

1 Commissioner Gonzalez asked if there was a Storm Water Runoff Plan included with the
2 application, and if the City Engineer has had any comments on the project pertaining to the storm
3 water runoff.

4
5 Mr. Thomson stated the City Engineer did review all of the plans, including the Grading Plan.
6 He noted that there is not stormwater management included in the proposal because it is not
7 required by City Code, as the property is outside of the Shoreland District. The applicant is not
8 requesting credit for impervious surface, and the City does not require stormwater management
9 for a single family home.

10
11 Commissioner Gonzalez stated they do request a storm water management plan as part of a
12 subdivision especially when adjacent properties may be affected. She requested the City
13 Engineer review the plans to determine if there are any measures that could be taken to reduce
14 potential impacts on the neighboring properties.

15
16 Mr. Thomson clarified whether the Commission is looking for additional information on the
17 grading and drainage for the property, and not a stormwater management plan.

18
19 Chair Iverson stated landscaping may be a way to assist with keeping stormwater on the property
20 so it does not affect the neighboring properties.

21
22 Applicant's representative, Mr. Bill Costello, Elevation Homes, 18312 Minnetonka Blvd.,
23 Wayzata, stated the site is unique in that it has never been built on, and they worked with the
24 current property owner and the existing grading. The main level of the home would be 3-feet
25 lower than the adjacent grading. He explained most of the roof runoff would go into catch
26 basins, and the terrace will be sand to accommodate the water runoff. They would develop a full
27 landscape plan as they move through the project.

28
29 Commissioner Gonzalez stated there are 10 significant trees being removed, and she asked the
30 applicant to do what they could to preserve the remaining trees. She asked if there was a plan to
31 replace the trees being removed and if so, what would be planted and where would it be planted.

32
33 Mr. Costello stated they would be meeting with the City Forester to review the health of the trees
34 that would remain and based on these findings, the applicant would be adding a row of quaking
35 aspen, two rows of white birch, and potentially additional trees in the southwest corner.

36
37 Commissioner Gonzalez encouraged the applicant to plant trees that are native to the area.

38
39 Chair Iverson stated she would like to see a tree preservation plan. She clarified based on what
40 the City Forester finds when he does his inspection, it is possible that all of the trees could be
41 removed from the property. She asked what the City can do to have accurate information to
42 determine the exact number of trees that would be removed. A tree removal permit application
43 would require the designation of all diseased and damaged trees, as well as all the materials to be
44 planted and replacement trees indicating size, species, and methods of planting. This
45 information should be included for the City Council when they consider the application. She
46 stated there were several trees on the property that were not indicated on the proposed plan.

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

Mr. Costello stated they would get an updated survey for the City.

Chair Iverson stated the City Ordinance states that the developer or applicant would do what was necessary to preserve as many trees as possible on the property. She asked if all the trees were removed, if the City or Commission could review where the house footprint would be. There are no trees left in this area. She stated it is important that the applicant provides a good landscaping plan. She stated there was a lot of glass along the front of the home. She asked if the applicant had concerns about privacy.

Mr. Costello stated they were not concerned about privacy. He stated he would provide a more formulated landscape plan for the City and Commission.

Commissioner Flannigan asked what the material would be for the patio, and what the green roof was.

Mr. Costello stated the patio would be cut concrete and the green roof was a flat roof, and they are constructing it so that the applicant can add it later.

Commissioner Flannigan stated the scale of the home fits with the neighborhood and it seems this is the best design for this lot.

Commissioner Gonzalez asked what the building materials would be and if the applicant had samples to show the Commission.

Mr. Costello stated they would be using cedar shake as the primary building material, the chimney would be stone and the flat portion of the roof would be treated metal.

Chair Iverson requested the applicant provide information on how they intended to preserve the remaining trees on the property.

Mr. Costello stated this information would be included with the building set.

Chair Iverson asked for any public comments. There was no one wishing to provide comments on the application.

Commissioner Young stated he fully supports this plan because the design of the home fits the property and neighborhood, and the owner's intent is to preserve as many trees as possible.

Commissioner Gruber stated she would agree with Commissioner Young.

Commissioner Gonzalez stated she is disappointed about the number of trees that would be removed from the site but she recommended the Commission recommend adding a condition of approval that the grading within the drip line of the trees that would be preserved on the southwest corner of the property must be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer.

1 Commissioner Flannigan stated he would also support the project.

2
3 Chair Iverson stated she would like to see a condition for approval added that a landscape plan is
4 included.

5
6 Commissioner Gonzalez made a motion, Seconded by Commissioner Murray to recommend the
7 Applicant include with the application to the City Council a grading and drainage plan and a
8 landscape plan, and recommend approval of the preliminary house plans for 181 Huntington
9 Avenue S. based on the finding that the design meets the standards of City Code Section
10 805.14.E, and satisfies the condition of Resolution No 06-2016 approving the Huntington
11 Heights subdivision. The motion carried unanimously.

12
13
14 **AGENDA ITEM 5. Public Hearing Items:**

15
16 **a.) Holdridge Homes – 1407 and unaddressed parcel on Holdridge Terrace**

17 **i. PUD Rezoning, Concurrent PUD Concept Plan and General Plan of**
18 **Development, Preliminary Plat**

19
20 Mr. Thomson stated the applicant and property owner, Lake West Development, LLC, has
21 submitted a development application requesting rezoning from R-2/Medium Density Single
22 Family Residential to PUD/Planned Unit Development, Concurrent PUD Concept Plan and
23 General Plan of Development approval, and preliminary plat review to subdivide the properties
24 at 1407 Holdridge Terrace and an unaddressed parcel on Holdridge Terrace for a six (6) lot
25 single-family residential development. He reviewed the property background including previous
26 development plans. He reviewed the information the Planning Commission had previously
27 requested including lot coverage, building height and size of homes, value of homes, building
28 materials, wetland buffers, grading and drainage plan, and tree preservation plan. He explained
29 as part of the PUD proposed, the applicant was requesting to reduce the front yard setback,
30 reduce the lot width requirement, and reduce the side yard setback.

31
32 Commissioner Gonzalez asked if the homes on the outsides of the subdivision meet the setback
33 requirements for the R2 District. She asked if the applicant should have a variance application
34 for the front yard setback, because this would not meet the periphery or outside boundaries
35 requirement for the development.

36
37 Mr. Thomson explained the front yard setback for the periphery or outside boundaries of the
38 entire development would be less than the PUD requires, and it could be interpreted that a
39 variance would be required because they are not meeting this requirement with the front yard
40 setbacks.

41
42 Chair Iverson stated the application is incomplete because the height for the homes is not
43 specified, there is no data on lot coverage, and there is not a complete landscaping plan.

44

1 Mr. Thomson explained if there was missing or additional information the Planning Commission
2 would like then they can request it. He stated because this is a new plan it would be beneficial
3 for the Commission to discuss whether a PUD is warranted for this application.

4
5 Commissioner Young stated it is not clear why a PUD would be appropriate for the property.

6
7 Mr. Curt Fretham, Lakewest Development, 14525 MN 7 #265, Minnetonka, reviewed the
8 background of the project and how they got to a six (6) lot development in the area. He
9 explained that he had been unaware that a variance would be required with the PUD application,
10 and he would submit this if needed. He stated a Landscape Plan had been included and they
11 would be planting more than the City would require. He stated having 6 lots instead of 4 lots
12 would help drive the land cost down so they could allow for the additional landscaping.

13
14 Commissioner Flannigan inquired about the selling price for the properties.

15
16 Mr. Fretham stated they expected the homes to sell for about \$600,000. They would be able to
17 provide the Commission with more detail once they know that the Commission supports the
18 project.

19
20 Commissioner Murray asked about the access to each home and how they would exit these
21 properties.

22
23 Mr. Fretham stated there is additional work that needs to be done on the driveway configurations
24 for Lots 3-6 because the turning radius is not quite enough. Lot 1-2 the homeowner would need
25 to back into the neighboring driveway then go forward to exit the property.

26
27 Commissioner Flannigan asked if there was a stream that ran through the property.

28
29 Mr. Thomson explained there had been a wetland delineation done and there was no stream
30 identified as part of this study.

31
32 Mr. Fretham stated they have worked with a third party regarding the wetlands, and they do not
33 intend to impact the wetlands and will preserve the boundary that is established.

34
35 Chair Iverson stated she would like to have information regarding the Wetland Conservation Act
36 included in future packets to ensure it is protected or removed as wetlands if needed.

37
38 Mr. Thomson stated the City is the local government agency that enforces the State, Federal, and
39 Watershed regulations. The core portion of these regulations is determining where the wetlands
40 are or the wetland delineation, and this has been done for this project.

41
42 Commissioner Gonzalez stated the PUD Ordinance requires the provision for a common open
43 space. She asked what the applicant intended to do to meet with requirement.

44

1 Mr. Fretham stated the trail easement area and the wetlands would be the common open space.
2 The trail would be a walking trail that would be located outside of the wetland area. They would
3 like to keep the trail natural to the environment and plan to use wood chips as the trail material.
4

5 Mr. Thomson stated it would be for the Planning Commission to discuss if this would meet the
6 requirement. This requirement is not intended to provide public park space.
7

8 Commissioner Gonzalez asked who would be responsible for maintaining the conservation
9 easement.
10

11 Mr. Thomson stated this is the responsibility of the homeowner to maintain these areas in
12 accordance to the conservation easement requirements.
13

14 Commissioner Gonzalez asked why the homes on lots 3-6 were slanted on the property.
15

16 Mr. Fretham stated the wetlands prevent the homes from being laid facing the street. He
17 explained they were trying to comply with the City's desire that the developer be creative in their
18 design, and that the massing of the homes would be more appealing.
19

20 Commissioner Gonzalez asked what the proposed square footage would be for these homes. Mr.
21 Fretham stated the homes were expected to be 2500+ square feet above grade in size.
22

23 Chair Iverson expressed concerns about the soil conditions where the trail would be located and
24 the amount of fill that would be brought to the site.
25

26 Mr. Fretham stated if the soil conditions are not stable, they would bring in material to make it
27 stable, and they would raise the trail if needed to meet the City's requirements for maintaining
28 the water table. He also explained the amount of fill that would be brought to the site would not
29 be excessive and would be within the normal range for any development.
30

31 Commissioner Gruber asked why the developer was seeking a PUD. Mr. Fretham stated there
32 had been resistance from the City Council on doing something commercial or high density with
33 these properties, and they found this would be a mid-ground compromise. The additional two
34 parcels would allow them to do more landscaping and add more architectural details to the
35 homes. This would make the price points lower for homes in Wayzata which would comply
36 with the PUD Ordinance. They feel they would have to provide several added features to the
37 homes in order to compensate for the location of these homes along the frontage road.
38

39 Chair Iverson opened the public hearing at 8:31 p.m.
40

41 Ms. Brooke Nelson, 1515 Holdridge Terrace, Wayzata, expressed concerns how close the homes
42 were to the wetland buffer.
43

44 Ms. Kathy Brown, 1515 Holdridge Terrace, Wayzata, expressed concerns with the amount of
45 trees that would be removed with the reduced setbacks. Removing more trees would increase the
46 amount of noise current residents in the area have from the highway. She asked where the trail

1 would enter the neighborhood. She does like the angled homes but does not want them to be low
2 income in her neighborhood.

3
4 Mr. Thomson clarified that the trail as proposed would be contained entirely within the property
5 and would not be accessible from the surrounding neighborhood.

6
7 Chair Iverson closed the public hearing at 8:33 p.m.

8
9 Commissioner Young stated the applicant has taken the intent of the PUD seriously. These
10 homes would be offered at a more affordable price point for those wishing to live in Wayzata,
11 but when going through the purpose and general standards of the PUD relative to current zoning,
12 this is the only standard being met. He noted that there is not enough differential over the
13 current R2 Zoning to warrant a PUD. He does not believe 5-feet between the homes would be
14 enough, and this project does not meet many of the standards of a PUD. He also expressed
15 concerns about the number of trees that would be removed. He stated would not support this
16 application.

17
18 Commissioner Gruber was not sure why the City would zone this area residential because it is
19 close to a wetland. The applicant has been working to create a residential development in this
20 area, but the current proposal does not meet all of the standards for a PUD.

21
22 Commissioner Gonzalez stated the PUD allows the City the flexibility to allow more density on
23 a site and have the internal buildings closer together. The setback between the homes is not what
24 she is concerned about. The PUD Ordinance does require that the periphery setback meet the
25 requirements of the underlying ordinance, and this project does not meet the front setback. Six
26 (6) homes in this small area was too much density. A PUD is not justified with this project
27 because the City is not getting anything in exchange. The land needs to be developed with
28 caution because of the wetlands.

29
30 Commissioner Murray stated he would like to see homes in this area, but this project does not
31 meet all of the PUD criteria.

32
33 Commissioner Flannigan stated he struggles with this project and the balance of the loss of trees,
34 the orientation of the homes, the values of the home, and the impact to the wetlands. Overall, he
35 does not believe a PUD is justified for this project.

36
37 Chair Iverson stated the density is too much, and she does not believe the project meets the
38 requirements of a PUD. She would like to see homes with more glass in the rear to view the
39 wetlands and a low profile to the street. She would like to see 3-4 homes in this area, instead of
40 the 6 homes proposed. There are other options that could be explored beyond what has been
41 presented at this time.

42
43 Commissioner Flannigan made a motion, Seconded by Commission Murray to direct Staff to
44 prepare a draft Report and Recommendation recommending Denial of the PUD Rezoning,
45 Concurrent PUD Concept Plan and General Plan of Development, and Preliminary Plat for

1 Holdridge Homes at 1407 and unaddressed parcel on Holdridge Terrace. The motion carried
2 unanimously.
3

4
5 **AGENDA ITEM 6. Old Business Items:**
6

7 **a.) None.**
8
9

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

12 **a.) Review of Development Activities**
13

14 Mr. Thomson stated the City Council is scheduled to review the Unitarian Church application,
15 and discuss on the Tree Preservation Ordinance at their May 17 meeting. He noted that the new
16 City Manager Jeff Dahl has started, and there will be an open house to meet him on May 17.
17 The next Planning Commission agenda is scheduled to include revised plans for Meyer Place at
18 Ferndale, 529 Indian Mound E for a 5-unit condominium building, and an impervious surface
19 variance request for a property on Ferndale Road.
20

21 **b.) Other Items**
22

23 Commissioner Young provided an update of the Lake Effect discussion during the last City
24 Council meeting.
25

26
27 **AGENDA ITEM 8. Adjournment.**
28

29 Commissioner Young made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Gruber, to adjourn the
30 meeting. The motion carried unanimously.
31

32 The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.
33

34 Respectfully submitted,
35

36 Tina Borg
37 *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*