

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

WAYZATA CITY COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES
April 5, 2016

AGENDA ITEM 1. Public Meeting.

a. Open Local Board of Appeal and Equalization Meeting

Mayor Willcox called to order the Local Board of Appeal and Equalization meeting at 5:40 p.m. Members presents: Willcox, Anderson, McCarthy, Mullin, and Tyacke.

Assessor Distel described his work as the City assessor for residential properties in the City. Assessor Distel noted that Josh Hoogland was in attendance to represent Hennepin County, which assesses apartments and commercial property in the City. Assessor Distel reported on the changes of home values in Wayzata in the last year: 1) Residential homes off the lake increased 5.1% and homes on the lake increased 3.9%; 2) Townhomes increased 4.4% and condos increased 2.6%; and, 3) Commercial properties increased 3.3% and apartment values are up 7.1%.

Mayor Willcox asked if the property values in Wayzata are rising more quickly or less quickly than the rest of Hennepin County. Assessor Distel stated Hennepin County property values have risen about 4%, so Wayzata is about average.

b. Hear Appeals

The Council considered the appeal of David Heil on the valuation of 190 Gleason Lake Road.

Assessor Distel stated that Mr. Heil was planning to attend, but was not present. He reported there were some large adjustments on Mr. Heil's street, but his property was one of the smaller increases. He received a valuation of \$445,000 last April from the County and the value is now at \$473,000. His house value went up \$2,000 with the rest of the increase on the land. Mr. Hoogland suggested voting no change so that Mr. Heil could continue in the process with the County.

Mrs. Anderson made a motion, seconded by Mr. Tyacke, to affirm and maintain the Estimated Market Valuation of \$473,000 at 190 Gleason Lake Road, PID# 05-117-22-13-0014. The motion carried 5/0.

The Council considered the appeal of Ralph and Lindsay Bashioum on the valuation of 461 Peavey Lane.

Assessor Distel stated Mr. and Mrs. Bashioum called him too late to change the value on their home and that is why it is before the Board. He recommended reducing the original value of \$871,000 to \$805,000. This change reflects some recent sales in the area that were low.

Mrs. McCarthy made a motion, seconded by Mr. Mullin, to reduce the Estimated Market Valuation at 461 Peavey Lane (PID# 01-117-23-31-0011) to \$805,000. The motion carried 5/0.

The Council considered the appeal of Celia Threlkeld on the valuation of 353 Park Street East.

Assessor Distel stated he met with the property owner today. She had some recent improvements and is unsatisfied with the valuation. However, due to the late notice, Assessor Distel was unable to recommend any change on the property and suggested the Council vote no change on the property so that Mrs. Threlkeld could continue in the process with the County.

Mrs. Anderson made a motion, seconded by Mr. Tyacke, to affirm and maintain the Estimated Market Valuation of \$477,000 at 353 Park Street, PID# 06-117-22-21-0042. The motion carried 5/0.

Assessor Distel read a statement from Mavis Frost. It stated she pays \$4,500 a year for property taxes, which is about \$375 a month, and it is too much.

1 The Council considered the appeal of the Estimated Market Valuation of the property of the Blue
2 Point Restaurant at 739 Lake Street East.

3 Mr. Hoogland reported he met with the property owner, Charlie Schoen, and agrees the
4 property requires substantial capital improvements. Its current valuation is \$844,000 for the land
5 and \$209,000 for the building, with a total property valuation of \$1,053,000. Mr. Hoogland
6 recommended increasing the land valuation to \$947,000 and reducing the building valuation to
7 \$1,000 for a total property valuation of \$948,000.

8 Mrs. Anderson stated given its intended use and what it would take to bring that property
9 back to that use, she agrees with the analysis.

10 Mr. Mullin asked for the comparables that were used in this analysis. Mr. Hoogland
11 stated they were done with land sales throughout Wayzata and the new valuation reflects a 35%
12 increase in the land value.

13 Mr. Tyacke made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Anderson, to reduce the Estimated Market
14 Valuation at 739 Lake Street East (PID# 06-117-22-42-0014) to \$948,000. The motion carried
15 5/0.

16
17 Assessor Distel stated he planned to retire and it has been an honor to serve the City of Wayzata
18 for 27 years. The Council thanked him for his work.

19
20 **c. Adjourn Local Board of Appeal and Equalization Meeting**

21 Mayor Willcox adjourned the Local Board of Appeal and Equalization Meeting at 6:10 p.m.

22
23 **AGENDA ITEM 2. City Council Meeting.**

24 Mayor Willcox called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

25
26 **AGENDA ITEM 3. Roll Call.**

27 Council Members present: Willcox, Anderson, McCarthy, Mullin and Tyacke. Also present:
28 Interim City Manager Reeder, City Attorney Schelzel, Director of Public Service Dudinsky, Chief
29 of Police Risvold, and Director of Planning and Building Thomson.

30
31 Mayor Willcox reported prior to the meeting, Council sat as the Local Board of Appeal and
32 Equalization, and referred the case of three properties on to Hennepin County. In Workshop,
33 Council reviewed possible redevelopment concept plans for 201-259 Lake Street East presented by
34 a group of property owners.

35
36 **AGENDA ITEM 4. Approve Agenda.**

37 Mr. Tyacke made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Anderson, to approve the agenda, as amended to
38 include the introduction of Troy Hoefker in the Public Forum section of the meeting, and to include
39 Consent Agenda Item 7g. for Approval of Resolution No. 08-2016 in Support of Legislation
40 Funding Safety Improvements for U.S. Highway 12. The motion carried 5/0.

41
42 **AGENDA ITEM 5. Public Forum – 16 Minutes (3 minutes per person).**

43 **a. Introduction of Troy Hoefker and Bennett Myhran, New Parks Department
44 Employees**

45 Director of Public Works Dudinsky introduced Troy Hoefker and Bennett Myhran and stated the
46 Parks Department now has four employees. The Council welcomed the new employees.

47
48 **b. Bushaway Road – Terry Huml**

49 Terry Huml, 293 Grace Point Court, stated she sent a letter to Hennepin County Commissioner Jan
50 Callison about the upcoming Bushaway Road closure and read Ms. Callison's response to the
51 Council. She asked the Council if the City can do anything to prevent the County from closing

1 Bushaway Road when it is not known when the work will begin, how long it will take, and when
2 it will be reopened. She also wanted to make sure the Council and City staff understand how
3 devastating this road closure will be at this time, and suggested the County do the project at the end
4 of the construction season.

5 Director of Public Service Dudinsky stated the signs for the detours are up, and suggested
6 meeting with the County Director of Public Works Jim Grube.

7 Mrs. Anderson stated the complexity of this type of construction is not as easy as it looks.
8 If the project is delayed again, all the other pieces involved with the project are delayed as well.
9 The ramifications to alter the schedule can be more devastating in the long run than to deal with
10 what has been planned for many years.

11 Mrs. Huml stated the road closure is for a crane to be placed to install pilings along the
12 lake. The work itself is only a 10 to 14 day project, but they want the road closed for six to eight
13 weeks.

14 Mayor Willcox directed Mr. Dudinsky to request a meeting with Mr. Grube to discuss the
15 concerns.

16 Mr. Mullin suggested the County publish a detailed schedule of the construction period
17 and asked if the County has thought through ways to relieve the impact of the closure.

18 Mr. Tyacke stated he is sympathetic to the business owners and asked if they can do one
19 lane at a time or explore bypass options.

20
21 **c. Lake Effect – Mary Bader**

22 Mary Bader, 117 Peavey Lane, stated she recognizes the amount of time invested in the Lake Effect
23 project. She requested the Council consider two questions before any decisions are made: 1) Do
24 you really know you have the support of the majority of residents? 2) Do we have a realistic,
25 sustainable finance plan for the construction and annual operating and maintenance costs of what
26 is built? She suggested Council hold public hearings to let people express their points of view and
27 consider a public referendum in November. Residents and business owners need to know what the
28 cost is to them before they can support anything.

29 Mayor Willcox stated Lake Effect was started as a way to enhance the lakefront for the
30 residents, not to attract more people for businesses.

31
32 **d. Maple Syruping – Cathy Carlson**

33 Cathy Carlson, 226 Minnetonka Avenue North, thanked Parks and Trails and Public Works for
34 another successful maple syruping event where they collected over 200 gallons of sap.

35
36 **AGENDA ITEM 6. New Future Agenda Items.**

37 Mr. Tyacke stated he has received calls from people interested in buying plots at Summit Hill
38 Cemetery, but there are none left. He requested the Council discuss an expansion at Summit Hill
39 Cemetery. The Council agreed to place the topic on a future meeting agenda.

40
41 **AGENDA ITEM 7. Consent Agenda.**

42 Mr. Willcox referenced item No. 7.g on the Consent Agenda and read the text of Resolution No.
43 08-2016, due to its late addition to the Consent Agenda. Police Chief Risvold reported two bills
44 have been introduced to both the Minnesota State House and the Senate. Both of the bills passed in
45 both the House and Senate Transportation hearings and have moved on to Finance. The \$15 million
46 funding in the bills will cover three areas of safety improvements for: 1) Highway 12 and County
47 Road 92 in Independence; 2) Highway 12 and County Road 90 in Maple Plain; and, 3) The center
48 barrier wall from Wayzata to County Road 6.

49 Mr. Mullin thanked Police Chief Risvold and staff for their focus on this funding to fix the
50 problems.

51 Mr. Mullin requested to pull item No. 7.a from the Consent Agenda.

1 Mrs. McCarthy referred to item No. 7.f and asked if it was for the appointment of one or
2 two applicants. Director of Planning and Building Thomson stated it was for two applicants.

3 Mr. Tyacke requested a change on the Regular Meeting Minutes of March 15, 2016. On
4 page 4 of the minutes, line 3, it should state public open house, not Public Hearing.

5 Mr. Mullin referred to page 2 of the Regular Meeting Minutes of March 15, 2016 and
6 requested item No. 7.f, Lake Effect Concerns, be transcribed verbatim.

7 Mrs. McCarthy referred to the Workshop Meeting Minutes of March 21, 2016, regarding
8 Mill Street Ramp Funding. On line 19, it states, "The Council accepted this explanation of the cash
9 shortfall..." Mrs. McCarthy stated the word "accepted" is not an accurate representation and
10 requested it be changed to "understood".

11 Mayor Willcox stated the appointees to the Public Art Selection Committee are Lindsey
12 Bashioum and Sue Gregor.

13
14 Mr. Mullin made a motion, seconded by Mr. Tyacke, to approve the following amended consent
15 agenda:

- 16 a. Approval of City Council Workshop Minutes of March 15, 21, and 29, ~~and City Council~~
17 ~~Regular Meeting Minutes of March 15, 2016~~
- 18 b. Approval of Check Register
- 19 c. Municipal licenses which received Administrative Approval (informational only)
- 20 d. Approval of Municipal Licenses
- 21 e. Approval of Amendment to Food License, On-Sale Wine License & On-Sale 3.2% Malt
22 Liquor License – Addition to Outdoor Patio at D'Amico & Sons
- 23 f. Appoint Public Art Selection Committee
- 24 g. Approval of Resolution No. 08-2016 In Support of Legislation Funding Safety
25 Improvements for U.S. Highway 12 in Western Hennepin County

26 The motion carried 5/0.

27
28 **AGENDA ITEM 8. New Business.**

29 **a. Consider Resolution No. 07-2016 Approving 2015 Year End Transfers**

30 Interim City Manager Reeder reported Resolution 07-2016 relates to the designated uses for the
31 year end surplus of over \$900,000 in 2015. He highlighted the specific transfer amounts outlined
32 in the Resolution.

33 Mrs. Anderson recalled the \$20,000 for the Parks and Trails Fund was designated for
34 Bushaway Landscape Committee for the Crossroads Gateway. Mr. Reeder stated the Resolution
35 shows the specific fund it goes into, but it is earmarked for the Crossroads Gateway.

36 Mr. Mullin stated the transfers related to the Parking Ramp, Parking Ramp Contingency,
37 and the interfund loan all go towards parking which nets out at \$670,000.

38 Mr. Tyacke made a motion, seconded by Mr. Mullin to Adopt Resolution No. 07-2016
39 Approving Year End Transfers. The motion carried 5/0.

40
41 **b. Appeal of Tree Removal Permit Denial at 559 Harrington**

42 Director of Planning and Building Thomson reported on the history of tree removal at this property.
43 In 2014, City Forester Klapprich approved a tree removal permit for the removal of eight trees on
44 this property. Five of the eight trees were removed. In 2016, the property owner and building
45 representatives met with Mr. Klapprich to request removal of the remaining three trees and an
46 additional six significant trees on the property. A tree removal permit for these nine trees was
47 submitted. Mr. Klapprich approved the removal of three trees for 2015 and denied the request for
48 the other six trees. The applicant has submitted an appeal letter and supporting documents.

49 Mayor Willcox asked about the size of the remaining six trees and how long the applicant
50 would have to wait until they could all be legally removed. Mr. Manual Jordan, City Forestry
51 Consultant, stated the tree removal period would go until 2018 based on the different categories the

1 trees fall under. The applicant is requesting to do the removal all at once so that the new hillside
2 planting does not have to be done in stages.

3 Mr. Tyacke asked if the tree that was leaning could be supported by guidewires. Mr. Jordan
4 stated guidewires would not work. Another type of support system might work, but he did not think
5 it would be worth it.

6 Mrs. McCarthy asked how many trees were removed for the project and how many new
7 trees are in the proposed landscape plan. Mr. Klapprich stated about 94 trees were removed and
8 126 new trees will be planted. Mrs. McCarthy asked about the site and what might be at risk if the
9 remaining trees stay. Mr. Klapprich stated the remaining trees are not deemed hazardous because
10 there is nothing to damage if they failed.

11 Matthew Stewart, Coen + Partners, landscape designer for the property, stated due to
12 timing and cost, they would like to remove all the trees for which the permit was requested now,
13 so that the landscaping can be completed at the same time as the construction of the house.

14 Mr. Tyacke asked if the caliper inches of trees removed are greater than what is being
15 planted. Mr. Stewart answered no.

16 Attorney Schelzel clarified the decision before the Council is whether to uphold the
17 decision of staff to deny the permit, or overrule that decision and allow the permit to go forward.
18 Staff made an interpretation under the ordinance that the trees we not hazardous, and the Council
19 can overrule that interpretation and direct the permit to be issued as requested.

20 Mr. Mullin stated staff interpreted and applied the code correctly. However, he supports
21 overruling staff and allowing the permit because the applicant has made it clear they are going to
22 landscape the property, there is going to be a net gain of trees, they are looking for efficiency in
23 delivering the project, and putting new trees in the ground this spring gives them two to three years
24 more to grow and enhance the property.

25 Mrs. Anderson asked about the tree replacement ratio. Mr. Thomson clarified that the tree
26 replacement requirements being referenced are in the draft Tree Preservation Ordinance, not in the
27 current Ordinance, and the draft Ordinance has not been adopted by the Council. Mr. Thomson
28 stated the tree replacement ratios in the draft tree preservation ordinance are inch for inch for
29 significant trees, and two inch for one inch for heritage trees. At a previous meeting, Council had
30 requested staff look at these mitigation ratios more closely, and staff is working on that.

31 Mrs. Anderson thanked the City Forester and staff for following the code, but also
32 understands the applicant's request and wants to be respectful of the neighbors to the property by
33 not having construction go on for two years. She suggested in exchange for the three trees that
34 would be removed, the applicant replace trees in a City park.

35 Mr. Tyacke stated it is important to hold everyone accountable to the inch per acre rule and
36 it should be applied. Staff was reasonable in their decision and he supports it.

37 Mrs. McCarthy stated she supports the recommendation of staff.

38 Mr. Willcox stated he supports overruling staff due to the timing involved. Mr. Willcox
39 stated that since all of the trees coming out within the next few years, taking them out all at once
40 and doing all the planting at once makes sense.

41 Mr. Stewart stated he would be willing to discuss with his client the suggestion of replacing
42 trees in a City park and is confident they could agree on something if it means the project could be
43 completed this season.

44 Mrs. Anderson stated she is in support of staff's ruling, but if the applicant is willing to
45 compromise and put replacements of trees for City property or in the parks, then she can support
46 the appeal.

47 Mrs. McCarthy asked about the requirements of the replacement trees. Mr. Thomson stated
48 they would want Council to clarify what that replacement requirement would be.

49 Mr. Schelzel cautioned against putting on a condition on that does not have a nexus to what
50 is going on with the property. He suggested to get something in writing from the applicant that

1 they would be comfortable and found this condition to be reasonable. Mr. Willcox stated it should
2 not be pursued further.

3 Mr. Jordan clarified they were following the rules City staff are supposed to follow and
4 that is what resulted in the denial. However, he recommended supporting the applicant by allowing
5 them to take the trees down now and finish the project.

6 Steven Streeter, Streeter and Associates, contractor for the property owner, stated the
7 timing of the project needs to be done now. He can speak on behalf of his client and agree to donate
8 whatever amount of trees the City requests.

9 Mrs. McCarthy thanked staff for clarifying their recommendation and prefers moving
10 forward without additional conditions.

11 Mr. Mullin made a motion, seconded by Mrs. Anderson, to overrule the denial of the tree
12 removal permit at 559 Harrington Road, allow the tree removal to proceed, and at the sole discretion
13 of the applicant, they can choose to make a donation of trees to the City for planting on City-owned
14 property. The motion carried 5/0.

15
16 **c. Update on Process for the Use of City Property for Valet Parking**

17 Director the Public Service Dudinsky reported on the process for use of City property for valet
18 parking. He conducted a survey of cities regarding if they allow valet parking in public parking
19 stalls or lots. Of the ten cities contacted, only three cities have some sort of valet parking process.
20 In response to the Council's direction on this issue, staff provided the following recommendations:

- 21 1) Permitting Process: Staff recommends the use of the City's 2016 Special Event Permit
22 Application Form that has been modified to address Valet Parking requests.
- 23 2) Permit Fee: Staff recommends a permit application fee for Valet Parking from the fee schedule
24 included in the 2016 Special Event Application Packet.
- 25 3) Per Parking Stall Fee: Three out of ten cities surveyed have some sort of Valet Parking process
26 and fee.

27 Staff recommends the Council direct staff to obtain Valet Special Event Permits from each
28 valet parking operation as soon as possible to limit the City's liability with them operating without
29 a permit on a public right-of-way. Mr. Dudinsky reported on the three restaurants that currently
30 use valet parking: CōV, District, and Gianni's.

31 Mrs. McCarthy asked about the parking fees that the City of Stillwater uses and what
32 Wayzata is currently charging for valet parking. Mr. Dudinsky stated Stillwater charges per stall
33 and per season. Wayzata does not currently charge for parking spaces and staff is recommending
34 charging a permit fee. Staff is sensitive to the businesses surrounding where the valet requests are
35 made so that it does not negatively impact them.

36 Mrs. McCarthy stated she has some concern with CōV using the municipal lots because
37 those lots were paid for by the taxpayers. There is also a safety issue with the workers running in
38 the dark trying to get to a vehicle.

39 Mrs. Anderson asked about the parking space fee and if it includes just the pick up and
40 drop off area or where they actually park the cars. Mr. Dudinsky stated it is the pick up and drop
41 off area. Staff believes that valet parking operations keep other spaces open for businesses because
42 they are parking the cars away from the restaurant and keeping the closer spots available.

43 Mr. Willcox asked about Gianni's and the spots they take in the summer for uses other than
44 valet parking. It needs to be defined how to handle valet parking and parking places being taken
45 up by the restaurant for other uses and if there should be a separate fee for that.

46 Mrs. McCarthy stated if businesses are allocated the same number of spots that are included
47 in the permit, she does not have a problem with how those spots are used. She does have concern
48 when a private business uses a valet service and parks the cars in lots paid for by the taxpayers.

49 Mr. Tyacke stated the intent of valet parking is to free up parking spaces and he is in favor
50 of continuing it. He agrees with Mrs. McCarthy that each business should be allocated the same
51 number of parking spaces, but struggles with the fee for the spaces.

1 Mrs. McCarthy stated there had been some discussion on a price per square foot of right-
2 of-way usage. Mr. Willcox stated of public right-of-way used for private purposes should be
3 charged rent.

4 Mr. Mullin stated the City is going to provide a service in the central area district and spread
5 that cost to property owners in the area. The City needs to be careful not to charge businesses for
6 services the City is going to impose on the district, and then ask them to pay more when they are
7 using their own resources to add their own valet service. He does not support adding more fees, but
8 supports coming up with an equitable standard to make sure each business is treated fairly.

9 Mrs. Anderson stated it is the business' decision to use private valets and with that comes
10 a fee to the City to cover administrative costs. If every business wants to use private valet service,
11 a lot of prime parking spaces are taken because of that. The public rights-of-way are for the public
12 and if a business wants to use it for a special service, there needs to be something in exchange,
13 especially for the pick up and drop off areas. The lots where the cars are parked need to be
14 negotiated differently.

15 Mr. Willcox stated he does not have a problem with a standard fee but is concerned with
16 the parking spaces being taken up and if there is reasonable rent in addition to the permit fee.

17 Mr. Dudinsky stated they would recommend three valet parking stalls per business. He
18 asked if there is a fee to park cars off site, how could that be measured, as each business parks the
19 cars in different areas.

20 Interim City Manager stated the City of Excelsior charges \$2,900 per space and that is
21 based on what a parking meter would make.

22 Mr. Dudinsky stated when the sidewalk goes in on the north side of Lake Street on the 600
23 block, they have considered widening the right-of-way.

24 Attorney Schelzel asked if the City charges other fees for use of right-of-way that is not
25 parking. Mr. Dudinsky stated they do not.

26 Terri Huml, 293 Grace Point Road, stated she spoke with someone who owns a business
27 in Excelsior and pays for a parking space. He renegotiated with that city and now pays \$1,000, not
28 \$2,900. Ms. Huml stated her customers and valets park in the lot behind her restaurant. She pays
29 \$25,000 annually for use of that lot. It is important to have a couple of spots to drop people off.
30 Otherwise, it becomes a safety issue when people stop in the lane of traffic to let people off. In the
31 off-season, she only offers valet parking on Thursdays, Fridays, and Saturdays because there is
32 plenty of parking available on the other days.

33 Anoush Ansari, District Fresh Kitchen & Bar, stated it makes sense to have two to three
34 spots for a valet service. He spends \$6,000 to \$7,000 on a valet service in addition to all the other
35 fees paid to the landlord. A valet service is for guests at a cost to the restaurant. He requested that
36 the business owners be involved in deciding a fee because of all the fees they pay every month to
37 operate in the City.

38 Mr. Mullin made a motion to move forward, but would like to see the fee reduced from
39 \$150 to \$50.

40 Mr. Willcox asked how staff came up with a \$150 fee. Mr. Dudinsky stated he met with
41 the client along with the Fire Chief and Police Chief and \$150 is what was decided on as a fair fee.

42 The motion died for lack of a second.

43 Mrs. Anderson made a motion, seconded by Mrs. McCarthy to approve the updated Special
44 Event Permit process and a permit fee of \$150. The motion carried 4/1. (Mullin)

45 Mr. Willcox stated they will address the topic of deciding a price for the parking stalls at a
46 later date.

47
48 Mr. Willcox recessed at 9:08 p.m. and reconvened at 9:16 p.m.

49
50 **d. Consider First Reading of Ordinance No. 758 – Parking Ordinance**

1 Director of Planning and Building Thomson reported on the draft amendment to the City's zoning
 2 ordinance relating to off-street parking and loading (City Code 801.20). He highlighted the changes
 3 relating to minimum parking requirements, parking lot design, credits toward parking requirements,
 4 changes in land use, calculating parking requirements, landscaping, and location. The Planning
 5 Commission reviewed the parking ordinance amendment and recommends approval.

6 Mrs. Anderson asked about the landscaping and if the wording about the requirement of a
 7 having a three- to four-foot hedge was too limited, especially when the parking area may be next
 8 to a residential area. Mr. Schelzel stated this language is in the design standards and it may be too
 9 descriptive. After discussion, the Council decided to remove the hedge or wall requirement height
 10 requirement from the draft Ordinance.

11 Mr. Willcox asked about the reduction in the number of parking spaces required by
 12 businesses. Mr. Thomson stated it significantly reduces the requirement for restaurant uses and
 13 would reduce the parking requirement for retail and office uses by 25 percent.

14 Mrs. McCarthy stated there was an applicant that did not fall into any of the categories and
 15 asked how that is handled. Mr. Thomson stated there is an existing provision in the ordinance for
 16 non-specified uses that states the Zoning Administrator may establish the minimum parking
 17 requirement based on similar uses in the Ordinance.

18 Mrs. Anderson referred to page 92 of the meeting packet and asked for clarification on the
 19 numbers. She also asked if there was discussion about having too many specific uses and trying to
 20 have more broad categories. Mr. Thomson stated the Planning Commission did not have that
 21 discussion. The direction from the Council was to move with implementing the downtown parking
 22 project, which only looked at retail, office, restaurant, and government uses. The City Council
 23 could consider changes to other land uses in the Ordinance in the future.

24 Mrs. Anderson thanked staff for their work. She stated this ordinance relates to off-street
 25 parking and the City has a lot of on-street parking. She asked if other communities include on-
 26 street parking. Mr. Thomson stated generally other communities' ordinances may reflect the
 27 availability of on-street parking by reducing overall parking requirements. However, he stated that
 28 on-street parking stalls should not be included calculating the minimum parking requirement
 29 because on-street parking stalls are not owned by the property owner and are not dedicated to
 30 specific businesses or uses.

31 Mr. Tyacke asked if the shared parking ratios are new or if they are the ratios that SRF had
 32 come up with. Mr. Thomson stated they are the same except *evening weekday period for retail uses*
 33 is reduced from 80 percent to 60 percent, and *multiple family residential uses* have been added.

34 Mr. Tyacke made a motion, seconded by Mr. Mullin, to adopt the first reading of Ordinance
 35 No. 758-Parking Ordinance (attachment C in the City Council packet), with a change on page 136
 36 to the section on landscaping to strike the sentence "A solid wall or dense hedge shall be no less
 37 than three (3) feet and no more than four (4) feet in height" based on the findings in the Planning
 38 Commission Report and Recommendation. The motion carried 5/0.
 39

40 **AGENDA ITEM 9. City Manager's Report and Discussion Items.**

41 **a. Trees**

42 Director of Public Service Dudinsky reported the Emerald Ash Borer is now five miles from
 43 Wayzata. There are 430 Ash trees on public land in the City, and over 2,000 Ash trees on private
 44 property. He urged residents to be proactive, and suggested residents have their Ash trees looked
 45 at to see if they are worth investing in protecting from the Emerald Ash Borer. If they are, residents
 46 should consider investing in EAB treatments. If the trees are removed, they should be replaced with
 47 a tree from a diversified stock of trees.

48 Mr. Dudinsky reported that volunteers have identified 40 Ash trees on public land in the
 49 City that are not worth saving due to the condition of the tree, and are recommending they be
 50 removed. He reviewed the City's plan to replace these trees. Staff will send notices to the residents
 51 in areas where these trees will be removed.

1 Mrs. McCarthy recommended finding every way possible to communicate about the tree
2 removal for those that do not live on Broadway and the other areas where significant trees will be
3 removed as well. Mayor Willcox suggested displaying signs that state the trees were being removed
4 due to Emerald Ash Borer.

5 Mayor Willcox stated the City of Minnetonka is making available chemical treatments to
6 help protect trees against EAB at a low cost, and asked if Wayzata was planning to do the same.
7 Mr. Dudinsky stated staff contacted Minnetonka and will bring that information back to the
8 Council. Mr. Willcox stated people can choose to take their tree down now or in the future, there
9 will be a low cost chemical treatment available when needed.

10 Mrs. Anderson asked if people are given options about the type of trees that the City will
11 be replacing on their streets. Mr. Jordan said they plan to give people several options to choose
12 from based on what is available.

13
14 **b. Announcements**

15 There will be a Special Council Meeting on April 12 at 7:00 p.m. that will include consideration of
16 a contract and appointment of a new City Manager.

17
18 Bushaway Road will be closed on April 11.

19
20 **AGENDA ITEM 10. Public Forum Continued (as necessary).**

21 There were no comments.

22
23 **AGENDA ITEM 11. Adjournment.**

24 Mr. Mullin made a motion, seconded by Mr. Tyacke to adjourn. There being no further business,
25 Mr. Willcox adjourned the meeting at 10:10 p.m.

26
27 Respectfully submitted,

28
29 *Becky Malone 04-19-2016*

30
31 Becky Malone
32 Deputy City Clerk

33
34 Drafted by Shannon Schmidt
35 *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*