

1 material and color, façade coverage, type of brick, accent materials, glass building materials, and
2 the parking lot and building lighting.

3
4 Mr. Rick Packer, President of Homestead Partners, 525 15th Ave. S., Hopkins, provided
5 background on the Meyer Dairy site, information on the year over year retail statistics for
6 downtown Wayzata and the project's building redesign. He clarified they would work with the
7 City to change the sidewalk width from 6-feet to 12-feet and they could also make changes to
8 accommodate the 20-foot setback from the north property line so the project would not require a
9 setback variance. He reviewed depictions of the applicant's 2015 proposal and compared them
10 to what they are proposing at this time. He provided information on the heights of other
11 buildings around the proposed project. He clarified they would be able to use different exterior
12 materials, but this would need to be part of a PUD because alternative materials are not included
13 in the Design Standards.

14
15 Commissioner Flannigan clarified that the applicant intended to withdraw the setback variance
16 request and meet the applicable setback standards. He asked why the developer was proposing a
17 project that did not comply with all of the standards of the City's Codes and Ordinances.

18
19 Mr. Packer stated the driving factors include economics and the desires of the property owner.
20 The proposed building provides an opportunity to build an exceptional building along Lake
21 Street to represent the City of Wayzata. Mr. Packer stated that a stacked 3-foot building would
22 be cheap to build but not meet the aesthetic goals of the City for this property.

23
24 Commissioner Flannigan asked how many units would be lost if the fourth story were not
25 allowed, or if the project would not proceed if they could not include a fourth floor.

26
27 Mr. Packer stated they have a 3-story plan prepared that would include the same number of units
28 as the building being proposed. He would not be able to decide tonight if they would proceed
29 with this 3-story plan if the current proposal is recommended for denial.

30
31 Chair Iverson asked what the square footage cost would be per unit.

32
33 Mr. Jeff Schoenwetter, JMS Custom Homes, stated the finished units would retail around \$550
34 per square foot.

35
36 Mr. Tim Whitten, Whitten Associates, stated they felt having the first two floors having more of
37 a brownstone feel would be better suited along Lake Street. He clarified the required setbacks
38 for each level does dictate the design of the building. They tried not to design a building around
39 approval but rather a good design. He said that it is difficult to fit 23-units into a 3-story building
40 without it looking like a box. He explained even if the building were 3-stories with a roof top
41 deck the building would need to accommodate two (2) staircases and an elevator. This would
42 make it just as tall as what is being proposed.

43
44 Commissioner Flannigan asked what the remediation cost was for cleaning up the chemicals and
45 asbestos on the site.

46

1 Mr. Packer stated the remediation will be about \$400,000, and they have applied for grants to
2 assist with this cost.

3
4 Chair Iverson asked what the material would be for the green roof and if the roof would be
5 usable for residents.

6
7 Mr. Whitten stated the rooftop patio is a float paver system and would be usable by the residents.
8 They have not determined the type of railing they would use because this will depend on the
9 building materials they are allowed to use. They are considering cable or glass for this feature,
10 and it would not be along the edge of the roof.

11
12 Commissioner Gonzalez asked where the equipment for the elevator would be housed.

13
14 Mr. Packer stated the equipment would internal on the fourth floor. The air conditioners would
15 be on the ground floor.

16
17 Commissioner Gonzalez asked if 5 guest parking stalls would be sufficient for 23 units.

18
19 Mr. Whitten stated they would have the 5-guest stalls along with the additional on street parking
20 around the site and the 2-stalls per unit within the site.

21
22 Commissioner Gonzalez asked what the setback was on the east side of the property.

23
24 Mr. Whitten stated this setback was 10-feet.

25
26 Commissioner Gonzalez asked if the City Engineer had reviewed the stormwater runoff
27 management plan and if he had concerns.

28
29 Mr. Thomson stated the City Engineer had reviewed the plans and due to the environmental
30 contamination on the site, the applicant may not be able to do the infiltration they are proposing.
31 The applicant will need to review the comments from the PCA.

32
33 Chair Iverson opened the public hearing at 8:03 p.m.

34
35 Ms. Peggy Douglas, 133 Edgewood Court, Wayzata, expressed concerns about this building
36 being the gateway to Wayzata. She said this is a massive building, and allowing this building to
37 be 4-stories opens up the possibility of all of Lake Street being 4-stories. She does not have
38 concerns that the building would not contain retail space, as called for in the ordinances. She
39 asked why this particular building required 23-units when other recent developments only
40 required 9-11-units to make the project work economically. She stated she would like to see
41 more architectural elements in the building as well.

42
43 Mr. Chris Hickman, 484 Highcroft Road, Wayzata, stated the setbacks are important so that
44 when you enter the City you do not see a monster building. He stated he is against having a 4-
45 story building in this location. He stated he would accept this building not containing office or
46 retail space. He stated he did not believe the sale price for the parcel was high enough to justify

1 a retail sale price over \$500/square foot. He stated eliminating the top 4-units should not break
2 the project.

3
4 Mr. David Carland, 130 Edgewood Court, Wayzata, stated residents would like to see something
5 appropriate developed on this property. He stated just because the property is an eye-sore
6 currently should not give the developer or the City the right to make new rules. He expressed
7 concerns about the size and mass of the proposal, and would not support a 4-story building.

8
9 Ms. Susan Yage, 110 Edgewood Court, Wayzata, stated the City established their Codes and
10 Ordinances for a reason, and they should be adhered to. She does not want to have a 4-story
11 building in this location. She would like to see something designed that better reflects Wayzata.

12
13 Chair Iverson closed the public hearing at 8:15 p.m.

14
15 Mr. Thomson stated the Commissioners had received several email comments from residents and
16 these were included in the packet materials for the meeting and are made part of the record.

17
18 Chair Iverson stated the two large issues with the proposal that the Commission should review
19 are conformance with Design Standards and the building height limit. If the Planning
20 Commission does not support the proposed height of the building, then they would not need to
21 discuss the Design Standards at this time. The property is currently zoned for a maximum 2-
22 story building.

23
24 Commissioner Young stated the Commission would need to decide if a PUD was even warranted
25 for this project, prior to determining if a 4-story building should be allowed. He generally likes
26 what is being proposed, and he would support granting a PUD for this location. The current
27 zoning requires a retail component that would not be in the best interest of the community, and a
28 rezoning to a PUD would allow the City the flexibility to remove this requirement. The PUD
29 would also allow for up to 3-stories.

30
31 Chair Iverson asked staff if the Commission could consider a PUD for a 2-story building.

32
33 City Attorney Schelzel stated the application before the Commission is for a PUD that includes a
34 particular 4-story building, and this is what the Planning Commission is considering and
35 reviewing this evening. If the application were for a PUD with a 2-story building, then the
36 Planning Commission would be considering that option. He noted that a PUD on this property
37 does not have to include 3-story buildings, but it could include buildings up to 3-stories.

38
39 Commissioner Gonzalez stated that when the City Council approved a PUD for the Bay Center
40 project, the PUD requirements were revised to ensure that buildings within PUDs would be
41 limited to 3-stories or 35-feet, and she has learned that the City needs to enforce the Ordinances
42 as written or rewrite them if they are granting too many variances. The PUD Ordinance states
43 that the project must meet the requirements of the Comprehensive Plan. The Comp Plan requires
44 the City to plan for an orderly transition between the central business development and adjacent
45 residential neighborhoods. A 4-story building next to single-family homes and townhomes is too
46 massive. The City also needs to consider density of the proposed project, and if the streets can

1 accommodate the additional traffic. She stated a PUD may be acceptable for the site, but the
2 applicant would need to meet the requirements of the PUD Ordinance, including the maximum
3 height of 3-stories or 35-feet. She would not support a 4-story building.

4
5 Commissioner Flannigan stated a PUD option should be approvable but with a 3-story maximum
6 building height.

7
8 Commissioner Young asked why the developer wanted 23-units.

9
10 Mr. Whitten stated the developer had used the formula established by the City that determines
11 the number of units based on the number of acres and enclosed parking stalls.

12
13 Chair Iverson stated the City does not have a lot of green space, and she asked the developer if
14 they had discussed ways to incorporate more green space in this project.

15
16 Mr. Whitten explained they have additional green space on the roofs, and the “L” shape of the
17 building allows for additional green space on the ground level. The ground level green space is
18 approximately 70-feet in length and an average of 40-feet in width.

19
20 Commissioner Murray agreed that the use of a PUD was warranted for the project. But he would
21 not support a PUD with a 4-story building.

22
23 Commissioner Gonzalez stated another reason she would not support the variance requested for
24 the building height because as presented this application does not meet the requirements of the
25 Variance Ordinance because they have not demonstrated that there are practical difficulties not
26 created by the applicant, and the variance request is mostly based on economic considerations.

27
28 Chair Iverson clarified the consensus of the Planning Commission would be to recommend
29 denial of the PUD and variance request for a 4-story building.

30
31 Commissioner Gonzalez stated she does not have enough information to make a
32 recommendation on the Shoreland Impact Plan/Conditional Use Permit. She would like to have
33 comments from the City Engineer on the Storm Water Management Plan.

34
35 Chair Iverson stated the lighting plan for the parking was also missing from the application.

36
37 Mr. Thomson suggested the applicant provide the additional information the Commission would
38 need in order to review the design of the project under the Design Standards, and provide general
39 feedback and direction for the applicant to consider for the next meeting.

40
41 Chair Iverson stated she would like to see the applicant address the ground level expression, and
42 any revised plans should include the change in the sidewalk width to 12-feet, and information on
43 seasonal landscaping and streetscaping. The application does not include plans for the
44 streetscape improvements, the required number of building articulations, the building height und
45 the PUD, information on roof material and color, facade coverage, the type of brick and accent
46 materials, additional information on the glass building materials, and a lighting plan for the

1 parking lot and building lighting. The Commission would like to have these items for review
2 prior to making additional decisions on findings and recommendations regarding the project.
3 Section 801.09.11.1b states the primary opaque surface material on all freestanding buildings
4 must be the same on all facades of the building. She would like to see documentation on how the
5 sun orientation, solar access, and views to Lake Minnetonka would be affected by the project.
6

7 Commissioner Young stated he would support a PUD to redevelop the property, and he agrees
8 that a 3-story building would be more appropriate in this location and this would require the
9 applicant to change the application. The Commission has reviewed and discussed a
10 comprehensive design critique of the project for the applicant. He would like to see the applicant
11 choose to present an application for a PUD that conforms more closely to the design critique that
12 has been created.
13

14 Chair Iverson asked the applicant if he would prefer to revise the application based on the
15 Commission's recommendations, or move the application forward with a recommendation of
16 denial from the Planning Commission.
17

18 Mr. Packer stated he would like to see the matter tabled at this time, and they would review the
19 application and provide the additional information the Commission has requested.
20

21 Commissioner Gonzalez made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Young to continue
22 consideration of the application for Meyer Place on Ferndale to the next Planning Commission
23 meeting. The motion carried unanimously.
24

25 The Planning Commission recessed at 8:45 p.m.
26

27 The Planning Commission reconvened at 8:50 p.m.
28
29

30 **AGENDA ITEM 5. Regular Agenda Old Business Items:**
31

32 a.) None.
33
34

35 **AGENDA ITEM 6. Other Items:**
36

37 a.) **Review of Development Activities**
38

39 Mr. Thomson stated there are currently 8-10 active development applications at this time. The
40 Planning Commission will have three (3) applications on the next agenda including Holdridge
41 Terrace, 529 Indian Mound E., and an impervious surface variance request on Ferndale Road.
42 At the next City Council meeting, the City Council is scheduled to review the Tree Ordinance
43 and an encroachment permit request for Gianni's, and a Resolution taking action on the Lake
44 Effect project.
45
46

1 **b.) Other Items**

2
3 Chair Iverson provided an overview of the last City Council meeting, including public comments
4 on the Lake Effect project.

5
6
7 **AGENDA ITEM 8. Adjournment.**

8
9 Commissioner Young made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Murray to adjourn the
10 meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

11
12 The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 9:08 p.m.

13
14 Respectfully submitted,

15
16 Tina Borg

17 *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*