

**WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
February 23, 2015**

AGENDA ITEM 1. Call to Order, Roll Call and Approval of Minutes.

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

Present at roll call were Commissioners: Gonzalez, Ramy, Vanderheyden, Young, and Gnos. Absent and Excused: Commissioners Iverson and Gruber. Director of Planning and Building Gadow was also present.

Chair Vanderheyden stated the minutes to be reviewed are from the February 2, 2015 meeting.

Commissioner Gonzalez stated she had provided corrections to Mr. Gadow.

Chair Vanderheyden stated on page 7, line 4, the word “stated” should be inserted after “Mr. Gadow.”

Commissioner Young made a motion, Seconded by Commissioner Gonzalez, to approve the February 2, 2015 meeting minutes as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 2. Agenda Items:

- a. **637 Harmony Circle – Fritz Gullickson (Continued from January 26, 2015)**
 - i. **Concurrent Preliminary and Final Plat for a Two (2) Lot Subdivision**

Mr. Gadow stated the Planning Commission began review of the application at their January 26 meeting. After conclusion of the public hearing, the Commission directed Staff to work with the Applicant to provide additional information on alternative house designs and a review of the existing oak tree on the property by the City Forester. He reviewed the alternate 1-1/2 story home designs proposed. The proposed homes would have heights of 28-feet and 30.4-feet. He also reviewed the report provided by Mr. Jordan from Heritage Shade Tree Consultants regarding the site inspection of the oak tree on the property. He stated he had also received an e-mail from the property owner to the north of Lot 1. This property owner would like to see a design that did not have windows on the side of the home and he would also like to see the oak tree saved. He also expressed concerns with how the driveways would align as related to his driveway.

Mr. Fritz Gullickson, 3443 Crystal Place, Orono, stated he had additional experts look at the oak tree to determine if this tree could be saved and their opinion was with the extensive excavating under the tree to remove the sewer it was unlikely the tree would survive. He also provided a rendering of a single 2-story home that he could be put on the parcel if the property was not subdivided.

1 Mr. Gadow stated the additional information provided by Mr. Gullickson had not been received
2 by the City until shortly before the meeting and had not been reviewed by Staff.

3
4 Commissioner Gonzalez asked if it would be possible to reduce the height of the home on Lot 2
5 to 28-feet to match the height of the proposed home for Lot 1.

6
7 Mr. Gullickson stated it might be possible to change the pitch of the roof enough but he does not
8 believe that the 2-foot height difference would be noticeable. He explained he had brought down
9 the front of the 2-story homes he had previously proposed in order to match the neighborhood.

10
11 Chair Vanderheyden asked what the height of the proposed homes would be at the front.

12
13 Mr. Gullickson stated the height would be approximately 32-feet for the side facing the street for
14 the 2-story homes and approximately 30-feet for the 1-1/2-story homes.

15
16 Commissioner Ramy asked if the proposed grading and utilities had changed with the new
17 proposed home designs. He also asked how the new designs would impact the hardcover
18 calculations. He clarified it was difficult to compare the different home designs without all the
19 calculations being done.

20
21 Mr. Gadow stated the grading plan provided is the same as the one included in the application
22 reviewed at the January 26 meeting. The proposed 1-1/2 story homes did not change the
23 grading, utilities or hardcover calculations significantly.

24
25 Mr. Gullickson stated the foundation for both proposals would be the same. The only difference
26 would be the shortening the height of the home by 2-feet by moving from a 2-story to a 1-1/2
27 story home. He stated the pitch of the roof for the 2-story homes could be changed to bring the
28 height down as well.

29
30 Commissioner Ramy clarified the Commission had been concerned with the mass of a 2-story
31 home in this neighborhood as well as the height. A 2-story home would be too large for this
32 neighborhood. He stated he would like to see the Applicant calculate the elevations and
33 hardcover. He would also like to know what the setbacks would be for the 1-1/2 story homes
34 along with an updated grading plan.

35
36 Mr. Gullickson stated the setbacks would not change because the foundation size for either home
37 design would be approximately the same.

38
39 Commissioner Gonzalez asked if there would be fill brought in for the project.

40
41 Mr. Gullickson stated the lots are perfect for a walk-out basement and he would not expect to
42 have any fill brought in or removed from the site because there would not be significant
43 regarding done on the site.

44
45 Mr. Gadow stated the elevation with the proposed 1-1/2-story homes would be the same as what
46 had been proposed with the 2-story homes on January 26.

1
2 Commissioner Ramy stated the City Forester had not stated if the tree would survive the
3 construction.

4
5 Mr. Gadow stated if the driveways stay where they are proposed it is unlikely the tree would
6 survive the construction and it would be difficult to determine if it would survive if the
7 driveways were moved.

8
9 Commissioner Gonzalez asked what type of trees the Applicant had planned on planting.

10
11 Mr. Gullickson stated there would be 5-6 large evergreens located between Lot 1 and Mr.
12 Engel's home and 3 large maple trees planted in the front. There are several maple trees in the
13 neighborhood currently.

14
15 Chair Vanderheyden opened the public hearing at 7:28 p.m.

16
17 Ms. Lisa Peterson-Nelson, 655 Harmony Circle, expressed concerns that having two (2) homes
18 on this property would be too much and she would not like to see the oak tree removed. If the
19 homes are scaled to match the neighborhood, it would work. She stated the City has parted from
20 the charm of what the City use to be in exchange for bigger and better.

21
22 Ms. Jeanne Osterby, 636 Harmony Circle, stated she would prefer to have only one (1) house on
23 this property and for it to be a rambler or a true story and a half home, similar to the style that is
24 currently in the neighborhood. There are other developments in Wayzata that are building
25 ramblers so this is possible. The 1-1/2-story homes proposed appear to be 2-story homes and are
26 taller than the 1-1/2 story homes currently in the neighborhood. She would also like to see the
27 oak tree preserved. She does not believe the proposed homes fit the character of the
28 neighborhood and if the subdivision is allowed, she would recommend having the driveways on
29 the left side of the lot to allow the tree to be saved. She explained the proposed homes were also
30 located closer to the road than the existing homes in the neighborhood.

31
32 Ms. Cheri Morris, 663 Harmony Circle, stated she would prefer to have only one (1) rambler
33 home built on this parcel and not two (2) larger 1-1/2 story homes. Two (2) homes on this
34 property would be overwhelming.

35
36 Chair Vanderheyden closed the public hearing at 7:43 p.m.

37
38 Mr. Gullickson provided a rendering of the single home he would propose if the subdivision
39 were not approved. This proposed home would meet all of the setback requirements including
40 the 35-foot height maximum and would not require any variances. He explained he had
41 provided all the setback information for the two (2) proposed homes and these homes would
42 meet all of the requirements of the Code including the height. The foundation of the single home
43 would be approximately 3300-feet including the garage.

44
45 Commissioner Young asked how the front yard setback compared to other homes in the
46 neighborhood.

1
2 Mr. Gullickson stated the proposed homes would be closer to the street. He had talked with Mr.
3 Gadow about the possibility of moving the homes back on the property but this would effectively
4 raise the height of the homes because of the drainage issues that would need to be addressed.

5
6 Commissioner Ramy stated he would like to see the proposed homes be in line visually with the
7 existing homes.

8
9 Ms. Person-Nelson asked if the tree could be saved if the driveways were shifted.

10
11 Commissioner Gonzalez stated it would be unlikely the tree would survive the excavation of the
12 sewer line.

13
14 Mr. Gullickson explained it could be possible to push the homes back on the lot farther to
15 increase the front yard setback.

16
17 Commissioner Young stated the proposal meets the requirements of the Ordinances so it comes
18 down to the character and he believes pushing the homes back on the lot would fit in more with
19 the neighborhood.

20
21 Mr. Gullickson stated if the drainage could be worked out then he would be able to move the
22 homes back from the street farther.

23
24 Commissioner Gonzalez stated the character of the neighborhood would be altered and the
25 proposal meets the requirements of the Ordinances. She clarified she could support the 1-1/2-
26 story homes if they were set back farther on the property. She would recommend a condition of
27 approval that the homes could not exceed 28-feet in height and the landscaping should be done
28 with native trees in consultation with the City Forester.

29
30 Commissioner Gnos stated the Applicant has been willing to work with the neighborhood and he
31 would agree with the conditions proposed by Commissioner Gonzalez.

32
33 Commissioner Ramy stated he would favor the two (2) home proposal over the one (1) larger
34 home. He stated a maximum height of 28-feet would be reasonable and he would like to see the
35 homes pushed back on the property. If these homes are moved on the property then a new
36 grading plan would be required for the City Council to review and he would like to have the City
37 Forester look at the potential for saving the oak tree under these circumstances.

38
39 Chair Vanderheyden stated he would also prefer the two (2) homes and having the homes set
40 back farther on the property. He would also like information on potentially saving the oak tree
41 and the impacts if the driveways are relocated and the tree dies. He would also like to know
42 what the height of the homes would be from the street view.

43
44 Mr. Gadow suggested the Commission direct Staff to prepare a report and recommendation for
45 the Commission to adopt at their next meeting.
46

1 Commissioner Gonzalez suggested adding the following conditions for approval: 1) The
2 Developer follow the recommendations of the City Engineer detailed on page 7, Section 4.1, of
3 the January 26, 2015 Staff Report, 2) Neither home exceed a total of 28-feet in height, 3) The
4 applicant shall pay the park dedication fee as required by the Ordinance.

5
6 Chair Vanderheyden clarified if the homes were pushed back on the property the calculated
7 height would be increase because the data points would change. This may increase the
8 calculated height of the homes over 28-feet even though the actual designs have not changed.

9
10 Mr. Gadow stated there could be a condition the homes that the homes be pushed back on the
11 property and the maximum height from the street level could not exceed 28-feet.

12
13 Commissioner Gonzalez suggested condition 2 be changed to: 2) the homes should be pushed
14 back on the property 4-6 feet and the maximum height from the street level could not exceed 28-
15 feet. She continued with the following conditions: 4) The Applicant shall take all necessary
16 measures to prevent runoff into the wetlands at the back of the property during construction, 5)
17 The Applicant shall work with the City Forester on a landscaping plan that would use native
18 trees whenever possible, 6) the project shall meet all the performance standards as required by
19 the Zoning Ordinance, 7) The Applicant shall construct the 1-1/2-story homes as presented and
20 not the 2-story homes previously presented, and 8) Any deviation from the construction
21 materials presented at the January 26 Planning Commission meeting should be approved by the
22 City Council.

23
24 Commissioner Young stated based on the information provided it is likely the tree would not
25 survive and he would like to see taken care of on the front end of the project. He felt the more
26 important concerns were to bring down the height of the homes and setting them farther back on
27 the property to match the character of the neighborhood.

28
29 Commissioner Gnos stated he would like to see the addition of the large spaded trees to replace
30 the removal of the oak tree at this time rather than potentially have the oak tree die and no trees
31 to replace it.

32
33 Commissioner Gonzalez made a motion, Seconded by Commissioner Ramy to direct Staff to
34 prepare a report and recommendation for approval for the Concurrent Preliminary and Final Plat
35 for a two (2) lot subdivision with the eight conditions outlined. The motion carried
36 unanimously.

37
38 **AGENDA ITEM 3. Other Items:**

39
40 **a. Review of Development Activities**

41
42 Mr. Gadow stated the next meeting, March 2, would be a 2 (two) lot sub-division for 151
43 Westwood Lane and a variance request for 123 Broadway Avenue North for hardcover. He
44 stated there would be a Planning 101 training offered by WSB and Associates on March 7 and
45 Commissioners were welcome to attend. He stated the City Council had approved the expansion
46 request for CoV Restaurant and the right-of-way encroachment for one (1) container. The other

1 container would need to be relocated onto the Applicant's property. The City Council had also
2 discussed telecommunication towers in the City and Staff would be working on these ordinances.

3
4 Commissioner Gnos stated he had tried to attend the Heritage Preservation Board meeting but
5 had the date incorrect. He stated he would attend the next meeting.

6
7 **b. Other Items**

8
9 There was no other business.

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

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

15
16 The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

17
18 Respectfully submitted,

19
20 Tina Borg

21 *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*