

**WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
APRIL 7, 2014**

AGENDA ITEM 2. Call to Order, Roll Call and Approval of Minutes.

Chair Gonzalez called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Present at roll call were Commissioners: Vanderheyden, Pearson, Gnos, Gonzalez, Ramy Jr., Tyacke, and Iverson. City Planner Gadow and City Engineer Kelly were also present.

Chair Gonzalez stated the first set of minutes to review and approve is from March 3, 2014 minutes. No corrections were noted.

Chair Gonzalez asked that the February 3, 2014 minutes be reviewed.

Commissioner Vanderheyden made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Ramy, to approve the March 3, 2014 workshop minutes and February 3, 2014 workshop minutes as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 3. Regular Agenda Public Hearing Item.

- a. 141 and 155 Central Avenue N – NLD Wayzata LLC**
 - i. Final Plat for Three (3) Lot Subdivision**
 - ii. Review of Building Design for Lot 2**
 - iii. Variance from Street Frontage Requirement for Lot 2**
 - iv. Variance from 35% Impervious Surface Requirement**

City Planner Gadow presented the application of 141 Central Avenue N and 155 Central Avenue N. He stated the project is the result of the recently approved Anchor Bank/Walgreens redevelopment at the adjacent 1055 Wayzata Blvd. One of the conditions of that approval was the two lots to the north be subdivided into three (3) single-family lots and one of the lots must be built and have a certificate of occupancy issued before a certificate of occupancy would be issued on the Walgreens building. The request at this time is to finalize the subdivision process and approve the design of the first of the three (3) new homes on the property. The preliminary plat for the three (3) new single-family residential lots was approved as part of resolution 05-2014, and now the owners of the residential property, NLD Wayzata LLC and the Leo & Algena Lund Partnership (the Applicant) request approval of the Final Plat in order to finalize the three (3) lot subdivision. He stated the applicant also has plans for the first of the three lots, Lot 2, ready for review and approval prior to submitting for building permits. He explained in order to finalize the Final Plat for the residential lots, two (2) variances need to be considered: a variance for the amount of street frontage for Lot 2 because this lot does not front onto a public street, and a variance for the amount of impervious surface because the private road access to all three (3) lots is a driveway that runs across all three (3) properties. He also explained the lots are in the R-3A Zoning District and have a minimum lot area requirement of 9,000 square feet. The lots

1 are proposed to be platted north to south, with Lot 1 adjacent to Central Avenue N, Lot 2 in the
2 middle, and Lot 3 on the western side adjacent to Wooddale Avenue.

3
4 City Planner Gadow explained the variance request for Lot 2 for the street frontage requirement.
5 He stated the Subdivision Ordinance Section 805.26.E requires that residential lots provide
6 minimum frontage on a City approved Public Street other than an alley. The minimum street
7 frontage in the R-3A Zoning District is 60-feet. Lot 1 and Lot 3 have the required frontage but
8 because Lot 2 is in the middle and accessed by a private driveway, it does not contain public
9 street access.

10
11 City Planner Gadow explained the second variance request is from the R03A 35% impervious
12 surface limit due to the private driveway. All three (3) of the new residential parcels will be
13 accessed by a 20-foot private driveway on a 30-foot easement area that connects from Wooddale
14 Avenue and runs eastward across the three (3) properties and terminates on Lot 1. He explained
15 this driveway crosses all three (3) parcels and each of the lots is burdened by the additional
16 hardcover impervious surface. He also stated the private driveway surface would be included in
17 the impervious surface calculations because it is not a public street. The private driveway and
18 the lots would connect to the Stormwater management system installed as part of this Project to
19 capture the water runoff from the road.

20
21 City Planner Gadow explained one of the conditions of Resolution 05-2014 was the Applicant
22 submit building plans for review and approval by the City depicting architectural appearance,
23 scale, mass, construction materials, proportion and scale of roof line and functional plan of the
24 residential structures proposed to demonstrate similarity to the characteristics and quality of the
25 existing homes in the neighborhood as required under Section 805.14.e.8 and 805.14.e.9.
26 Additionally Walgreens may not be issued a certificate of occupancy until a certificate of
27 occupancy has been issued for the first house constructed on the residential parcels that are part
28 of this Project. The Applicant's builder, Steiner & Koppleman, have residential design plans
29 prepared for Lot 2 and they are requesting review and approval of the plans in order to apply for
30 building permits to construct the home on Lot 2. The building plans for Lots 1 and 3 are
31 required to be submitted for Planning Commission and City Council review at a future date. The
32 Applicant has also submitted a colorized illustration of the proposed home, building elevation
33 drawings, landscaping plan, grading plan, and utility plan for the three (3) residential lots.

34
35 Commissioner Vanderheyden asked if staff had fully reviewed the driveway access from a public
36 safety perspective.

37
38 City Planner Gadow stated the private driveway is 20-feet, which meets the State Fire Code
39 requirements.

40
41 Commissioner Vanderheyden asked if the Stormwater management system was part of the total
42 package redevelopment and not just the homes. City Planner Gadow stated this was correct.

43
44 Commissioner Vanderheyden clarified the runoff from this site, post development, will be equal
45 to or less than the present runoff on the site.

46

1 City Engineer Kelly stated the Stormwater had been divided into two (2) separate portions. The
2 commercial portion, south of the public access into the Anchor Bank and Walgreens, a majority
3 of this drains into a drainage structure that is within the commercial parcel. The private
4 driveway and the rear yards of the residential portion will drain into two (2) infiltration trenches,
5 which will drain to the north. These are two (2) separate Stormwater management systems.
6

7 Commissioner Vanderheyden asked if the City had a normal calculation to figure the percentage
8 of cover a Stormwater system will take.
9

10 City Planner Gadow stated there is a disconnect in how the Zoning Code references hardcover
11 and percentages of total hardscape versus the Stormwater Management Plan, which refers to it
12 and the ability of a stormwater system to treat suspended fossils and phosphorus. Typically, if
13 the applicant uses a Stormwater treatment system for more than 10% of their required hardcover
14 then it is eligible for up to 50%.
15

16 Commissioner Pearson clarified if the variance for the street frontage for Lot 2 was not granted
17 then there could not be a home on Lot 2 and without a home on Lot 2 the whole plan cannot
18 move forward.
19

20 City Planner Gadow stated this variance is predicated on the previous discussions in 2013 and
21 early 2014 about the project needing three (3) lots, from a neighborhood perspective. In order to
22 get three (3) lots out of the existing two (2) lots, the one in the middle would not have access to a
23 public street. He stated the other option the City had would be to do this as a public street to get
24 access to Lot 2, but this would platting a portion as an outlot and making the roadway 26-feet
25 rather than 20-feet.
26

27 Commissioner Pearson clarified the City Council already approved the private driveway and the
28 only way that can happen is if the variance is granted.
29

30 City Planner Gadow stated this was the case unless the City Council changed it to a public street.
31

32 Commissioner Pearson stated this creates an undue hardship in that they cannot build without the
33 variance.
34

35 Commissioner Tyacke stated Section 805.15 states the final plat is submitted and then the
36 Council may refer it to the Planning Commission if there is substantial difference. He asked
37 what the differences are between the initial plat and the final plat being presented.
38

39 City Planner Gadow stated there were no substantial differences but the final plat was brought
40 back to the Planning Commission was because of the variances needed in order to implement it.
41 Since the Planning Commission is reviewing the variance requests they should review the final
42 plat.
43

44 Commissioner Tyacke asked if the an emergency vehicle or first responder would be able to find
45 these homes because they are not on a street but on a private driveway.

1
2 City Planner Gadow stated if the final plat is approved and recorded with the County, Staff
3 would work with emergency management to determine an addressing system with the County
4 that would make it workable.

5
6 Commissioner Tyacke asked where the nearest fire hydrant would be located. City Planner
7 Gadow showed where the hydrants would be located.

8
9 Commissioner Tyacke asked if these would be close enough for fire services. City Planner
10 Gadow stated it would be.

11
12 Commissioner Tyacke stated the building designs for the three (3) homes would all be walk-out
13 basements but there were no walk-outs on the elevations.

14
15 Mr. David Steingas, owner Steiner and Koppelman, LLC, 18340 Minnetonka Boulevard,
16 Deephaven, stated this would have to be corrected on the application because the application
17 states look-out basement.

18
19 Mr. John Kohler, architect for Kolridge Partners, 8110 Pennsylvania Road, Bloomington,
20 introduced himself.

21
22 Commissioner Tyacke asked if they were going to be walk-out basements. Mr. Steingas
23 clarified these homes would be have look-out basements.

24
25 Mr. Kohler stated this would allow the widows to be egress without being below grade.

26
27 Commissioner Tyacke asked the home could be financed even though it did not have access to a
28 public road. Mr. Steingas stated the home could be financed.

29
30 Commissioner Iverson asked why the City did not consider leaving the two (2) lots as they were
31 rather than requiring three (3) lots.

32
33 Mr. Kohler stated the desire of the neighborhood was to create a wall of houses, facing south,
34 across this area to create a strong line between the commercial and the residential.

35
36 Commissioner Iverson stated her recollection of the discussions were the three lots would keep
37 the commercial from encroaching into the residential area. She did not recall a specific number
38 of lots being discussed just that this area being residential.

39
40 Mr. Kohler stated when the project originally started there had been discussions of four (4)
41 houses in this area but based on lot size and home size and help from the neighborhood the
42 number was reduced to three (3). This allows the lots and the homes to match the other part of
43 the neighborhood.
44

1 Commissioner Iverson asked if this had resulted from private discussions with the residents in
2 their homes or if it had been in public meetings

3
4 City Planner Gadow stated there had been discussions during the public forum in August and
5 September.

6
7 Commissioner Iverson stated she had concerns that the City was being too short sighted by not
8 looking at the option of having two (2) homes rather than three (3). She also expressed concerns
9 regarding the number of trees that are being removed in order to have three (3) homes in this
10 location.

11
12 City Planner Gadow stated the changes in the number of trees being removed from the
13 preliminary plat were because the building pads were not finalized at the time of the preliminary
14 plat review. Now that the building pads have been finalized the final plat shows what the actual
15 tree removal would be with building out the three (3) lots. He explained all the trees currently
16 marked on the property are proposed to be removed as part of the grading and building pads for
17 the three (3) lots. He stated as part of the project, the developer would re-landscape and plant
18 additional trees. The preliminary plat showed 36 trees would not be removed, but this was
19 before the building pads were finalized and with the homes there will be six (6) trees that will
20 not be removed.

21
22 Commissioner Ramy asked if some of the trees being removed were diseased or dead. City
23 Planner Gadow stated there were one (1) dead and a couple more diseased that were included in
24 the number of trees being removed.

25
26 Commissioner Ramy asked if the consultant had proved an analysis of the trees. City Planner
27 Gadow stated he was not aware of this but the Parks Department did go to the site and inspected
28 all the trees that had been tagged.

29
30 Commissioner Iverson asked if the trees along the metal fence that had been removed and cut
31 had been inspected. City Planner Gadow stated those were part of the grading for the
32 commercial piece of the property.

33
34 Commissioner Ramy asked if the mitigation outweighed the hardpack of the private driveway.

35
36 City Engineer Kelly stated what the applicant is providing is more than enough for treatment.
37 The original design, particularly the catch basin in the southeast corner of the private driveway.
38 Staff had made a suggestion to modify that to provide a sump so that the outlet is deeper than the
39 pipe it outlets from, which allows sediment to be captured in it and removed without it
40 transferring down the pipe. The developer and the engineer were willing to make these
41 modifications. They are going beyond what they would be required to do.

42
43 Commissioner Gnos clarified 30 trees would be removed but 40 trees would be added back in
44 with the landscaping.

45
46 City Planner Gadow stated there would be 34 trees removed and 34 would be added back in.

1
2 Commissioner Gnos asked if there had been a review of the trees that would be used in the
3 landscaping to determine if they would make up for the size of the trees that were being
4 removed.

5
6 Chair Gonzalez stated there had been discussion and there are limits on the size of tree that can
7 be transplanted safely.

8
9 City Planner Gadow reviewed the list of trees being planted including sugar maple and black
10 hills spruce. All the trees need to be a minimum of 3-inch caliper.

11
12 Commissioner Tyacke asked how the stormwater runoff was being handled with the driveway.

13
14 City Engineer Kelly stated the driveway is slopped to drain to the east and picked up by the catch
15 basin in the southeast corner of the driveway. It will then drain to the north via an infiltration
16 trench, which will allow it to percolate into the ground. It will tie into a manhole on the
17 northeast corner of the lot and this ties into an existing storm sewer on Central Avenue. There is
18 also a drainage swale behind the homes that will pick up the natural drainage from behind the
19 homes. This will drain into the same system in the northeast corner of the lot.

20
21 Commissioner Tyacke asked if Staff had considered requiring the use of pervious pavement or
22 pavers on the driveway.

23
24 City Engineer Kelly stated these had not been considered because of the problem of making sure
25 they are maintained properly. There would be three (3) different homeowners and this would
26 require three (3) separate agreements and this would be challenging. Staff did make sure there
27 was an infiltration area. He stated typical standards for infiltration are to capture the first inch of
28 rain and this is being met with the proposed project.

29
30 Commissioner Ramy asked if the initial maintenance of the catch basin would be the City's
31 responsibility. City Engineer Kelly stated this would be the developer's responsibility.

32
33 Commissioner Iverson asked if the proposed home for Lot 2 was a custom home or a spec home.
34 Mr. Steingas stated two (2) people were currently interested in the home. The design was
35 initially a spec home but due to the interest it will probably be a custom home.

36
37 Commissioner Iverson asked if the exterior of the home would change or just the interior of the
38 home. Mr. Steingas stated it would depend on the buyer but they will have to comply with what
39 has been designed.

40
41 Commissioner Iverson asked if the buyer or developer would be required to come back to the
42 Planning Commission if they used materials other than what was being present at this time.

43
44 City Planner Gadow stated if the design of the exterior structure, such as the roofline, were
45 changed they would have to come back to the Planning Commission. He explained there is not a

1 set standard of materials for residential homes but if they were using materials completely
2 different than what is proposed they would need to come back to the Planning Commission but if
3 it is in the same spectrum of material then they would not.

4
5 Mr. Steingas reviewed all the materials they are proposing to use in the design of the home.

6
7 Chair Gonzalez thanked the developer for presenting a nice design that was under the maximum
8 height. She asked if there would be any fill either brought to the site or removed from the site.

9
10 City Engineer Kelly stated there was significant grading on the site and approximately 1.25-feet
11 of new material will be brought to the site. This will level the sites so they match the homes and
12 provide the appropriate drainage.

13
14 Chair Gonzalez asked if this material would be brought in on roads that have weight restrictions.
15 City Engineer Kelly stated they would not be using roads with weight restrictions.

16
17 Mr. Steingas stated the material that is dug out for the basements of the homes would also be
18 used as part of the grading. This will reduce the amount that will be brought in.

19
20 City Engineer Kelly stated there was also material being moved on the commercial site that may
21 be used in the residential site.

22
23 Chair Gonzalez stated if the private driveway was removed from the equation the only lot that
24 does not meet the impervious surface requirement is Lot 2. She asked if the Planning
25 Commission needed to consider more mitigation for water runoff because of this.

26
27 Commissioner Pearson stated the driveway hardcover for Lot 2 was 1750 and 1375 and 1420 for
28 the other two (2) lots. He asked why there was such a significant difference between the outside
29 lots and the middle lot.

30
31 City Engineer Kelly stated the main difference is the driveway does not fully cross Lot 3 and Lot
32 1, whereas the driveway fully crosses Lot 2 from property line to property line. The driveway is
33 20-feet wide and there is also a 24-foot driveway access to the home.

34
35 Commissioner Pearson stated he was asking about the private driveway cover not the driveway
36 access.

37
38 City Engineer Kelly explained if the private access driveway was to be a public road then the
39 only hard surface that would be counted would be the 24-foot wide by 5-feet long driveway.
40 This is the same for Lot 1 and Lot 3. The consideration is due to the private access driveway.

41
42 Chair Gonzalez stated according to Staff reports Lot 2 would still need a variance.

43
44 City Engineer Kelly stated Lot 2 would be over the maximum allowed hard surface by 1% if the
45 private driveway access is not included in the calculations.

1
2 Chair Gonzalez asked if it was necessary to mitigate that 1% or is Staff satisfied that this would
3 not create a problem with the neighborhood.

4
5 Commissioner Pearson stated the Staff Report shows the total area of private driveway hardcover
6 for Lot 2 at 1750-square feet, 1375-square feet for Lot 3, and 1420-square feet for Lot 1 and total
7 hardcover for Lot 2 as 4904-square feet, 4377-square feet for Lot 3, and 4269-square feet for Lot
8 1. He asked again where the difference is in the amounts between the two outer lots and Lot 2.

9
10 City Planner Gadow explained Lot 2 would have the private access driveway crossing from
11 property line to property line whereas the two outside lots will not. The total square footage for
12 Lot 2 is larger because the square footage for the private access driveway is larger.

13
14 Chair Gonzalez opened the public hearing at 7:45 p.m.

15
16 There being no public input Chair Gonzalez closed the public hearing at 7:46 p.m.

17
18 Chair Gonzalez stated the Final Plat is straightforward. She asked if there were any comments
19 or questions from the Planning Commission.

20
21 Chair Gonzalez asked if the Planning Commission had to do anything regarding the Park
22 Dedication fee on page 13. City Planner Gadow stated the developer would be paying into the
23 park dedication fund for the one (1) new lot being created. This will be finalized at the time the
24 Final Plat will be filed.

25
26 Chair Gonzalez asked the Planning Commission if there were any comments or questions
27 regarding the building design being proposed.

28
29 Commissioner Gnos asked how the footprint for the three (3) new lots would be in relation to the
30 new Anchor Bank. City Planner Gadow stated the lots face the new private driveway and the
31 screening for the new commercial area.

32
33 Chair Gonzalez asked the Planning Commission for comments or questions regarding the
34 variance for street frontage for Lot 2.

35
36 Commissioner Pearson asked if the Planning Commission would have to recommend approval of
37 the variance excluding the private access driveway otherwise a variance will be needed for Lot 3
38 as well.

39
40 City Planner Gadow stated it would be a blanket variance to exceed the 35% with the
41 understanding the total hardcover would be 39.3% for Lot 3, 43.6% for Lot 2, and 34.4% for Lot
42 1 but the variance would allow the exclusion of the private access driveway from the
43 calculations. This will reduce the total hardcover to 33.01% for Lot 3, 36.07% for Lot 2, and
44 29.05% for Lot 1. Lot 2 would still be over the 35% maximum and require a variance.
45

1 Commissioner Pearson asked how the Planning Commission would go about changing the
2 definition of hardcover that goes into the calculation.

3
4 City Planner Gadow stated the clearest path would be to grant the variance assuming the private
5 access driveway is not included in the hardcover calculations and not be limited to just Lot 2.

6
7 Chair Gonzalez stated there are two (2) different variance standards.

8
9 City Planner Gadow stated the Subdivision Ordinance, which s related to the street frontage for
10 Lot 2. The Subdivision Ordinance has a different set of standards for a variance compared to a
11 variance from the Zoning Ordinance. These standards are listed in the Staff report Section 3.3
12 and Section 3.5. There are two (2) different variances and two (2) different standards.

13
14 Chair Gonzalez stated without a variance Lot 2 cannot be built because it would not meet the
15 frontage requirement.

16
17 Commissioner Iverson stated part of it is the Planning Commission has set the standards but
18 there are consistently variance requests. There are options for impervious surfaces but this never
19 really gets discussed. There are other options to reduce the hardcover and the Planning
20 Commission continues to not look at these other options.

21
22 Commissioner Pearson stated the street front variance is different than the hard surface variance.

23
24 Commissioner Iverson stated the Planning Commission could look at the whole design of the
25 project. The developer could look at reducing the amount by 1% somewhere else so that a
26 variance would not be needed.

27
28 Chair Gonzalez stated the application in front of the Planning Commission at this time was
29 approved by the City Council and part of this approval was the subdivision of this parcel into
30 three (3) lots. There is not a lot of leeway because the Council had approved this. The Planning
31 Commission is reviewing this variance to determine if there are any reasonable conditions that
32 the City would like to add to this request. The Planning Commission had discussed different
33 ways to reduce the hardcover.

34
35 Commissioner Iverson stated nothing was discussed.

36
37 City Planner Gadow stated the developer is mitigating the hardcover of the roadway by having it
38 connect with the stormwater management system so that all of the water that would runoff from
39 this roadway will be treated by an infiltration system that will be installed in the rear and
40 sideyard of the property.

41
42 Chair Gonzalez stated this should be a condition of approval.

43
44 Commissioner Ramy asked if there were some calculations that had been used previously that if
45 measure A is put into place it would reduce the amount of hard surface by X.

1
2 City Planner Gadow stated this was a calculation of rain gardens plus pervious pavers and a
3 couple of other techniques that were being utilized together. He asked Commissioner Iverson if
4 there was something she would like to have considered.

5
6 Commissioner Iverson stated she would like to consider what other options would provide a
7 softer impact than a large hard surface driveway.

8
9 Chair Gonzalez stated the driveway option was already reducing the amount of hard surface
10 because a road would have to be 26-feet wide and the driveway will only be 20-feet wide. She
11 asked Commissioner Iverson if she had any recommendations for the developer to consider.

12
13 Commissioner Iverson stated she had not done any research and was not prepared to provide the
14 developer with other options to consider.

15
16 Commissioner Tyacke stated when looking at the plat for the three (3) lots versus two (2) lots it
17 states the property is guided under the plan for low-density, single-family residence. He asked
18 what the definition of low-density, single-family was.

19
20 City Planner Gadow stated low-density, single-family would be a range between 1 and 4 units
21 per acre. What the applicant is proposing will meet the minimum standard of the R3-A Zoning
22 District.

23
24 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated if the City permitted a 50% credit for the mitigation of the
25 infiltration system the calculations would change to 33.1% for Lot 3, 35.8% for Lot 2, and
26 28.6% for Lot 1.

27
28 Chair Gonzalez asked the Planning Commission if they would prepare the findings of fact or
29 direct Staff to prepare the findings and bring it back to the Planning Commission for approval.

30
31 Commissioner Pearson suggested directing Staff to prepare the findings and bring it back to the
32 Commission at the next meeting.

33
34 It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to direct Staff to prepare the findings for both
35 variance requests.

36
37 Commissioner Pearson made a motion, Seconded by Commissioner Tyacke to direct Staff to
38 prepare a Planning Commission report and recommendation with findings with
39 recommendations for approval at the next Planning Commission meeting that is consistent with
40 the Staff Planning Report and approves the Final Plat for the three (3) lot subdivision, approves
41 the variance for street frontage for Lot 2, approves the variance for impervious surface coverage,
42 and approves the residential design for Lot 2.

43
44 City Planner Gadow stated this would be brought back to the Planning Commission at their April
45 21, 2014 meeting and if approved it would go to the City Council May 6, 2014.

1
2 Chair Gonzalez asked the applicants if this would be acceptable.

3
4 Mr. Steingas stated May 15 is when they would like to start digging because of the road
5 restrictions.

6
7 Chair Gonzalez suggested adding the condition that the stormwater management would be what
8 was presented.

9
10 Commissioner Pearson amended the motion to include the condition that the stormwater
11 management follow the plans presented.

12
13 Commissioner Tyacke accepted the amended motion.

14
15 The motion was called to a vote. The motion passed unanimously.

16
17 **AGENDA ITEM 4. Other Items.**

18
19 **a. Review of Development Activities**

20 City Planner Gadow reported at the April 21 meeting the Planning Commission will have the
21 recommendation for approval of the project discussed tonight. The City Council has invited the
22 Planning Commission to a joint workshop April 15. Future development activity includes a new
23 home on the far side of Ferndale. Staff is continuing to work on the Ordinances.

24
25 **b. Other Items**

26 Commissioner Tyacke provided a report of the last City Council meeting.

27
28 City Planner Gadow provided an update regarding Sunset Restaurant doing an outside sidewalk
29 café. Since the approval the restaurant has changed ownership and will be rebranded as Cru. As
30 part of this rebranding there will be less of the items that had been approved in 2013.

31
32 Chair Gonzalez stated she had heard there was a new restaurant going in where Jan's was.

33
34 City Planner Gadow stated People's Organic would be going into that location.

35
36 Chair Gonzalez stated she and City Planner Gadow had reviewed the ordinance and the Planning
37 Commission Chair and/or delegate is a non-voting member of the Heritage Preservation Board.
38 The Planning Commission will need to start attending these meetings.

39
40 Commissioner Ramy stated he is not able to attend the upcoming joint Council Workshop
41 meeting. Mr. Gadow stated it is considered to be a special meeting.

42
43 Chair Gonzalez stated in the past, joint Council Workshops had been scheduled on Mondays,
44 prior to the Planning Commission meeting. She asked staff to offer that scheduling suggestion to
45 the Council.

46

1 Commissioner Iverson stated she told a Wooddale Avenue resident she would bring up her
2 concern that the City is creating a driveway radius of 18 feet by 9 feet, which is not of adequate
3 size. Mr. Gadow stated staff met with that resident on Friday and discussions are ongoing with
4 the developer so it is expected they will find a geometry that will work. Mr. Kelly explained that
5 access will be to a 20-foot wide roadway and it appears there is more room than the resident
6 feared. Mr. Gadow stated the surveyor will mark that dimension so the resident can determine
7 whether it is adequate. Commissioner Iverson asked staff to also consider space needed for
8 snow storage and resale to a new resident who may have a larger-sized vehicle.
9

10 **AGENDA ITEM 4. Adjournment.**
11

12 There being no further business, Commissioner Vanderheyden made a motion, seconded by
13 Commissioner Pearson, to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed unanimously.
14

15 The meeting was adjourned at 8:22 p.m.
16

17 Respectfully submitted,
18
19

20 Tina Borg

21 *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*