

**WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
March 16, 2015**

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

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

Present at roll call were Commissioners: Young, Vanderheyden, Iverson, and Gruber. Absent and excused were Commissioner Ramy, Gonzalez and Gnos. Director of Planning and Building Gadow and City Attorney David Schelzel were also present.

Chair Vanderheyden stated the minutes to be reviewed are from the March 6, 2015 meeting.

Mr. Gadow stated City Attorney Schelzel had submitted grammatical corrections.

Commissioner Gruber made a motion, Seconded by Commissioner Iverson, to approve the March 6, 2015 meeting minutes as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 2. Regular Agenda Public Hearing Items:

**a. 125 Wayzata Blvd E – Wayzata Community Church
i. Design Review for Roof Modification**

Mr. Gadow stated last June the Wayzata Community Church had received approval of a PUD Amendment to allow for a 2-phase expansion of the facility. As part of their preparations to begin work on Phase 1 of the project, the Applicant had some value engineering completed on the project, and determined that there would be cost savings if the roof line of the proposed 2nd story addition could be converted from a pitched roof with mechanicals enclosed with the roof pitch to a flat roof with mechanicals that are screened by a mansard roof section on the Wayzata Boulevard and Ferndale Road sides. He reviewed the Staff reports and the proposed design.

Mr. Chip Lindeke, Rafferty, Raffert, Tollefson, Lindeke Architects, 278 E. 7th St., St. Paul, explained the reason for the requested modification and the screening they were proposing. He stated the height would be less than what had been approved originally.

Commissioner Gruber stated the modification blended better with the existing architecture.

Chair Vanderheyden opened the public hearing at 6:14 p.m.

There being no comment, Chair Vanderheyden closed the public hearing at 6:15 p.m.

1 Commissioner Young made a motion, Seconded by Commissioner Iverson to recommend
2 approval of the roof modification as submitted for the Planned Unit Developed for 125 Wayzata
3 Boulevard E - Wayzata Community Church. The motion carried unanimously.
4

5 **b. 901 Lake Street – East Block of the Promenade of Wayzata**

6 **i. Planned Unit Development Amendment to allow conversion of proposed**
7 **office use to condominium**

8 **ii. Review of Proposed Design Modifications**
9

10 Mr. Gadow stated BohLand Development LLC has submitted an application for an amendment
11 to the Planned Unit Development (PUD) and modification of the design of the East Block of the
12 Promenade project. The Wayzata Bay Center Project General Plan PUD and associated building
13 designs were approved in 2008 and a condition of the approval was that the Applicant continue
14 to work on the design of each block to include as a final design for the Final Plan of the PUD,
15 and any material design deviations in the Final Plan from the building designs depicted would be
16 subject to City Council review and approval. The proposed PUD Amendment is to allow the
17 Applicant to replace the previously proposed 27,000 square-foot office space with 29
18 individually owned condominiums. The rest of the building would contain an 80-90 room
19 boutique hotel, a restaurant, a spa, and 14,000 square-feet of commercial space. He reviewed the
20 Staff report and proposed plans.
21

22 Mr. Steve Bohl, President BohLand Development, 825 Wayzata Blvd. E., Wayzata, reviewed
23 how the Applicant had developed the proposed concept and he presented the Commission with a
24 PowerPoint presentation on the proposal including renderings of the building and the materials
25 that would be used.
26

27 Mr. David Stahl, Cunningham Group Architecture, 201 Ortman St SE #325, Minneapolis, stated
28 they had looked at the Lake Effect, the pedestrian experience and the return of a hotel in
29 Wayzata when designing the architectural look of the building. He explained the need to be
30 respectful to the neighbors to the east facing the parking lot and there would not be windows on
31 this side so they would not have the light from the ramp and there would be additional plantings
32 to screen this.
33

34 Mr. Bohl explained the proposed layout and design of the building including the hotel,
35 restaurant, and condominium designs.
36

37 Chair Vanderheyden asked for an explanation on the shared parking.
38

39 Mr. Terry Schneider, Project Developers, 15333 Boulder Creek Drive, Minnetonka, explained
40 they used a blended method to assess the parking needs because the office space is a larger
41 demand of parking versus condominium and hotel uses. The biggest challenge had been
42 determining the overlap in needs and what would be an appropriate amount of parking. They did
43 three analysis including the original parking plan. The 287 proposed spots would be
44 conservative. The Hotel operator feels valet parking would be a requirement and he reviewed
45 how this would be accommodated. It is less parking than the original plan but this is due to the
46 decrease in need by removing the office space.

1
2 Mr. Bohl reviewed the landscaping plan, the proposed storm water management system and the
3 proposed building height and design compared to the approved building height and design.
4

5 Commissioner Gruber asked for clarification on the materials being proposed, specifically lap
6 siding.
7

8 Mr. Stahl explained the lap siding makes this building feel more lakeside. It is a fiber-cement
9 product that looks like wood but would last longer and be less maintenance. If they move
10 forward with this they would be coming back for a variance. He explained this product is
11 replacing the traditional wood lap siding because it does not have the same maintenance
12 requirements. He explained brick is not traditionally seen along lakeside properties and that is
13 why they moved away from using brick.
14

15 Commissioner Gruber asked where the valet parking would be.
16

17 Mr. Bohl stated the parking calculation would still provide adequate parking without valet
18 parking but the hotel operator wants valet parking as a service for guests. Having the valet
19 parking would also be beneficial during peak times without going outside of the facility. He
20 stated a study had been provided in the Staff Report as well.
21

22 Chair Vanderheyden opened the public hearing at 7:00 p.m.
23

24 Mr. Dan Gustafson, 1040 E. Circle Drive, Wayzata, stated the 2008 plan had included park space
25 on the east side and this is not going on. The east buffer is lacking in buffering and landscaping.
26 The holding pond is not attractive and there is no connecting sidewalk. He is less than
27 enthusiastic about the parking structure being what faces the east neighborhood. He felt the
28 neighborhood should have been involved. He also expressed concerns about dumpsters, garbage
29 and trucks.
30

31 There being no additional comment Chair Vanderheyden closed the public hearing at 7:03 p.m.
32

33 Commissioner Young asked what the landscaping plans were for the west side of the building
34 and how this will look for those residents that face the parking structure.
35

36 Chair Vanderheyden asked if the City owned a portion of this property.
37

38 Mr. Gadow explained there is a portion owned by the City but the Developer owns the majority
39 of the property. The buffer would be part of the project and the landscape plan had been
40 included in the application. The Applicant is proposing additional landscaping in this area.
41

42 Commissioner Iverson asked what would happen to the existing trees with the construction of
43 the parking structure.
44

45 Mr. John Mehrkens, Presbyterian Homes, explained there is a landscape management plan that
46 starts with the removal of all the invasive plantings within this area. The work to the north has

1 been completed and replacement trees have been put in place. The same plan is intended for the
2 space to the south or the area facing the east block. The previous plan had parking in this same
3 area with opaque windows. This particular design would close off those windows and make the
4 structure appear to be a complete building not a parking structure. The addition of vertical
5 elements with landscaping trees on top is soften this edge.

6
7 Commissioner Young clarified this edge was not being changed based on the conversion of
8 office space to condominiums but rather on feedback from the Commission and City Council.

9
10 Mr. Mehrkens stated this was correct and the building did not get any longer or taller than what
11 had been previously approved.

12
13 Commissioner Iverson asked what precautions would be taken to preserve the cottonwood on the
14 east corner.

15
16 Mr. Mehrkens stated he was not a landscape architect and could not speak to the trees that have
17 been lost. There are three wetlands and they are working to make sure the water runoff is
18 maintained and there is no additional impact to the trees.

19
20 Commissioner Iverson asked about the planting on the north because there are root balls
21 showing.

22
23 Mr. Mehrkens stated this is part of the landscape management system and there is a warranty
24 with these trees so any trees that do not survive would be replaced.

25
26 Commissioner Iverson stated she had sent photos when the original project had started showing
27 the damage that had been done to the trees and the removal of trees that should have been
28 maintained. She asked what the City could do to ensure this does not happen again with this
29 portion of the project. She asked if there was a way to make a legal requirement that if it
30 happens there would be consequences.

31
32 Mr. Gadow stated if this recommendation were to move forward then any tree identified in the
33 landscape management plan to remain should be maintained as part of that plan and if there is
34 damage done to these trees then the applicant would need to replace these trees. The landscape
35 plan does have an inventory of the trees on the property and this could be linked to what is to be
36 maintained.

37
38 Commissioner Iverson stated something harsher needs to happen when there are mature trees
39 removed that should not be because these buffer the neighborhoods.

40
41 City Attorney Schelzel stated he would work on language with the amendment and they would
42 look into what had happened previously and how to keep this from happening again.

43
44 Mr. Mehrkens stated there had been two large trees in the north area that should have been
45 maintained but as the utility project moved forward there had been some miscommunication with
46 the contractor and these trees were removed. It is not clear if the trees would have survived the

1 construction or not. The landscaping would be completed as the construction is completed,
2 weather permitting.

3
4 Mr. Bohl stated they would like to start construction in June and anticipate completion within
5 20-months. Landscaping would be completed late 2016 early 2017 completion.

6
7 Commissioner Iverson asked if the traffic impacts on Central Avenue and the proximity of the
8 parking had been reviewed.

9
10 Mr. Gadow stated the traffic had been looked at a couple of times but a new analysis has not
11 been completed.

12
13 Commissioner Iverson suggested requiring a new traffic study as part of this project.

14
15 Mr. Mehrkens stated the change of use from office space to condominiums would have a
16 negative impact on traffic and reduce the amount of traffic to the site. There would only be one
17 valet point as well.

18
19 Commissioner Iverson stated she would like to see the traffic counts. She asked if there would
20 be street parking in front of the condominiums.

21
22 Mr. Mehrkens stated street parking would be available.

23
24 Commissioner Iverson stated she would like to see the neighborhood involved with this project
25 and she asked if the applicant would consider this.

26
27 Mr. Bohl stated he had tried to reach some of the neighbors the previous week and he had not
28 been able to get a hold of many. He talked to a couple neighbors that had the closest impacts.
29 One neighborhood had expressed concerns about a portion of the development where the
30 lighting was coming into his home. The Developer would work with him as they are completing
31 the project and plant a couple of additional trees in this area to block that light. There had been
32 conflicting ideas on the buffer to the east. The eastern edge is brought back some and the
33 parking is enclosed to keep the lighting from the neighborhood.

34
35 Commissioner Gruber stated Mr. Steve Fox had provided a memo regarding the removal of some
36 trees and she recommended Mr. Bohl contact him.

37
38 Commissioner Young stated the shift from office to residential is positive for the property. The
39 design aesthetic is good and it is important the landscape plan is followed to ensure there are no
40 impacts to the neighbors. There is a fair concern about the potential traffic on Central. He
41 would recommend approval of this based on the information provided.

42
43 Commissioner Gruber stated she also favors this project but she lives to the north and has
44 concerns about landscaping in this area.

45

1 Mr. Gadow asked about the lap siding material because the standards do not allow for more than
2 10% of this material. Using this material would require a variance.

3
4 Commissioner Iverson stated there had been concerns about changing the plan in 2008. The
5 2008 plan had open space and changes in architectural material and height. This proposal is
6 more of a wall. She would like to see the Developer go back and redesign the project to include
7 more green space and reduce the scale and mass. She asked if the Developer would be willing to
8 meet with the neighbors and look at softening the mass and scale of this structure.

9
10 Mr. Bohl stated he would be willing to have input from the Commission or the neighborhood.
11 This is an improvement over what had been approved in 2008. They had looked at adding vines
12 as well to soften the impacts. The building has been stepped back in the southeast corner as
13 well. The rooftop deck would be limited to the condominium residents only.

14
15 Commissioner Iverson stated there is nothing dimensional about the hotel and it looks like an
16 apartment. She asked what could be done to change this appearance.

17
18 Mr. Stahl stated this is a by-product of the internal setup of each room. He explained some of
19 the architectural changes they were implanting and if there was too much the building would
20 look busy. Hotels are repetitive because this is how they are on the interior. They would be
21 open to looking at adding more elements.

22
23 Commissioner Iverson stated they should provide options for the Commission to consider. The
24 current proposal does not look historical.

25
26 Mr. Stahl stated it was not intended to look historical but more of a lakeside property.

27
28 Commissioner Gruber suggested incorporating more of the history of Wayzata.

29
30 Commissioner Vanderheyden stated he liked the project.

31
32 Mr. Gadow stated Commissioner Gnos was in support of this project.

33
34 Commissioner Iverson asked what color the lap siding would be because this would drive her
35 decision to allow more than 10%.

36
37 Commissioner Gruber stated she would like more information on the durability of the product
38 and see it before it is painted.

39
40 Chair Vanderheyden stated he is in favor of the fiber-cement product.

41
42 Commissioner Young stated the move from office space to residential would create more interest
43 in keeping the property looking good because people are buying into the look and feel of the
44 property.

45

1 Chair Vanderheyden clarified the Commission was in general support of the project, there was
2 encouragement for the Developer to reconsider mass and scale, a request to pursue a remedy or
3 assessment of significant tree damage and more general understanding of the traffic impacts,
4 they would like to request the Developer to also review the historical nature of properties around
5 the lake for articulation in the façade, and general support for the fiber-cement board.

6
7 Commissioner Gruber stated there was also concern about contacting the neighbors and making
8 sure they were doing everything they could to make the landscaping plan meets their needs.

9
10 Ms. Janet Lillevold, 307 Hampton Street, Wayzata, stated she is happy to see the office space
11 replaced with residential but she is concerned about the hotel because this is a lot of people
12 coming in and out of the property. The buildings on this property already compromise this
13 neighborhood. The roundabout does not work and the sidewalk is on the wrong side. This
14 project will continue to reduce the value of the homes on Circle. She asked the Commission to
15 reconsider the setbacks and the scale of the project.

16
17 Commissioner Gruber made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Young to direct Staff to
18 prepare a Planning Commission Report recommending approval of the Planned Unit
19 Development Amendment to allow conversion of proposed office use to condominium and the
20 proposed design modifications with the conditions outlined and appropriate findings for approval
21 a the next Planning Commission meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

22
23 The Planning Commission recessed at 7:57 p.m.

24
25 The Planning Commission reconvened at 8:05 p.m.

26
27 **c. 151 Westwood Lane – White Birch Properties and Development Group**
28 **i. Concurrent Preliminary and Final Plat for Two (2) Lot Subdivision**
29 **ii. Variance for Private Roadway**
30

31 Mr. Gadow stated White Birch Properties and Development Group has submitted a Development
32 Application requesting concurrent preliminary and final plat subdivision approval for a new 2-lot
33 subdivision. The project would require the removal of the existing structure and access to the
34 project would be thru an existing private driveway that would be widen to 20-feet to meet State
35 Fire Code requirements and would require approval of a variance from the Subdivision
36 Ordinance. He reviewed the Staff Report, the preliminary and final plat, the grading and utility
37 plan, and the significant tree inventory plan. There are no home plans at this time and a
38 condition of approval would be that the owners would need to have approval on the building
39 designs. Staff would work with the applicant on having a fire hydrant included with the project.

40
41 Mr. Scott Roe, 5128 Bryant Avenue S., Minneapolis, stated making this a 2-lot subdivision
42 instead of the previously submitted 3-lot subdivision has reduced the impacts to the
43 neighborhood. By utilizing the existing driveway there would be less impact to the existing
44 trees and less impact on those neighbors across the street.

45
46 Commissioner Gruber asked about the former research on the Indian Mound.

1
2 Mr. Rose stated he was aware of this and there had been an issue years ago and they would be
3 cognizant of the potential for additional mounds and remains.

4
5 Commissioner Iverson appreciated the amount of trees being removed would be less.

6
7 Chair Vanderheyden asked what the pad size would be for the proposed homes.

8
9 Mr. Roe stated the lots are large enough to support a 10,000 square foot home.

10
11 Chair Vanderheyden asked if there would be an outlot created in this project.

12
13 Mr. Gadow stated there is no need for an outlot to be created with the 2-lot subdivision being
14 proposed.

15
16 Chair Vanderheyden opened the public hearing at 8:14 p.m.

17
18 There being no public comment Chair Vanderheyden closed the public hearing at 8:15 p.m.

19
20 Mr. Gadow explained the variances that would be required to utilize the existing driveway as the
21 private roadway. The Applicant is requesting to use this driveway to reduce the impact to the
22 neighborhood and to existing trees.

23
24 Commissioner Iverson made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Gruber to recommend
25 approval of the concurrent preliminary and final plat for a two (2) lot subdivision at 151
26 Westwood Lane and the four variances for a private roadway as outlined by Staff including the
27 addition of a fire hydrant and the conditions contained in the Staff report. The motion carried
28 unanimously.

29
30
31 **AGENDA ITEM 3. Other Items:**

32
33 **a. Review of Development Activities**

34
35 Director of Planning and Building Gadow stated the next meeting would be the Planning
36 Commission recommendation on East Block and 313 Central Avenue subdivision. There are
37 two other items but they are not ready for the Commission to review at this time.

38
39 **b. Other Items**

40
41 Mr. Gadow stated the Council had discussed Harmony Circle and the project was to table their
42 next meeting.

43
44
45 **AGENDA ITEM 4. Adjournment.**

46

1 There being no further business, Commissioner Young made a motion, seconded by
2 Commissioner Iverson to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

3

4 The meeting was adjourned at 8:24 p.m.

5

6 Respectfully submitted,

7

8 Tina Borg

9 *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*