

**WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MAY 5, 2025**

AGENDA ITEM 1. Call to Order

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

Chair Cameron read a prepared statement that outlined multiple options for joining remotely or submitting comments and questions.

AGENDA ITEM 2. Roll Call

Chair Cameron asked Community Development Director Sharpe to take roll call.

Present at roll call were Commissioners: Plantan, Schwalbe, Severson, Elg, Cameron, VanLoy, and Ankeny. Community Development Director Alex Sharpe, Planning Consultant Lori Johnson, and City Attorney David Schelzel were also present.

AGENDA ITEM 3. Approval of Agenda

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

Commissioner Schwalbe made a motion, seconded by Commissioner VanLoy, to approve the May 5, 2025, 2025 agenda as presented.

The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 4. Consent Agenda

- a.) Approval of the April 21, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
- b.) Approve Planning Commission Report and Recommendation for a Conditional Use Permit and Design Deviation at 1221 Wayzata Blvd. E
- c.) Approve Planning Commission Report and Recommendation for Denial of a Variance at 617 Park Street E

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

Chair Cameron asked for a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

Commissioner Schwalbe made a motion, seconded by Commissioner VanLoy, to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 5. Old Business Items

AGENDA ITEM 6. Public Hearing Items

a) 323 Waycliffe North Building Coverage and Impervious Surface Variance

Planning Consultant Johnson gave an overview of the variance requests for property located at 323 Waycliffe North for building coverage and impervious surface. She reviewed the project location, current zoning, zoning and land use of the surrounding neighborhood, existing conditions, and details of the variance requests. She highlighted comments received from the engineering department and explained that as of May 1, 2025, there had been no public comments received on this item.

Chair Cameron asked if the Commission had any questions for staff.

Commissioner Ankeny asked if Ms. Johnson had stated that there was already a building that had done this same thing, and if that meant there was existing precedent.

Ms. Johnson stated that she had looked through City records and found one from 2004/2005, which was processed as a PUD amendment, not a variance, but stated that the City Council had approved it. She explained that this application wants to essentially do the same thing and enclose the existing deck that was situated similarly to the deck being discussed in this application.

Commissioner Schwalbe asked if they were adding onto the deck to make this happen.

Ms. Johnson explained that they would be adding about 1-1.5 feet to the existing deck and stated that the drawings were a bit misleading in making the space being added look larger than it was.

Commissioner Schwalbe asked how close it would be to the pond and stated that this was a tight neighborhood.

Ms. Johnson stated that she believed that it would be between 50 and 60 feet to the pond.

Chair Cameron noted that what he was looking at says 27.3 feet to the property line, but he wasn't sure if that was the water. He noted that there was also a notation for 32.2 feet, which appeared to be on the back of the structure.

Ms. Johnson stated that she was looking at the wrong notation and clarified that to the proposed addition, it would be 27.3 feet and 32.2, but noted that the existing survey did not show what the distance was to the deck itself.

Mr. Sharpe stated that based on his estimates comparing the proposed survey and the existing conditions survey that he estimated the porch would extend up to 3 feet closer to the property line.

Commissioner Schwalbe asked if it would be a two-story addition.

1
2 Ms. Johnson explained that it was currently an elevated deck and would be an elevated addition,
3 and clarified that there would be nothing above it. She stated that there was a patio on the lower
4 level and an elevated deck above it, and the proposal would be to replace the deck with a 4-season
5 addition, and the patio would remain.

6
7 Mr. Sharpe clarified that the ground floor would be fully enclosed as a 4 season room.

8
9 Commissioner Severson referenced the existing versus the proposed and asked if putting on a roof
10 meant that you lost some impervious surface. She explained that she was just trying to figure out
11 where the differences were in the percentages for lot coverage and impervious surface from the
12 existing to the proposed.

13
14 Mr. Sharpe explained that the primary difference was that right now, the deck was not considered
15 an impervious surface, so water can flow through it. He stated that secondarily, it was getting
16 larger as the angles of the deck are squared off, so there ended up being additional square footage.
17 He stated that overall, it appears to be close to 1.5 to 3 feet further out and noted that all of these
18 things add up to the increase that was reflected in the staff report.

19
20 Chair Cameron asked when this was zoned R-4.

21
22 Ms. Johnson stated that the research they did showed that it was constructed in the 1990s.

23
24 Chair Cameron stated that at some point, it was rezoned to R-4 after it was constructed.

25
26 Mr. Sharpe explained that he was not confident it had been rezoned because it was a PUD, but
27 stated that it was possible that the impervious surface coverages were not in place when this was
28 initially adopted.

29
30 Commissioner Elg stated that he thought that it had been pointed out in the staff notes that the
31 impervious surface coverage amounts were not in place at that time.

32
33 Mr. Sharpe stated that he did not believe this property had been rezoned, but believed that the
34 impervious surface coverages, particularly with the shoreland, were adopted at a later date, after
35 the PUD had been adopted.

36
37 Chair Cameron asked if the City had created a non-compliance state for these homeowners.

38
39 Commissioner Ankeny stated that they were grandfathered in.

40
41 Mr. Sharpe stated that they became a legal non-conformity during that process and stated that to
42 answer his question about the City, they had done this, but they were required to pass the shoreland
43 overlay requirements by the DNR. He noted that the City was not able to choose what those
44 requirements would be at the time they were adopted.

45

1 Commissioner Schwalbe stated that she understood this plan had gone to their HOA and asked if
2 the Commission could assume that the neighbors were okay with what they were proposing.

3
4 Mr. Sharpe stated that was where there was a discrepancy and where the City became involved in
5 upholding association requirements. He stated that he met with members of the HOA this
6 afternoon, who informed the City that this proposed development had not been reviewed by the
7 association. He explained that this was why cities do not enforce what an association regulates
8 and what they do not. He stated that an HOA can have its private regulations that were above and
9 beyond the City, but the City was not in charge of the HOA's enforcement or its mechanisms. He
10 suggested that the Commission ask the applicant this question about whether the HOA had
11 reviewed this item or not.

12
13 Chair Cameron asked for an explanation of the Stormwater Facilities Maintenance Agreement.

14
15 Mr. Sharpe explained that they are fairly standard, albeit time-consuming, agreements. He
16 explained that they were time-consuming because staff needed to maintain them in perpetuity and
17 stated that they essentially set up an agreement with the property owner that was recorded against
18 the subject property, regardless of ownership. He stated that the agreement lives with the land and
19 ensures that the stormwater feature that was installed to mitigate the negative impacts from the
20 additional stormwater is still functioning in 5 -50 years. He stated that these types of agreements
21 are less common for single-family and duplex lots and more common in the City's commercial
22 zones.

23
24 Commissioner Elg asked how many units there were in this development.

25
26 Mr. Sharpe stated that he believed there were 22 around the pond and additional homes around the
27 lake. He explained that there were two phases of the Waycliffe development, which appear to
28 have been on the west side and the east side.

29
30 Commissioner Elg stated that there was already one home that had done this, and if this was
31 approved, there would be two in the neighborhood, and asked if that meant that eventually every
32 unit could also do the same thing and potentially create stormwater control issues that may be
33 difficult to mitigate.

34
35 Mr. Sharpe stated that was an item that the City had promised the individuals he met with earlier
36 today that the City Engineer would review and be able to respond to and noted that the Assistant
37 City Engineer's review found that, with the Stormwater Maintenance Agreements, and the
38 requirement that they be recorded against the property in perpetuity, their intent would be to offset
39 the treatment of this area. He explained that everyone around the pond could do this while still
40 maintaining the overall function of the stormwater system, as long as they had their private systems
41 that were essentially over and above the original design of the system.

42
43 John Krantz, 323 Waycliffe Drive N, stated that he brought some photographs and explained that
44 there have been a lot of porches that have been enclosed either on just the top or both the top and
45 bottom through this area, and it wasn't just the one that they had referenced. He stated that they
46 had complied with the HOA requirements and explained that in their bylaws, it says that they

1 needed to get signatures from the neighbors on each side of them and had also submitted plans to
2 the HOA management company in June of 2024.

3
4 Commissioner Elg asked if the HOA management company had taken this to the HOA Board and
5 if the HOA Board had taken any action.

6
7 Mr. Krantz stated that he did not know and explained that, according to their bylaws, that was not
8 part of the process.

9
10 Commissioner Elg stated that he had lived in an association neighborhood for 18 years and felt it
11 was Mr. Krantz's responsibility to know what the association said regarding his development
12 because he was part of the community.

13
14 Mr. Krantz stated that he did know and explained that they had replied that it was approved.

15
16 Commissioner Schwalbe asked if the HOA had any concerns or qualifications that they brought to
17 Mr. Krantz.

18
19 Mr. Krantz stated they had not expressed any concerns and had approved it as it was being
20 presented today.

21
22 Commissioner Schwalbe stated that Wayzata was a small City that was rapidly growing and knew
23 that there were concerns about the lot coverage and impervious surface, but noted that it seemed
24 like the City had gotten more strict on that over the years. She stated that they were a small
25 community that was very close to the best lake in the area and explained that she had some
26 concerns. She noted that this was a very tight neighborhood and she felt that they could only be
27 so tight and asked if making small changes to many different properties was a concern for the City,
28 as a whole.

29
30 Mr. Sharpe stated that small cumulative effects are an item of concern, but when they are fed into
31 private stormwater systems, such as this one, that mitigates some of the City's concerns. He stated
32 that, eventually, it comes down to the higher-level policy direction from the Planning Commission
33 and the City Council in terms of how to start reviewing the cumulative impacts rather than the
34 small impacts of a single property. He stated that he had spoken with the Assistant City Engineer
35 about this topic. He noted that typically the primary concern was to ensure that these systems
36 function now and into perpetuity rather than as a cumulative effect, as a whole. He explained that
37 because these systems treat the stormwater effectively, they are of less concern than if they were
38 not maintained. He then stated that during the building permit process the applicant provided
39 evidence of the association's approval of the project. He clarified that the City does not check into
40 the voracity of these and did not determine if these were official association documents or not, but
41 wanted to mention the documents since this was mentioned by Commissioner Elg, but stressed
42 that this was not a matter for the Planning Commission or City Council to weigh in on the private
43 matters of the association. He further stated that the City is not responsible for, nor does it enforce
44 private association rules and regulations.

1 There being no additional questions from the Commission for the applicant, Chair Cameron
2 opened the public hearing on the application at 7:00 pm.

3
4 Mr. Sharpe stated that there were no people who called in to the meeting that have asked to speak
5 at the public hearing.

6
7 There being no one wishing to comment on the application, Chair Cameron closed the public
8 hearing at 7:00 pm.

9
10 Chair Cameron asked the Commission to share their questions and feedback on the application.

11
12 Commissioner Severson stated that if this were a 'known' thing, she asked why they wouldn't
13 come back and ask for a PUD amendment to do this.

14
15 Ms. Johnson stated that she believed that was the goal of the development agreement change a few
16 years ago, because they did not want to come back every time they amended the PUD development
17 for small additions, such as this one. She explained that they chose to take that parameter out of
18 the development agreement, so anything that comes forward for things like additions or impervious
19 surface variances, will be treated as variances rather than a PUD amendment. She noted that she
20 did not think this would be something that they would amend a PUD development agreement for
21 because they had just amended it a few years ago to take that language out.

22
23 Chair Cameron stated that it sounded like many of these properties already were not conforming.

24
25 Ms. Johnson stated that because this was developed so long ago, it essentially had evolved into a
26 legal non-conforming situation for many of the buildings and properties, and noted that it was
27 fairly common in this neighborhood for the impervious surface coverage of lot coverage amounts
28 that were over the City requirements.

29
30 Commissioner VanLoy stated that he drove through the neighborhood and found it was very
31 difficult to see the back of the buildings, but noted that typically for these types of developments
32 the purchaser would have a list of things that could be added and wondered if some of these 3
33 season porches referenced by the applicant, weren't options that were provided at the time these
34 were built, since there was only one request to add one afterwards. He stated that there appeared
35 to be a disconnect between what the applicant had indicated was already in the neighborhood.

36
37 Mr. Sharpe stated that the City did not know whether that was an original option on these units.

38
39 A gentleman from the audience asked to address the Commission.

40
41 Chair Cameron asked him to step to the microphone and introduce himself.

42
43 John Zuber, Satin Touch Construction, explained that he was the designer for this project, and
44 before he started, he walked about the neighborhood. He stated that many of the enclosed porches
45 appear to have been done at the time of their original construction.

46

1 Commissioner Severson stated that she would have liked to see this be the same footprint as the
2 existing deck.

3
4 Commissioner VanLoy stated that, from his standpoint, he felt it was generally the same size and
5 would not look out of place. He noted that as long as the stormwater was taken care of, he felt this
6 was a reasonable request.

7
8 Commissioner Elg stated that he did not see an inconsistency with the Comprehensive Plan and
9 saw this request as neutral. He stated that he felt the plans were beautiful, which may make it a
10 positive, and felt the variance request was reasonable and would not alter the character of the
11 neighborhood.

12
13 Commissioner Plantan stated that she was also in favor of this application and felt that it added to
14 the character and livability of the neighborhood.

15
16 Commissioner Ankeny stated that she was also in favor of recommending approval of this variance
17 request.

18
19 Commissioner Schwalbe stated that she agreed with the comments, even though she was a bit
20 reluctant.

21
22 Chair Cameron stated that he agreed with the comments already shared by the Commission.

23
24 Commissioner Schwalbe suggested that they add a condition that this would be subject to the
25 applicant being vigilant about the Stormwater Facilities Agreement with the City, which was
26 mentioned in the staff report by the City Engineer.

27
28 Mr. Sharpe explained that for projects like this, that would be a standard condition of approval.
29 He noted that if the Commission wanted to recommend it, it would not hurt the motion to have it
30 added as a recommended condition from the Commission.

31
32 There being no further discussion, Chair Cameron asked for a motion on the application.

33
34 Commissioner Schwalbe made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Elg, to direct staff to prepare
35 a draft Planning Commission Report and Recommendation with appropriate findings reflecting a
36 recommendation of approval for 323 Waycliffe North Building Coverage and Impervious Surface
37 Variance for review and adoption at the next Planning Commission meeting, subject to the
38 applicants diligent observation of the Stormwater Facilities Agreement with the City of Wayzata.

39
40 City Attorney Schelzel stated that he appreciated the sentiments of Commission Schwalbe, but he
41 would recommend that the applicant enter into that agreement, and staff can simply note the
42 Commission's admonition to the applicant. He noted that he did not believe the motion language
43 needed to include additional language, but that it could include the condition that a stormwater
44 maintenance agreement be added to the report and recommendation.

45
46 The motion carried unanimously.

1
2 Commissioner Elg explained that he would recuse himself from discussion of the next item
3 because he was the applicant for the next agenda item.
4

5 **b) 1407 Holdridge Lane Fence Variance**
6

7 Mr. Sharpe gave an overview of the fence variance request for 1407 Holdridge Lane. He reviewed
8 the project location, guiding and land use, zoning, existing conditions, and details of the proposed
9 fence location. He highlighted some of the rationale given through the applicant's narrative that
10 was submitted with the application. He noted that the Engineering Department had no comments
11 on this proposal and that the City had received 2 public comments as of May 5, 2025, that were in
12 favor of the project, which had been left at the dais.
13

14 Commissioner Schwalbe noted that the fence looks like it was actually on the side of the home and
15 not the front.
16

17 Mr. Sharpe stated that when fences are adjacent to a roadway, they are considered a 'front' within
18 the City's code.
19

20 Commissioner Severson asked if that meant that the current fence was non-conforming.
21

22 Mr. Sharpe stated that it was an interesting nuance that he had to discuss with their planning
23 consultant. He explained that when it was technically within the full rear of the home, and because
24 of its height being significantly above, it was likely that it was deemed sufficient at the time, but
25 felt it was a worthy nuance for the Commission to note.
26

27 Commissioner Schwalbe asked if the view from the frontage road would be that a good deal of the
28 fencing would be behind the row of trees.
29

30 Mr. Sharpe stated that, according to the survey, the answer would be 'yes'.
31

32 Adam Elg, 1407 Holdridge Lane, stated that when he received his permit for the northeast fence,
33 he was told that from the back north corner of the home to the front north corner was considered
34 the side yard and could be 4 feet tall and 100% opaque. He stated that they also told him that from
35 the front corner to the front property line was considered front yard and could only be, at the time,
36 50% opaque and 4 feet tall. He stated that it was a bit different, but wasn't sure if it had something
37 to do with the street or if it was just two different interpretations. He stated that he felt the pictures
38 that were submitted spoke for themselves and explained that this request has been a long time
39 coming because the view is atrocious, and they also have very bad northwest winds during the
40 winter and summer months. He stated that they were hopeful that if the fencing variance was
41 approved that they would also see a bit of reduction in the winds on their property. He stated that
42 there was a row of evergreens and a row of lilacs that face Highway 12 and Wayzata Boulevard
43 that will block the fence. He stated that he felt the only people who would be able to see the fence
44 would be themselves and anyone driving down Holdridge Lane. He explained that they wanted to
45 do something a bit different with the design by doing horizontal cedar, which was more in line
46 with mid-century modern architecture and landscape design. He explained that he has also planned

1 on installing shrubbery and flowering areas in front of the fence because they wanted to attract
2 more bees and pollinating insects.

3
4 Commissioner Schwalbe asked if some parts of the fence would be horizontal and others vertical.

5
6 Mr. Elg acknowledged that the existing fencing would remain the same, but explained that they
7 would never see the two kinds of fencing together.

8
9 Commissioner Schwalbe asked if the dealership kept their lights on all night long.

10
11 Mr. Elg stated that they do keep the lights on all night long, which was why they had installed
12 thick blinds on their bedroom windows.

13
14 Chair Cameron asked about the property line to the retaining wall and asked if there was a
15 significant easement located behind the fence.

16
17 Mr. Elg stated that it was about 20 feet, but wasn't sure it was an easement. He explained that the
18 City used to mow one strip with their riding mower up against the wall, but they stopped doing
19 that after they had moved in. He stated that they were fine with that because they liked the wild
20 flowers and things that grow back there.

21
22 There being no questions from the Commission for the applicant, Chair Cameron opened the public
23 hearing on the application at 7:28 pm.

24
25 Mr. Sharpe stated that there were no people who called in to the meeting that have asked to speak
26 at the public hearing.

27
28 Chair Cameron noted that the Commission had received copies of the 2 public comments that were
29 submitted, which were both in favor of this request.

30
31 There being no one wishing to comment on the application, Chair Cameron closed the public
32 hearing at 7:28 pm.

33
34 Chair Cameron asked the Commission to share their questions and feedback on the application.

35
36 Commissioner Ankeny stated that she felt the request was reasonable.

37
38 Commissioner Severson stated that she agreed and did not think anyone would be able to see the
39 fence.

40
41 There being no further discussion, Chair Cameron asked for a motion on the application.

42
43 Commissioner VanLoy made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Ankeny, to direct staff to
44 prepare a draft Planning Commission Report and Recommendation with appropriate findings
45 reflecting a recommendation of approval for 1407 Holdridge Lane Fence Variance for review and
46 adoption at the next Planning Commission meeting.

1
2 The motion carried unanimously.

3
4 Commissioner Elg rejoined the Commissioner at the dais.

5
6 **AGENDA ITEM 7. Other Items:**

7
8 **a) Review of Development Activities**

9
10 Mr. Sharpe stated that 150 Broadway Avenue was under construction and explained that a portion
11 of the roadway had been blocked off because they were digging out foundations. He stated that
12 this was for a ground-floor office with upstairs residential use. He stated that 641 Lake Street had
13 received the demolition and other various permits, so the City can expect to see that work begin.

14
15 Chair Cameron asked if Xcel had withdrawn their application.

16
17 Mr. Sharpe confirmed that Xcel had withdrawn their application for the monopole but noted that
18 they intend to resubmit it sometime in the future with materials that were meant to address some
19 of the concerns raised by the Commission and the public with their initial application.

20
21 Commissioner Schwalbe stated that demolition was beginning on Lake Street and noted that she
22 felt it was unfortunate that the City would be losing the 'Love Local' mural that was done by a
23 charming young woman just a few years ago.

24
25 Mr. Sharpe stated that the mural was briefly discussed at the Art Steering Committee, but they
26 were unsure how the mural may be able to be retained. He explained that the City had let the
27 applicant know that if there was a way to pay homage to it or replicate it in some way with the
28 new development that the City would encourage that approach.

29
30 **b) Planning Commission Meeting Schedule**

31
32 **AGENDA ITEM 8. Adjournment.**

33
34 There being no further business on the agenda, Chair Cameron asked for a motion to adjourn.

35
36 Commissioner Severson made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Plantan, to adjourn the
37 Planning Commission meeting.

38
39 The motion carried unanimously.

40
41 The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 7:33 p.m.

42
43 Respectfully submitted,
44 Kayla Atkins Rokosz
45 *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*
46