

**WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
JANUARY 26, 2026**

AGENDA ITEM 1. Call to Order

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

AGENDA ITEM 2. Roll Call

Chair Cameron took roll call.

Present at roll call were Commissioners: Plantan, Schwalbe, Severson, Elg, Cameron, VanLoy, and Ankeny. Community Development Director Alex Sharpe, 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 Severson made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Plantan, to approve the January 26, 2026, agenda as presented.

The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 4. Consent Agenda

a.) Approval of the January 5, 2026 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.

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

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

The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 5. Old Business Items

AGENDA ITEM 6. Public Hearing Items

a) Consider Application to Construct a Walser Lamborghini Dealership at 1022 and 1042 Wayzata Boulevard E

1 Community Development Director Sharpe reviewed the application for a Walser Lamborghini
2 dealership at 1022 and 1042 Wayzata Boulevard E. He gave an overview of the project location,
3 land use/zoning of the parcels, existing conditions, demolition plans, differences between the PUD
4 Concept Plan and the current submission which include, a General PUD Plan, Final Plat, variance
5 requests, and the design deviations being proposed.

6
7 Commissioner Elg asked why the sidewalk design deviation was being considered.

8
9 Mr. Sharpe explained that City Code requires a 6-foot separation from any sidewalk when adjacent
10 to a building.

11
12 Commissioner Schwalbe referenced the Huntington parking area and confirmed that it would stay.
13 She asked if any of those parking spots would be gone because of the entrance into this parcel.

14
15 Mr. Sharpe explained that there would be an increase in available parking because one of the two
16 access points would be closed. He noted that the Huntington parking area was for public parking,
17 but would be available for this site to use.

18
19 Commissioner Schwalbe asked if there would be parking along Wayzata Boulevard.

20
21 Mr. Sharpe clarified that there was no parking along Wayzata Boulevard because it was too busy
22 a thoroughfare.

23
24 Commissioner Schwalbe stated that many people were surprised when the medical building was
25 constructed on Wayzata Boulevard and how close it was to the road. She asked how close this
26 proposed building would be to the road.

27
28 Mr. Sharpe explained that the building was at the minimum setback from the property line. He
29 noted that the design requirements push buildings up against roadways in the current code
30 requirements. He stated that by adopting the City's design requirements.

31
32 Chair Cameron noted that there was also a requirement for parking to be in the rear.

33
34 Commissioner Schwalbe asked if the medical building had a 7-foot sidewalk in front of it.

35
36 Mr. Sharpe stated that he believed that the building may have been constructed before the 7-foot
37 requirement. He noted that the County requirement is 5 feet, so it may be that measurement.

38
39 Commissioner Ankeny asked about the height of the medical building in comparison with the
40 proposed building.

41
42 Mr. Sharpe stated that he did not know that information. He stated that the proposed building is
43 26 feet tall, which is well under the requirement.

44
45 Commissioner Severson asked for more information on the fencing.

46

1 Mr. Sharpe gave an overview of the proposed fencing and its location and noted that the variance
2 request was related to the height.

3
4 Commissioner Severson asked about plans to install a sidewalk in front of the current dry cleaner
5 and if that meant the existing tree would be taken down.

6
7 Mr. Sharpe explained that he believed the tree referenced by Commissioner Severson would be
8 removed. He noted that many of the street trees were elm trees and needed to be removed anyway.

9
10 Commissioner Severson asked if there was a current retaining wall and for clarification on why
11 one would be needed.

12
13 Mr. Sharpe stated that there currently is a retaining wall, but portions of it are in disrepair, and
14 noted that it was primarily for stormwater prevention in order to prevent water from going downhill
15 too quickly. He stated that the applicant's narrative has indicated that they intend to replace
16 sections of the retaining wall based on damage, but not the entire wall.

17
18 Commissioner Schwalbe asked if there would still be a stairway that goes from the south side to
19 the residential area.

20
21 Mr. Sharpe stated that the current stairway on Huntington was not part of this project or proposal
22 and is within the right-of-way and would not be affected as part of this project.

23
24 Commissioner Plantan asked if the City could assign a use to a PUD so it wouldn't turn into a
25 different use.

26
27 Mr. Sharpe stated that his answer would be 'yes', but with some nuance, and explained that he and
28 the City Attorney Schelzel would need to work with the applicant to create a series of conditions
29 that would allow the City to clarify that nuance.

30
31 City Attorney Schelzel shared examples of ways the City can tie the health, safety, and welfare of
32 the community into the conditions.

33
34 Commissioner Plantan stated that she was looking to protect the neighbors. She stated that the
35 description of the retaining wall says that it would be a black chain link fence on top, but that was
36 not shown in the renderings.

37
38 Mr. Sharpe suggested that the Commission ask the applicant to elaborate on that issue. He noted
39 that the City does allow vinyl-coated chain link as a permitted fence material.

40
41 Commissioner Plantan expressed potential concerns with noise, exhibition driving, and hours of
42 operation.

43
44 Commissioner Ankeny asked if, in the future, the applicant wanted to change this from a Walser
45 Lamborghini to a Walser Kia, if they would have to get permission from the City.

46

1 Mr. Schelzel answered that it would depend on the details of the final approved PUD.

2
3 Commissioner Ankeny referenced the possible used trade-in vehicles that the applicant would
4 accept and asked if those vehicles would be stored inside.

5
6 Mr. Sharpe stated that the applicant had not sought exterior storage, so it was not included at this
7 time, and those vehicles would be required to be stored inside. He noted that vehicles that show
8 up for service or repair may be stored outside for a limited duration.

9
10 Chair Cameron invited the applicant to address the Commission.

11
12 Brannin Gries, 500 North Commercial Street, explained that he was the architect for this project
13 and had previously presented the concept plan to the City. He stated that since that time, they took
14 the comments that they received about the plan and tried to accommodate as many of these as they
15 could. He gave a brief overview of the changes in the recent plans and removal of the dry cleaning
16 business, but noted that the overall intent of this project had not changed. He stated that it would
17 be a 5-car showroom space and a 6-car service bay and reminded the Commission that many of
18 the cars will be made to order. He gave a brief overview of the reasons behind the variance and
19 design deviations requests.

20
21 Commissioner Severson stated that the original building was smaller than the proposed current
22 building and asked why they had increased the building size.

23
24 Mr. Gries stated that the footprint of the building had expanded as they tried to help with the
25 parking area, and since the dry cleaner was leaving, they had more site area available.

26
27 Commissioner VanLoy asked if they knew that the Lamborghini would not scrape as they are
28 coming in from Wayzata Boulevard to Huntington and onto the site.

29
30 Mr. Gries stated that they know the driveway location works.

31
32 Commissioner VanLoy explained that he has had people asking about noise and asked what Walser
33 would try to do to ensure that their patrons understand those concerns and try to control the noise.

34
35 Mr. Gries stated that the building is fully heated and cooled, so the service doors would be closed
36 most of the time. He explained that when they need to run engines on the repair side, it would be
37 enclosed. He stated that much of the vehicle traffic will be delivery-based, which means customers
38 would not necessarily be the ones pulling up to get their vehicle, which will give employees more
39 control over the noise.

40
41 Commissioner Ankeny asked if Mr. Gries was saying that customers would not be coming to
42 Wayzata to pick up their vehicle, and instead it would be delivered to them.

43
44 Katie Cohen, Director of Facilities and Construction, Walser Automotive Group, stated that their
45 understanding from Lamborghini is that a large majority of the vehicles are custom-made and
46 ordered. which means they would typically be delivered to the customer. She stated that for noise

1 concerns, it would be a managerial issue and would be up to the staff to communicate with the
2 buyers. She noted that they are planning to install signage asking people who are exiting the site
3 to be cognizant that they are in a residential area and to respect that.

4
5 Commissioner Schwalbe asked about typical hours of operation.

6
7 Ms. Cohen stated that the dealership hours for their larger flagship locations are typically 7:00 a.m.
8 for service until 6:00 p.m., and sales are typically open 10:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. She noted that this
9 location would be a boutique location and more appointment-based, so they were still evaluating
10 the hours of operation.

11
12 Paul Walser, Walser Automotive Group, noted that about 90% of the products they will be selling
13 will be hybrid products, so they would not be the typical noisy vehicles that can be heard driving
14 around the City. He stated that this car dealership is different from a typical dealership in just
15 about every way and gave the example of comparing Walmart to Chanel.

16
17 Commissioner Ankeny asked if customers would test drive the cars, even just the modest coupe
18 products.

19
20 Mr. Walser confirmed that there would be test driving that takes place and explained that he
21 believed the least expensive product was around \$350,000.

22
23 Sawyer Walser stated that the modest sport line prices range from \$350,000 to \$500,000.

24
25 Mr. Paul Walser reiterated that there would be test driving, but with the hybrid technology, people
26 would not be racing out of the dealership down Wayzata Boulevard and would instead go to the
27 freeway.

28
29 Chair Cameron asked about the snow removal plans for the lower-level area.

30
31 Mr. Paul Walser stated that many of their dealerships have restricted space, so they haul it out.

32
33 Mr. Sawyer Walser stated that the answer to Chair Cameron's question will that it would be based
34 on the quantity. He explained that in other locations, they have used a bucket attachment to haul
35 snow to other areas in the lot where it is easier.

36
37 Chair Cameron opened the public hearing at 7:47 p.m.

38
39 Gordy Straka, 130 Huntington Avenue, stated that his home is immediately south of the proposed
40 dealership. He stated that in the neighborhood meeting, they had asked the applicant to extend the
41 8-foot fencing all the way across, which Mr. Gries had already mentioned during his presentation.
42 He stated that he was also happy that they were planning to regrade the lot so the water would be
43 taken care of, and shared some of the problems they have had with the current runoff. He noted
44 that the applicant has been working with the neighbors on this project for a long time and shared
45 that all the neighbors were in support of this proposal.

46

1 Robert Macnae, 1000 Superior Boulevard, asked for an explanation of the impact on Huntington.
2 He noted that they have gotten used to having that road to themselves and have taken care of
3 plowing and repairs. He stated that this was already a busy intersection and explained that they
4 had recently had a car drive into their building. He noted that they were in favor of the project,
5 but really wanted to be able to understand how this would impact the tenants of the building and
6 the parking.

7
8 Nan Sloan, 144 Huntington Avenue S, noted that her major concerns, before this proposal, were
9 noise, traffic, and safety with a drive-thru. She stated that she believed that people who lived in
10 Huntington were pretty unanimous in their opinion that this proposal is a good solution for this
11 site. She explained that she still had some concerns about noise, but liked the idea of finding a
12 way to remind customers to be cognizant that this is a neighborhood. She noted that she felt that
13 the noise with the previous plans that involved 2 drive-thru lanes would be substantially more than
14 what they will have with this proposal. She explained that Walser had worked well with the
15 neighborhood to try to address their concerns for their unique little neighborhood. She clarified
16 that she was in favor of this project and felt comfortable that she would be able to bring any
17 concerns that arise to the Walsers.

18
19 Bruno Solokowski, 173 Huntington Avenue S, noted that the previous applications for this site
20 were challenging and described some of the topography and grading in the area. He stated that
21 having a tall fence would benefit them and is thankful because he believed it would control noise
22 issues and provide a visual barrier. He stated that this was a tough parcel and he believes this
23 current proposal is one of the best uses for it. He stated that he was in favor of this proposal and
24 agreed that everyone along Huntington has been saying the same things and did not see this use
25 becoming a problem for their neighborhood.

26
27 Chair Cameron closed the public hearing at 7:57 p.m. and asked the applicant to address the
28 question raised by Mr. Macnae related to Huntington and parking.

29
30 Mr. Gries explained that on Huntington, they would be eliminating one of the drive openings, so
31 it would open up additional parking space, or two. He stated that outside of this change, they were
32 not planning any other adjustments to Huntington. He noted that the traffic would have pretty
33 light use, so there shouldn't be a real increase in parking traffic at the intersection.

34
35 Mr. Sharpe explained that there was a traffic study done as part of this application and encouraged
36 Mr. Macnae to send him an email, and he can share it with him. He noted that the traffic impact
37 study showed less use than prior usage on this site.

38
39 Commissioner VanLoy stated that he thought this application showed a significant improvement
40 over the previous plan. He noted that he also felt it was a benefit to remove some of the entrances
41 to these lots and described some of his other thoughts on the application. He stated that he felt the
42 City still had some work to do to capture the type of business that could be run here, should the
43 Lamborghini business close down. He stated that overall, as this has been presented, he felt it was
44 a very good use for a very tough piece of land.

45

1 Commissioner Schwalbe stated that she agreed and thought the building was beautiful and would
2 be an asset to the neighborhood. She stated that one of the most important things is that Walser
3 has been able to cultivate a good relationship with the neighborhood and, if this proposal works
4 for them, doesn't cause issues on Wayzata Boulevard, then she felt it would be a great use of the
5 property.

6
7 Commissioner Severson stated that the applicant had done a good job of addressing the concerns
8 of the neighbors. She suggested that the Commission make a recommendation that the fencing be
9 continued along the back of the property, which is something the neighbors supported.

10
11 Chair Cameron stated that he agreed with the comments shared on this application and encouraged
12 the applicant to keep snow removal in mind. He stated that he agreed that the fence should extend
13 to the western edge of the new combined parcel.

14
15 Commissioner Plantan asked for guidance from City Attorney Schelzel on assigning health, safety,
16 and welfare of the area related to future use designation.

17
18 Mr. Schelzel stated that in the Planning Commission Report and Recommendation that will be
19 brought back at their next meeting, staff will have detailed findings and can easily draw those
20 things from the comments the Commission had made during their discussion. He reviewed the
21 items that he felt were being considered as conditions of approval.

22
23 Chair Cameron asked for a motion.

24
25 Commissioner Schwalbe made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Elg, to direct staff to prepare
26 a draft Planning Commission Report and Recommendation of approval for Walser Lamborghini
27 Dealership at 1022 and 1042 Wayzata Boulevard E., with conditions of approval related to a
28 business description being included in the PUD, noise, and a fence extension to the west property
29 line. The motion carried unanimously.

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

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

34
35 Ms. Sharpe noted that there have been minimal building permits coming into the City. He stated
36 that he would like to put together a schedule for when Commissioners were able to attend the City
37 Council meetings. He asked the Commission to send him the list of dates when they would not be
38 available to attend. He explained that in the near future, they will also begin discussing the
39 possibility of changing the Bylaws related to Commission attendance at City Council meetings.
40 He stated that Klapprich Park is open and available for use, including the warming house, but
41 noted that the large slide was still closed.

42
43 **b) Planning Commission Meeting Schedule**

44
45 Mr. Sharpe stated that the next meeting was scheduled for February 9, 2026.

46

1 **AGENDA ITEM 7. Adjournment.**

2
3 There being no further business on the agenda, Chair Cameron asked for a motion to adjourn.

4
5 Commissioner Severson made a motion, seconded by Commissioner VanLoy, to adjourn the
6 Planning Commission meeting.

7
8 The motion carried unanimously.

9
10 The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 8:24 p.m.

11
12 Respectfully submitted,

13 Kayla Atkins Rokosz

14 *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*

15