

**WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES - DRAFT
JUNE 2, 2014**

AGENDA ITEM 1. Call to Order and Roll Call.

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

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

AGENDA ITEM 2. Regular Agenda Public Hearing Items:

a. 125 Wayzata Blvd. E. – Wayzata Community Church

I. Amendment to Planned Unit Development (PUD)

II. Project Design Review

City Planner Gadow stated the Comprehensive Plan guides this property for Institutional Public and as part of the 1993 project approval the property was rezoned to PUD District. The existing Wayzata Community Church building is a one and two story building with a 51,815 square-foot building footprint. The Project proposes to add 5,281 square feet for a total of 127,598 square feet. The Church is accessed off Wayzata Boulevard and Ferndale Road N. The Project proposes to reconfigure the parking lot and access to provide better circulation with the site. The existing south drive on Ferndale would be shifted farther south and be a one-way into the site. The Church is proposing a two (2) phased development with Phase 1 starting this year if approved and Phase 2 to be completed within five (5) years as funding allows. As part of Phase 1 there would be some bituminous surface removed to make room for the expansions. There would also be some tree removal and tree preservation. Phase 2 would remove additional parking to assist with complete the reconfiguration of the parking lot. The bulk of the work would be done during Phase 1. The trees that are removed would be replaced resulting in a net gain of trees and shrubs for the total project. There would also be additional berms and landscaping along Wayzata Boulevard to keep headlights from shining into the homes across the street. Staff did a design review of the proposal and the deviations that would need to approved are the percent of accent materials is more than 10% fiber cement and surface parking/front yard parking. He provided renderings showing the proposed project. The architect is proposing to match the existing materials and colors.

Mr. Chip Lindeke, Rafferty Rafferty Tollefson Lindeke Architects, 278 E. 7th Street, St. Paul, stated they have worked with the Church throughout all of development phases. He stated this project includes four (4) additions to the building; a new entrance canopy, a 14-foot addition to the Chapel, an entry vestibule to the Chapel, converting the interior of the building from a 1.5 story to a full 2 story building but would be the same height as other parts of the building. There would also be interior mechanical maintenance and exterior improvements.

Commissioner Vanderheyden asked if the addition of the half story would make any changes to the south wall distance to the street.

1
2 Mr. Lindeke stated the wall was not being extended any further south. They are extending
3 upward from the existing walls.
4

5 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated one of the issues is the parking in the front of the building,
6 along Wayzata Boulevard. He asked if the current distance in the parking bubble to Wayzata
7 Boulevard would be greater or lesser in the proposed Project.
8

9 Mr. Larry Walker, Loukcks and Associates, 365 E. Kellogg Blvd., St. Paul, stated it is proposed
10 to be an average of 10 feet closer to Wayzata Boulevard. He stated a goal of the first phase is to
11 make the south entry of the Church more accessible and more inviting.
12

13 Commissioner Vanderheyden asked what the height would be for the hedge that is planned for
14 the south end.
15

16 Mr. Walker stated at the time of install the hedge would be about 2 feet and would be maintained
17 at a 3.5-4-foot height over time. This will screen the headlights. On the west end of the parking
18 area there is a natural berm that enhances the screening and on the east end the parking area
19 slopes downward.
20

21 Commissioner Iverson asked what the Alpine White hedge would look like in the winter.
22

23 Mr. Walker stated it is a deciduous plant and would be a dense branching without leaves in the
24 winter.
25

26 Commissioner Vanderheyden asked if the lighting for the parking lot would be downcast and
27 where they would be placed.
28

29 City Planner Gadow stated this would be a topic for discussion. The Applicant was looking at
30 this particular design to match the character of the building. They did include a photometric plan
31 as part of the application and it appeared that the lighting would remain on the Applicants
32 property.
33

34 Commissioner Pearson asked if there were pavers under the proposed canopy and in front of the
35 Chapel.
36

37 Mr. Walker stated this has not been determined but pavers are a possibility.
38

39 Commissioner Tyacke stated there are three (3) monument signs (two (2) on Ferndale Road and
40 one (1) on Wayzata Blvd.) He asked if these would be added during Phase 1 or Phase 2. He also
41 asked if these signs would require a permit under the Ordinance.
42

43 Mr. Walker explained the sign on Wayzata Blvd. would be part of Phase 1 and the signs on
44 Ferndale Road would be part of Phase 2.
45

1 City Planner Gadow explained the City requests the signage material as part of the overall
2 project package to be reviewed. They do not have the monument sign designed at this time so
3 they were not able to submit it as part of the package. If this application moves forward the
4 solution would be once they submit the monument sign permits they would be reviewed by the
5 Planning Commission and City Council and if it is approved then a permit would be granted
6 administratively.

7
8 Commissioner Tyacke asked what proof of parking stalls are.

9
10 Mr. Walker explained these are spaces that can be added in the future or installed as part of
11 Phase 1. The proof of parking shows there are five (5) additional spaces that could be added in
12 this location.

13
14 Commissioner Tyacke asked if there would be any changes made to the stairway going to the
15 lower parking on the east and if there would be lighting in this parking area.

16
17 Mr. Walker stated lighting would be added but the stairs are expected to remain the same. There
18 are no plans at this time to add lighting to the parking area on the east side. The existing lighting
19 has been sufficient but this can be reviewed if the Planning Commission would like. When this
20 parking area was constructed in 1992 there was a lighting plan done to create uniform
21 illumination throughout the parking lot and there has not been any communication that it is not
22 sufficient.

23
24 Commissioner Tyacke asked if there had been any requirements in the lease with the school to
25 have lighting for the east portion of the parking lot.

26
27 City Planner Gadow stated he did not recall seeing anything pertaining to lighting in the lease
28 agreement but he would look into this.

29
30 Commissioner Tyacke stated the survey noted the lease agreement had not been recorded yet.

31
32 City Planner Gadow stated this is something that can be added as a condition of approval.

33
34 Commissioner Ramy stated the rendering showed a paver or stamped concrete at the entry and
35 this would be more aesthetically pleasing. The Church currently uses the grassy area along
36 Wayzata Blvd. for events. He asked if there were any plans to enhance this area.

37
38 Mr. Walker stated this area is being designed to host the events that are currently taking place in
39 this area. They are currently working with the Church to meet their design needs for this area.

40
41 Chair Gonzalez stated the list of trees provided by the applicant does not appear to comply with
42 the City's recent move to keep plantings native.

43
44 Mr. Walker stated the majority of the trees have native origins.

45

1 Chair Gonzalez asked if the Applicant had considered using evergreens for the hedge to provide
2 a year round screening.

3
4 Mr. Walker stated they have used evergreens for this type of application but the winters are
5 tough on the evergreens, they are difficult to maintain, and it is difficult to have evergreen
6 withstand the salt from the roads and parking. The dense branching of the alpine current would
7 provide satisfactory screening in the winter months.

8
9 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated Section 4, page 11, of the Staff Report, the applicant's
10 response to potential impacts to the force main was "the consultant team will avoid adverse
11 impacts on the line". He asked what this means in means of binding protection.

12
13 City Gadow stated this is acknowledgement that the line is there and they would make all best
14 efforts not to impact it. If this moves forward the Applicant would be required to coordinate any
15 of the site work with the Utility Superintendent and the City Engineer during construction to
16 ensure this would not be impacted.

17
18 Commissioner Vanderheyden asked if there were any concerns about the existing storm line out
19 of the north side of the property freezing this winter.

20
21 City Planner Gadow stated this is something the Utility Superintendent wanted to point out for
22 the development team.

23
24 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated page 12 of the Staff Report, broadly references the catch
25 basin and the Storm-Tech system and this is supported by Attachment D "Stormwater Plan". He
26 the last page of Attachment D pertains to the Storm-Tech system itself. He asked if this system
27 would be going into the northwest corner of the parking lot area if the drawing provided is to
28 scale with a 12-inch line going into a bed of 12-inch lines.

29
30 Mr. Walker stated the Storm-Tech system would be located in the northwest corner of the
31 parking lot and the bed of pipes is larger than 12-inches. This system is designed for the runoff
32 from both phases of the development.

33
34 Commissioner Vanderheyden asked if the cubic feet per second of runoff from this project upon
35 completion would be slightly less than what is coming off the property currently. He asked if the
36 capacity would be enough to accommodate the increased volume from the increased hard surface
37 area.

38
39 City Planner Gadow stated the additional volume would be accommodated by the Storm-Tech
40 system that would be installed.

41
42 Chair Gonzalez asked if there were concerns about the gravity sewer line for the Church and
43 potential impacts from the project.

44

1 City Planner Gadow stated the Utility Superintendent just wanted to be sure the Applicant was
2 aware of the gravity sewer line to be sure the design team was aware of it before they got into
3 construction phase so they can plan around it.

4
5 Chair Gonzalez asked if the City received an erosion control plan with the application.

6
7 City Planner Gadow stated it had been included. The City would require erosion control
8 measures to be installed prior to construction starting.

9
10 Commissioner Pearson stated the PUD should be consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan
11 and he did not see any areas that were not consistent with the Comp Plan. He asked if there had
12 been areas of concern with consistency.

13
14 City Planner Gadow stated he was not aware of any concerns. This property has already been
15 guided for this type of institutional and religious use. The reason for the PUD in 1993 was to
16 provide the City with flexibility in doing a phased construction.

17
18 Commissioner Tyacke asked if the City Engineer was familiar with the Storm-Tech system and
19 if there were any special maintenance requirements for this system.

20
21 City Planner Gadow stated the City engineer was familiar with the system and he is not aware of
22 any special maintenance requirements. He stated he would check into this and respond back to
23 the Planning Commission.

24
25 Commissioner Tyacke stated on page 10, number 11, references the maximum building height.
26 He asked how this would be interpreted and applied to this application since the building was
27 over the maximum height of 35 feet.

28
29 City Planner Gadow clarified the way this is interpreted is as part of the original PUD they have
30 a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to go above the 35 feet and this would be the governing
31 provision in this application.

32
33 Commissioner Gnos asked what the timeline would be for Phase 1.

34
35 Mr. Lindeke stated they are estimating about 12 months of construction and they would like to
36 start this year.

37
38 Chair Gonzalez asked about the materials being used because some of the material deviate from
39 the design standards.

40
41 Mr. Lindeke stated the biggest deviation is the trim. A lot of the existing building has painted
42 wood trim and this has been rotting and they have not been able to maintain it. During past
43 expansion phases they have used an aluminum material and they would like to continue using
44 this with this expansion to keep the building look consistent. They would also like to use the
45 same baluster material at the base of the steeple as they had used in past construction phases and

1 a fiber cement for the columns at the entrance. He provided samples for the Planning
2 Commission.

3
4 Commissioner Tyacke asked what structural problems there would be if one of the fiber cement
5 columns were to be hit by a car.

6
7 Mr. Lindeke stated these columns would be decorative only and would not provide any structural
8 support.

9
10 Chair Gonzalez asked if the Planning Commission what findings they could use to approve a
11 deviation of the material.

12
13 City Planner Gadow stated the Planning Commission could approve based on the material being
14 maintenance free and matching existing materials. These materials also lead to a better project.

15
16 Commissioner Vanderheyden asked if the new Chapel would match the existing brick.

17
18 Mr. Lindeke stated the intention was to find the same brick product that was used for the original
19 Chapel construction. They would like to keep the spirit of the current buildings.

20
21 Commissioner Vanderheyden asked if the new cupola would be the same height as the existing
22 cupola.

23
24 Mr. Lindeke stated there is no reason to go any higher than the existing cupola.

25
26 Commissioner Iverson asked if the Applicant had done any research to find a shrub that would
27 provide better year round screening and be tolerant of the salt.

28
29 Mr. Walker stated they had researched evergreen products in the past and they could do
30 additional research if needed.

31
32 Commissioner Iverson asked where they planned to put snow during the winter.

33
34 Mr. Walker stated there are spaces on the west and along the drive. There may be some snow on
35 the screening shrubs. Evergreens would be more susceptible to winter kill and salt damage than
36 the proposed shrubs. Covering evergreen with burlap helps with winter burn but may not be
37 effective for keeping the salt off them.

38
39 Commissioner Iverson stated she would like to see more research on alternatives to the proposed
40 alpine current including evergreens.

41
42 Mr. Walker suggested using evergreens on the west end of the parking lot because this is more
43 distant from the parking and the salt. He stated additional research would be done.

44

1 Chair Gonzalez stated one of the design standard requirements for landscaping is to have vines
2 on any large walls, window boxes and hanging baskets. She asked if any benches would be
3 provided.

4
5 Mr. Walker stated they intend to install benches and there are some on the site currently. The
6 Church is considering the long term maintenance of the building and property with the materials
7 and landscaping they are proposing. Excessive landscaping would be difficult for the Church to
8 maintain.

9
10 Commissioner Ramy asked if the proposed hedge created more of a visual screening than what
11 currently exists.

12
13 Mr. Walker stated it does provide better screening than what is currently in place.

14
15 Commissioner Ramy asked if the height of the berm could be increased to provide additional
16 screening.

17
18 Chair Gonzalez stated the Ordinance requires either a solid wall or a dense hedge between 3-4
19 feet in height.

20
21 City Planner Gadow pointed out that the Ordinance was designed more for commercial spaces
22 and business corridors.

23
24 Mr. Walker stated the berm height was not increased because of the existing trees.

25
26 Commissioner Iverson suggested using snow fencing to protect the new hedge for the first
27 couple of years.

28
29 Mr. Dick Minors, Co-Chair Capital Campaign at Wayzata Community Church, stated fencing is
30 put in every year for the Church rummage sale and the new hedge would be included in this
31 fencing.

32
33 Commissioner Tyacke stated there are storage containers placed along Wayzata Blvd during the
34 Church rummage sale. He asked if it would be possible to put some these in the back so they
35 were not visible from Wayzata Blvd.

36
37 Mr. Minors stated this could be looked into.

38
39 Chair Gonzalez opened the public hearing at 8:02 p.m.

40
41 There being no public input Chair Gonzalez closed the public hearing at 8:03 p.m.

42
43 Commissioner Gnos expressed some concern about the hedge along Wayzata Blvd. He would
44 also like to see additional research for covering during the winter.

45

1 Commissioner Iverson stated she understands the need to move away from using wood as accent
2 material. She would like to have more information on the Storm-Tech system to ensure the City
3 is comfortable approving it. She would also like to see additional research for alternatives to the
4 alpine current hedge.

5
6 Commissioner Tyacke stated he is concerned about the lighting in the parking lot, the stairway,
7 and the screening hedge.

8
9 Commissioner Pearson supports the project.

10
11 Commissioner Vanderheyden is encouraged the Church is making this investment and supports
12 the project and the deviations required.

13
14 Chair Gonzalez stated she would also recommend modification of the PUD and the deviation
15 requests. There are a few conditions that should be looked at including the registration of the
16 parking agreement with the school and they address the comments from City Staff. She would
17 also like to add a condition that all lighting on the site is downcast.

18
19 Commissioner Ramy stated there is existing lighting on the site that is not downcast.

20
21 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated a photometric plan had been submitted.

22
23 City Planner Gadow reviewed the photometric plan and stated if there were any questions this is
24 something that Staff can continue to work with the Applicant on.

25
26 Chair Gonzalez stated she is only concerned with the lights that would affect the neighboring
27 residence.

28
29 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated the intent of the Ordinance is to limit light on the neighbors
30 and according to the photometric study by the time you get to the middle of Wayzata Blvd the
31 light is at zero.

32
33 Commissioner Ramy stated the light fixtures will not have an impact on the neighbors and is
34 aesthetically pleasing.

35
36 Mr. Lindeke stated he would work with Staff to meet the City's requirements.

37
38 Commissioner Vanderheyden made a motion seconded by Commissioner Iverson to recommend
39 approval for the Wayzata Community Church application amendment to the PUD and the project
40 design as submitted with the following conditions: recording of the lease with the school, City
41 Staff be affirmed with the drainage system and drainage plan and described in more detail for the
42 City Council, the deviations in materials are acceptable, and have the Applicant look at
43 alternatives to the alpine currant hedge proposed. The motion carried unanimously.

44
45 City Planner Gadow stated this could be in front of the City Council at their June 17 meeting.

46

1 **b. 312 Hampton Street – Daniel and Julie Vanderheyden**

2 **I. Redevelopment Conditional Use Permit**

3 **II. Shoreland Conditional Use Permit (CUP)**

4 **III. Front Yard and Side Yard Variances**

5 Commissioner Vanderheyden recused himself from the discussions and left the meeting at 8:17
6 p.m.

7
8 City Planner Gadow stated the Applicant is requesting approvals to construct additions onto a
9 pre-existing non-conforming residential house. The project includes adding a ½-story to an
10 existing 1-story, adding a front porch, adding a new addition to side and rear, and adding a new
11 deck onto the rear of the house. The zoning requests included in the application are a Shoreland
12 Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for hardcover above 25% with stormwater mitigation, a CUP to
13 redevelop a legal non-conforming lot, a variance from the front yard setback, and a variance
14 from the side yard setback. The property falls within the Shoreland Overlay District, which has
15 a hardcover limit of 25%. The property, as it exists currently has 42.5% hardcover, which is a
16 pre-existing non-conformity. The Applicant is proposing to add a cistern tank to capture the rain
17 water from the existing 492 square-foot garage on the property. Capturing the water from the
18 garage would reduce the hardcover on the property to 36.6%, including the proposed additions.
19 The existing residential structure has an existing wood front porch that is only 1.6 feet from the
20 front property line, as well as a substantial portion of the existing residence that is in the front
21 yard setback. The Applicant is proposing to remove the existing non-conforming porch and
22 install a new porch at the existing 1.6-foot front yard setback. The existing structure was also
23 built into the side yard setback and has a side yard setback of 1.6 feet at the closest point. The
24 Applicant is proposing to add a mudroom where the existing non-conforming deck is located, so
25 the non-conformity would not be increased. A proposed new deck would be located to the south
26 in a location that meets the required 10-foot setback. The existing residence is a 1-story
27 structure with an existing height of 18 feet 6 inches to the peak of the roof. The Applicant is
28 proposing to add an additional half story, which would bring the total height to 30 feet at the
29 peak. The modification in roof line would be included in the setback variance requests.

30
31 Commissioner Ramy asked if the Commission would have to approve the non-conformity even
32 though it currently exists.

33
34 City Planner Gadow stated the Applicant is adding volume vertically to the front deck and the
35 addition of a half story and this triggers the need for a variance approval.

36
37 Commissioner Iverson stated the Staff Report states all projects shall be subject to the review of
38 the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District. She asked if this had occurred or if it would be
39 necessary for this project.

40
41 City Planner Gadow stated the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District does not typically review
42 single-family residential projects that fall within the Shoreland District.

43
44 Commissioner Iverson asked if Staff had reviewed the cistern tank proposal for mitigation.

45
46 City Planner Gadow stated the City Engineer had discussed this system with the Applicants.

1
2 Commissioner Tyacke asked if there were any historical significance in the neighborhood the
3 Planning Commission should be aware of since the home at 308 Hampton has been designated a
4 “Centennial House” by the Preservation Heritage Board.

5
6 City Planner Gadow stated there would not be and the Historic Preservation Ordinance is setup
7 as a voluntary opt in by the property owner.

8
9 Commissioner Tyacke asked if the gravel material on the existing driveway would be changed as
10 part of the project and if there would be a condition in the permit that if the applicant were to put
11 a hard surface on the driveway they would have to come back to the City for review of the
12 impervious surface requirement.

13
14 City Planner Gadow clarified if the applicants maintain the existing square footage of the
15 driveway they would not be required to have it reviewed by the City but if they were to expand
16 the area of the driveway then they would.

17
18 Commissioner Tyacke asked if there would be any trees removed from the property as part of the
19 project.

20
21 Mr. Dan Vanderheyden, 312 Hampton Street, Wayzata, stated there were no plans to remove any
22 trees.

23
24 Chair Gonzalez asked if gravel surfaces were considered pervious.

25
26 City Planner Gadow clarified gravel surfaces are considered impervious. The City would work
27 with the applicant to potentially change this gravel driveway to asphalt in the future.

28
29 Chair Gonzalez asked if the applicants had considered other mitigating measures such as rain
30 gardens or rain barrels.

31
32 Mr. Vanderheyden stated the City Engineer had discussed rain gardens and if this is done it
33 would be towards the back of the property. The driveway does occupy a large portion of the
34 property and they have looked at products that may offer some pervious capability. Phase 1 of
35 the project is the building and maybe in the next year or so the landscaping and driveway can be
36 looked at. He stated they would continue to work with City Staff on these options.

37
38 Commissioner Iverson asked about parking for the contractors because the road is narrow. She
39 suggested the City also look at this overall as the City has had more construction activity.

40
41 Mr. Vanderheyden stated the front of his driveway had been damaged by snow plows so he
42 would like to pursue options to keep the width of this area consistent with the property to the
43 north so that the road does not narrow there and additional damage is done. During the project
44 they would allow people to park on the back side of their property and this will hold three (3)
45 trucks.

46

1 City Planner Gadow stated this would be an Ordinance issue not a Zoning Ordinance issue.

2
3 Chair Gonzalez asked if there were other non-conforming lots in this area.

4
5 City Planner Gadow stated there are several that are substandard because when this development
6 was platted the ordinances were different.

7
8 Chair Gonzalez opened the public hearing at 8:38 p.m.

9
10 There being no public input Chair Gonzalez closed the public hearing at 8:39 p.m.

11
12 Commissioner Iverson asked if they could put a condition on contractor parking.

13
14 City Planner Gadow stated they could put in a condition that the applicant work with City Staff
15 regarding contractor parking during construction.

16
17 Chair Gonzalez asked if there would be excavation and if conditions needed to be established to
18 protect the existing trees.

19
20 City Planner Gadow explained this would be a standard item included in the conditions of
21 approval.

22
23 Commissioner Tyacke moved, seconded by Commissioner Ramy to accept and approve: the
24 Shoreland Conditional Use Permit for hardcover above 25% with the condition the cistern tank is
25 installed, the Conditional Use Permit to redevelop a legal non-conforming lot due to practical
26 difficulties that have been demonstrated, a variance from the front yard setback based on the
27 existing setback not being exceeded, and a variance from the side yard setback. The motion
28 carried unanimously.

29
30 City Planner Gadow stated this would go to the City Council June 17.

31
32 **AGENDA ITEM 4. Other Items.**

33
34 **a. Review of Development Activities**

35 City Planner Gadow stated the Planning Commission agenda for June 16 tentatively includes a
36 review of a 5 lot subdivision on Central Avenue and Shoreland Conditional Use Permit for 420
37 Rice Street. The Planning Commission is invited to attend a planting event on June 7 from 8:30
38 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. The Great River Greening Organization has provided the City with grant
39 money for native land restoration.

40
41 Commissioner Ramy reported on the City Council meeting including the Heritage Preservation
42 Board award and the approval of 520 Ferndale redevelopment project. He asked if the Planning
43 Commission would be involved in the approval of the concession stand.

44
45 City Planner Gadow explained the City has been working with a business owner to rehab the
46 existing City structure by the beach to potentially turn a portion of it into a concession area. This

1 would not be changing the building design so it would not trigger a design review by the
2 Planning Commission.

3
4 **b. Other Items**

5 Chair Gonzalez stated the Trapper's Cabin will be located at Shaver Park. She asked for a
6 volunteer to attend the next Heritage Preservation Board meeting on June 10.

7
8 City Planner Gadow stated the Heritage Preservation Board has a Cemetery Stroll on Saturday
9 June 7.

10
11 Commissioner Pearson volunteered to attend the HPB meeting on June 10.

12
13 Commissioner Iverson asked what was going on by the beach at the water pumping station.

14
15 City Planner Gadow explained this was a Met Council structure and he was not sure what they
16 were doing to it. The City is working with Three Rivers to accommodate the construction
17 parking.

18
19 **AGENDA ITEM 5. Adjournment.**

20 There being no further business, Commissioner Pearson made a motion, seconded by
21 Commissioner Iverson, to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

22
23 The meeting was adjourned at 8:57 p.m.

24
25 Respectfully submitted,

26
27
28 Tina Borg
29 *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*