

**WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION
WORKSHOP MEETING MINUTES
DECEMBER 7, 2015**

AGENDA ITEM 1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chair Vanderheyden called the workshop meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Present at roll call were Commissioners: Vanderheyden, Gonazalez, Young, Iverson and Gruber. Absent and excused: Commissioners Ramy, and Gnos. Director of Planning and Building Jeff Thomson, and Management and Planning Intern Jason Peters were also present.

AGENDA ITEM 2. Workshop Items:

a.) 529 Indian Mound E – Concept Plan Review for Ron Clark Construction & Design

Director Thomson stated Ron Clark Construction & Design is proposing to develop the vacant property at 529 Indian Mound East. The proposed plan consists of a 3-story condominium building with one level of indoor parking on the basement level. The building would contain five (5) condominium units and shared common space. Mr. Thomson reviewed the background of the property, the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, and zoning standards.

Mr. Tim Whitten, Whitten Associates, 4159 Heatherton Place, Minnetonka, reviewed the concept plans, exterior elevations, streetscapes perspectives, and site plan for 529 Indian Mound E. He stated the units would range in size from 1,900 square feet to 2,300 square feet. He stated the potential applications to be considered would be a Shoreland Conditional Use Permit for impervious surface coverage above 25%, variance for building height above 35-feet, a Conditional Use Permit for stairs and elevator penthouse taller than 5-feet, and a variance for the exclusion of an office space component.

Commissioner Gruber asked what the average cost for the units would be.

Mr. Whitten stated the selling price would be approximately \$450 to \$475 per square foot, and the upper units would be more costly because they would be more desirable. Mr. Whitten stated that the cost is similar to the Garrison Landing building to the west.

Commissioner Gruber asked how many condominiums priced over \$400,000 were in the City at this time.

Mr. Thomson stated he did not have this information at this time.

Commissioner Gruber expressed concerns about the price of the units being proposed, and she stated that this would not be considered affordable housing.

1
2 Mr. Whitten stated land prices dictate the cost of housing and the closer to the lake, the more
3 costly the land and the more costly the housing.
4

5 Commissioner Gonzalez asked what kind of stormwater plan the developer would provide to
6 ensure the water that ends up in the lake is clean.
7

8 Mr. Whitten that they are in the process of working on the Stormwater Maintenance Plan and
9 have not determined the prefect solutions at this time. This will be finalized prior to the project
10 moving forward.
11

12 Commissioner Gonzalez stated the policy question for the Council would be if the City wants to
13 build luxury condominiums in areas that are zoned mixed use because these facilities may be
14 empty as demographics change. Ms. Gonzalez stated that when the Comp Plan was updated the
15 idea had been for mixed-use buildings for this area. The Staff report also specifies that multi-
16 family condominium buildings are not a permitted or conditional use in the C-1 Zoning District.
17 The Council had also made a decision on another project that they would not allow buildings to
18 extend above 35-feet. Ms. Gonzalez clarified the use of a planned unit development (PUD)
19 should not be used as a tool to get around the zoning ordinance. Ms. Gonzalez stated that she
20 does not see any value to the City that would justify a PUD with so many variances.
21

22 Mr. Whitten stated having a mixed-use building presented several legal challenges such as who
23 owns and/or maintains the various components of the building. The other challenge they face is
24 that more people are working from home, which has reduced the need for small office spaces.
25 Mr. Whitten stated that he would count people working from their homes as office use.
26

27 Chair Vanderheyden stated this particular lot was the same size as his home parcel and he
28 struggled with applying the mixed-use requirement to this size parcel. It is difficult to hold every
29 parcel in a commercial district to the same standard when the parcel is this small. There is an
30 opportunity to apply a reasonable test and what the City would get in exchange is long-term
31 tenants in this area.
32

33 Commissioner Iverson stated the Commission needed to be aware of the demographics that these
34 types of condominiums would draw. Most may have other residence and are older, and she is
35 concerned that they would not be spending as much as those demographics that are in their
36 thirties and forties. These people may not be supporting the City's retail. She stated in order to
37 support the City's retail they needed to get more affordable inner City housing. Affordable
38 housing and small business can come back to Wayzata if the City starts making different choices.
39

40 Commissioner Young stated he agreed there was a broader policy question on housing but when
41 looking at this particular parcel, the land costs, and the proximity to the lake he did not feel this
42 would be the right parcel for affordable housing. He would rather see more residential housing
43 in this area than additional empty office space. The drainage and hardcover issues need to be
44 addressed and would be as the project moves forward.
45

1 Commissioner Gonzalez stated the only thing that would justify a PUD was if the developer
2 brought forward a good stormwater management plan and if the plan limited the lot coverage.
3 The City's 35-foot building height requirement has been upheld by the courts, and she would like
4 to see this project be 35-feet and not require a variance.

5
6 Mr. Whitten clarified at the time the 35-foot height requirement was established, the building
7 requirements were different and the new codes require more height. He suggested changing the
8 maximum height requirement to 37-feet to provide flexibility for builders. They are not trying to
9 build a taller building than others in the area. The ceiling heights are 9-feet and the garage
10 would be constructed to accommodate handicap vehicles. They would like to have the ceilings
11 at 9-feet 4-inches in order to accommodate mechanical systems.

12
13 Mr. Thomson stated the building height is measured to the copping on a flat roofed building, not
14 the actual deck of the roof.

15
16 Chair Vanderheyden stated the visual line is the most important line to protect. He asked what
17 the tallest a building could be based on the City's ordinances under any circumstances.

18
19 Mr. Thomson stated for this type of building the maximum height would be 35-feet to the top of
20 the copping.

21
22 Commissioner Iverson stated she would like to push the developer to be creative and stay within
23 the boundaries the City has set. All of the buildings are looking the same and this concerns her.

24
25 Commissioner Gonzalez asked if the garage could be lowered.

26
27 Mr. Whitten stated the garage could not be lowered due to the slope grade from the street to enter
28 the garage. The City Code's grade requirement for driveways is 10% but if they could lower the
29 garage it would make everything easier. They would not want to have a grade more than 10%
30 because it would be difficult to enter/exit the parking garage. He stated they did have flexibility
31 with the parapet. He explained they created movement in the building so that it would not
32 visually appear to be over 35-feet in height at any one place. He explained the units would be
33 more affordable if they were able to increase the density on the site but they are working within
34 the City's Shoreland regulations.

35
36 Commissioner Gonzalez stated the density could be increased with a PUD and she would be
37 more in favor of the project with a good stormwater management plan, the lot coverage does not
38 exceed 50%, and a reduction in the height.

39
40 Commissioner Iverson asked if the developer would consider reducing the square footage of the
41 units.

42
43 Mr. Whitten stated they would discuss this with the developers.

44
45 Chair Vanderheyden stated the location of this parcel makes it difficult to keep values affordable
46 unless the City makes a policy change that mandates certain price points or development.

1
2 **AGENDA ITEM 3. Other Items:**

3
4 **a.) Review of Development Activities**

5
6 Mr. Thomson stated the City's Design Team for the Lakefront Central Project is visiting
7 Wayzata December 7 and 8. There is not a community meeting during this visit. The next
8 meetings are scheduled for January 12 and this would include a community meeting. There will
9 be design concepts presented at this meeting.

10
11 Mr. Thomson announced that City Manager Nelson has accepted a position with another City,
12 and that there will be a going away reception on December 10.

13
14 Mr. Thomson stated that the City Council would be reviewing Council-requested changes to the
15 proposed new Telecommunications Ordinance at its next meeting.

16
17 Commissioner Gonzalez stated the City Council reviewed the 1120 Wayzata Boulevard medical
18 office building project at their last meeting. The issues they discussed were why the building
19 was closer to the sidewalk than the other buildings. The Mayor did explain that the City had
20 decided they did not want parking in front of buildings, and the City had changed the design
21 standards. The City Council also discussed the awning versus canopies, but the City Council did
22 approve the metal awnings and the project on a 3-2 vote.

23
24 Mr. Thomson stated the December 21 Planning Commission agenda is scheduled to include
25 public hearings for a two (2) lot subdivision on Bushaway Road and a fence height variance
26 request on Stonecrest, for a pool. The first meeting in January would include two (2) new
27 Commissioners, election of a new chair and vice chair, and would be preceded by a workshop for
28 training and orientation.

29
30 **b.) Other Items**

31
32 Mr. Thomson stated he would be attending the Heritage Preservation Board meeting and would
33 provide the Commission with an update.

34
35 **AGENDA ITEM 4. Adjournment.**

36
37 There being no further business, Commissioner Young made a motion, seconded by
38 Commissioner Iverson, to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

39
40 The meeting was adjourned at 8:03 p.m.

41
42 Respectfully submitted,

43
44 Tina Borg
45 *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*