

**WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 23, 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

Present at roll call were Chair Cameron and Commissioners Plantan, Schwalbe, Elg, VanLoy, and Ankeny. Community Development Director Alex Sharpe and City Attorney David Schelzel were also present.

Absent at roll call was Commissioner Severson.

AGENDA ITEM 3. Approval of Agenda

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

Commissioner Plantan made a motion, seconded by Commissioner VanLoy, to approve the February 23, 2026, agenda as presented.

The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 4. Consent Agenda

a.) Approval of the February 9, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

**b.) Approve Planning Commission Report and Recommendation of Denial of
Subdivision by Preliminary Plat at 190 Gleason Lake Road and 121 Gleahaven
Road**

Chair Cameron read the items on the consent agenda and asked if any Commissioner wished to pull an item for further discussion. He noted that a letter from Lake West Development related to the Application for Preliminary Plat at 190 Gleason Lake Road and 121 Gleahaven Road had been provided to the Planning Commission, and that it would be added to the record.

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

Commissioner Elg made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Schwalbe, 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. New Business**

6
7 **a) Discussion of Planning Commission Representation at Council Meetings**

8
9 Community Development Director Sharpe explained that in the last year several of the
10 Commissioners have expressed a desire for a potential change to the Bylaws of the Commission,
11 which require Planning Commission members to in turn represent the Commission at regular City
12 Council meetings on a rotating basis. He stated that the purpose of this item on the agenda was to
13 allow for Commissioners to discuss the current bylaws, their perspectives, and whether the
14 Commission would have a recommendation to the City Council to amend the Bylaws. He briefly
15 reviewed the process of making a recommendation for this change and outlined three possible
16 actions that the Commission could choose following their discussion.

17
18 Chair Cameron stated that he believed the original intent of the requirement was that
19 Commissioners would attend the Council meeting to then report back to the Commission and
20 questioned whether this practice had occurred in the past.

21
22 Mr. Sharpe noted that the Bylaws do not include a requirement to report back to the Commission,
23 but that did occur in past practice.

24
25 Commissioner Plantan asked if the intent would still be to have one Commissioner attend every
26 City Council meeting.

27
28 Mr. Sharpe stated that staff was facilitating this discussion and that if there was a recommendation
29 for an amendment, it would be from the Commission to City Council. Mr. Sharpe noted that he
30 would like the Commission to discuss the topic and explained that some Commissioners have
31 expressed a desire to not be required to attend meetings that were light on items relevant to the
32 Commission and that they would rather focus attention on items where they felt there would be
33 value for the Commission to learn about particular topics, even if they weren't Planning
34 Commission related, or following specific Planning Commission items.

35
36 City Attorney Schelzel stated that the other rationale discussed at the Commission's workshop on
37 this topic was that often City Council members come from the ranks of the Planning Commission,
38 and a familiarity with Council meetings and current business may be another reason that this
39 requirement was included in the Bylaws. He stated that he agreed with Community Development
40 Director Sharpe that this had been in the Bylaws as long as he could remember and that even
41 though there was not a Bylaw related to the Commissioners reporting back, it was what used to be
42 done. He noted that most of this practice pre-dated being able to watch the City Council meetings
43 online, on-demand.

44
45 Commissioner Elg stated that he thinks the Commission should consider eliminating Section 3.6
46 of the Bylaws altogether, and not require any attendance at the City Council meetings.

1
2 Mr. Sharpe stated that is an option as the Commission could make a recommendation to amend
3 the Bylaws, however they like.

4
5 Commissioner Elg stated that he would recommend eliminating Section 3.6 and the requirement
6 for the Commissioners to attend the City Council meetings, and Commissioners could still choose
7 to attend those meetings whenever they liked.

8
9 Commissioner VanLoy asked if there have been times at City Council meetings where the Council
10 has asked questions of the Planning Commissioner who was present.

11
12 Mr. Schelzel stated that he did not recall that happening and would also discourage it, unless it
13 was the Planning Commission Chair being directed to attend as a representative of the Commission
14 to report on a policy question they had researched or been tasked with reviewing.

15
16 Chair Cameron asked if the Bylaws were to be amended to allow Commissions to choose to attend
17 or not, what issues may arise if, for example, four of the Commissioners chose to show up for a
18 particular meeting.

19
20 Mr. Sharpe stated that he had already checked on that scenario with City Clerk Leervig and
21 explained that it would not constitute a meeting of the Planning Commission because they were
22 not discussing official business. He noted that he would advise them not to sit together or discuss
23 the topic as a group, but the scenario would not violate open meeting law or require formal meeting
24 notice as they would be attending as members of the public.

25
26 Chair Cameron stated that he felt it was still important that the Commission attend City Council
27 meetings to see the business and observe how the recommendations from Planning Commission
28 impact City Council discussion. He proposed that instead of forcing attendance into a rigid
29 schedule, the Bylaws could provide Commissioners the option to attend Council meetings of
30 interest. He explained that his thoughts were to have a requirement parameter be twice a year,
31 once in the first half of the year and once in the second half of the year, or quarterly.

32
33 Commissioner Schwalbe asked what form the previously practiced report back to the Commission
34 had taken.

35
36 Mr. Sharpe stated that it was a report back to the other Commissioners during their discussion on
37 other topics but noted that it was before his time with the City.

38
39 Mr. Schelzel stated that was correct, and explained that the report was part of a normal discussion,
40 with the Commissioner giving a quick summary of what took place at the City Council meeting.

41
42 Commissioner Plantan stated that she served at the time those reports were given. She noted that
43 this practice was before City meetings were available online and felt it was helpful to come back
44 to the Commission and give them a quick summary. She explained that she would recommend
45 that they either get rid of this requirement completely or keep what they have, instead of what was
46 proposed by Chair Cameron, because she felt that would get too complicated.

1
2 Commissioner Schwalbe noted that with the current schedule, it already works out that each
3 Commissioner attends a Council meeting in the first half of the year and another in the second half
4 of the year.

5
6 Mr. Sharpe stated that the current schedule rotation requires each Commissioner attend 3 City
7 Council meetings in a year.

8
9 Commissioner Schwalbe stated that she had attended some City Council meetings that were very
10 short, and if that is what the agenda looks like, she felt it was a lot to ask that the Commissioners
11 schedule their day around coming to a 10 or 15-minute meeting.

12
13 Commissioner Ankeny stated that she agreed with Commissioner Schwalbe and noted that if there
14 is no requirement to report back information and that could not also be found online, she was not
15 sure what the purpose would be to have Commissioners attend the City Council meetings. She
16 explained that she would rather attend a meeting that had some 'meat' in it rather than something
17 procedural where they had nothing on the agenda.

18
19 Commissioner VanLoy stated that this was also his thought and noted that he believes there used
20 to be a purpose in this, but he was uncertain that purpose still existed. He stated that he would like
21 to see the Bylaws amended so that physical attendance was no longer a requirement for the
22 Commission because the Commission could follow along and see what happens at the City Council
23 level by going online, or could still choose to attend the meetings.

24
25 Commissioner Elg asked if any of the other City Commissions had been asked to attend City
26 Council meetings.

27
28 Mr. Sharpe stated that the Heritage Preservation Board used to have a requirement to attend, but
29 that had been removed from their Bylaws. He noted that HPB members have been asked to attend
30 Council meetings related to significant actions the Board has taken so they can present to the City
31 Council. He stated that most Commissions come forward to the City Council approximately once
32 a year to make a presentation or recap topics/actions.

33
34 Commissioner Elg stated that there seemed to be a growing consensus to eliminate Section 3.6
35 from the Bylaws.

36
37 Commissioner VanLoy suggested that the Commission make a recommendation to change the
38 Bylaws to suggest that each Planning Commission member follow along with City Council
39 meetings for significant Planning Commission agenda items. He stated that this would make it
40 clear that the Commission had considered the fact that the Planning Commission should be paying
41 attention to what the City Council does.

42
43 Commissioner Schwalbe stated that she would like to see language included that it would be highly
44 recommended that the Planning Commissioners watch the City Council meetings on a regular
45 basis.

46

1 Commissioner VanLoy agreed that there would be value in doing what was suggested by
2 Commissioner Schwalbe.

3
4 Chair Cameron asked for a motion to reflect their discussion.

5
6 Mr. Schelzel noted that the Commission could make a recommendation for a change, and staff
7 could bring it directly to the City Council for consideration, or staff could draft the proposed
8 changes and bring this topic back to the Commission for review before it goes to the City Council.

9
10 Mr. Sharpe suggested that when this recommendation is presented to the City Council, a member
11 of the Planning Commission attend to present the item to City Council to ensure that it is fully
12 explained.

13
14 Chair Cameron offered to represent the Planning Commission at a future Council meeting to
15 explain their recommendation.

16
17 Commissioner VanLoy made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Elg, to direct staff to prepare
18 a draft amendment to the Planning Commission Bylaws, changing Section 3.6 to reflect the
19 discussion regarding the elimination of the requirement for physical attendance at the City Council
20 meetings.

21
22 The motion carried 5-1 (Cameron opposed).

23
24 **AGENDA ITEM 7. Public Hearing Items**

25
26 **AGENDA ITEM 8. Other Items:**

27
28 Chair Cameron stated that he would like to consider potential items that the Commission desires
29 to run through the City Council. He noted that there have been side discussions regarding the City's
30 zoning ordinance and some of the difficulties with how current zoning functions or reads. He
31 stated that he felt it would be good to make Council aware of possible issues with the ordinance
32 and start pulling some of those details apart. He referenced the zoning for the Gleahaven
33 neighborhood and central Wayzata having similar requirements, as an example, but the areas are
34 very different neighborhoods that he felt should be zoned differently. He stated that some of the
35 difficulties that come from having them zoned the same could be eliminated by a review and update
36 of the zoning.

37
38 Commissioner VanLoy stated that he agreed and noted that R-3 and R-3A are significantly
39 different in terms of property characteristics, but the zoning standards were essentially the same.
40 He stated that he thought it was a good idea to make the City Council aware that the Planning
41 Commission has seen some difficulties that could be addressed with an update of the zoning before
42 they begin the Comprehensive Plan process.

43
44 **a) Planning Commission Meeting Schedule**
45

1 Mr. Sharpe noted that the Walser Lamborghini application would be on tomorrow night's City
2 Council meeting agenda. He noted that the next Planning Commission meeting was scheduled for
3 March 9, 2026, but he currently did not have any agenda items slated for that night, so it may end
4 up being cancelled.

5
6 **b) Review of Development Activities**
7

8 Mr. Sharpe gave a brief update on the current projects happening in the City, including: Wells
9 Fargo site; Moments of Wayzata; Westway Condominiums; Harbors of Wayzata (Cantissimo);
10 and a demolition permit/building permit at 720 Wayzata Boulevard.

11
12 Chair Cameron asked if there were any updates related to 200 Lake Street East.
13

14 Mr. Sharpe explained that they were moving through a second stage of litigation, but noted that
15 the applicant had applied for a Hennepin County grant to clean up the site, due to it being a former
16 railroad site and that the City is scheduled to apply for a DEED grant to assist with the
17 contamination cleanup as well.

18
19 Commissioner Ankeny asked about past discussions related to forming a Retail Task Force to talk
20 about how retail has been working on Lake Street.
21

22 Mr. Sharpe stated that he has made the City Council aware of this discussion and the topic has
23 been scheduled for discussion at a City Council Workshop in late spring or early summer.
24

25 Commissioner VanLoy asked what would be going into the new building on Lake Street, where
26 Caribou used to be located.
27

28 Mr. Sharpe explained that there have been rumors, but noted that the City had not received interior
29 build-out permit applications or information about whether the proposed use could go into the
30 space or not.
31

32 **AGENDA ITEM 9. Adjournment.**
33

34 There being no further business on the agenda, Chair Cameron asked for a motion to adjourn.
35

36 Commissioner VanLoy made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Schwalbe, to adjourn the
37 Planning Commission meeting.
38

39 The motion carried unanimously.
40

41 The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.
42

43 Respectfully submitted,
44 Kayla Atkins Rokosz

45 *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*