

**WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MAY 18, 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, Severson, and VanLoy. Planner Hedblom, Planning Intern Jagodzinski, City Forester Myhran, and City Attorney David Schelzel were also present.

Absent at roll call were Commissioners: Elg and Ankeny.

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 May 18, 2026, agenda as presented.

The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 4. Consent Agenda

a.) Approval of the May 4, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

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

Hearing no such request, Chair Cameron asked for a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

Commissioner Severson made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Plantan, 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 Zoning Text Amendment to Chapter 950 – General Zoning District Provisions

Planning Intern Jagodzinski gave a brief overview of the amendments proposed by staff to Chapter 950 of the City's Zoning Code, which would make minor updates to the zoning district titles in the table of that Chapter to match the current zoning district names on the official zoning map and in other chapters of the Zoning Code.

Commissioner Schwalbe asked when the discrepancy between the titles in Chapter 950 and the rest of code came about, and why they needed to make the changes.

Ms. Jagodzinski explained that some of the titles in the Chapter 950 table were outdated and inconsistent with the Zoning Map, which could cause confusion.

Commissioner Schwalbe stated that she wanted to make sure the title changes were not proposed for an increase in density requirements for districts.

Chair Cameron confirmed with Planning Intern Jagodzinski that the purpose of the proposed amendment is simply to correct outdated district titles in one specific section of code so they align correctly consistently throughout Code and on the official Zoning Map. He stated that the Commission was not being asked to change the current titles, description or requirements of the Zoning Districts, rather just correct the outdated titles in this section.

Commissioner Schwalbe reiterated her question about when the discrepancy had happened.

City Attorney Schelzel underscored that this amendment proposal was not a substantive change and was really just to bring consistency between the map and this particular part of the Code. He stated that he thinks this discrepancy may have happened when the City adopted the Use Table to streamline the Zoning Ordinance, so that permitted uses and conditional uses would be found within the table. He recalled that it happened sometime within the last 5 years.

Commissioner Schwalbe stated that the proposed title changes appear to increase the density possibilities for R-3A, R-4, R-4A, and R-5. She asked if the district titles as currently written in Chapter 950 were correct related to density requirements per district or if the title changes corresponded to the change in density requirements within the last few years when the State/County had asked the City to increase its density.

Planner Hedblom stated that the proposed amendment change is just a situation where this portion of the Code was not updated to match the rest, and reiterated the point that there was no substantive change to the Code. She stated that the titles within this table were never updated to the accurate titles in order to match the City's Zoning Map and the corresponding zoning district chapters within other parts of the Code. She clarified that there would not be any changes to density or the district requirements, and that the purpose of the text amendment is only to correct errors that were found while doing planning review.

1 There being no further questions for staff, Chair Cameron opened the public hearing at 6:40 p.m.
2 There being no one wishing to provide public comment, he closed the public hearing at 6:40 p.m.

3
4 After brief discussion about the amendment and its purpose among the Commissioners,
5 Commissioner Plantan made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Schwalbe, to direct staff to
6 prepare a draft Planning Commission Report and Recommendation of approval of the proposed
7 Zoning Text Amendments to Chapter 950 – General Zoning District Provisions for the
8 Commission’s review and adoption at its next meeting.

9
10 The motion carried unanimously.

11
12 **b) Consider Zoning Text Amendments to Chapter 936 – Tree Preservation**
13 **Ordinance**

14
15 Ms. Hedblom gave a brief overview of the zoning text amendments proposed by staff to Chapter
16 936, the Tree Preservation Ordinance, and explained that the additional language requested by the
17 City Forester was intended to resolve recurring points of confusion and potential unintended results
18 related to the classification of heritage and significant trees.

19
20 Commissioner Severson asked for examples of the evidence of confusion Planner Hedblom had
21 referred to.

22
23 City Forester Myhran gave a brief example of the confusion staff has encountered when reviewing
24 development and permit applications. He explained that applicants will sometimes miscalculate
25 removal/replacement allowances based on the inclusion of heritage trees in the overall total of
26 trunk inches that is used to identify the allowed removal percentage. He said that applicants will
27 include trunk inches of heritage trees because the current code language does not completely
28 differentiate between the classification of significant versus heritage trees, and that a heritage tree
29 could technically also qualify as a significant tree under a literal reading of the code definition. He
30 stated that this goes against the intent of the ordinance and is not how the code has been interpreted
31 or enforced by staff.

32
33 Mr. Schelzel stated that the proposed text amendments were explicitly written in the way the City
34 has historically interpreted the definitions in the Tree Preservation Ordinance from the beginning,
35 and the way it was intended. He explained that these proposed text amendments, like the last
36 agenda item, are not a fundamental shift in code application or a new policy question to consider.
37 He stated that this was something that he would refer to as an administrative clean-up because
38 some developers were attempting or could attempt to exploit the existing ambiguity to argue with
39 City Forester Myhran about significant and heritage tree requirements.

40
41 Commissioner VanLoy asked if homeowners had the same requirement for cutting down heritage
42 or significant trees.

43
44 Mr. Myhran stated that there are certain requirements for homeowners when there is no
45 development application and briefly reviewed the differences.
46

1 There being no further questions for staff, Chair Cameron opened the public hearing at 7:00 p.m.
2 There being no public comment, he closed the public hearing at 7:00 p.m.

3
4 After brief discussion about the amendment and its purpose among the Commissioners,
5 Commissioner Plantan made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Severson, to direct staff to
6 prepare a draft Planning Commission Report and Recommendation of approval for the proposed
7 Zoning Text Amendments to Chapter 936 - Tree Preservation Ordinance for the Commission's
8 review and adoption at its next meeting.

9
10 The motion carried unanimously.

11
12 **AGENDA ITEM 7. Other Items:**

13
14 **a) Planning Commission Meeting Schedule**

15
16 Ms. Hedblom noted that the next meeting would happen on June 1, 2026.

17
18 **b) Review of Development Activities**

19
20 Ms. Hedblom gave a brief update on the development projects throughout the City.

21
22 Commissioner VanLoy asked if there were updates regarding interior permits for the old Caribou
23 site.

24
25 Ms. Hedblom stated that the City has issued interior tenant build out permits for the two ground
26 level spaces at 641 Lake St.

27
28 Commissioner VanLoy asked what businesses would occupy those spaces and if the use would be
29 retail.

30
31 Ms. Hedblom responded that she wasn't sure if the individual tenants were ready for their
32 information to be shared publicly. She noted that one tenant will be a coffee shop and the other
33 appears to be a private business office and conference space.

34
35 Commissioner VanLoy stated he thought the ground floor use is required to be retail. He asked for
36 clarification and if the office-conference space is a permitted use.

37
38 Ms. Hedblom stated that the ordinance requirement Commissioner VanLoy referred to requires
39 fifty percent of a building's ground floor along Lake St to be retail or service commercial. She
40 explained that the property for this project is comprised of more than just the building addition at
41 the end of the block and the calculation for retail actually takes into account more building area
42 than what has been remodeled. She stated that the total building footprint for this property spans
43 through Gianni's location and that the fifty percent requirement is calculated by the full ground
44 floor footprint. She added that the interior permits were reviewed and issued by the City while she
45 was on maternity leave and that to her knowledge the use meets zoning requirements.

1 **AGENDA ITEM 8. 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 7:11 p.m.

11
12 Respectfully submitted,

13 Kayla Atkins Rokosz

14 *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*

15