not clearly create a more desirable and creative environment than would be possible under the existing zoning. Existing zoning of PUD centered on a single office building of unique architectural significance with landscaped open space to either side is more desirable and creative than the Proposed PUD.

D. The Proposed PUD does not meet all of the PUD general standards listed in Section 933.2.A of the Zoning Ordinance, including:

1. Health Safety and Welfare. Aspects of the Proposed PUD would be detrimental to the health, safety and welfare of residents of the

community and the surrounding area, and does not conform with the overall intent and purpose of the PUD Ordinance as noted in this Report.

2. Comprehensive Plan Consistency. The Proposed PUD is not entirely consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan as noted in this Report.

3. Density. The Proposed PUD density standards are not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan as noted in this Report.

3.2 Subdivision / Preliminary Plat. The adverse effects of the proposed Preliminary Plat and Subdivision include:

1. The building pads that result from the Subdivision would have negative impacts on sensitive areas of the Property and surrounding neighborhood, including streetscape, scenic points, boulevard trees, and open areas of the surrounding neighborhood.

2. The design of the lots and the site layout reflected in the Preliminary Plat does not respond to and nor is it reflective of the surrounding lots and neighborhood character, as noted in the findings of Sec. 3.1. of this Report.

3. The architectural appearance, scale, mass, construction materials, proportion and scale of roof line and functional plan of the buildings proposed is not similar to the characteristics and quality of existing development in the City and surrounding neighborhood, as noted in the findings of Sec. 3.1. of this Report.

Section 4. RECOMMENDATION

4.1 Planning Commission Recommendation. Based on the findings in section 3 of this Report, the Planning Commission recommends **DENIAL** of the (i) PUD Concept Plan, and (ii) Preliminary Plat Subdivision requested in the Application**.**

Adopted by the Wayzata Planning Commission this 7th day of December 2020.

Attachments:
Attachment A: Legal Description of Property

Attachment A
Information and Legal Description of Property

Lot 1, Block 1, Pinehurst First Addition, according to the plat of survey thereof, Hennepin County, Minnesota.

PID No. 06-117-22-32-0029

DRAFT

City of Wayzata
Planning Commission
Agenda Report

MEETING DATE: December 7, 2020	**AGENDA ITEM:** 5.a
TITLE: Review of Development Activities	
PREPARED BY: Nick Kieser, Assistant Planner	
REVIEWED BY: Emily Goellner, Community Development Director	
60 DAY DEADLINE: N/A	

BACKGROUND:

Staff will give a verbal update at the meeting.

ACTION REQUESTED:

N/A

ATTACHMENTS:

None

City of Wayzata
Planning Commission
Agenda Report

MEETING DATE: December 7, 2020	**AGENDA ITEM:** 5.b
TITLE: Planning Commissioner Liaison Schedule and City Meeting Calendar	
PREPARED BY: Nick Kieser, Assistant Planner	
REVIEWED BY: Emily Goellner, Community Development Director	
60 DAY DEADLINE: N/A	

BACKGROUND:

Commissioner Douglas is scheduled for the December 15, 2020 City Council meeting. The Liaison Schedule, 2020 City Meeting Calendar, and 2021 City Meeting Calendar are attached.

ACTION REQUESTED:

N/A

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Planning Commission Assignments at Council Meetings 2020 - Updated 09/18/2020
2. 2020 Public Meeting Calendar - Updated 09/15/2020
3. 2021 Wayzata Public Meeting Calendar

2020
Planning Commission assignments at Council meetings

Meeting Date		**Commission Representative**
Tuesday	January 7, 2020	Christine Plantan
Tuesday	January 21, 2020	Jeff Parkhill
Tuesday	February 4, 2020	Peggy Douglas
Tuesday	February 18, 2020	Gregory Flannigan
Tuesday	March 10, 2020	Cathy Iverson
Tuesday	March 24, 2020	Jeff Parkhill
Tuesday	April 7, 2020	Lindsay Bashioum
Tuesday	April 21, 2020	Lindsay Bashioum
Tuesday	May 5, 2020	Laura Merriam
Tuesday	May 19, 2020	Peggy Douglas
Tuesday	June 2, 2020	Gregory Flannigan
Tuesday	June 16, 2020	Cathy Iverson
Tuesday	July 7, 2020	Jeff Parkhill
Tuesday	July 21, 2020	Christine Plantan
Tuesday	August 4, 2020	Lindsay Bashioum
Tuesday	August 18, 2020	Laura Merriam
Tuesday	September 1, 2020	Peggy Douglas
Tuesday	September 15, 2020	Gregory Flannigan
Tuesday	October 6, 2020	Cathy Iverson
Tuesday	October 20, 2020	Laura Merriam
Tuesday	November 10, 2020	Christine Plantan
Tuesday	November 24, 2020	Lindsay Bashioum
Tuesday	December 1, 2020	Laura Merriam
Tuesday	December 15, 2020	Peggy Douglas

Last Updated: September 18, 2020

City of Wayzata
2020 Meeting Calendar

January 2020

S	M	T	W	Th	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

February 2020

S	M	T	W	Th	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29

March 2020

S	M	T	W	Th	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

April 2020

S	M	T	W	Th	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30		

May 2020

S	M	T	W	Th	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

June 2020

S	M	T	W	Th	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30				

July 2020

S	M	T	W	Th	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

August 2020

S	M	T	W	Th	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

September 2020

S	M	T	W	Th	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			

October 2020

S	M	T	W	Th	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

November 2020

S	M	T	W	Th	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

December 2020

S	M	T	W	Th	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

City of Wayzata

- Energy & Environment Committee - 5:00 PM
- Planning Commission - 6:30 PM
- City Council - 7:00 PM
- Wayzata School Board
- Lake Minnetonka Conservation District (LMCD)
- Heritage Preservation Board (HPB) - 5:00 PM
- Housing & Redevelopment Authority (HRA) - 7:30 AM
- Parks & Trails Board - 6:00 PM
- Charter Commission - 9:00 AM
- Elections (see below)
- ~~Night to Unite (cancelled for 2020)~~

Meeting dates and times are subject to change. Dates can be confirmed by calling City Hall.

- Holiday Observed City Offices Closed

Presidential Nomination Primary Elec - 3/3/20

Primary Election - 8/11/2020

General Election - 11/3/2020

Caucus - 2/25/2020

Revised Sept 15, 2020

City of Wayzata
Meeting Calendar

January 2021

S	M	T	W	Th	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

February 2021

S	M	T	W	Th	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28						

March 2021

S	M	T	W	Th	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

April 2021

S	M	T	W	Th	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	

May 2021

S	M	T	W	Th	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

June 2021

S	M	T	W	Th	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			

July 2021

S	M	T	W	Th	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

August 2021

S	M	T	W	Th	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

September 2021

S	M	T	W	Th	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30		

October 2021

S	M	T	W	Th	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

November 2021

S	M	T	W	Th	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30				

December 2021

S	M	T	W	Th	F	S
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

City of Wayzata

- Energy & Environment Committee - 5:00 PM
- Planning Commission - 6:30 PM
- City Council - 7:00 PM
- Wayzata School Board
- Lake Minnetonka Conservation District (LMCD)
- Heritage Preservation Board (HPB) - 7:00 PM
- Housing & Redevelopment Authority (HRA) - 7:30 AM
- Parks & Trails Board - 6:00 PM
- Charter Commission - 9:00 AM
- Elections (see below)
- Night to Unite

Meeting dates and times are subject to change. Dates can be confirmed by calling City Hall.

Holiday Observed
City Offices Closed

Precinct Caucuses -

Primary Election -

General Election - School Board Election