

**WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION
APPROVED MEETING MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 8, 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: Elg, Cameron, VanLoy, and Ankeny. Community Development Director Alex Sharpe and City Attorney David Schelzel were also present.

Absent at roll call were Commissioners: Plantan, Schwalbe, and Severson.

AGENDA ITEM 3. Approval of Agenda

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

Commissioner Elg made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Ankeny, to approve the September 8, 2025, agenda as presented.

The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 4. Consent Agenda

- a.) Adopt the August 18, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
- b.) Adopt Planning Commission Report and Recommendation for Approval of Shoreland Setback Variance at 547 Harrington Road
- c.) Recommend Approval of Preliminary Single-Family House Plans for 1400 Holdridge Lane

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

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

1 The motion carried unanimously.

2
3 **AGENDA ITEM 5. Old Business Items**

4
5 **AGENDA ITEM 6. Public Hearing Items**

6
7 **a) Consider Development Application for Two Conditional Use Permits (CUP) for**
8 **Xcel Energy at 701 Central Avenue N.**
9

10 Community Development Director Sharpe gave an overview of the request for two CUPs for Xcel
11 Energy related to the installation of a new 123-foot monopole communication device at Xcel's
12 Gleason Lake Substation at 701 Central Avenue North. He reviewed the project location,
13 surrounding neighborhood, guidance, land use, and zoning for the parcel, photographs, and
14 description of the existing conditions of the site, site plans, reasons that the CUPs were required
15 with this application, proposed structure height details, and coverage area with the proposed pole
16 height. He noted that the City did receive some public comments in advance on this application
17 and that they had been placed on the dais for the Commission and had been included in the official
18 public record. He stated that those comments either expressed significant concern about the
19 monopole or supported denial of the application.
20

21 At the conclusion of Mr. Sharpe's presentation, Chair Cameron asked if the Commission had any
22 questions for Staff. There being no questions, Chair Cameron invited the applicant to address the
23 Commission.
24

25 George Wojcicki, Xcel's representative, 414 Nicollet Avenue, Minneapolis, introduced a few of
26 his colleagues who were also present, including: Michelle Swanson, Community Relations
27 Manager for this portion of the metro area; Joe Zanotti, Project Manager for the PLTE project; and
28 Wendell Rymer, Program Director for the entire PLTE program. Mr. Wojcicki outlined the
29 differences between the current application and Xcel's previous application, and explained that
30 after the feedback they received from the City, they went back and re-engineered things for a
31 slightly smaller monopole that would still fully cover the west metro area. He gave a brief
32 presentation explaining their desire to build a 123-foot-tall monopole to propagate a private, long-
33 term evolution network (PLTE) that will take communications from their smart meters across the
34 State and move them from the public cellular spectrum onto a separate frequency that Xcel has
35 leased for the next 30 years. He shared some background information on PLTE systems, how they
36 can be utilized, and described what he felt would be the benefits for the Wayzata area customers.
37 He briefly reviewed responses from Xcel to the questions raised at the public hearing for their
38 previous application and explained that depictions of the coverage maps with and without the use
39 of the proposed monopole. He displayed photo simulations of what this type of monopole would
40 look like from various vantage points throughout the surrounding area.
41

42 At the conclusion of Mr. Wojcicki presentation, Chair Cameron asked if the Commission had any
43 questions for the Applicant.
44

45 Commissioner VanLoy referenced the depiction of the coverage map that showed locations of
46 other monopoles in the system, and asked if the rest of these had already been built.

1
2 Mr. Wojcicki answered that a number of them were already built, and reviewed which ones were
3 in place and which ones were in the building permit process in other areas.
4

5 Commissioner VanLoy stated that one of his questions is related to the height because it is
6 significantly more than R-3 allows, and also more than the 100-foot pole that was currently there.
7 He asked if the impact had been modeled, if the other ones that haven't been built were taller in
8 order to be able to have better coverage with a shorter pole at Gleason.
9

10 Mr. Wojcicki stated that the general recommendation from their engineers has been 140 feet and
11 noted that they do take into account the foliage and elevation of the sites around it.
12

13 Joe Zanotti, another representative of Xcel Energy, stated that as far as the height goes, they found
14 that 140 feet was desirable for this network and noted that in this scenario, they were able to take
15 the pole down to 123 feet because some of the other poles were approved at 140 feet, so they could
16 adjust their antennas to bleed into some of the Wayzata area.
17

18 Commissioner Ankeny noted that all the others had been approved, and it appeared that only the
19 Gleason Lake would be located in a residential area. She asked if she was correct in saying that
20 all the other locations approved were located in non-residential areas.
21

22 Mr. Wojcicki stated that the Wyoming location was not part of this same network, but it was
23 approved for a residential area and noted that it had a similar characteristic to the Gleason Lake
24 neighborhood.
25

26 Commissioner Ankeny referenced the photo simulations of what the pole would look like in
27 various locations. She asked if the basket shown at the top of the pole had to be included.
28

29 Mr. Wojcicki stated that the basket is the antennas that propagate the network and explained that
30 without it, it would just be a taller lightning rod.
31

32 Commissioner VanLoy asked how big it is and how likely it would be that, over time, that would
33 change.
34

35 Mr. Zanotti explained that the platform the Commission was referring to was about 12 feet long
36 on each side of the triangular array. He noted that they would only have one antenna on each side,
37 where most cell towers have multiple antennas located on each side, and explained that what they
38 are planning would be a much smaller form factor.
39

40 Commissioner VanLoy stated that with their last application, they had a picture that showed what
41 the coverage area looked like at 100 feet and what it looked like at 140 feet. He stated that he
42 understood they were asking for 123 feet for the monopole, but asked what would happen if it
43 were 100 feet instead.
44

45 Mr. Wojcicki stated that as the height increases or decreases, the network coverage would
46 significantly change. He reiterated that their ideal height was 140, but they found that 123 feet

1 was the minimum height they could have to adequately fill in the gaps in the network. He
2 explained that if they went shorter than that height, they would have to build more poles in other
3 locations and noted that with only a 100-foot pole, there would be service gaps in the Wayzata
4 area.

5
6 Commissioner Ankeny asked if Xcel had looked at other options if Wayzata chose to keep their
7 pole height at 100 feet, and they looked at one in Minnetonka at 100 feet.

8
9 Mr. Zanotti stated that, based on the studies done by their architect, they have found that 100 feet
10 just doesn't work in the area. He explained that at that point, they would have to eliminate the
11 location and go outside the area to try to find another location. He stated that they have not found
12 anything in the area that would be adequate.

13
14 Chair Cameron asked how high the pole in Eden Prairie is.

15
16 Mr. Wojcicki stated that the Eden Prairie pole was 140 feet.

17
18 A man spoke from the audience and stated that it was 160 feet.

19
20 Mr. Wojcicki acknowledged that the Eden Prairie pole was 160 feet high.

21
22 Chair Camerson stated that you can see the pole when you head down 494 because it's big and
23 sticks out, which would be one of his concerns, even at 123 feet in height in the City. He stated
24 that his other comment would be that Mr. Wojcicki had stated that they didn't have room at Parkers
25 Lake, but he pulled up the property information. He explained that the Gleason Lake site was 2.14
26 acres, and at Parkers Lake, they had 13.36 acres, and he finds it hard to believe that they could not
27 find room at Parkers Lake.

28
29 Mr. Wojcicki stated that within their substations, it isn't exactly their call, as far as security goes,
30 and explained that these kinds of infrastructure improvements have to be located within their
31 fenced area. He stated that they cannot just place this in another location and described some of
32 the general security requirements. He noted that because of those standards and the existing
33 upgrades that were planned for the Parkers Lake site, they were not able to accommodate this
34 project at the Parkers Lake location.

35
36 Commissioner Elg stated that, given they were already planning renovations and construction at
37 the Parkers Lake site, he felt that Xcel's project there could include expanding the fence and
38 including the security perimeter of the space, given the total land area available in that space. He
39 explained that their response was not really cutting it for him.

40
41 Mr. Wojcicki explained that he was not directly involved in the Parkers Lake project.

42
43 Mr. Zanotti noted that their initial conversations with the engineering teams indicated that their
44 footprint would not be changed. He stated that there was a lot of work that would happen
45 underground and stated that there just was not adequate space for them in the Parkers Lake
46 location.

1
2 Commissioner VanLoy noted that he had brought up this same point the last time Xcel appeared
3 before the Commission, but if this was the best and only place, whether they had considered the
4 shielding they could do to make the pole look like a massive pine tree or something, so there would
5 be less visual impact to the neighborhood.

6
7 Mr. Zanotti stated that they have seen that and noted that shielding was something that they tend
8 to steer away from because it can also harm the signal and create a lot of interference. He stated
9 that the ones that look like a tree do work, but they weren't readily available and were very
10 expensive. He noted that this type of pole was not recommended for cellular use because the
11 shielding can cause interference.

12
13 There being no additional questions from the Commission for the applicant, Chair Cameron
14 opened the public hearing on the application at 7:13 pm.

15
16 Patrick Mandile, 300 Narcissus Lane, noted that he lived in Hawthorne Ponds, explained that he
17 sincerely appreciated everything that Xcel does, and in most instances, felt they did a great job.
18 He stated that in situations like this, he believed it was important for the Commission to understand
19 what was happening. He stated that the reasons given by Xcel for why moving it to Parks Lake
20 cannot be done astounded him. He noted that the location they were proposing in Wayzata was in
21 the middle of a neighborhood with a school just across the street, and it is in the middle of a
22 residential zone. He stated that the amount of industrial space available just down the street seems
23 like an adequate space for Xcel to place this pole, even if they go up to 140 feet to help compensate
24 for the additional ¼ mile move. He explained that he didn't think that Xcel had really given a good
25 reason behind that and felt the Commissioners had also pointed this out. He stated that he thinks
26 the issue of real estate value was important to the discussion and shared the reasons that he felt it
27 was important in this area. He noted that he thinks the proposed location would impact the real
28 estate values in the City of Wayzata and Plymouth, and impact those residents. He stated that one
29 factor that has not been mentioned is the health and safety impact from the construction being
30 placed so close to the people that live there, as well as the children that attend the nearby school.
31 He stated that he would guess that lowering the pole height from 140 feet to 123 feet would just
32 exacerbate the health and safety impact on the people who live in that area. He asked the
33 Commission to consider this and noted that there are many disputed articles about radiofrequency
34 radiation, but it is real. He explained that there have been substantiated documents and studies
35 that address this. He stated that the one thought he wanted to leave with the Commission was one
36 that has haunted him since the last presentation by Xcel. He stated that with lowering the pole, the
37 radiofrequency impact has to be greater. He noted that historically, there have been other products
38 that have been approved and introduced into the marketplace that later were proven to be harmful
39 and stated that he believed this was something that the Commission needed to consider and shared
40 the examples of tobacco, asbestos, lead, formaldehyde, and PFAS. He asked the Commission to
41 be wise about where they allow this pole to be placed.

42
43 Gilles Stassart, 660 Harmony Circle, stated that he would not repeat the story he shared the last
44 time this application was in front of the Commission. He stated that he wanted to echo that they
45 were also very pleased with the service that Xcel Energy has provided them. He noted that the
46 proposal would have a negative effect on the area and echoed the comments shared by Mr. Mandile

1 about the effect this pole would have on property values. He referenced the photo simulations that
2 were shown as part of Xcel's presentation and noted that it would basically be looking at a garden
3 shed on top of the existing pole. He stated that the home in the picture was just sold and noted
4 that if the pole was in place, he believed the home would probably decrease in value by about
5 \$100,000. He stated that he felt there was a big difference between the current pole on the site and
6 the new one that is being proposed by Xcel. He stated that for this application, he sees the positive
7 impact for Xcel Energy, but did not see a positive impact for the City or the residents. He stated
8 that he thinks the potential for loss of property value and the potential visual impacts to the people
9 in just looking at it were more impactful than any potential benefits. He recommended that the
10 Commission not approve this request.

11
12 Mr. Sharpe stated there were no people who called in to the meeting that have asked to speak at
13 the public hearing.

14
15 There being no one else wishing to comment on the application, Chair Cameron closed the public
16 hearing at 7:23 pm.

17
18 Chair Cameron asked the Commission to share their questions and feedback on the application.

19
20 Commissioner VanLoy stated that there would be one 12-foot array going on this pole and asked
21 if they would have the right to do whatever they wanted at the top of the pole, or if they would
22 have to come back if they wanted to add other arrays.

23
24 Mr. Sharpe stated that it would depend on the nature of approval conditions and noted that
25 conditions could be added that would require future Commission review, which would limit the
26 number of facilities that could be added.

27
28 Commissioner VanLoy stated that Parkers Lake has a ton of room and noted that the current
29 fenced-in area was not all the way to the edge of the property. He explained that his inclination is
30 that there may be opportunities at Parkers Lake for Xcel to have their right hand talk to their left
31 hand and look at possibilities in that location and moving the security perimeter, rather than
32 moving forward at Gleason Lake.

33
34 Chair Cameron stated that his personal perspective is that this application was not compatible with
35 present use and did not see the future use of the area changing, because it is a highly residential
36 area with a school. He noted that Mr. Wojcicki mentioned in his presentation that Xcel had been
37 deploying smart meters since 2022, and they have been getting along just fine with the technology
38 that they have. He stated that there was no mandate in this situation because this is something
39 Xcel wants to do and not something that they have to do. He stated that from a negative impact
40 perspective, he thinks it was 100% and explained that some of the visualizations shown made him
41 think about the charm of Wayzata and the possibility of this pole being the first thing people see
42 as they come down County Rd 101, which is not charming. He stated that he went and looked at
43 the tower located in Eden Prairie and found that it stuck out like a sore thumb, and suspects that
44 would be the case here, even though it would be lower at 123 feet.

1 Commissioner VanLoy stated that he felt the existing 100-foot pole, which was just a lightning
2 rod, was different because your eye isn't drawn to it, but with a higher pole that had an array on
3 top, it would be very different.

4
5 Commissioner Ankeny stated that in the photo simulations, it was very difficult to see the existing
6 pole in the existing conditions, but not difficult at all in the simulation of the proposed pole.

7
8 Commissioner Elg referenced the coverage map from the presentation and stated that he suspected
9 this location is ideal because they have an existing structure there, and it will be the least expensive
10 approach to accomplishing their goal. He noted that the Parkers Lake site is very close and will
11 give them similar, if not identical, and possibly better coverage. He stated that, given that Xcel
12 was already planning updates at that site, he believed it made sense that they would work this into
13 that project and encouraged Xcel to consider that. He stated that it may cost more, but he believed
14 it would be the better option for everyone overall. He noted that he felt this request was an
15 economic issue more than anything. He explained that he agreed with their desire to take this
16 information off the public networks because it would provide greater security.

17
18 There being no further discussion, Chair Cameron asked for a motion on the application.

19
20 Commissioner Elg made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Ankeny, to direct staff to prepare
21 a draft Planning Commission Report and Recommendation with appropriate findings reflecting a
22 recommendation of denial of two Conditional Use Permits (CUP) for Xcel Energy at 701 Central
23 Avenue North for review and adoption at the next Planning Commission meeting.

24
25 The motion carried unanimously.

26
27 Commissioner Ankeny expressed her appreciation to Xcel for their presentation and stated that the
28 City understands what they were trying to do, and encouraged them to look at a non-residential
29 area if they brought another application before the City.

30
31 **AGENDA ITEM 7. Other Items:**

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

34
35 Mr. Sharpe stated that he would be ordering the training books for the Commission in the near
36 future and stated that they should be available for them to pick up at one of the upcoming meetings.
37 He noted that the book was written for a wide variety of cities, so there will be things included that
38 do not apply in Wayzata. He gave an update on the progress of the Wells Fargo project, 641 Lake
39 Street, and Klapprich Park.

40
41 **b) Planning Commission Meeting Schedule**

42
43 Mr. Sharpe noted that the next meeting would be on September 22, 2025, and expected it to be a
44 short meeting.

45
46 Commissioner Elg asked for an update on the Lamborghini site.

1
2 Mr. Sharpe explained that the Council approved the PUD concept plan, but that does not convey
3 any actual approvals for the project. He noted that the applicant had not resubmitted anything
4 since that time and explained that he felt the applicant had heard loud and clear that they were
5 trying to fit a large number of things on the site. He stated that the City did not have any say or
6 information in the private transaction between Walser and the Mulberry location. He noted that
7 he does think there is an inclination from the applicant to move forward, but noted that they have
8 not seen any additional information come before the City.

9
10 Commissioner VanLoy asked if the Moments of Wayzata had asked the City for another extension.

11
12 Mr. Sharpe confirmed that they had asked for an extension of their current approval and noted that
13 it was the first extension to this approval. He explained that one of the conditions the Council had
14 added was that the applicant needed to become current with all the billings before the end of
15 October for the extension to be continued for another year.

16
17 **AGENDA ITEM 8. Adjournment.**

18
19 There being no further business on the agenda, Chair Cameron asked for a motion to adjourn.

20
21 Commissioner Elg made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Ankeny, to adjourn the Planning
22 Commission meeting.

23
24 The motion carried unanimously.

25
26 The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 7:41 p.m.

27
28 Respectfully submitted,
29 Kayla Atkins Rokosz
30 *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*
31
32