

WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION
APPROVED MEETING MINUTES
MAY 15, 2017

AGENDA ITEM 1. Call to Order and Roll Call

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

Present at roll call were Commissioners: Young, Gruber, Iverson, and Buchanan. Absent: Gonzalez, Murray, Flannigan. Director of Planning and Building Jeff Thomson and City Attorney David Schelzel were also present.

AGENDA ITEM 2. Approval of Agenda

Commissioner Buchanan made a motion, Seconded by Commissioner Young, to approve the May 15, 2017 meeting agenda as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 3. Approval of Minutes

a.) None

AGENDA ITEM 4. Public Hearing Items:

a.) Nolan Properties – 1330 Wayzata Blvd E

i. Design review, Conditional Use Permits, Variances

Director of Planning and Building Thomson stated the applicant, Nolan Properties Group, LLC, has submitted a development agreement for the property at 1330 Wayzata Blvd E. The proposal includes demolition of the existing building, parking lot, and other site improvements. The new development would consist of a 4,500 square-foot commercial building and 47 on-site parking stalls. In addition, a new 9-foot public sidewalk would be constructed adjacent to Wayzata Blvd. As part of the submitted development application, the applicant is requesting approval of the design with deviations, conditional use permit (CUP) for drive-in facilities, CUP for restaurant, CUP for convenience food restaurant, variance from the minimum parking lot setback requirement, variance from the minimum landscaping area requirements, and variance from the minimum parking stall requirements.

The City's Tree Preservation Ordinance states that for projects that require design review, up to 10% of the inches of significant trees may be removed for the project. Removal beyond 10% requires tree replacement mitigation or a fee in lieu of such replacement. For heritage trees, all possible measures must be taken to preserve heritage trees and heritage trees can only be removed when there is not a practical alternative. Any heritage tree removal requires two inches of tree replacement for every one inch removed. There are a total of seven trees on the property, one

1 heritage and six significant trees. The proposed plan includes the removal of the heritage tree and
2 one significant tree. The tree preservation plan indicates that the heritage tree, a 26-inch green
3 ash, is in poor health. If the City Forester confirms the ash tree meets the City's definition of a
4 dead, diseased, dying, or hazard tree, it would not be required to be replaced.

5
6 Applicant's representative, Ms. Katelyn Murray, Nolan Properties Group, 328 Barry Avenue S,
7 Wayzata, discussed the significant complexities of the property, including the disrepair of the
8 existing building and parking lot on the site, the poor circulation on the property due to the
9 significant drop from the front of the property to the back of the property, and the narrowness of
10 the site. She stated the proposed design would bring a fresh complimentary look to the corridor
11 and the clean design brings life to the street and creates a sense of place. This is accomplished
12 through high quality and attractive building materials, building massing, and a significant amount
13 of glazing.

14
15 Applicant's architect, Mr. Jack Amdal, Studio 55 Architects, 10700 Highway 55, Plymouth, stated
16 they are planning to use two types of material on the exterior of the proposed building to
17 differentiate the two tenants of the property. They pushed the building as close to the street as
18 possible while maintaining circular access in order to push the urban edge on the building. The
19 sidewalk was added to increase the connectivity of the project and broadening the public sidewalk.
20 He provided samples of the exterior materials they are proposing to use. He explained the use of
21 the rain screen would reduce the potential for mold in the exterior of the building. The glazing on
22 the building would be clear in order to show the lighting in the winter months.

23
24 Ms. Murray stated meeting the City's comprehensive plan objectives for the Wayzata Blvd.
25 corridor is challenging without some relief in the dimensions required in the Zoning Ordinance.
26 The project would provide significant benefits including site improvements from existing
27 conditions, improved vehicular circulation, increased landscape buffers around the site, and
28 significant Stormwater Management improvements.

29
30 Commissioner Buchanan asked what the current building setback was from the street.

31
32 Mr. Amdal stated the proposed building would be close to the same distance from the street as the
33 existing building.

34
35 Commissioner Young stated since there were no tenants identified for the property, it might be
36 premature to discuss the design standards.

37
38 Ms. Murray stated that based on their experience with design, they looked at the tenant
39 possibilities, and included these possible scenarios into the building design and application.

40
41 Mr. Thomson stated the project proposed in this particular application approached the building
42 design in a manner that the City would like to see it done, by designing a quality building for the
43 community and not a franchise building for a particular client or tenant.

44
45 Chair Iverson asked if the applicant would alter the design based on potential tenants.

46

1 Ms. Murray stated they would be looking for quality tenants that would work with the design they
2 have presented for the building.

3
4 Mr. Thomson stated the City has strict design standards limits related to franchise architecture. If
5 the building design were to change, it would likely need to come back to the City for review and
6 approval.

7
8 Chair Iverson asked why there was only the drive-up window on the east side of the building.

9
10 Mr. Amdal discussed how the corner feature of the building wraps the corner. The back of the
11 building would be where the maintenance areas and bathrooms will be located. These areas would
12 not be suitable for windows.

13
14 Commissioner Gruber stated the applicant had done a good job with the narrative in outlining the
15 difficulties with the site, including applicable references to the Comprehensive Plan, and
16 explaining in depth the reasons for the variance requests. She expressed concern however with
17 the grade change along the east side of the building. She asked how the applicant would deal with
18 this significant elevation change.

19
20 Ms. Murray stated they would be raising the grade in the back of the lot. There would be a small
21 retaining wall along the property line. There will be a safety feature provided once the height is
22 determined.

23
24 Chair Iverson asked if there would be any runoff into the wetland with the infiltration system the
25 applicant would be installing.

26
27 Ms. Murray stated there would be some but it would be significantly reduced from what it is
28 currently. They would be installing two new catch basins and infiltration system.

29
30 Commissioner Buchanan asked what the setbacks were currently on the property.

31
32 Mr. Thomson stated currently the parking lot is a zero-foot setback from the east and west property
33 lines.

34
35 Chair Iverson expressed concerns about the increased traffic on Wayzata Boulevard. She noted
36 that this would be a policy question for the City Council and Hennepin County with respect to the
37 road.

38
39 Ms. Murray stated they had looked at the traffic as it related to the project. The circulation around
40 the site would be improved over existing conditions, and that they would be adding access points
41 and traffic flow would be in the path of least resistance. They would stripe the turn lanes at the
42 access points.

43
44 Chair Iverson stated she was concerned about the traffic and with the application presented, they
45 did not have a clear understanding of the traffic impacts because the tenants of the building had

1 not been identified. She would like to know who the tenants would be and see the traffic studies
2 before approving.

3
4 Ms. Murray stated they have built similar projects along busy streets with only one curb cut. They
5 did not have tenants identified for these projects prior to construction. They were able to identify
6 the tenants that would work best for the building and the community. They do consider the traffic
7 when determining the tenants.

8
9 Mr. Thomson stated the staff also reviews traffic with every project. The current access point is
10 the best location in order to address the circulation on the three sites the access point serves.

11
12 Commissioner Young stated the traffic concerns would be a policy question for the City Council
13 but they would not be applicable to the application that is being presented.

14
15 Chair Iverson opened the public hearing on the Application at 7:53 p.m.

16
17 Mr. Thomson stated the Commission had received a written response to the Application from
18 Patrick Lensing, on behalf of Laskin Properties, and this would be included in the public record.

19
20 Ms. Joni Holst, 121 Bushaway Road, Wayzata, expressed concerns about the traffic for Wayzata
21 Boulevard and on Bushaway Road. She asked if the access to Bushaway Road would remain. She
22 would like to know who the tenants of the building would be because some would have higher
23 traffic volumes. She also expressed concerns about miscellaneous cars being in the adjacent office
24 building parking lot at all hours of the day and night. The increased traffic would increase the
25 number of cars in the parking lot and her home is next to this parking lot.

26
27 Mr. George Daniels, 1285 Zircon Lane N, Minneapolis, stated he works at the Carisch building.
28 He stated he recently purchased 1310 Wayzata Boulevard. He had talked with the applicant about
29 development on this property. He stated unless all of Wayzata Boulevard were a redevelopment
30 district the City can not do anything about the curb cuts. He suggested signage along the roadway.
31 He stated that the proposed application is a good development. He further stated he had installed
32 LED lights in the lower portion of his parking lot to eliminate people hanging out in the parking
33 lot, and he suggested Ms. Holst contact the office building owners and discuss their parking lot
34 with them. He supports the application.

35
36 There being no one further who wished to speak, Chair Iverson closed the public hearing at 8:05
37 p.m.

38
39 Commissioner Young stated he supports the CUP requests, the variance request for minimum
40 parking lot setback and the variance from the minimum landscaping area. However, with respect
41 to the parking stall variance requested, he stated the gap in the number of parking stalls on the site
42 and what would be required is too large without knowing the actual tenant mix.

43
44 Commissioner Gruber expressed concerns about potential lighting problems along the south side
45 of the property and the neighboring residential property.

46

1 Ms. Murray stated they would accommodate the resident with reducing the light in this area but
2 they are also raising the grade along the south so the traffic lights would not shine directly into the
3 home. They would also have trees along the property line that would reduce the exposure to the
4 surrounding properties. On parking, she noted that the Zoning Ordinance requires 58 parking stalls
5 for a coffee shop and convenience food restaurant but according to the traffic study, a coffee use
6 in the building would have a peak demand of 23 parking stalls and a convenience food use would
7 have a peak demand of 23 parking stalls. These two uses also have different parking demand times
8 which allows for the 47 proposed parking stalls to meet these demands. She stated there are other
9 uses that would also comply with the parking provided on the property.

10
11 Chair Iverson asked how much the grading would be increased and if the lighting would be a
12 problem for the second level of the residential property.

13
14 Ms. Murray stated she did not know the exact height of the grade increase but with the appropriate
15 screening and safety measures they would be able to block the headlights from the neighboring
16 residential property.

17
18 Commissioner Gruber stated she is hesitant to approve the variance for the required parking stalls.

19
20 Ms. Murray stated she had talked with the property manager for the dental office building and no
21 one will be incentivized to go up the hill to use their parking lot. But they want to be good neighbors
22 and will police this activity as much as possible. They worked to balance the amount of parking
23 with the size of the building.

24
25 Mr. Daniels stated there had been a parking study done 10-years ago and it looked at the type of
26 use versus the expected turnover of parking. The proposed strip mall type building with only two
27 uses would provide for a quicker turnover in parking. The drive-thru also reduces the need for
28 parking.

29
30 Mr. Thomson clarified that the tenant combination of a restaurant and coffee shop would be the
31 only reason the parking would be out of compliance. He reviewed the applicant's illumination
32 plan and the City's illumination requirements. The proposed plan does meet all of the City's
33 requirements, and the illumination levels along the south property line meet the City's standards.

34
35 Commissioner Buchanan stated he had concerns about the parking until he reviewed the in-depth
36 information the applicant had provided. He would support the parking stall variance.

37
38 Chair Iverson stated she had concerns about the parking stall variance without knowing who the
39 tenants would be.

40
41 Commissioner Gruber stated Mr. Daniels had persuaded her about the parking stall variance. The
42 parking provided in this project is more than what is provided at other locations, and the two uses
43 that are being discussed do have different peak times. She would support the application as
44 presented.

45

Commissioner Young made a motion, Seconded by Commissioner Gruber, to direct staff to prepare a draft Planning Commission Report and Recommendation, recommending approval of the development application for 1330 Wayzata Boulevard, including approval of the design with requested deviations, approval of the CUP for drive-in facilities, approval of the CUP for restaurant, approval of the CUP for convenience food restaurant, approval of the variance from the minimum parking lot setback requirement, approval of the variance from the minimum landscaping area requirements, and approval of the variance from the minimum parking requirements, with certain conditions as discussed and appropriate findings of fact. The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 5. Old Business Items:

a.) None

AGENDA ITEM 6. Other Items:

a.) Review of Development Activities

Director of Planning and Building Thomson stated that at the last City Council meeting, the Heritage Preservation Board presented the Centennial House Award, and the Council approved the variance request for 128 Broadway N. The agenda for the next City Council meeting includes: HPB presentation of the Mayor's Award for best preserved home, review of the Tree Ordinance amendments, and review of the Comp Plan Community Engagement contract. The agenda for the next Planning Commission meeting will include the review of the draft report and recommendation for 1330 Wayzata Blvd. He stated he would check with Commissioners about rescheduling the July 3 meeting.

b.) Next Meeting is Scheduled for June 5, 2017

AGENDA ITEM 7. Adjournment.

Commissioner Young made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Gruber, to adjourn the meeting of the Planning Commission. The motion carried unanimously.

The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 8:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tina Borg
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.