

**WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MAY 15, 2023**

AGENDA ITEM 1. Call to Order

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

Chair Stockton read a prepared statement outline multiple options for joining remotely or submitting comments and questions.

AGENDA ITEM 2. Roll Call

Chair Stockton asked Community Development Director Goellner to take roll call.

Present at roll call were Commissioners: Douglas, Merriam, Stockton, Sorensen, Schwalbe, Severson, and Elg. Community Development Director Emily Goellner and City Attorney David Schelzel were also present.

AGENDA ITEM 3. Approval of Agenda

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

Commissioner Severson made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Douglas to approve the May 15, 2023 agenda as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 4. Consent Agenda

a.) Approval of the May 1, 2023 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

b.) ~~Approval of Planning Commissioner Report and Recommendation of Denial for Development Application at 200 Lake Street East~~ (pulled for further discussion)

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

Commissioner Merriam asked to pull item b. for further discussion.

Chair Stockton asked for a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as amended.

Commissioner Douglas made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Schwalbe to approve the Consent Agenda as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

b. Approval of Planning Commissioner Report and Recommendation of Denial for Development Application at 200 Lake Street East

1 Community Development Director Goellner stated that before the Commission discusses this item
2 further she would like to suggest a friendly amendment to the title of the report so it more
3 accurately reflects the content of the report. She explained that this is a recommendation of denial
4 for the first two requests for rezoning and CUP for joint parking and a recommendation of approval
5 for the remaining requests.

6
7 Commissioner Merriam asked for clarification on the recommendation for a title change because
8 they are recommending denial and she feels that every piece of this hinges on whether or not the
9 zoning amendment is approved.

10
11 City Attorney Schelzel stated that was true, but explained that staff believed that there were some
12 particular nuances to this report. He stated that staff tried to make it clear that the recommendation
13 of approvals for items 3-6 would be contingent upon the first two items. He explained that their
14 suggestion regarding retitling it was really to more accurately reflect the summary of
15 recommendation from the Commission.

16
17 Commissioner Severson asked if the applicant came back if the Commission would have to
18 reapprove items 3-6.

19
20 City Attorney Schelzel clarified that this is a whole application and would go on with the
21 Commissions report and recommendation to the City Council. He explained that the City Council
22 would make a decision on all of these items, but if the applicant came back with a new application,
23 it would be considered a whole new project and the Commission would take a new look at that
24 information.

25
26 Chair Stockton stated that she thinks this retitling adds some clarity to the ultimate
27 recommendation the Commission is making and underlines what they are saying regarding this
28 specific application.

29
30 City Attorney Schelzel stated that the reason staff thinks this approach makes sense is because it
31 is probably the most helpful to Council to get the Commissions input, findings, and
32 recommendations on each of the 6 requests, even though they are co-dependent.

33
34 Commissioner Douglas stated that if the Council approved the zoning amendments she asked if
35 item 2 would automatically be approved for the joint parking.

36
37 Community Development Director Goellner explained that if the Council decided to move forward
38 for the zoning amendments it would not give any sort of automatic approval because they are
39 separate requests.

40
41 Commissioner Merriam stated that there were some of the findings that she had a difficult time
42 with and referenced page 11 of the report. She noted that there was a statement about advancing
43 the goals of the Comprehensive Plan including walkable and pedestrian friendly and explained
44 that she would disagree with that statement because, from a pedestrian point of view, it is much
45 more appealing to walk by the property as it is now than it would be with six buildings there
46 blocking the views beyond and creating sort of a canyon effect. She stated that while you can walk

1 there, but she would not consider it pedestrian friendly or as pleasant of an experience. She
2 explained that she also wondered about the health, safety, and welfare of having residential units
3 in close proximity to the railroad tracks. She stated that she felt that should have been included in
4 the report. She noted that the other issue she wanted to touch on was the density because the City
5 is asking for 20-30 units/acre and she has a hard time seeing how that would be achieved with a
6 two-story. She noted that the Commission has discussed in the past that they don't really want
7 that kind of density in this area and asked how they can solve that issue.

8
9 Chair Stockton asked if the idea was to reopen discussion or to simply correct these documents.

10
11 Community Development Director Goellner stated that tonight, the goal of the discussion is to
12 ensure that the minutes and the report and recommendation are working together simultaneously
13 and that they accurately captured the findings and recommendations that were made by the
14 Commission. She stated that tonight staff does not want to necessarily get into an evaluation of
15 the discussion from the last meeting, but to ensure that the findings that were made were made by
16 a majority of the Commission. She noted that individual comments or thoughts would be reflected
17 in the minutes, but would not necessarily be part of the majority recommendation.

18
19 Commissioner Merriam explained that she was just wondering if the Commission could add those
20 finding details to the report. She stated that the density question could be discussed at a different
21 time.

22
23 City Attorney Schelzel stated that to address Commissioner Merriam's concerns, he is confident
24 that those points were included in the minutes. He stated that as part of the vote tonight, the
25 Commission can add their own view and details regarding their individual vote.

26
27 Chair Stockton asked for a motion to approve the proposed title amendment to the report and
28 recommendation, as suggested.

29
30 Commissioner Sorensen asked for an explanation of the title change that was being recommended.

31
32 City Attorney Schelzel explained that the recommended change is not a substantive change. He
33 stated that their suggestion is to change the title to, 'Report and Recommendation of Denial of
34 Rezoning and CUPs for Joint Parking, and Approval of First Floor Multiple Family Dwellings,
35 Shoreland PUD/CUP and SIP/CUP, and Project Design at 200 Lake Street East.' He reiterated
36 that the idea is that this is a nuanced report.

37
38 Commissioner Sorensen made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Douglas, to modify the title
39 of the Draft Report and Recommendation, as discussed, recommending denial for the first two
40 requests for rezoning and CUP for joint parking and a recommendation of approval for the
41 remaining requests. The motion carried unanimously.

42
43 Chair Stockton asked for a motion to adopt the Report and Recommendation with the revised title.
44

1 Commissioner Elg made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Severson, to approve the Planning
2 Commission Report and Recommendation of denial for the Rezoning and CUP for Joint Parking,
3 and recommendations for approval for the remaining requests.
4

5 Commissioner Merriam stated that she would like to make a change in the report to include a
6 concern about health, safety and welfare considering the proximity of the residential units to the
7 railroad track and that a series of six buildings would also inhibit the pedestrian experience because
8 it would create a canyon effect.
9

10 Commissioner Elg explained that he would not be in favor of making that amendment. He stated
11 that the Commission is recommending denial so it is unlikely that the builder will be able to move
12 forward with the 6 buildings they had proposed and will likely need to come back with a different
13 plan. He stated that personally, he was in favor of the density. He stated that there are also homes
14 that are close to railroad tracks all around the City and feels that decision is something for the
15 builder and the railroad company to be cognizant of and make sure there are plans in place to make
16 it as safe as possible.
17

18 Chair Stockton stated that she feels the train safety issue was out of the Commission's purview
19 and noted that she felt the minutes did a good job of reflecting some of the points that were brought
20 up by Commissioner Merriam during the meeting.
21

22 Commissioner Elg stated that he thinks that these items are adequate items to be brought up again
23 when a new proposal comes back and explained that, at this point, he doesn't think they should
24 mess with what they have already captured.
25

26 Commissioner Merriam explained that she felt that these items were not included in the findings
27 and were things that the Commission had discussed.
28

29 Commissioner Douglas stated that she also felt that they were well documented within the minutes.
30

31 Commissioner Merriam stated that if the majority of the Commission did not want to add these
32 items into the findings, she is fine with that, as long as it is documented.
33

34 Commissioner Douglas confirmed that the City Council will see the Planning Commission
35 meeting minutes.
36

37 Chair Stockton asked for a roll call vote on the motion.
38

39 Community Development Director Goellner completed a roll call vote on the motion. The motion
40 carried unanimously.
41

42 Community Development Director Goellner stated that the intent will be for the Council to review
43 this item at their June 6, 2023 meeting.
44

45 **AGENDA ITEM 5. Public Hearing Items**
46

1 **AGENDA ITEM 6. Other Items:**

2
3 **a) Review of Development Activities**

4
5 Community Development Director Goellner stated that because there are no completed
6 applications ready, she would be cancelling the June 5, 2023 meeting.
7

8 **b) Planning Commission Meeting Schedule**

9
10 Community Development Director Goellner stated the June 19, 2023 will have multiple public
11 hearings and will be a busy meeting. She stated that Chair Stockton will be absent for the meeting,
12 so Vice-Chair Sorensen would lead the meeting. She noted that there would also not be a Planning
13 Commission meeting on July 3, 2023.
14

15 **AGENDA ITEM 7. Adjournment.**

16
17 There being no further business on the agenda, Chair Stockton asked for a motion to adjourn.
18

19 Commissioner Elg made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Severson, to adjourn the Planning
20 Commission meeting. The motion carried unanimously.
21

22 The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.
23

24 Respectfully submitted,

25 Kayla Atkins Rokosz

26 *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*
27