

1 Mr. Thomson stated he had discussed this with City Attorney Schelzel. There is a separate non-
2 conforming use section of the Zoning Ordinance that addresses non-conforming parking.
3 Section 801.20.4 could be removed.

4
5 Mr. Thomson stated Staff recommends adding Sections 801.20.12.5.a, 801.20.12.5.b, and
6 801.20.12.c, pertaining to the minimum parking requirement for joint facilities that include
7 office, restaurant, retail, and/or government uses.

8
9 Chair Iverson asked how the percentages were calculated for retail 6:00 p.m. to midnight. Chair
10 Iverson stated these percentages seemed high because most of the businesses close between 5
11 p.m. and 6 p.m. and they are closed on Sundays.

12
13 Mr. Thomson stated these figures are from the ULI model based on national case studies. The
14 Planning Commission can discuss and change these figures.

15
16 Commissioner Gonzalez stated restaurants are busier during the 6 p.m. to midnight time than
17 retail. She state that she would recommend lowering the retail percentage for the 6 p.m. to
18 midnight times.

19
20 Chair Iverson asked if the consultant could look into these figures and make them more Wayzata
21 specific.

22
23 Mr. Thomson stated he had discussed this with SRF and it is difficult to study individual uses.
24 This is why parking ratios are based on general land uses. Mr. Thomson stated that there is
25 flexibility with the parking demand ratios and it could be lowered; but he cautioned this would
26 also apply to the broader community and these percentages could be closer to the actual usage in
27 other retail areas of the City.

28
29 Chair Iverson expressed concern about the percentages for the retail 6 p.m. to midnight amounts
30 and thought these could be lowered to 50% in order to accurately reflect Wayzata data.

31
32 Mr. Thomson stated Staff would review the data to recommend a number that more closely
33 reflects the needs of Wayzata. He pointed out that residential was not included in the ordinance
34 at this time and this may be something the City should look at, especially for the downtown area.
35 Staff could include these calculations for the Planning Commission to consider.

36
37 Commissioner Gonzalez stated the City has landscaping requirements in the Design Standard
38 Ordinance. She asked if Section 820.20.6 aligned with the Design Standard Ordinance or if it
39 could be removed.

40
41 City Attorney Schelzel stated Staff would review this to ensure the standards are clear and there
42 are no contradictions on what these standards are. This section could be removed if necessary.

43
44 Commissioner Flannigan pointed out the parking requirements for office buildings and retail had
45 only decreased slightly. He asked if this was reflective of the Commission's workshop
46 discussions.

1
2 Commissioner Gonzalez stated the Commission had discussed reducing the requirements for
3 office, and she would like to see the requirement lowered more.

4
5 Mr. Thomson stated Staff would look at these numbers and include a recommendation on
6 lowering the office parking requirements.

7
8 Commissioner Gonzalez recommended setting the parking requirements for retail and office at 3
9 stalls per 1,000 square feet of floor area.

10
11 Chair Iverson asked Staff to look into why the parking requirement for restaurants is twice as
12 high as Edina's parking requirement.

13
14 Commissioner Gonzalez stated she would support 15.2 stalls per 1,000 square foot of floor area
15 for restaurants.

16
17 Mr. Thomson stated he would change the parking requirements in the proposed language to 3
18 stalls per 1,000 square feet of floor area for retail and office uses, which could be considered by
19 the Planning Commission.

20
21 Chair Iverson opened the public hearing at 7:34 p.m.

22
23 Ms. Kathleen Kasprick, 722 Widsten Circle, Wayzata, stated at the 30 plus meetings regarding
24 the parking ramp there had been no mention of the structure being a grade+2 building. She
25 commented on the number of Commissions and Committees the City had and that the minutes do
26 not accurately reflect what happens in the City because they are prepared by an off-site paid
27 person. The City does not know how many parking stalls it needs and there seems to be no clear
28 answers on the parking structure, who is paying for it, and how many stalls are truly needed.
29 The Consultants the City hired do not have a vested interest in the City. She stated she is
30 confused about what the City is doing and the direction it is moving in. She would like to see a
31 consolidation of the actual decision making in the City.

32
33 Chair Iverson suggested Ms. Kasprick bring her concerns to the City Council because the role of
34 the Commission is to make recommendations to the City Council, who makes the decisions.

35
36 Mr. Thomson stated the City Council would be discussing the Mill Street Ramp on Tuesday,
37 March 15 at a 5:00 p.m. workshop, and on March 16 at 6:30 there will be an open house at City
38 Hall to discuss the parking ramp.

39
40 Chair Iverson closed the public hearing at 7:42 p.m.

41
42 Chair Iverson clarified the City Council had voted 3/2 on the Mill Street Parking Ramp. She
43 asked if this had been for approval of a 2-level ramp.

44
45 Mr. Thomson stated the City Council would not be voting on anything at the open house. This is
46 for the public to provide comment on the pre-design. In April, the City Council will review all

1 the comments and other information and decide if they would like to proceed forward with a
2 ramp in this location and if so, what the design would be.

3
4 Chair Iverson asked if the City had conducted any public hearings regarding the parking ramp.

5
6 City Attorney Schelzel stated the City has had several open meetings where the City Council has
7 discussed the parking ramp and the parking study. He explained that with a project of this
8 complexity, there are several decision points that are tied to different phases of the project and
9 that with the parking ordinance reviewed this evening, the Commission is making a
10 recommendation to the City Council on a small piece that is related to the parking ramp but not
11 necessarily tied to the ramp. The City Council will be moving toward a decision on moving
12 forward with the parking ramp in April, and the public is encouraged to attend all of the open
13 meetings and public hearings.

14
15 Commissioner Gonzalez stated once the City Council has a design then this would come to the
16 Planning Commission for a design standards review and public hearing.

17
18 Chair Iverson stated based on discussions, she understands that the Commission is requesting
19 Staff review the retail use percentages that are included in the chart presented and review of
20 Section 801.20.6 and determine if this should be removed or if it should be included in design
21 standards. The Commission is also recommending reducing the parking ratio for retail and
22 office.

23
24 Commissioner Flannigan stated Section 801.2.4 would also be removed.

25
26 City Attorney Schelzel asked if the Commission would like to have multi-family residential
27 added to the percentages in the shared parking table.

28
29 Chair Iverson stated there is an upcoming need and this should be included.

30
31 Commissioner Gonzalez made a motion, Seconded by Commissioner Flannigan to direct Staff to
32 prepare a draft Report and Recommendation recommending approval of the Amendment to the
33 City of Wayzata Zoning Ordinance related to Off-Street Parking and Loading, City Code Section
34 801.20 with the recommended additions and changes discussed at this meeting to be reviewed at
35 the next Planning Commission meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

36
37
38 **AGENDA ITEM 3. Regular Agenda Old Business Items:**

39
40 None.

41
42
43 **AGENDA ITEM 4. Other Items:**

44
45 **a.) Review of Development Activities**
46

1 Mr. Thomson stated the City Council would be meeting on March 15 to discuss the Mill Street
2 Ramp. The next Planning Commission meeting would include a public hearing and review of
3 the application of Universalist Unitarian Church of Minnetonka for design review, preliminary
4 plat, PUD amendment, rezoning, Comprehensive Plan Amendment and variance requests. The
5 Holdridge Homes application is still pending and the Applicant is working on a revised plan.
6
7

8 **b.) Other Items**

9

10 Chair Iverson asked if the height of the new homes on Circle drive had been looked at.
11

12 Mr. Thomson stated the building plans do conform to the height requirement but the height is
13 based on the finished grade. In order to verify the height does meet the requirements the City
14 needs the “as built” survey. During construction there are inspections to ensure the building does
15 meet the approved building plans.
16

17 Chair Iverson stated the Design Standards require decorative plantings in the front of buildings,
18 and there are several businesses in the City that only have trashcans.
19

20 Mr. Thomson stated the City had reached out to Walgreens, and they said they will work to
21 comply with these standards.
22

23 Commissioner Gonzalez provided an update from the City Council meeting including a request
24 to have the Tree Preservation Ordinance brought forward for approval. One City Council
25 member had expressed concerns with the drainage for the Huntington Avenue and Circle Drive E
26 project. The applicant had been working with Staff to address these concerns and the project
27 was approved. Police Chief Risvold made a presentation on traffic safety initiatives for Highway
28 12.
29

30 Mr. Thomson stated he would forward an update on the Heritage Preservation Board meeting.
31

32 Chair Iverson suggested asking the Heritage Preservation Board attend a Planning Commission
33 meeting and provide periodic updates.
34
35

36 **AGENDA ITEM 4. Adjournment.**

37

38 Commissioner Gruber made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Gnos, to adjourn the meeting.
39 The motion passed unanimously.
40

41 The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.
42

43 Respectfully submitted,
44

45 Tina Borg
46 *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*