

**WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
JUNE 9, 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: Schwalbe, Severson, Elg, Cameron, VanLoy, and Ankeny. Community Development Director Alex Sharpe, Planner Haily Hedblom, and City Attorney David Schelzel were also present.

Absent at roll call: Commissioner Plantan

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 Ankeny, to approve the June 9, 2025, agenda as presented.

The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 4. Consent Agenda

a.) Approval of the May 5, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

b.) Approval of the May 19, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Chair Cameron read the items on the consent agenda and asked if any Commissioner wished to pull an item for further discussion. He pointed out some minor corrections to the May 5, 2025, and May 19, 2025, meeting minutes.

Chair Cameron asked for a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as amended with the corrections noted.

Commissioner VanLoy made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Ankeny, to approve the Consent Agenda as amended with corrections noted.

The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 5. Old Business Items

AGENDA ITEM 6. Public Hearing Items

a) 1022 and 1042 Wayzata Boulevard East (Lamborghini) – PUD Concept Plan

Community Development Director Sharpe reviewed the proposed PUD Concept Plan for adjacent properties located at 1022 and 1042 Wayzata Boulevard East. He outlined the project location, land use, zoning, existing conditions, and details of the concept plan, and other action steps that would be required in order for the applicant to develop the property for a Lamborghini dealership. He reviewed some of the City engineer's comments and noted that a neighborhood meeting was held on June 2, 2025, with 12 residents in attendance. He stated that the City had received 4 public comments, but three were received after the packet had already been sent out to the Commission.

At the conclusion of Mr. Sharpe's presentation, Chair Cameron asked if there were any questions from the Commission for staff.

Commissioner Schwalbe referenced the slide from Mr. Sharpe's presentation that showed access and asked about the purple 'x', where it was located, and what it was.

Mr. Sharpe explained that the purple 'x' was at an existing access point, just before it closes into the adjacent cul-de-sac. He noted that the diagram in his report was supposed to show that they were intending for that access point to be closed. He stated that there was currently no structure located on this parcel, but that was the access used when one was present.

Commissioner Schwalbe asked how long it had been since there was a structure on this site.

Mr. Sharpe stated that it had been several years and reminded the Commission that the structure on this site had been demolished.

Commissioner Schwalbe asked about the access points on Central Avenue.

Mr. Sharpe pointed out the two access points on Central Avenue.

Commissioner Schwalbe noted the portion of the sidewalk that exists today, the two trees shown on the dry cleaner site, and asked if, when the PUD was put into effect, there had been a requirement for sidewalks.

Mr. Sharpe stated that, to his knowledge, there had not been a PUD in this location, and it was just a straight zoning site. He stated that these parcels are relatively old and explained that it was likely that they had been redeveloped multiple times over the City's lifetime. He noted that a sidewalk was not present for the entire length of the property, which he assumed would not have been required in the past, but would be required today.

1 Commissioner Ankeny asked if there was a sidewalk in front of the building, and if the new
2 development on the corner of Superior and Wayzata Boulevard would have sidewalks.

3
4 Mr. Sharpe explained that there is a section to the north of Mulberry's that lacks a sidewalk and
5 stated that the new development she mentioned would have sidewalks.

6
7 Chair Cameron asked if the City, in the C-3 zoning district, had any other car dealerships.

8
9 Mr. Sharpe stated that the City has at least one other car dealership but would need to look up what
10 it was zoned as and report back to the Commission.

11
12 Commissioner Schwalbe referenced the Huntington right-of-way and asked for details on its width
13 and the parking in the area.

14
15 Mr. Sharpe stated that, to the best of his knowledge, Edina Realty was using both parking areas,
16 even though those areas belonged to the City.

17
18 Commissioner Schwalbe asked if they may be able to share parking with the applicant.

19
20 Mr. Sharpe clarified that he did not know the specifics of the agreements put into place when
21 Edina Realty came along, but that is something staff could look at more closely and could include
22 more information about this in future iterations of the plans, as well as his staff report.

23
24 Commissioner Ankeny asked if the City had a lighting ordinance, and noted that she assumed this
25 applicant would want their property lit for safety reasons, but she would like to know how this
26 would affect the neighborhood.

27
28 Mr. Sharpe confirmed that the City has a lighting ordinance, and explained the information the
29 applicant would be required to submit to the City for review and consideration. He noted that he
30 did not believe that there would be any exterior storage of the vehicles on this site, and the exterior
31 parking areas would be used for customer and employee parking.

32
33 Commissioner Schwalbe asked how staff had made the determination that this proposal would
34 need 41 parking stalls.

35
36 Mr. Sharpe explained that the code did not have a parking requirement for auto dealership
37 inventory, but it does set a requirement for their sales and services areas, as well as for Mulberry's.

38
39 Commissioner Elg asked if parking was allowed on the east side of Huntington.

40
41 Mr. Sharpe stated that because it was located in public right-of-way, he would presume that answer
42 would be 'yes', but there may be specific agreements put into place as part of the Edina Realty
43 situation that he would want to check into more closely. He stated he believed that this site will
44 need to apply for a parking variance, no matter what staff found.

45

1 Commissioner Elg noted that there was not currently a continuous sidewalk from Huntington to
2 Bushaway on the south side of Wayzata Boulevard, but believed that any future projects that come
3 through in those areas would be required to add a sidewalk.

4
5 Mr. Sharpe stated that this approach to sidewalks was a common 'best practice' for cities. He
6 explained that when there are sidewalk gaps, they are identified by the City, and the understanding
7 was that any future development 'shall' provide a sidewalk.

8
9 There being no further questions for staff, Chair Cameron invited the applicant to address the
10 Commission.

11
12 Dan Burnham, 10 Nicholas Way, Hudson, WI, explained that he was with the architect for the
13 project, Gries Architecture. He reviewed renderings and plans for development and changes to
14 the existing Mulberrys building. He noted that currently, north of Mulberrys, there is some
15 landscaping and trees, but no sidewalk, and they are proposing to remove this and put in sidewalks
16 so people can get to the corner crosswalk. He explained that with that design, they would not be
17 able to have a landscape buffer. He noted that they were also planning to put up a decorative fence
18 along the southern property line to prevent headlights from shining into the neighboring properties.
19 He reviewed the general site layout plans, and explained that they were planning to remove the
20 furthest south existing access to Huntington Avenue. He showed plans for the lower level,
21 including the indoor parking areas for vehicles, and confirmed that they would not use any surface
22 parking for their vehicles for overnight usage. He outlined plans for the upper-level showroom,
23 customer lounge, and service bay areas. He reviewed the planned building materials and
24 renderings that showed the overall proposed look of the Lamborghini dealership building and the
25 changes to the Mulberrys building.

26
27 At the conclusion of Mr. Burnham's presentation, Chair Cameron asked if the Commission had any
28 questions for the Applicant.

29
30 Commissioner VanLoy asked about vehicle deliveries and how they would take place on this site.

31
32 Mr. Burnham stated that he assumed they would come in and park parallel to Wayzata Boulevard,
33 unload the vehicles, and then leave via Wayzata Boulevard, but noted that he had not run turning
34 radius calculations yet.

35
36 Commissioner VanLoy referenced parts, which was going to be located on the lower level, and
37 asked if those deliveries would allow someone access to the site off of Central.

38
39 Mr. Burnham stated that was correct.

40
41 Commissioner VanLoy noted that there would be 5 service bays, and asked if they had thought
42 about a situation where they needed to clear a bay and how that would take place.

43
44 Mr. Burnham stated that he assumed they would handle this through scheduling, and noted that
45 this would not be like a Toyota dealership where they would be servicing multiple vehicles at the
46 same time. He noted that there would be options for where they could move the vehicles, if needed.

1
2 Commissioner VanLoy noted that this was a very tight spot, and explained that he was concerned
3 about the nearby residents with potential engine noise sounds from sports cars that may be serviced
4 there.

5
6 Mr. Burnham stated that he assumed that when the vehicles were done being serviced, they would
7 be pulled around to the area along Huntington, but acknowledged that they could not necessarily
8 control a customer who wanted to rev their vehicle.

9
10 Commissioner Elg asked if the other Walser Group representatives would be able to answer some
11 of the Commission's questions, and explained that he did not like that their architect was simply
12 speculating on operational matters. He asked if Walser owned this entire property and why it was
13 paramount to leave the existing dry cleaner on the site.

14
15 Don Schilling, Walser Automotive Group, stated that they do own the entire property and stated
16 that part of the purchase agreement for the property allowed the dry cleaner to remain on the
17 property as a tenant for a drop-off and pick-up site.

18
19 Commissioner Severson asked how long the terms of the purchase agreement would last.

20
21 Mr. Schilling explained that it would be in place for 10 years.

22
23 Commissioner Severson asked why they wanted to put the Lamborghini dealership in this location,
24 and explained that she had looked at other locations across the United States and did not find any
25 others that were placed in the middle of a residential area in a city. She referenced other local auto
26 parks in the area, and asked why they felt this would be the ideal location for the dealership.

27
28 Mr. Schilling explained that when the manufacturer determines that there should be better
29 representation for their product in a market, they put out an RFP. He stated that the manufacturer
30 defined the market and where they wanted the building to be located, and then Walser started
31 looking for properties in that vicinity. He noted that they had shown Lamborghini 3 properties in
32 the area, and this was the one they chose.

33
34 Commissioner Ankeny asked what would happen if this were approved by the City, but the
35 Lamborghini dealership turned out not to be sustainable, and if it could be switched to something
36 like Walser Ford.

37
38 Mr. Sharpe answered that the land use approvals would run with the land and not with a particular
39 land use, but conditions could be put in for things specific to the site, for example, the number of
40 vehicles on site and the access points, that would remain in place, but the actual user could change
41 to a different car brand.

42
43 Commissioner Ankeny asked if, no matter what, there would be no parking allowed outside.

44
45 Mr. Sharpe acknowledged that it could be one of the PUD conditions that the City puts in place.
46

1 Chair Cameron asked about the location of the parking spots for the dry cleaner.

2
3 Kate Cohen of Walser Automotive Group, stated that the dry cleaner parking was the 3 stalls in
4 front, to the left of the building. She explained that they anticipate the majority of the vehicles
5 would be delivered to the site on a flat bed, and most of the owners in the area preferred to have
6 this type of concierge service.

7
8 Commissioner Schwalbe asked where the truck that would unload the new vehicles at the
9 dealership would park to unload.

10
11 Chair Camerson explained that Commission VanLoy had already asked this question, and the
12 applicant had told them they would park parallel to Wayzata Boulevard.

13
14 Mr. Schilling noted that these vehicles would not be coming to them on a traditional transport truck
15 and would come to them as they get built, which would typically be one at a time.

16
17 Commissioner Severson asked about used cars that customers may trade in.

18
19 Mr. Schilling explained that they were not facilitating a used car department for this dealership but
20 explained that he would have to check with the owners regarding trade ins. He stated that they
21 may be sent to one of their other lots for liquidation, but he was not sure.

22
23 Commission Severson asked the applicant to give the Commission an idea of the busyness and
24 activity level at the dealership on a day-to-day basis.

25
26 Katie Cohen stated that they are anticipating having about 10 employees at their peak, and
27 explained that this operation would primarily be a boutique, which means customers would need
28 an appointment. She stated that because this is an ordered vehicle, they will not have vehicles in
29 the inventory lower level that someone could pick up on the same day. She noted that they have
30 an ordering center on site where people can choose their materials with the expectation of a 12-18
31 month delivery window. She stated that she was not aware that they were planning to have any
32 test drives for the vehicles at this location.

33
34 Commissioner Elg stated that the renderings showed 4 vehicles located in the showroom.

35
36 Katie Cohen explained that her understanding of those vehicles was for people to be able to see
37 the finishes that could be achieved for the different vehicle models.

38
39 There being no additional questions from the Commission for the applicant, Chair Cameron
40 opened the public hearing on the application at 7:25 pm.

41
42 Kimberly Walsh, 495 Highcroft Road, stated that she did not feel this property was a practical use
43 of space in the City. She explained that she did not see Wayzata residents using a Lamborghini
44 dealership, and felt it was also a potentially slippery slope for the City to have a car dealership on
45 the main street within their small village. She stated that opening the City up for car dealerships
46 in this area would not be picturesque. She noted that what they heard from the applicant's

1 presentation was that this was not being done to serve a local need but was done because
2 Lamborghini was looking for an ideal location, which was not a Wayzata-focused decision.
3

4 Gordy Straka, 130 Huntington Avenue, stated that his property abuts the back of the property, and
5 noted that he had lived there for 57 years. He stated that he felt this current proposal was a big
6 step up from the last one, which wanted to put in a Caribou Coffee drive-thru. He noted that the
7 Walsers have worked well with the neighborhood, and some of their questions were related to
8 lighting and fencing, which would be up to the City. He stated that this property is commercial,
9 so he wasn't sure how the City could defer it for something else. He stated that, as a neighborhood,
10 they have met with Walser numerous times, who has shown that they want to work with the
11 neighborhood. He stated that if customers need an appointment to come to the site, there would
12 not be a high volume of traffic associated with the business. He stated that the neighbors that have
13 met with Walser felt that this proposal was something they could work with since it was going to
14 be so low volume.
15

16 Jason McClain, 141 Wooddale, stated that he lives about 500 feet from this property and would
17 be able to see the dealership from his home. He stated that he has spoken with his neighbors, and
18 none of them want this here. He noted that he believed it would be a nuisance and would be loud,
19 and believed the question raised by Commissioner VanLoy was spot on about the possibility of
20 people who just bought an expensive car from revving their engine as soon as they get it. He stated
21 that they built their home ten years ago and asked the City for one variance, which was not
22 approved, and this project has quite a long list of variances that would be needed and were expected
23 to come forward. He stated that building code rules and regulations were in place because of what
24 they want the community to look like, and asked the Commission to keep that in mind.
25

26 Greg Hoglund, 120 Chevy Chase Drive, stated that he and his wife own the multi-family building
27 to the south of the proposed property. He stated that there have been several neighborhood
28 meetings over the last 6 months, and the adjacent neighbors are the most in favor of this proposal.
29 He noted that this site has been an eyesore for at least 10 years and part of the issue is that there is
30 water that flows through their property down into the backyards of everyone on Central, and one
31 positive of getting development on this property would be that they will restrict the water that is
32 running through the yards downstream. He stated that Lamborghinis are sold in a different fashion
33 than the car dealers that are located along 394, and noted that, as a concierge service, he was told
34 that they sell 50 cars per year. He stated that they were willing to work with the applicant, and felt
35 that this would be an asset to the community and would not reduce property values.
36

37 Mr. Sharpe stated that there were no people who called in to the meeting that have asked to speak
38 at the public hearing.
39

40 There being no one else wishing to comment on the application, Chair Cameron closed the public
41 hearing at 7:35 pm.
42

43 Chair Cameron asked the Commission to share their questions and feedback on the application.
44

45 Commissioner Elg stated that he assumed that there was a business plan for this business, and Mr.
46 Hoglund had alluded to this site selling 50 vehicles per year. He asked if that was an average

1 among dealerships across the country. He noted that Wayzata was not the same as Los Angeles
2 or New York, and asked what they planned for sales volume at this specific location.

3
4 Katie Cohen stated that they would be happy to go back to ownership and find out that information
5 for the Commission.

6
7 Commissioner VanLoy stated that the initial drawings that have been presented show a very stark
8 view from the street, which included no landscape buffers or trees, and asked if that was intentional
9 or if they have not yet put together the overall landscape plans.

10
11 Mr. Burnham answered that they have not put together the landscape plans at this point in the
12 process, and what they had shown was purely conceptual. He stated that if they could proceed to
13 the next round, they would come back with many more drawings that included landscape plans
14 and stormwater calculations.

15
16 Commissioner Schwalbe stated that she has seen previous proposals for this site and believed this
17 one was the most unique, interesting, creative, and innovative idea on how to use the site. She
18 noted that it was unusual to have the neighbors who are very nearby to be in favor of this proposal.
19 She stated that there were things that will need to be worked on, and agreed with Commissioner
20 VanLoy that there needs to be some greenery and sidewalks so it looks inviting and not so stark.
21 She stated that they are proposing a modern building, which she didn't mind, but it needed to be
22 softened a bit.

23
24 Commissioner VanLoy stated that he was concerned about lighting and noted the recent request
25 the Commission reviewed related to a fence to limit the amount of lights that could be seen from
26 the dealerships along 394. He asked if there would be a way to protect the nearby property owners
27 from the lighting. He stated that while this was just a concept plan, he was concerned about the
28 number of boxes that they were not able to check and felt a bit like this was trying to be shoehorned
29 into the space.

30
31 Commissioner Elg stated that he agreed with the comments shared by Commissioner Schwalbe
32 that this was a creative use of the property, and felt that this concept was a unique opportunity for
33 the City to have a Lamborghini dealership and was excited to see this move forward.

34
35 Commissioner Ankeny referenced the question related to whether this created a development
36 pattern in harmony with the objectives of the Wayzata Comprehensive Plan, which was supposed
37 to be charming. She stated that she was not sure that there needed to be a car dealership in
38 downtown Wayzata.

39
40 Commissioner Schwalbe stated that she felt that Lake Street comes up for her when she thinks of
41 charming and walkable. She stated that this is Wayzata Boulevard and is a business district, so
42 there will be a business located there.

43
44 Commissioner Severson stated that she agreed with Commissioners Elg and Schwalbe that this
45 was very innovative and a creative use of the land. She explained that where she was getting hung
46 up was that she wrote down the phrase, 'so many variances'. She stated that it felt a bit more

1 palatable to her to approve variances when there is an odd-shaped lot or other things at play, but
2 this would be a brand-new building. She explained that the other thing she came back to was that
3 the applicants made a lot of assumptions about how things would be handled operationally and
4 about the amount of sales in this location. She stated that it would have been nice for the
5 Commission to have heard from Lamborghini or someone who had more direct experience on how
6 this business would run on a day-to-day basis. She stated that she appreciated the representatives
7 who were present tonight, but she still had a lot of questions about how this space would operate
8 with this business. She stated that she did not oppose having the Lamborghini name in Wayzata,
9 but also did not love it. She noted that there were a lot of other spaces where they have luxury
10 brand car dealerships in the area, and felt it may be better for this to be located closer to those
11 areas. She explained that she still had too many concerns about the project for her to be
12 comfortable with what was being proposed today.

13
14 Chair Cameron stated that he liked what the applicant had done and agreed that it was innovative,
15 and noted that this is a tough spot to put something in. He stated that what they were looking at
16 today was a concept plan, which is essentially something scratched out on the back of a napkin
17 rather than all the details. He stated that conceptually, he liked what was being proposed, but
18 would agree that they will have some challenges, but that was not under the purview of the concept
19 plan. He stated that the neighbors who spoke tonight about Walser working with them were
20 positive and explained that he would support the concept plan being able to move forward, even
21 though there were still a lot of details that needed to be ironed out.

22
23 Mr. Sharpe stated that the Commission had asked a few questions throughout their discussion, and
24 explained that he could address some of them at this time. He stated that the first question was
25 related to the zoning district and explained that it appeared that there was a single parcel in a C-3
26 district that was a dealership, but clarified that he was not sure which dealership it was.

27
28 City Attorney Schelzel said he believed that this parcel was the Lexus dealership.

29
30 Mr. Sharpe referenced the building plans submitted by the applicant, and noted that staff had not
31 determined that there were 16 stalls in the lower level because of a parking stall in front of the
32 trash enclosure, which would not be permitted, which had been noted within the staff report. He
33 stated that the applicant can amend their application as they move forward from the concept plan
34 after hearing concerns raised by the public and the Commission. He reminded the Commission
35 that an approval of a concept plan did not bind the Commission or Council to future approvals or
36 future iterations of the plan.

37
38 Commissioner Severson asked what specific concept they were being asked to consider.

39
40 Mr. Sharpe explained that the PUD concept plan was considered a preliminary stage application,
41 before the more detailed plans came into the City. He stated that they do need to identify what
42 those future items would be under this proposal for the Commission to decide on the 30,000-foot
43 view. He stated that what the Commission was acting on tonight was essentially the proposal of
44 the type of land use, identifying where they had concerns, and identifying items that they felt
45 functioned well.

1 Mr. Schelzel stated that the specific concept the Commission was being asked to consider was
2 what was presented tonight and noted that the concept, as it stands today, would require the
3 variances and deviations that staff pointed out. He stated that between the PUD concept stage and
4 the general plan stage, assuming the applicant received concept plan approval from the City, they
5 could refine their plans which may eliminate the need for some of the variances and deviation
6 noted by staff.

7
8 Commissioner Severson explained that she was having a hard time separating the full application
9 and the concept of the application.

10
11 Mr. Schelzel stated that the concept that the Commission was weighing in on requires all the other
12 things right now, which means the applicant was either going to have to come back and get
13 approval of those things or will have to modify their concept to eliminate the need for those things.
14 He stated that if Commissioner Severson was of the mindset that this was a concept that she could
15 never get behind because all those things would be required, then she could vote accordingly. He
16 stated that they could also approve with conditions that certain things be addressed or modified in
17 the general plan, or approve the concept plan with commentary, but noted that those comments
18 already made would be available within the minutes of this meeting.

19
20 There being no further discussion, Chair Cameron asked for a motion on the application.

21
22 Commissioner Elg made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Schwalbe, to direct staff to prepare
23 a draft Planning Commission Report and Recommendation with appropriate findings reflecting a
24 recommendation of approval for 1022 and 1042 Wayzata Boulevard East (Lamborghini) – PUD
25 Concept Plan for review and adoption at the next Planning Commission meeting.

26
27 Upon a roll call vote, the motion carried 4 ayes, 2 nays (Ankeny and Severson).

28
29 **AGENDA ITEM 7. Other Items:**

30
31 **a) Review of Development Activities**

32
33 Mr. Sharpe stated that staff was still working on the 641 plan for providing a pedestrian walkway
34 in the area. He introduced the City's new Planner, Haily Hedblom, and shared some of her
35 background and experience.

36
37 **b) Planning Commission Meeting Schedule**

38
39 Mr. Sharpe stated that their next meeting would be on June 16, 2025.

40
41 **AGENDA ITEM 8. Adjournment.**

42
43 There being no further business on the agenda, Chair Cameron asked for a motion to adjourn.

44
45 Commissioner Severson made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Elg, to adjourn the Planning
46 Commission meeting.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

The motion carried unanimously.

The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 7:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kayla Atkins Rokosz

TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.