

**WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
APRIL 22, 2024**

AGENDA ITEM 1. Call to Order

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

Chair Stockton read a prepared statement outlining 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, and Severson. Community Development Director Emily Goellner, Planning Consultant Eric Zweber, and City Attorney David Schelzel were also present.

Absent at roll call were Commissioners: Schwalbe and Elg

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 Sorensen, to approve the April 22, 2024 agenda as presented.

The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 4. Consent Agenda

a.) Approval of the March 11, 2024 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

b.) Approval of the Planning Commission Report and Recommendation of Approval for Setback Variances at 620 Bushaway Road

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

Hearing no such request, Chair Stockton asked for a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

Commissioner Plantan made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Severson, to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

1 The motion carried unanimously.

2
3 **AGENDA ITEM 5. Public Hearing Items**

4
5 **a) Consider Development Application for Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Zoning**
6 **Map Amendment, Conditional Use Permit, Variance to the West Side Yard**
7 **Setback, and Design Deviations for an Elderly Care Facility (Moments of**
8 **Wayzata) at 163 Wayzata Boulevard West**
9

10 Community Development Director Goellner reviewed the project location, the zoning and land
11 uses in the surrounding neighborhood, and gave a general summary of the application.
12

13 Planning Consultant Zweber reviewed details about the previous business that was located on this
14 site, Meridian Manor. He outlined the existing conditions and the previous approvals from the
15 City for Moments of Wayzata from 2021. He reviewed the current application submittals for a
16 new building, the proposed site plan, setbacks, building height, residential units/sizes, outdoor
17 recreation areas, CUP and rezoning request, variance to side yard setback, design standard
18 deviations for the parking location/building recesses/massing breaks/unit entries/screening of
19 sheet roofing, and the lot coverage/FAR, grading and retaining walls, parking, trees, and
20 landscaping plans.
21

22 Ms. Goellner stated that notification of the requested Comprehensive Plan amendment was sent to
23 the Cities of Orono and Plymouth, and no concerns were received back from them. She outlined
24 the other notification actions taken, and explained that a neighborhood meeting was held on
25 February 5, 2024 and noted that 15 people attended. She outlined some of the topics of discussion
26 and concerns that were raised at the meeting, including, headlight glare, east property line
27 improvements, entry/exit points, parking configuration, design deviations, and site lighting. She
28 noted that there has been one letter received from a group of neighbors that expressed concerns
29 regarding tree preservation, light pollution, design and deviations, and the property condition since
30 2021. She noted that in 2023 there were property maintenance violations for this property which
31 have since been addressed by the property owner through a separate process with the City. She
32 reviewed the questions the Commission was being asked to consider in related to the requests of
33 the application.
34

35 Chair Stockton asked if the Commission had any questions for Staff.
36

37 Commissioner Sorensen asked about the elevation in the parking lots of the proposed lots in
38 comparison to the existing parking.
39

40 Ms. Goellner suggested that they note that question to answer later after staff has had time to look
41 at the plan figures.
42

43 Commissioner Severson asked staff to confirm the location and layout of the parking, and how it
44 differs from the existing parking. She asked if this would be a two-story building from the front
45 but three stories in the rear and noted that, if so, it would be different from the current building.
46

1 Mr. Zweber reviewed the proposed building height plans and noted that the building height would
2 be 39 feet and 11 inches. He noted that under City Code, the building would be not considered to
3 have a third story because less than 50% of the building foundation is exposed for more than 6 feet
4 in height. He noted, however, that if you looked from the north you would see three levels, but
5 again clarified that under the definitions of City Code, the building was only two stories.

6
7 Commissioner Severson stated that she was also curious about the tree plan for the front of the
8 building.

9
10 Mr. Zweber clarified that they were not planning to remove any trees within the boulevard between
11 Wayzata Blvd and Babcock Lane, but that they were planning to install trees within the gaps of
12 the existing vegetation. He noted that details could be found on page 58 of the packet.

13
14 Ms. Goellner noted that this same diagram would also answer Commissioner Severson's questions
15 related to the parking configuration.

16
17 There being no further questions for staff, Chair Stockton invited the applicant to address the
18 Commission.

19
20 Jeff Schuler, 3953 Regent Avenue, Robbinsdale, explained that he was functioning as the owner's
21 representative and lead architect for the project.

22
23 Elizabeth Wright, 13564 Westernesse Road, Minnetonka, explained that she was the owner of
24 TMSO of Wayzata and the Moments of Wayzata.

25
26 Mr. Schuler reviewed their proposed design deviations and explained why they felt it would
27 enhance the project. He explained that the 'feel' of this portion of town is residential, which was
28 what they tried to include in their design choices. He shared some details related to their tree
29 preservation efforts, especially on the south side, but noted that many trees will need to be removed
30 because of building demolition. He reviewed details related to the parking lot and noted that the
31 grade of the lot will block most headlights. He added that they were also planning ways to obscure
32 the lights with things like bushes. He reminded the Commission that none of the residents of the
33 proposed building would own cars, nor would visitor cars be present after 9:00 or 10:00 p.m. He
34 reviewed the existing screening and tree cover, and noted that all of the trees along Wayzata
35 Boulevard would be preserved. He reviewed the requests for design deviations for building
36 recesses and massing breaks. He explained that they have attempted to not have the building be
37 just straight walls, and shared details of their proposed design. He explained the reasons for their
38 design deviation request related to the individual exterior unit doors was due to this being a
39 memory care facility.

40
41 At the conclusion of Mr. Schuler's remarks, Chair Stockton asked if the Commissioners had
42 questions for the applicant.

43
44 Commissioner Douglas asked about the parking lot and if the only spaces facing Wayzata
45 Boulevard will be the same as what is already there.

46

1 Mr. Schuler confirmed that this was correct.

2
3 Commissioner Douglas stated that she is interested to hear the grading details from staff. She
4 stated that the new proposal will have the headlights facing the building on the southeast side.

5
6 Mr. Schuler stated that was correct and any additional parking in the front of the building will all
7 face the building.

8
9 Chair Stockton stated that the diagram of the building looks flat and level, but noted that she
10 believed that it would actually be sloped.

11
12 Mr. Schuler stated that was correct, and explained that the rendering was prepared by the architect
13 to highlight the building and not necessarily the lot.

14
15 Commissioner Plantan asked about the number of stalls. She stated that they were only required
16 to have 54 stalls and were proposing 62.

17
18 Ms. Wright explained that what they have been doing with the Moments of Lakeville location was
19 having some robust staffing so, in order to accommodate the shift change times, they need to have
20 additional parking. She stated that they also like to invite families and neighbors to come in and
21 see what they are doing as well. She stated that they love being part of the community, as a larger
22 fixture, and gave the example the dog contests that Meridian Manor used to hold in the parking lot
23 during J.J. Hill Days.

24
25 Commissioner Plantan confirmed that their plans were just for 2 additional parking stalls in front
26 compared to what is currently in place.

27
28 Mr. Schuler stated that he believes that was correct.

29
30 Chair Stockton confirmed that the current building did not have parking in the rear, and asked if
31 the proposed function was for visitors and staff up front and waste management type use in the
32 back.

33
34 Mr. Schuler explained that it will be mandated to staff that if there is an available spot in the rear,
35 that is where they will need to park and noted that will be most of where the traffic for the building
36 will be. He stated that they had also moved the loading docks so they now face north from where
37 they currently faces southwest. He noted that the front stalls would primarily be for visitors and
38 overflow parking.

39
40 Ms. Wright stated that part of their design includes the employee entrance off the rear west side
41 and that she believes that employees will all want to park as close to that as possible.

42
43 Mr. Zweber stated that the Commission had asked about the height of the building from the
44 sidewalk to the peak of the roof for the existing building and the proposed building.

45

1 Commissioner Sorensen clarified that he was looking for details on the elevations of the existing
2 parking lot compared to the proposed parking lot.

3
4 Mr. Zweber reviewed details from the current elevations and noted that the sidewalk at the front
5 door is currently at 998.9 feet, and they are proposing 1,001.5 feet. He stated that would make the
6 elevation of the front door 2.6 feet taller than the current configuration. He noted that generally,
7 for the whole site, the two entrances to the parking lot will be the same as they are currently. He
8 explained that on the west side, it is currently at the 998.9 feet elevation and on the east side it is
9 almost 1,004 feet, and those would stay the same. He noted that the southwest corner of the
10 parking lot would be the same as it is today at 998.5 feet. He stated that the current proposal on
11 the south side of the parking lot is at an elevation of 1,002 feet, which means the southern curb
12 line is 1 foot below the current Wayzata Boulevard elevation and the northern curb line is actually
13 at 1,000 feet, which would be a 2 foot grade drop.

14
15 Commissioner Sorensen asked how that would differ from the current parking lot and noted that
16 he was just looking for a general idea of the proposed parking in front compared to what is
17 currently is.

18
19 Mr. Zweber stated that if they look at the east side, the proposed parking elevation and the existing
20 curve is the same. He stated that the port cochere is 2.6 feet higher than the current front door but
21 the parking lot is at the same elevation as it is today.

22
23 Chair Stockton summarized that the point she felt Mr. Zweber was trying to make was that it would
24 more or less feel similar to what is currently there.

25
26 Mr. Zweber stated that was correct, and noted that if you ignore the west parking that faces
27 Highway 12, the parking in front of the building currently has 31 stalls and they are proposing 35
28 stalls.

29
30 There being no further questions from the Commission for the applicant, Chair Stockton opened
31 the public hearing on the application at 7:32 pm.

32
33 Mike Sund, 136 Babcock Lane, stated that he was right across the street from the former Meridian
34 Manor and had lived there for 26 years. He stated he thinks everyone understands that the City is
35 really a special place, which was not an accident, and explained that some of the reasons were due
36 to the zoning and the design guidelines, along with the City's enforcement of them. He referenced
37 Folkstone which he stated was compliant with the look, feel, and character of the City, along with
38 the new Wells Fargo development, Chipotle, and Punch.

39
40 Mr. Sund further stated that all of these projects have a good look and feel, and are not dominated
41 by automobile traffic or parking. He explained that in this case, the Commission is considering a
42 number of deviations from the City's rules. He stated that he felt these deviations may diminish
43 some of the value of the adjacent neighborhood but because of its location, may also have an
44 impact on the way people who approach the City feel about Wayzata. He stated that when there
45 is something that has a monolithic look, with parking out front, it feels more like a motel than
46 some of the other current developments that he mentioned. He stated that he feels this will affect

1 all of the City, and believes that first impressions matter. He stated that he thinks that what the
2 residents are asking for is that the City enforce the current rules, which may mean that the applicant
3 has to go back to the drawing board.
4

5 Ken Wilcox, 178 Westwood Lane, shared some history of this property, and explained that it used
6 to be a community garden. So, when Meridian Manor came along, there was a lot of pressure put
7 on them to fit into what was basically a residential neighborhood. He noted that no one wanted
8 the garden to go away, but they wanted to make sure that whatever did go in there would fit into
9 the residential neighborhood, which he believes was still the case. He stated that Meridian Manor
10 has been a really important building and has always been an active part of the community. He
11 explained that he felt that whatever is put in here needed to adhere to that kind of history and feel,
12 which may be hard to accomplish, but asked the Commission to keep that in mind while they were
13 deliberating. He stated that what they are proposing is a solid building going across and, in his
14 opinion, this kind of long white building will be a bit of a spotlight into the neighborhood. He
15 stated that the City has deliberated on color for long time and found that dark colors tend to recede
16 and light colors, such as white, are more in your face, but can also be more of a holiday or lakeshore
17 kind of thing. He stated that in this location, he believes that they will want it to recede, so white
18 would not be the correct choice.
19

20 Mr. Wilcox further explained that he was unsure if design standards for materials applied in this
21 location, but one of the reasons that Meridian Manor looks residential like it does is because of the
22 brick and the white trim. He noted that what the applicant is proposing does not look residential
23 and thinks that if they put more effort into materials and color, it would help. He stated that
24 variances used to be tough to get, which has eased and the new standards are now based on
25 'practical difficulty'. He stated that if they have a clean slate, in this case, with Meridian Manor
26 going away, the applicant can put anything on that property that they want, so he didn't feel there
27 was really an excuse for needing a variance, which is why he would be against the City granting
28 one. He stated that he felt that it kind of made sense to rezone this property to institutional, but it
29 is zoned a PUD right now and that could be changed to a new PUD, which means the City would
30 have more control over what happens. He stated that redesignation to institutional would allow
31 them a bit more height, which he does not think the City wants to see in this area. He asked the
32 Commission to give this point some serious thought, and reiterated that just having a new PUD
33 would allow the City more control over the design elements.
34

35 Joe VanLoy, 136 Birch Lane W, stated that he has been a resident of the City for 24 years. He
36 stated that his question about rezoning was whether staff had taken the time to see where that
37 would be of value for the City, and not just for the applicant. He stated that the City has worked
38 on the Comprehensive Plan for a very long time, and had also put a lot of money and effort into it,
39 and believes that the City needed to make sure that the right choices were being made. He stated
40 that the proposed building is 355 feet wide, which is essentially a football field plus the end zones,
41 which is very linear. He stated that the Commission needs to picture what it would look like on
42 this site and if they compare this to Meridian Manor, they will be able to see that what they are
43 proposing goes way to the edges. He asked the Commission to make sure that they are considering
44 what that impact will be. He stated that the City has worked very hard so they are not just looking
45 at parking lots, and noted if this project is starting from scratch, he feels that there should be a way
46 to either put more behind or put it underground.

1
2 Daniel Grotning, 120 Westwood Lane, explained that he had lived in the City for 36 years and was
3 right across the street from the exit that this building will create. He stated that he hoped that the
4 Commission considers site lighting. He explained that he used to build SuperValu stores, and
5 noted that because of that experience understands that it is very easy to make a difficult mistake,
6 which could mean that the site lighting has a large impact on the neighbors. He stated that he was
7 in support of this property being developed, but would like the Commission to remember that the
8 devil is sometimes in the details.

9
10 Jane Wallace, 118 Babcock Lane, stated they purchased their home about 9 years ago and fell in
11 love with the charm of Wayzata. She explained that they were interested in purchasing where they
12 did because it was family friendly. She stated that her concern with the proposed plan is similar
13 to what has already been expressed by her neighbors, in that it lacks the charm and character that
14 attracted her to the City. She stated that this was not just an entrance to the neighborhood or that
15 it may be a potentially corporate looking building in their neighborhood, but is also the west end
16 entrance to the City. She did not think their proposed plan would represent them well.

17
18 Ms. Wallace further noted that she had worked for a high-end senior residential living facility in
19 Arizona and when they were building, they were required to adhere to very strict guidelines in the
20 area, which they did because they wanted to be a good neighbor. She stated that her concern is
21 that the applicant has not seemed to demonstrate that they are willing to be a good neighborhood
22 and has not seen that their proposed plans match the look and feel of the community. She stated
23 that the property has been neglected over the past few years, and was hopeful that a rejection at
24 this point may bring everyone to the table to be able to create a plan that works for all of them.

25
26 Ms. Goellner advised the Chair that there were no people that called in to the meeting that have
27 asked to speak at the public hearing.

28
29 There being no additional comments on the application, Chair Stockton closed the public hearing
30 at 7:47 pm.

31
32 Chair Stockton asked for the Commission to share their thoughts and feedback on the application.

33
34 Commissioner Douglas asked staff if there had been any discussion with the applicant about
35 keeping a PUD in place.

36
37 Ms. Goellner explained that there was discussion about that, and noted that a PUD rezoning would
38 be a two-step process because it requires a Concept Plan approval and a General Plan approval,
39 and would typically take about twice as long to get through the entitlement process. She stated
40 that the City also looks for solutions that do not require a PUD, and explained that the applicant
41 had been charged with looking to see if they could find a solution within the City's zoning
42 ordinance. She noted that the institutional Comp Plan designation and zoning district would be
43 very appropriate for memory care. She stated that ultimately the applicant had indicated that they
44 were interested in the 40 foot height limit that is offered within the institutional district. She
45 explained that the applicant was also concerned because a PUD requires dedication of public space,
46 and felt this use was not very conducive to memory care. She stated that the Commission should

1 be focused tonight on exactly what the applicant has applied for, even though the PUD has been
2 raised as an alternate idea.

3
4 Commissioner Douglas stated that in looking over the Comprehensive Plan, one of the goals of
5 the community is to support multi-generational community and provide housing for people of all
6 ages. She stated that part of that idea was that as people age there are opportunities created so that
7 younger people can move into the homes, which is one part she likes about this proposed
8 amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. She explained that she can support senior living because
9 it is an important part of the community.

10
11 Commissioner Severson stated that she likes the idea of having senior living in this location, and
12 believes that Meridian Manor was a great addition to the neighborhood, but is not sure that she is
13 ready to change the zoning to institutional. She stated that she agreed with some of the comments
14 made by the neighbors related to parking in the front and the point made that because they are
15 tearing down the existing building, they will have a clean slate. She stated that coming before the
16 City and asking for a lot of variances, when they have a clean slate, is not something that makes
17 her super comfortable at this point.

18
19 Commissioner Plantan thanked the applicant for making this proposal, and stated that she felt more
20 facilities like this were needed. She stated that she loves the idea of multi-generational housing
21 and letting residents find a way to age in place. She stated that she would support a change in the
22 Comprehensive Plan to Institutional because the properties that are adjacent are already this land
23 use category. She stated that she felt that it would also support the safety of the residents in the
24 institution by allowing things like recreational areas in the back. She stated that she would really
25 hate this parcel to be used for high density housing.

26
27 Commissioner Sorensen stated that he was very much aligned with Commissioners Douglas and
28 Plantan and their comments, especially those related to the possibility of this being developed as
29 a high density development and the burdens that would bring. He stated that he could support the
30 amendment to Institutional.

31
32 Chair Stockton stated that she was also in alignment on that issue with Commissioners Douglas,
33 Plantan, and Sorensen, and would be in support of moving the parcel towards Institutional.

34
35 Commissioner Plantan asked if the City had made any amendments to the Comprehensive Plan to
36 date.

37
38 Ms. Goellner stated that the City has made a few Comprehensive Plan amendments, and noted that
39 the last one was for another memory care facility called Cantissimo Senior Living that changed its
40 name to Harbors of Wayzata, and that parcel was also changed to Institutional guidance as well.

41
42 Commissioner Severson asked what that land use had changed from.

43
44 Ms. Goellner stated that parcel had been in a single family residential area and was re-guided
45 institutional in 2022-2023.

46

1 City Attorney Schelzel pointed out the list of standards for consideration of rezoning on page 35
2 of the packet. He explained that the Commission was charged with looking at the possible adverse
3 effects of a rezoning.

4
5 Chair Stockton stated that the description from the applicant has made her more comfortable about
6 the parking as well as the additional stalls facing north.

7
8 Commissioner Sorensen stated that for the Zoning Map Amendment, he would be inclined to
9 support that given the criteria of conforming with the present and future land uses of the area.

10
11 The Commission discussed the proposed outdoor recreation area, the retaining wall and fence
12 locations, and concluded that these features would be appropriate within the CUP requested.

13
14 Chair Stockton suggested that they move the discussion onto the other requests starting with the
15 side yard setback variance. She noted that she felt that this request contributes to the massing
16 break deviation request as well.

17
18 Ms. Goellner agreed that the length of the building would be effected by this variance and if not
19 approved, the required setback would be 50 feet.

20
21 Chair Stockton stated that she felt it was important to consider this request with respect to the
22 design deviations because she felt they were related.

23
24 Commissioner Plantan stated that normally she would look at this and say that the request makes
25 sense because it is up against Highway 12; however, with the variance there is a building that is
26 20 feet longer. She stated that because of that proposed additional length, it brings along all the
27 other problems with the design deviations. She explained that she has some challenges in
28 supporting this request, and noted that she did not see a benefit to the community of approving it,
29 it would just be a benefit to the applicant. She stated that usually when the City grants variances,
30 there is some type of greater good for the community.

31
32 Commissioner Douglas asked if the request was because they were increasing the number of
33 residents to 80. She stated that it adds to the length of the building and does drive the other
34 deviation requests.

35
36 Commissioner Severson explained that she had the same thought as Commissioner Plantan with
37 the proximity to Highway 12, but the mass of the building itself bothers her. She stated that this
38 is a big building and is twice the footprint that is there today, which is what she has a problem
39 with. She noted, however, that she wasn't sure that having the building be 20 feet less would fix
40 the issue because it would still be a 304 foot long building.

41
42 Commissioner Sorensen stated that when he first saw this proposal he wasn't too concerned about
43 it because of what is there up against the highway and the golf course, but noted that he did think
44 that as they talk about the other issues, this may become a bit more clear. He stated that he believes
45 the long, linear nature of the building was causing some of the issues and concerns that have been

1 raised. He suggested that perhaps the Commission should move on and talk about the design
2 deviation requests because he felt that make this answer more clear.

3
4 Ms. Goellner noted that technically there were 6 design deviation requests but noted that there are
5 really just 5 because two of them are related to the same design issue but addressed in two different
6 code sections.

7
8 Chair Stockton suggested that they look at numbers 5 (ground-level entries) and 6 (screening of
9 sheet roofing) first.

10
11 Commissioner Douglas stated that she felt she could support eliminating the ground level entries
12 because she cannot imagine having a doorway to every resident's room and agreed that having a
13 locked door would cause agitation to the resident. She stated that she could support the eliminating
14 the sheet roofing in that one location to reduce the height, as long as it was better than the City
15 standards.

16
17 Chair Stockton noted that as long as they were not planning to put anything on the roof, then she
18 did not see a need to drive that higher in height.

19
20 Commissioner Sorensen stated that he had similar thoughts on both of those items, and would
21 support both of these requests.

22
23 Chair Stockton suggested that they move the discussion onto the building recesses and massing
24 breaks, and the overall presence of the building. She stated that she walked the site earlier today
25 and that what stood out to her is the distinct tonal and material difference of the current building,
26 which makes a difference visually because of the use of the materials and helps break up the
27 building. She stated that they have also used color to create visual recesses where they may not
28 actually be a recess. She stated that what is being proposed is an extended continual façade, and
29 noted that the design standards are intended to make sure that they create something that feels
30 connected with the residential feel of the neighborhood. She stated that she appreciated the
31 comparisons that the applicant has made with properties in the area and the care that they have put
32 into moving in that direction, but noted that she felt that this may not be enough in that direction.

33
34 Commissioner Douglas stated that in the proposal are comments from Moments dated February
35 28, 2024, which had a statement that the exterior of the building was influenced by the character
36 of the City. She stated that the City runs into the word 'character' all the time when trying to
37 describe the City. She stated that there are many beautiful homes in the neighborhood that are
38 white or light colored, but that they were not 355 feet long. She stated that she understands that
39 white buildings with black windows is very popular right now, but felt that there was something
40 missing in what they have presented. She explained that she would love to see the planned building
41 materials. She explained that there was something about the proposed design of the building that
42 bothers her.

43
44 Commissioner Severson stated that Commissioner Douglas had stated that she 'thought there was
45 something missing' and, in her opinion, she thinks there isn't enough missing. She stated that she
46 thinks there is just too much building, and noted that she was almost having the same reaction as

1 she has had to some of the proposals for the TCF building space. She stated that just because they
2 have the space does not mean that you should take it all up, as they are proposing with the whole
3 front of the property.

4
5 Commissioner Douglas stated that she also felt it needed to be more subtle.

6
7 Chair Stockton stated that she thinks it is probably a combination of the length of the proposed
8 building, the tone, and the harder edges, that collectively create a lot of impact and feels less
9 residential.

10
11 Commissioner Plantan stated that she understands how difficult massing breaks can be and
12 wanting to have the walkway connection for the residents, so it wouldn't be viable to have a lot of
13 separate buildings; however, the intent of massing breaks is to eliminate monolithic buildings. She
14 stated that she just did not see enough of that in this case. She noted that she felt a deviation was
15 appropriate when the purpose and intent of the design standards were achieved, but did not feel
16 either the purpose of the intent of massing breaks was being achieved with the proposed deviation
17 request.

18
19 Commissioner Sorensen stated that he did not have a big issue with the massing break issue if they
20 believe, in general, that having a linear building is important to the operation of the facility. He
21 stated that he thought he had heard, related to the building recess issue, that this recess every 50
22 feet is only particular to the Bluff District, and asked if that was correct.

23
24 Ms. Goellner confirmed that this was correct.

25
26 Commissioner Sorensen asked what the initial intent had been of requiring there be a recess every
27 50 feet in the Bluff District.

28
29 Ms. Goellner explained that this parcel is not in a design district, so it defaults to the Bluff District
30 standards. She noted that generally the buildings in this part of town are smaller, less suburban
31 and more of the urban core, which means building widths are smaller and that the recesses would
32 be more frequent to more generally match that character.

33
34 Commissioner Sorensen stated that applying that to this long building is a bit of a challenge. He
35 stated that with that in mind, he felt the recess issue was not very applicable, but what he felt was
36 applicable was the feedback from the community and from the Commission was the overall look
37 and feel of the building. He explained that he would tend to agree that it is lacking in residential
38 scale, architecture, and character due to the long, linear nature of the building. He stated that for
39 some reason they did not feel that way about Meridian Manor because it had a nice, homey,
40 residential feel. He stated that this has more of the look and feel of institutional monolithic design,
41 and explained that he did not think that what has been proposed would be the best for their
42 community. He noted that if it had more of a residential flair, he thinks that it would be much more
43 appealing. He stated that he thinks the other deviation requests are reasonable and appropriate.

44
45 Chair Stockton stated that her point was that she felt that perhaps color or material choices may be
46 able to impact the affect that massing breaks or recesses. She asked how the Commission felt

1 about the variance request for the setback on the west side, now that they have discussed some of
2 the other deviation requests.

3
4 Commissioner Severson stated that for her she still would not support it because it just extends a
5 massive building another 20 feet.

6
7 Commissioner Douglas stated that she did not feel that it would be significant, and believes they
8 should focus on the look of the building.

9
10 Commissioner Plantan stated that she also did not think the additional 20 feet would make that
11 much of a difference. She stated that it is just that if you look at what they are looking at in the
12 packet, their proposed building takes up the entire frontage of the lot which she did not feel was
13 appropriate. She referenced the green spaces near the church parsonage and the church and stated
14 that even though they are an institutional lot, things are broken up enough to still feel compatible
15 with the neighborhood and still have a residential feel. She explained that the building being
16 proposed just did not feel like a residential building.

17
18 Chair Stockton stated that it sounded like she was saying that it was about the character of the
19 locality. She asked if there was a variation that somehow they could get more compliance with
20 the design standards.

21
22 Commissioner Severson stated that she thought so, and shared examples of other institutional
23 properties along Wayzata Boulevard. She stated that she felt that there were other institutional
24 and industrial buildings along that corridor that do have a look and feel that matches the look, feel,
25 and character of the neighborhood. She stated that if this building would look more like the
26 Wayzata Country Club, for example, then she may feel better about what they are proposing.

27
28 Commissioner Douglas stated that she did not have a problem with the massing breaks, and likes
29 the corridors because they are all glass and likes that you can see all the way through it.

30
31 Ms. Goellner noted that she had been taking notes during the Commission discussion in order to
32 be able to put together potential findings for each of the requests. She stated that the one that the
33 Commission had not discussed in detail was the parking location.

34
35 Commissioner Severson asked if the parking would need to be a deviation if they make the change
36 to Institutional.

37
38 Ms. Goellner stated that since design standards must be complied with for all new construction,
39 they are required to move the parking to the back, unless they obtain a deviation.

40
41 Commissioner Severson stated that thinking about the other buildings in the area, they do have
42 parking in the front and this parking would be screened and lower than the street. She noted that
43 she does not love what they are proposing but understands why they did it so they can have more
44 room in the back, so she thinks she would be comfortable with what they are proposing for parking.

45

1 Chair Stockton stated that she also liked that the level was the same as the existing parking lot, and
2 they would be adding a lot of trees. She further noted that the City has approved parking in the
3 front for other projects.

4
5 Chair Stockton noted that she believed that the Commission had come to a consensus on all the
6 requested items.

7
8 Ms. Goellner suggested that she review what she had heard from the Commission and outlined
9 that she heard support from most Commissioners on the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, the
10 Zoning Map Amendment and the CUP, noting that the Commission was comfortable with an
11 elderly care facility in the Institutional zoning district. She stated that generally the discomfort
12 with Variance and Design Deviations in that the shape of the building is causing concern and
13 potential for findings of denial. She noted that what she heard from the Commission was that
14 while the building is close to the highway side, the building is already much longer than the
15 existing building and is, in general, a long building not suitable for Wayzata and its character. She
16 stated that adding a setback variance may not contribute to the character of the locality even though
17 a few of the Commissioners felt that the additional 20 feet would not make a huge difference. She
18 explained that she felt that the majority of the Commission were not comfortable moving forward
19 with a variance because of the issues around character of the locality due to the width of the
20 building. She stated that for design standard deviation requests, she heard general support for
21 parking location, unit entries, and screening of sheet roofing. She stated that there were still
22 concerns raised about building recesses and massing breaks, and what she heard is that it was a
23 combination of the length of the structure, the harder edges, and the color that was creating some
24 visual impact that makes this property feel less residential. She stated that the Commission had
25 stated that it may be a good idea to have the glass hallway, but it did not seem to be the design
26 solution where the Commission felt that the positives outweighed the negative, which is what the
27 design deviations are all about. She reviewed some of the comments that the Commission had
28 made on this topic. She stated that she felt that there would not be majority support for building
29 recesses or massing breaks, and that the variance was still a bit up in the air, as well.

30
31 Commissioner Sorensen stated that he was okay with the massing breaks.

32
33 Commissioner Douglas stated that she was too.

34
35 Chair Stockton stated that where she is sort of 'in between' was that if the appearance of massing
36 breaks could be achieved through material usage, the massing breaks would not be such a big deal
37 aesthetically for her.

38
39 Commissioner Sorensen asked if the massing breaks would be pretty much glass.

40
41 Ms. Goellner stated that was correct, but would not be the case on the ground level. She noted that
42 it was not even required on the ground level.

43
44 Chair Stockton explained that what makes the most impact for her was the ground level, which is
45 why she was suggesting some type of color change in order to make more visual breaks in lieu of
46 an actual massing break.

1
2 Commissioner Douglas asked if just having a color break would follow the City's design
3 guidelines.

4
5 Chair Stockton clarified that she felt that visual impact could be changed by color and material.

6
7 Commissioner Severson stated that she did not have a problem with the glass walkway as a
8 massing break and thinks it is a clever way to connect the buildings, but reiterated that she had an
9 issue with the size of the building itself.

10
11 The Commission discussed the items that they had not yet reached consensus.

12
13 Ms. Goellner gave another summary of the Commission for recommending approval of deviation
14 requests for parking in the front yard, the glass walkway massing break, the elimination of the
15 ground-level entries and the lack of roof screening and denial of reduction of the number of the
16 building recesses. She noted that the Commission supported the Comprehensive Plan Amendment,
17 the Zoning Map Amendment, Comprehensive Plan Amendment and the Side Yard Setback
18 Variance.

19
20 Commissioner Severson asked how she should vote if the motion was made that matched what
21 Ms. Goellner had just stated and she, for example, disagreed with the building recesses and the
22 side yard setback variance.

23
24 Mr. Schelzel stated that he would recommend that Commissioner Severson vote 'no' because she
25 would not be in favor of everything included in the motion. He noted that all of the comments
26 shared by the Commission would be included with the draft report and recommendation, and
27 would encourage Commissioners to look carefully at the minutes to ensure that their concerns were
28 expressed accurately for the City Council.

29
30 There being no further discussion, Chair Stockton asked for a motion on the application.

31
32 Commissioner Sorensen made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Douglas, to direct staff to
33 prepare a draft Planning Commission Report and Recommendation with supporting findings
34 reflecting a recommendation of approval for Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Zoning Map
35 Amendment, Conditional Use Permit, Variance to the West Side Yard Setback, and Design
36 Deviations for parking location, massing break, unit entries, and screening of sheet roofing; and a
37 recommendation of denial for the design deviation for building recesses, for the Elderly Care
38 Facility (Moments of Wayzata) at 163 Wayzata Boulevard West for review and adoption at the
39 next Planning Commission meeting.

40
41 Director Goellner completed a roll call vote on the motion. Upon a vote, the motion carried
42 3 ayes, 2 nays (Plantan and Severson).

43
44 Commissioner Severson clarified that she was not in favor of the side yard setback or the deviation
45 from the massing break and recess deviations.

46

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

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

4
5 **b) Planning Commission Meeting Schedule**

6
7 Ms. Goellner noted that the next Planning Commission meeting will be May 6, 2024 where they
8 will have an application for 425 Highcroft Road; updates to the City's tree ordinance; and updates
9 to the chicken keeping ordinance. She asked that the Commissioners keep her informed if there
10 are specific dates over the summer that they will be gone.

11
12 **AGENDA ITEM 7. Adjournment.**

13
14 There being no further business on the agenda, Chair Stockton asked for a motion to adjourn.

15
16 Commissioner Severson made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Douglas to adjourn the
17 Planning Commission meeting.

18
19 The motion carried unanimously.

20
21 The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 8:58 p.m.

22
23 Respectfully submitted,
24 Kayla Atkins Rokosz
25 *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*
26