

**WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 9, 2026**

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 all seven 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 VanLoy made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Schwalbe, to approve the February 9, 2026 agenda as presented.

The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 4. Consent Agenda

a.) Approval of the January 26, 2026, Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

b.) ~~Approve Planning Commission Report and Recommendation of Approval of PUD for Walser Lamborghini at 1022 and 1042 Wayzata Boulevard E (Pulled for separate discussion)~~

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

Commissioner Schwalbe asked to remove item b. from the agenda. She explained that she wanted to make a few comments related to the Walser Lamborghini application.

Chair Cameron asked for a motion to approve item a of the consent agenda, the meeting minutes from January 26, 2026, and take up item b subsequently for separate discussion and action.

1 Commissioner Plantan made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Ankeny, to approve the item b
2 of the Consent Agenda.

3
4 The motion carried unanimously.

5
6 **Former Consent Agenda item b: Approve Planning Commission Report and**
7 **Recommendation of Approval of PUD for Walser Lamborghini at 1022 and 1042 Wayzata**
8 **Boulevard E**
9

10 Commissioner Schwalbe stated that she had concerns about the front of the proposed building, and
11 how tight things are from Wayzata Boulevard to the front of the building. She explained that she
12 didn't want to end up with something they would regret later. She further stated that her
13 understanding was that Walser would take trade-ins, but wanted to make sure that they would be
14 moved off-site to be sold, and that activity would not take place at this location.

15
16 Community Development Director Sharpe stated that he believed that was accurate.

17
18 Commissioner Schwalbe asked Community Development Director Sharpe to clarify this before
19 this item goes before the City Council.

20
21 Commissioner Schwalbe made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Severson, to approve former
22 Consent Agenda item b, Approve Planning Commission Report and Recommendation of Approval
23 of PUD for Walser Lamborghini at 1022 and 1042 Wayzata Boulevard E, with her comments
24 noted.

25
26 Mr. Sharpe noted that he had misspoken at the last Planning Commission meeting when he said
27 that the City Council had unanimously approved the PUD Concept Plan presented in June, and
28 clarified that it was actually done with a 3-2 Council vote.

29
30 There being no further discussion of the motion, Chair Cameron called for a vote. The motion
31 carried unanimously.

32
33 **AGENDA ITEM 5. Public Hearing Item**
34

35 **a) Consider an Application for a Subdivision at 190 Gleason Lake Road and 121**
36 **Gleahaven Road**
37

38 Mr. Sharpe gave an overview of the application for a subdivision at 190 Gleason Lake Road and
39 121 Gleahaven Road. He reviewed the project location, land use/zoning, existing conditions,
40 subsequent plats, proposed Preliminary Plat, hypothetical home configuration, lot requirements,
41 Shoreland Overlay District requirements, tree inventory and removal plan, summarized comments
42 from the City Engineer, and briefly outlined the public comments that had been received.

43
44 At the conclusion of Mr. Sharpe's presentation, Chair Cameron asked if the Commissioner's had
45 any questions for Mr. Sharpe.
46

1 Chair Cameron asked if the applicant was proposing to manage stormwater underground.

2
3 Mr. Sharpe stated that there is some existing underground stormwater management that needs to
4 be maintained, and there will also be additional stormwater mitigation required if the subdivision
5 is approved. He noted that the applicant can explain their plans and the timing during their
6 presentation.

7
8 Commissioner Plantan asked if the proposed tree plan would be a condition of approval or if it
9 was something that would be submitted and agreed upon later.

10
11 Mr. Sharpe stated that it could be made a condition of approval, and noted that the plan was
12 submitted to demonstrate that they could meet the requirements of the ordinance.

13
14 There being no further questions for staff, Chair Cameron invited the applicant to address the
15 Commission.

16
17 Kelsey Thompson, Lake West Development, the Applicant, reviewed details of the applicable R-
18 3 zoning for single and two-family residential units. She noted that the 2 existing homes on the
19 properties have been rental units for a long time, and explained that the overall property area is
20 1.411 acres. She briefly outlined some of the previous development plans that had been considered
21 for the properties, and stated that she had knocked on the doors of neighbors in the area to discuss
22 some of what they were proposing in order to get their feedback on the plans. She stated that there
23 appeared to be more support for the proposed 4-lot subdivision plan than other options, and had
24 pursued that option in discussions with City staff. She outlined some of the feedback received
25 from the neighbors. She noted that Lake West Development would be saving all the heritage trees
26 on the property and plan to plant 25 new trees, which they felt would improve the landscape. She
27 explained that the plans were compliant with City requirements and noted that they were not asking
28 for any variances.

29
30 At the conclusion of Ms. Thompson's presentation, Chair Cameron asked if there were any
31 questions for the applicant.

32
33 Commissioner Elg asked about the information for the 5-lot plans compared to the 4-lot plans, and
34 the potential size of the homes on the lots.

35
36 Ms. Thompson stated that she believed the footprint for the 5-lot plan would be around 1,500 sq.
37 ft. and for the 4-lot plan, it would be a little over 1,500 sq. ft.

38
39 Commissioner VanLoy referenced the application from 2017, and noted that many of the points
40 made in the denial of that application were aligned with the points of the Comprehensive Plan
41 rather than the Code criteria. He asked if the applicant had points that addressed the points that
42 were made for the 2017 proposal.

43
44 Ms. Thompson stated that she understood how important the Comprehensive Plan is, and noted
45 that most of her presentation addressed the issues that had been outlined in the past application.
46

1 Commissioner Schwalbe asked if the garage doors would be able to be recessed so they won't
2 stand out too prominently.

3
4 Ms. Thompson stated that they have not started putting together the actual home designs yet, so
5 she could not speak to that question.

6
7 Commissioner Schwalbe explained that she was curious about that because of how narrow the lots
8 are.

9
10 Ms. Thompson noted that the homes they depicted in their application were all with 3-car garages,
11 but clarified that they have not begun the specific design plans for the garage doors.

12
13 Mr. Sharpe noted that in 2025, the City adopted an ordinance to change the R-3A zoning district
14 requiring that garages have an additional 5-foot setback to specifically address the concern of front-
15 loading garages and their appearance. He noted that this project is located within the R-3 Zoning
16 District, so that requirement would not apply in this situation.

17
18 Commissioner Severson asked if they were supposed to be looking at redrawing the actual lines
19 for the 4 parcels, or if they were just considering the overall concept of taking these 2 lots and
20 making them 4 lots.

21
22 Mr. Sharpe explained that this was a preliminary plat application, and that the Commission should
23 review the approval criteria and make a recommendation to the City Council on the application.
24 He further clarified that the actual subdivision requested would take place through action on the
25 Preliminary Plat.

26
27 City Attorney Schelzel clarified that this application was for an actual plat of a new subdivision,
28 so what was being presented included the actual property lines for the proposed new lots. He
29 stated that the Commission was being asked to look at actual information related to the subdivision
30 shown on the plat, and not just the concept of going from 2 lots to 4 lots.

31
32 Commissioner Severson stated that there is currently a driveway that goes onto Gleason Lake Road
33 from the property, and asked why the applicant had chosen to go with 4 long and narrow lots rather
34 than having 2 lots access off of Gleason Lake Road and 2 lots access Gleahaven Road.

35
36 Ms. Thompson answered that having all access off a cul-de-sac makes things more livable, makes
37 them more a part of the neighborhood, and will fit better with the overall character of the
38 neighborhood.

39
40 Mr. Sharpe referenced Commissioner Severson's question about access to the County road and
41 noted that the City Code discourages, if not prohibits, additional driveway accesses on County
42 roadways.

43
44 Commissioner Severson asked if the applicant would build the homes and then sell them, or if they
45 were planning on the homes being custom-built.

46

1 Ms. Thompson stated that they have not yet selected which building partner they would partner
2 with for this project, but she expected that they would be custom-built homes that would likely be
3 constructed by the same builder.

4
5 Commissioner Schwalbe referenced a nearby development called Waycliff, which is mostly twin
6 homes that are beautiful and expensive. She asked if the applicant had considered having two twin
7 homes as opposed to 4 separate homes.

8
9 Ms. Thompson stated that they had considered twin homes, but because the existing neighborhood
10 had all single-family homes, they felt that this proposal was a better fit and would go over better
11 with the neighborhood.

12
13 Commissioner Plantan asked about the width of the lots.

14
15 Mr. Sharpe displayed that plat details and noted that the width measurement would be taken from
16 the setback line for the front.

17
18 Commissioner VanLoy stated that the most concerning lot for him in the proposed subdivision
19 was Lot 3 in terms of topography, and the amount of grading and cutting that may be necessary to
20 build on that lot.

21
22 Ms. Thompson stated that there was a two-foot average for cut and fill that was required for each
23 of the lots, and they met that requirement for all of the lots, including Lot 3.

24
25 There being no further questions from the Commission for the Applicant, Chair Cameron opened
26 the public hearing at 7:23 p.m.

27
28 Kathy Dasgupta, 110 Gleahaven Road, noted that they were selling their home and are moving out
29 of state. She explained that she still cares about this proposal because she cares about the neighbors
30 and their street. She noted that she received the letter about the neighborhood meeting the day of
31 the meeting, so she was not able to attend the meeting. She referenced points 6 and 12 of the
32 criteria to be considered for approval. She stated that the applicant had indicated that they were
33 planning to install 3-car garages on all 4 properties, which she found concerning because it
34 indicated that they would be very similar homes, and all the current homes on Gleahaven are
35 different and unique. She shared examples of comments received from real estate brokers when
36 they hosted an open house, and they all questioned what was going to happen at this corner. She
37 stated that based on this input, they ended up listing their home lower than originally planned
38 because of concerns raised about the potential development. She shared concerns about the traffic
39 this proposed development will bring to Gleahaven and its intersection with Gleason Lake Road.

40
41 Ryan Schultz, 108 Gleahaven Road, noted that he had already submitted most of his concerns with
42 this proposal via email to the City. He referenced the 2013 variance that ended up being the lot
43 they bought and built a home on. He explained that there was one home on the lot at the time,
44 which was a meth house, which had to be torn down. He stated that this was not the same case as
45 this situation because these two homes are fine and do not need to be torn down. He stated that
46 there is a curvature to Gleahaven Road, so even parking on the street is difficult, and expressed

1 concern about adding 4 additional homes to the street. He stated that he felt this proposal was too
2 much in the area. He stated that the 2013 variance request was not opposed by any of the
3 neighbors, and explained that his builder at the time went to all the neighbors and got their approval
4 for the subdivision of the lot.

5
6 Michelle Schultz, 108 Gleahaven Road, stated that she had also submitted comments via email to
7 the City. She stated that they were also not able to attend the neighborhood meeting because they
8 were out of town. She referenced the topography of the land, and noted that the hill and the trees
9 currently in place help to block the noise and the view of the busy County road. She expressed
10 concern that if the lot were leveled, they would end up with a view of the busy County road. She
11 stated that, in addition to concerns related to noise and the view, she was also concerned about
12 adding 4 homes and the traffic that will bring. She explained that their kids take the school bus
13 and wait on the corner, where it can be dangerous with traffic coming around the curve in the road.
14 She stated that she and her husband have lived in their home since 2015, and the homes being
15 discussed were owner-occupied until about 2020. She noted that there has been some turnover of
16 occupants in the apartment unit, but overall, they have had no issues with the renters for these
17 properties. She explained that she did not think that these were currently rental properties, which
18 should be a consideration in the City's decision about whether to allow the subdivision or not.

19
20 Dan Foss, 133 Gleahaven Road, stated that their neighborhood is unique because the cul-de-sac is
21 about 6 acres for 10 homes, and asked how this was zoned as R-3. He noted that the developer
22 had described it as high-density single-family dwelling units. He stated that he thinks the history
23 of the area is important and would like to understand how the City could end up allowing 30 homes
24 on those 6 acres with this zoning designation, which would be a drastic change. He reiterated his
25 request to understand how this could happen, why the City allowed it, and why it was designated
26 R-3/high-density. He stated that he felt subdividing the parcel in 2013 opened Pandora's Box. He
27 stated that allowing 30 homes in this area under the 'rules' of the City would be ridiculous. He
28 stated that the people who live here appreciate the current uniqueness of the neighborhood.

29
30 Doug Weston, 106 Gleahaven Road, stated that they have lived here for 16 years and bought here
31 because they loved the lot and the neighborhood and its differentiation. He noted that there has
32 been a lot of talk about stormwater management, and from their perspective, all the water comes
33 down from the hill and drains into the ditch on their property. He stated that at times this can end
34 up being like a river and gushes down to the area and meanders through their property. He stated
35 that if they do away with a lot of the seepage that can occur on the open ground, he felt this situation
36 would only get worse. He stated that was one of his major concerns, and referenced another
37 neighbor in the area who wasn't here tonight who had shared the same concerns with him related
38 to stormwater management. He stated that the character of the neighborhood would change
39 dramatically if the City allowed 4 more homes to be built.

40
41 There being no other member of the public wishing to comment further on the application, Chair
42 Cameron closed the public hearing at 7:46 p.m.

43
44 Chair Cameron referenced a question asked during the public hearing about the R-3 zoning and
45 the references to both high and low density. He noted that his understanding was that there was
46 no high and low because it was just guided for 1 to 3 units per acre.

1
2 Mr. Sharpe stated that the difference was Comp Plan guidance versus zoning. He explained that
3 the Comprehensive Plan guidance sets the zoning, which determines the maximum density allowed
4 in those zones, and is the overarching rule that in this case allows up to 3 units per acre. He noted
5 that both guidance and zoning apply to the application, and stated that the zoning district had the
6 more nuanced and detailed standards that reflected the Comprehensive Plan guidance. He stated
7 that the purpose of the R-3 zoning district was to have high-density single-family dwelling units,
8 but that is a high density within the context of Wayzata, and must meet the overall guidance of 1
9 to 3 units per acre.

10
11 Chair Cameron stated that with this information, if you ignored property lines on the 6 acres of the
12 neighborhood, that would mean it would be guided for a total of 6 to 18 houses.

13
14 Mr. Sharpe stated that it was correct, but noted that he believed 10 acres was used, which would
15 mean 10 to 30 homes.

16
17 Commissioner Schwalbe asked the applicant to address the last-minute notice of the neighborhood
18 meeting.

19
20 Ms. Thompson apologized for the last-minute notice of the neighborhood meeting, but noted that
21 a neighborhood meeting in this instance was not required. She explained that this was why she
22 had gone around the neighborhood knocking on doors to speak with the residents in the
23 neighborhood. She stated that later in the process, staff had recommended that they hold a
24 neighborhood meeting even though it wasn't required, and that was why the notification ended up
25 being last-minute. She stated that she appreciated the concerns that had been shared in the public
26 hearing and that they cared so much about the neighborhood. She stated that many of the
27 comments referenced 4 new homes, but clarified that it would only be 2 additional homes because
28 there were already 2 homes there. She noted that there was a concern raised about the 3-car garage
29 and explained that they had only shown that on their plans to show that it would be possible, and
30 it was not intended to show that the homes would be cookie-cutter homes. She assured the residents
31 that the homes would be custom and beautiful. She reviewed some of the benefits of this project
32 moving forward, including park dedication fees. She noted that she believed the R-3 zoning of the
33 property came into effect sometime in the 1970s.

34
35 Mr. Sharpe explained that staff found that in 1971, the properties were zoned R-2, and in 1980,
36 they were zoned R-3, but noted that it was unclear when the exact action to rezone the properties
37 took place. He stated that the properties have been zoned R-3 at least since 1980, but it was
38 possible that it took place before that time.

39
40 Ms. Thompson stated that she understood the concern raised by Mr. Foss, but didn't think many
41 of the lots in the neighborhood would be able to meet the criteria for subdividing their lots, so they
42 wouldn't be able to put that many homes in. She stated that she will have their engineer look into
43 the stormwater drainage concerns raised by Mr. Weston.

44
45 Commissioner Schwalbe stated that she had driven through the neighborhood a few times, and if
46 she were to pick out homes that were rental properties, she would have picked these two homes

1 because they look like they have not been carefully tended to. She noted that she sensed that better
2 homes may be a benefit to the neighborhood and make it even more beautiful, as long as they could
3 maintain the trees and the brightness. She agreed with Ms. Thompson that this request was just
4 for 2 additional homes and not 4. She reiterated that she thought this proposal would be an
5 advantage to the community as a whole to have new construction there.

6
7 Commissioner Ankeny stated that she also drove through the neighborhood several times and
8 thought the two existing homes looked dated and not in character with the rest of the neighborhood.
9 She stated that she also felt that it may be better for the neighborhood to have 2 new homes there,
10 and believed the proposed homes would be to scale in the neighborhood. She stated that her initial
11 thoughts on this proposal were that it could be an improvement for the neighborhood.

12
13 Commissioner Elg stated that he appreciated the comments shared by Commissioners Schwalbe
14 and Ankeny, but he had mixed feelings because he lived on a street that was almost identical to
15 this area. He stated that a long vacant lot in his neighborhood was being developed with a two-
16 story home that has a 4-car garage, which is completely outside of the character of his street. He
17 explained that he was sympathetic to the concerns shared by the neighbors, but noted that he felt
18 this proposal would help decrease the noise from the road. He noted that he agreed that the existing
19 homes were not very attractive, and felt it was highly unlikely that the 4 homes would be identical
20 with 3-car garages in the front. He stated that he believed it was more likely that they would all
21 be unique custom-built homes. He noted that beautiful new homes would be a lot better than 2
22 ugly homes.

23
24 Commissioner VanLoy stated that he didn't think the fact that these homes are rental properties
25 should be part of the discussion. He noted that he has split feelings about this proposal, and felt
26 that 4 homes on this property was knocking on the door of the smallest lot in the neighborhood.
27 He stated that he understood that change can be hard, but also did not think that this change would
28 be bad, and reiterated his concern about the lot sizes being so different than the majority of the
29 homes in the neighborhood.

30
31 Chair Cameron stated that he lives in a similar neighborhood, and a lot was subdivided about 8
32 years ago, and the result was that 2 larger homes that essentially look like garages were put in. He
33 noted that if they were to build 4 houses right next to each other, and over 50% of the frontage of
34 the homes is garages, he felt that would be an issue, because it would be out of character with the
35 neighborhood. He explained that he had walked the neighborhood to get a different perspective,
36 and he was struck by the fact that all the homes in the neighborhood have large front yard spaces,
37 and there was also a lot of separation between the homes, which he felt was lost in the current
38 proposal. He stated that he felt having 3 lots instead of 4 would be a better fit for the area.

39
40 Commissioner Plantan stated that she was sympathetic with the neighbors, but the Commission's
41 job is to go back to the guiding documents, and the proposal for 4 lots doesn't require any variances
42 or rezoning, and aligns with the City's Comprehensive Plan and the density guidance. She stated
43 that change can be hard, but in reviewing this proposal, the stormwater management will be
44 improved, the tree plan is generous and sensitive to the heritage trees, and would be across all 4
45 lots. She stated that this would go from having 3 families living on these lots to 4 families.

1 Commissioner Elg stated that he agreed that 3 homes rather than 4 homes would be a better fit.
2 He referenced a situation near The Landings Hotel where they were seeking 3 homes, and the City
3 had encouraged them to come back with 2, and that has turned out beautifully.
4

5 Commissioner Severson noted that she agreed with most of what had already been shared by the
6 Commission. She noted that one of the things that she was getting hung up on was the slope of
7 Lot 3, and stated that the character of the neighborhood would look different if it had flat lots. She
8 explained that she could go either way on this proposal,
9

10 Commissioner Schwalbe stated that the building process is not very pleasant for the neighborhood
11 because of the necessary trucks, dirt, and noise, but they need to look ahead to what it can bring in
12 the future. She stated that in this case, she believed that they would end up having beautiful homes
13 after they live through a year or two of dirt.
14

15 Commissioner Elg stated that, within the criteria for consideration, the only one they are really
16 discussing is whether this would change the character of the neighborhood.
17

18 Commissioner Plantan asked for the garage setback requirements for R-3A.
19

20 Mr. Sharpe explained that within R-3A, two setbacks apply: a house setback of 20 feet and the
21 garages must be setback 25 feet, but clarified that R-3 did not have that requirement.
22

23 Commissioner Ankeny asked if the Commission could make that a condition of approval.
24

25 Mr. Schelzel stated that the Code would allow for adding conditions of approval as long as they
26 are appropriate, and go toward protecting the health, safety, welfare, comfort, and convenience of
27 the City. He stated that the conditions need to be reasonable and need to be linked to something.
28

29 Commissioner Severson stated that having 4 narrow lots was not in character with the
30 neighborhood, and also felt there was the potential that the architectural appearance, scale, and
31 mass could negatively impact the neighborhood. She clarified that she wasn't saying that the
32 Commission shouldn't recommend approval of the proposal, but there were some possible adverse
33 impacts from this application.
34

35 Chair Cameron reiterated his concerns about the proposed homes not matching the space between
36 homes in the rest of the neighborhood, and explained that he would feel better if they had 3 lots
37 instead of 4.
38

39 Commissioner Elg stated that someone would buy one of the single-family homes, tear it down,
40 and, if they didn't ask for variances, could build a home without neighborhood input, which could
41 still change the character of the neighborhood.
42

43 Commissioner VanLoy stated that the home on Lot 3 will end up being a beacon on a hill because
44 of the topography, which will stand out as being out of character with the neighborhood.
45

46 Commissioner Schwalbe asked if there would be leveling on land.

Chair Cameron noted that the applicant had mentioned there would be earthwork.

Mr. Sharpe explained that the City had a maximum amount of grading that is allowed without City Council approval, and this proposal was beneath that requirement, so it would not require City Council approval. He noted that there would be grading, cutting, and filling as part of the project.

Chair Cameron asked for a motion.

Commissioner Severson made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Cameron, to direct staff to prepare a draft Planning Commission Report and recommendation of denial of the request for a Subdivision at 190 Gleason Lake Road and 121 Gleahaven Road with the appropriate findings related to the negative impacts of it altering the character of the neighborhood, the scale, pattern, density, and character of the homes, related to criteria 5, 6, and 7 of the Subdivision Ordinance.

Upon a roll call vote, the motion failed with 3 Ayes (Cameron, VanLoy, and Severson), 4 Nays (Ankeny, Plantan, Schwalbe, and Elg).

Commissioner Elg explained that he had not meant to say Nay and should have changed his vote to Aye.

Mr. Schelzel stated that in light of Commissioner Elg's statement, Chair Cameron could ask for the same motion again, and they could take another vote.

Commissioner Severson made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Cameron, to direct staff to prepare a draft Planning Commission Report and recommendation of denial of the request for a Subdivision at 190 Gleason Lake Road and 121 Gleahaven Road with the appropriate findings related to the negative impacts of it altering the character of the neighborhood, the scale, pattern, density, and character of the homes, related to criteria 5, 6, and 7 of the Subdivision Ordinance.

Upon a roll call vote, the motion carried with 4 Ayes (Cameron, Elg, Severson, and VanLoy), 3 Nays (Ankeny, Plantan, and Schwalbe).

AGENDA ITEM 6. Other Items:

b) Review of Development Activities

Mr. Sharpe noted that the City has had a slow spring with building permit requests.

c) Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

Commissioner Severson stated that she would not be at the next Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Sharpe suggested that she could send him an email if she wanted to weigh in on the potential bylaw change discussion.

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 Cameron made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Ankeny, to adjourn the
6 Planning Commission meeting.

7
8 The motion carried unanimously.

9
10 The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 8:32 p.m.

11
12 Respectfully submitted,

13 Kayla Atkins Rokosz

14 *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*

15