

1 **WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION**
2 **MEETING MINUTES**
3 **APRIL 5, 2021**

4
5
6 **AGENDA ITEM 1. Call to Order**

7
8 Chair Plantan called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

9
10 Chair Plantan read the following prepared statement:

11 Pursuant to Minnesota Statute Sec 13D.015 and because of the COVID-19 pandemic, this Planning
12 Commission Meeting is being held remotely by electronic means using the audio and video
13 conferencing platform, Zoom. Members of the Commission, City staff, and others that are a part
14 of the meeting will be participating by video or audio connections where we can all hear each other
15 and see the presentations being made. We have a public forum and public hearing this evening on
16 the agenda. If you'd like to speak during these portions of the meeting you may call 1-(312) 626-
17 6799, enter the Zoom meeting ID 9383303, and press 9 to speak. Callers will be placed on hold
18 and muted until the appropriate time of the meeting is reached. At that time, each caller will be
19 recognized in turn, and invited to speak. Public comments continue to be welcomed and
20 encouraged and we ask if possible, that comments of future agenda items be submitted in advance
21 by emailing PublicComment@wayzata.org. Please include "public comments" in the subject line,
22 your name and address, and the agenda item that you are speaking to. Comments can also be
23 submitted by calling City staff or mailing comments to Wayzata City Hall at 600 Rice St E,
24 Wayzata, MN 55391 (Attn: Public Comments). The meeting will be shown on Channel 8, WCTV,
25 and streamed on the City's website at www.wayzata.org/wctv.

26
27 **AGENDA ITEM 2. Roll Call**

28
29 Chair Plantan asked Director Goellner to take roll call.

30
31 Director Goellner completed the roll call and present were Commissioners: Plantan, Douglas,
32 Merriam, Parkhill, Stockton, and Bashioum. Community Development Director Emily Goellner,
33 Assistant Planner Nick Kieser, and City Attorney David Schelzel were also present. Absent was
34 Commissioner Flannigan.

35
36 **AGENDA ITEM 3. Approval of Agenda**

37
38 Chair Plantan asked for a motion to approve the agenda for the meeting.

39
40 Commissioner Merriam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Douglas, to approve the April
41 5, 2021 agenda as presented.

42
43 Director Goellner completed a roll call vote on the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

44
45 **AGENDA ITEM 4. Consent Agenda**

46

1 **a.) Approval of the March 15, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes**

2 **b.) Approval of March 15, 2021 Special Meeting Minutes**

3
4 Chair Plantan read the items on the consent agenda and asked if any Commissioner wished to pull
5 an item for questions or further discussion.

6
7 Hearing no such request, Chair Plantan asked for a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as
8 presented.

9
10 Commissioner Parkhill made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Douglas, to approve the
11 Consent Agenda as presented.

12
13 Director Goellner completed a roll call vote on the motion, the motion carried 5 ayes, 1 abstain
14 (Merriam).

15
16 **AGENDA ITEM 5. Public Hearing Item**

17
18 **a) Consider Zoning Ordinance Amendment to Update Chapter 909 – Design**
19 **Standards**

20
21 Community Development Director Goellner presented an overview of the work on updating the
22 City’s Design Standards. She explained that Van Meter Williams Pollack was hired by the City
23 in October, and outlined the competitive process the City used in their selection. She noted that
24 the Zoning Task Force has met seven times so far and have reached a point where they are
25 comfortable bringing the recommendations for updates to the Design Standards forward to a public
26 hearing. She stated that staff is recommending that the public hearing be kept open through the
27 next Planning Commission meeting in order to give people two meetings to comment because
28 there are a lot of changes being recommended. She noted that any changes to the Design Standards
29 will need to be approved by the City Council. She introduced Andrew Faulkner, Project Manager
30 at Van Meter Williams Pollack to provide a presentation on the process and recommendations.

31
32 Andrew Faulkner, Van Meter Williams Pollack, introduced Laura Shagalov the Associated
33 Principal of Van Meter Williams Pollack’s Minneapolis office.

34
35 Ms. Shagalov stated that they have been working closely with City staff as well as the Zoning
36 Task Force to develop a shared vision for the updated Design Standards. She noted that she grew
37 up in the west metro area, and has fond memories of Wayzata. She introduced Rick Williams, a
38 founding partner from the San Francisco office, and Preeti Srinivasan, who is an urban designer
39 also out of their San Francisco office.

40
41 Mr. Faulkner gave an overview of their process in working with the Zoning Task Force and
42 explained that they had conducted a visual preference survey that touched on both design standards
43 and zoning issues. He stated that the changes being proposed are really in direct response to what
44 they have heard from the community, filtered through their professional expertise. He explained
45 that design standards are just one of several tools that can be used to ensure that new development,
46 at a minimum, will support the goals of the community. He noted that design standards do not

1 replace zoning and will not determine things like the height of a building or how much coverage
2 is allowed on a lot. The design standards work within the zoning envelope and stated that he felt
3 it was a good idea for the City to revise the zoning and the design standards parallel to each other.
4 He explained that the packet provided to the Planning Commission contemplates a few changes to
5 the district outlines for design standards which came about through the general comments portion
6 of the visual preference survey. For example, there were comments that people felt it didn't make
7 sense that the Wayzata Boulevard District extended all the way out to Barry Avenue because they
8 thought there was a much more residential feel in the Bluff District. He stated that he and Laura
9 Shagalov walked through the City and would totally agree with that survey input. He gave a brief
10 overview to their proposed changes to the district boundaries including the addition of the
11 Boatworks site to the Lake District. He stated that they were very pleased with the amount of
12 engagement they got to the visual preference survey and commended staff for their efforts to
13 increase participation. He clarified that the survey was conducted on an opt-in basis and was not
14 conducted scientifically or randomly sampled so they understand that survey participants likely
15 feel more strongly about these issues than the Wayzata community as a whole does because they
16 took the time to fill out the survey. He explained that participants were asked to choose words that
17 described and illustrated their vision for each of the design districts. He stated that 'charm' was
18 found to be very important to Lake Street and noted that it was interesting to see the balance
19 between active/vibrant along with relaxing and commercial and residential usage. The Bluff
20 District was fairly straight forward and there seemed to be a strong consensus that it should be
21 residential in its feel, charming, and slower paced than Lake Street. The opinions surrounding
22 Wayzata Boulevard seem to be a bit more open and people are okay with the more commercial
23 nature and a more active/vibrant environment. He stated that it seems to have a distinct identity
24 from the Bluff District and Lake Street. He stated that several respondents wrote in the word 'safe'
25 which probably has to do with the current roadway design, the speed of traffic, and the pedestrian
26 amenities. Mr. Faulkner explained that they had also asked the respondents to rank the existing
27 compatibility with the future vision of the different districts. He stated that they found it striking
28 that in the Bluff District, the preference is really for a modern expression of traditional forms and
29 materials. He stated that they also found the results for Wayzata Boulevard to be interesting
30 because people understand that it is a fairly typical commercial strip with parking lots in front of
31 buildings, but when people were asked for their future vision, a clear majority feel it should be a
32 more vibrant, active, and walkable location.

33
34 Mr. Faulkner went on to explain that the survey asked whether people would be willing to
35 exchange massing restrictions and concessions on building form for a hypothetical 4th story. He
36 stated that the results for both Lake Street and the Bluff District showed that people would like the
37 buildings to stay at 3 stories, but were a little more open to the possibility along Wayzata
38 Boulevard. He stated that the additional comments received on the survey were very interesting
39 and noted that they categorized the responses into similar areas. He stated that the most dominant
40 comments were related to: Charm; Consistency; and Bigness and Material. He stated that it
41 appears as though the existing design standards may have exacerbated the challenges related to
42 those issues. He reviewed the language in the code that requires setbacks for the 2nd and 3rd story
43 of a three-story building. He explained that it is their opinion that the most important role of the
44 Design Standards should be to break up large building massing into smaller forms. They found
45 that 'Main Street Charm' demands a strong ground floor design and showed examples of a building
46 that followed the existing standards and one that broke most of the design standards but was more

1 successful at appearing charming. He explained that places that are commonly considered
2 charming such as Mackinaw Island or Stillwater, are characterized by vertical articulation.
3

4 Mr. Faulkner gave an overview of the proposed massing and articulation standards for the updated
5 Design Standards: Massing breaks; Upper floor setbacks; and Building recesses. He stated that
6 massing breaks are proposed to subdivide the building length to no more than half the length of a
7 traditional Wayzata block and noted that for the lakefront, there should be a massing break over
8 150 feet and for inland this requirement would only be applied above the first floor. Upper floor
9 setbacks would be refined to reinforce the building streetwall, reduce the perceived height of taller
10 buildings, and allow for increased vertical rhythm along the first two stories of the façade. He
11 explained that for building recesses, the concept is to be 250 square foot of façade recess to allow
12 for increased outdoor dining, seating, landscaping and other ground-level amenities without
13 encroaching on the public sidewalk. He noted that when he and Ms. Shagalov were walking in
14 Wayzata, one of the buildings that struck them was 800 Lake Street, which is a small retail building
15 on the lake side of Lake Street, because the building bridges over the existing creek and creates a
16 really nice space around it. He stated that they are hoping to create opportunities for skilled
17 architects and developers to really help create nice places like that.
18

19 At the conclusion of Mr. Faulkner's presentation, Chair Plantan asked if the Commission had any
20 questions for the City's consultants.
21

22 Commissioner Parkhill thanked Mr. Faulkner and his associates for the work they have done. He
23 stated that it had been a pleasure to work on the Zoning Task Force with them, and encouraged the
24 Commission to spend some time looking over this information because the proposed changes are
25 dynamic.
26

27 Commissioner Bashioum asked how walkability factored into their thoughts surrounding massing.
28 She stated that she likes the idea of the breaks in the façade, and agrees that it will break up the
29 feeling of one long corridor. She noted that Mr. Faulkner had mentioned articulations, and asked
30 what they would recommend with reference to walkability.
31

32 Mr. Faulkner stated that they definitely considered walkability, and noted that their team includes
33 both architects and urban designers. He explained that architects think from the inside out and
34 urban designers think from the outside in; so as the new standards were designed, they were trying
35 to see how the buildings could become a frame for a great street space. He stated that a few of the
36 advantages are the significant building massing breaks that could allow considerable outdoor space
37 and could be great amenities despite the limitations of the access issues related to the railroad
38 tracks. He stated that there could even be some spaces that are a bit elevated that could look down
39 on the lake, outdoor dining, or landscape as pocket parks could be sprinkled through the area. He
40 stated that he feels that breaking up the buildings will really help the walkability of the streets. He
41 stated that he lives in Minneapolis and there are certain streets that walking a block or two feels
42 like it takes 10 minutes longer than it actually does, and much of that is because of how repetitive
43 the elements are along the street. He stated that there needs to be a good rhythm, with enough
44 variety, especially with buildings stepping in and out a bit. He explained that if everything is built
45 to the same setback with a uniform storefront, it will feel fairly monotonous. The building in the
46 City that is universally the most loved in their findings is the CōV building, and they believe that

1 is because it has nice materials close to the pedestrian walkway, but the architect also did a good
2 job with their awnings which helps to create a rhythm. He stated that along with attractive signage,
3 lighting, unit entrances, and something like small terraces or stoops could do a lot to help the street
4 feel more friendly for pedestrians. He stated that the new projects in the Bluff District have done
5 better, but Wayzata Boulevard presents a bigger challenge because there is a high traffic arterial
6 road which has minimal sidewalks because of how the County designed it. He stated that what
7 they thought of in that area is how they could use building massing and articulation strategies to
8 allow the buildings to step back a bit further from the sidewalk. He stated that in this area, it may
9 be advantageous for the City to require applicants to construct additional width of sidewalk on
10 their private property or to provide additional buffer area, such as the Punch Pizza building,
11 because they did a great job putting the planters in and raising the level of the dining a bit up from
12 the street. He stated that they are thinking with the pedestrian in mind and are trying to create
13 vibrancy and vitality in the building facades that people walk alongside them.

14
15 Commissioner Merriam stated that she noticed some language in the revised proposal about the
16 recesses being opened to the sky. She asked if there would be some way to allow arbors or some
17 type of shelter in that area for rain or shade protection.

18
19 Mr. Faulkner stated that thinks there is probably a way to thread that needle in the language of the
20 standards. He explained that what they were afraid of is that someone would create the small
21 recess and then make it a tunnel under the 2nd or 3rd floor of the building. He stated that he thinks
22 the language could be amended to, for example, allow a temporary awning or trellis that may be
23 40% open to the sky.

24
25 Commissioner Douglas stated that there had been discussion of 150 feet of length without a break.
26 She asked what approximate amount of density that would mean in a 3-story building. She stated
27 that she would like to know how many units would be in a standard building that fit those
28 parameters.

29
30 Mr. Faulkner stated that it would depend on unit size. He noted that a 1-bedroom unit would be
31 25-30 feet wide and a 2 bedroom would be about 35 feet wide. He stated that if you did an estimate
32 of 150 feet for 2- and 3-bedroom units, that would be about 4 units, which means over 3 floors
33 there would be about 12 units on each side.

34
35 There being no questions from the Commission for the applicant, Chair Plantan opened the public
36 hearing on the application at 7:17 pm.

37
38 Barry Petit, 420 Peavey Lane, stated that this is a complicated document with lots of stuff going
39 on. He stated that the bottom line is the question of who will be the user of this document because
40 there is an altruistic idea approach to this great document. He stated this document is for the
41 developer, which means that they will be trying to sift through it to find out what the City wants.
42 He stated that he does not need a history of the City but simply needs to know what the City wants.
43 He stated that he could be working on 5 different projects as an architect, with just 1 located in the
44 City, which is why there needs to be simplicity in the document because if the developer has to
45 sift through this kind of document, it will drive them insane. He stated that he does not think
46 simplicity and clarity can be over emphasized because it is at the core, and the City's history does

1 not matter. He stated that he thinks it is important to eliminate abstractions and get rid of the kinds
2 of things that can be interpreted in multiple ways. He stated that the document also cannot use
3 abstract adjectives because they create struggle with interpretation. He gave the example of using
4 the word 'charming' because that is not a design ideology and does not exist in the world of
5 architecture. He stated that he would like to see the setback standard for the 3rd floor be "x" number
6 of feet and not calculated by the length of the building and some percentage amount. He stated
7 that he thinks it is little things like that which are so germane to success. He stated that he is not
8 sure where the idea of vertical elements equal charm came from and in his travels in throughout
9 the world, he has not found vertical to be charming. He stated that he is also not sure that awnings
10 should be considered great architecture. He stated that he thinks the idea of being charming and
11 like a village are from the idea of regionalism, and he has not heard anyone discuss regionalism.
12 He explained that regionalism is the idea that it looks like it belongs here and not anywhere else.
13 He stated that he felt the issue of density is irrelevant to this conversation because there is a
14 building height and setbacks which creates a volume, and it is not the City's place to determine
15 what happens with that volume. He stated that what will protect the City is the parking
16 requirements. He reiterated that the density can be controlled via volume and parking restrictions.
17 He stated that what the Planning Commission wants to know is when this document is put together
18 and the rules are followed, is what it will look like, because nothing else matters. He stated that it
19 is more likely that the Planning Commission will approve a building that they will never go inside,
20 but will drive by it every day. He stated that another thing to keep in mind is what the sun
21 orientation will be for these little recesses and indentations. He stated that there is an idealistic
22 planning for the City versus reality, and he is not certain that those are yet clear. He reiterated that
23 his main points are simplicity, acknowledgement of who is the end user, and clarity of the
24 information.

25
26 Polly Anderson, 230 Chicago Avenue North, stated that what she likes about the proposed
27 standards is that the City is really thinking and being diligent about what this is creating for the
28 City. She stated that for her, when she thinks about the charm or vibrancy of the City, she has to
29 think about the trees. She stated that she questions where the charm or vibrancy would be without
30 the trees. She stated that they need to think about the lived landscaping on the outside, and what
31 will the experience will be for people who live and work in the City. She stated that she thinks it
32 is important to include the trees as part of this process because she believes it will at least guide
33 resolution on some of the other problems in terms of ambiguity and clarity. She would like to see
34 the City come forward and say that it will protect the trees as they are today. She stated that she
35 thinks it is important to include a broad definition of the attributes that the City is looking for, in
36 terms of trees, and quantifying that information. She stated that she would like there to be some
37 goals that set up tree cover by zone or area. She stated that she would also like to comment on
38 fees that the City is collecting from developers who make the decision to go ahead and cut down
39 trees, and the City makes the decision to allow them to do that. She asked what would be done
40 with those fees, and suggested that they be used to enhance the green design in the City. She stated
41 that she would disagree with the earlier statement that the experience of the buildings will primarily
42 be from the drive-by experience because she thinks it is how people walk on the sidewalk, where
43 they can sit, what sort of shade they have, and what sort of landscaping there is.

44
45 Brad Hoyt, 326 Ferndale Road West, stated that he is assuming the conversation in this public
46 hearing is around the TCF building and the moratorium issues. He stated that in a general sense,

1 regardless of the plan, his sensitivity is to that whatever will go up in that location. He explained
2 that he has a massive investment underway in the area, as do the owners at Wayzata Blue and
3 nearby properties. He stated that they have developed these things in reliance on the stability of
4 the uses and zoning. He stated he understands that there is a rush to get the TCF application
5 through, but as a guy who just spent 28.5 years getting a permit, he is not sensitive to that. He
6 stated that he thinks there has been a policy and an experience in Wayzata that has always been
7 extremely deliberate, so he is not sensitive to someone getting an application in before a
8 moratorium is or isn't adopted. In terms of the moratorium, he thinks it is essential because the
9 City has very limited resources and ability to respond to the surge in development that is taking
10 place. He stated that the TCF site is a unique situation, and noted that there have been mistakes
11 made in the past regarding text amendments and abuse of the PUD process. He stated that he
12 believes the City needs to hit the pause button and have a careful and deliberate discussion of what
13 is happening because once it is done, it is done. The aesthetic of the City is very important and
14 needs careful consideration. He stated that there are people who have invested close to
15 \$90,000,000 in reliance on the stability of the zoning. He stated that the guidance of the
16 Comprehensive Plan does not conform with what is being proposed, and noted that it is getting
17 pretty popular to find ways around zoning laws through text amendments and PUDs. He stated
18 that PUDs are not to be used as a way to get around the zoning and basically do spot zoning. He
19 stated that he agreed with Mr. Petit that parking can be a way that the City can limit density. He
20 reiterated that he feels the City needs to hit the pause button and involve the community in this
21 discussion.

22
23 There being no additional comments, Chair Plantan explained that the public hearing would be
24 kept open and continued through the next Planning Commission meeting. She noted that there
25 would be additional information shared at the next meeting from staff and the City's consultant,
26 and invited additional public participation and comments at that time.

27
28 Community Development Director Goellner noted that the City had received several public
29 comments prior to the meeting, and noted that the Planning Commission could give some feedback
30 this evening that could be incorporated into the next meeting. She gave a general overview of
31 some of the public comments that had been provided in advance, and noted that there were
32 comments similar to Polly's comments related to trees, and asked Van Meter Williams Pollack
33 representatives if they have any thoughts on addressing the tree issue that has been raised.

34
35 Mr. Faulkner stated that they can do some thinking surrounding that issue and noted that generally,
36 trees, especially boulevard and street trees, would be part of the City's right-of-way design. He
37 stated that they have seen some communities that create additional standards having to do with
38 tree planting as part of private landscaping. He noted that it can get a bit tricky down the road
39 because it can be difficult to determine who is maintaining the trees, but he does think there are
40 some things that can be done. He stated that they had begun to think about how the Design
41 Standards would incorporate the existing tree preservation policies, so there may be a way there
42 could be work alongside the zoning work, to either suggest ways in which the policies could be
43 strengthened or ways in which they could inform the design guidelines further.

44
45 Chair Plantan asked for that to be incorporated in the next portion of the presentation.
46

1 Commissioner Bashioum asked about the advance public statements that were received at the City,
2 and noted that she did not think the Commission had seen any of them in their packet. She asked
3 if staff could address those comments, since the Commission had not seen or heard them.
4

5 Community Development Director Goellner stated that a few of the comments came in during the
6 meeting and a few e-mails were received earlier today. She stated that they are very brief and that
7 they will be included in the April 19, 2021 meeting packet. She read them aloud so the
8 Commission would have a general idea of what was included in the comments.
9

10 Chair Plantan expressed her appreciation to everyone that has been working on the updates to the
11 Design Standards because she knows it is a lot of work and is not an easy thing to tackle, such as
12 including the word “charm” in an architectural context. She stated that she would agree with the
13 earlier comment that this document needs to be simple and provide clarity to the end user. She
14 stated that she liked the phrasing someone used that the ‘buildings need to look like they belong
15 here’.
16

17 Commissioner Merriam stated that within the draft it talks about 100-foot length as well as 150-
18 foot length having building recesses. She asked what the distinguishing factor is between the two
19 lengths.
20

21 Mr. Faulkner stated that he believes the difference is between the building recess and the massing
22 break. He stated that the massing break occurs at 150 feet or is required for buildings longer than
23 150 feet, but the small recess would be required under 100 feet. He stated that they are trying to
24 set up 2 overlapping layers of articulation that start to break up buildings.
25

26 Commissioner Merriam asked for an explanation of the difference between a massing break and a
27 recess.
28

29 Mr. Faulkner explained that a recess is a smaller area which would be like an outdoor dining area
30 or an entrance. They set that with a maximum area of 250 square feet, which would be something
31 around 15 x 15 whereas the building break would go all the way through the depth of the building.
32

33 There being no further discussion, Chair Plantan moved to the next agenda item.
34

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

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

39 Assistant Planner, Nick Kieser stated in addition to the continued public hearing, there may be two
40 additional applications that are currently under review by the City: one for the Rice Street
41 Brownstones and another for Meridian Manor.
42

43 Commissioner Bashioum asked why the Rice Street Brownstone project was stopped from
44 construction.
45

1 Planner Kieser stated that after further review of the existing PUD and PUD agreement for the
2 District that was approved around 2005, staff concluded that the structure being constructed did
3 not meet all of the standards of the PUD and agreement, so the construction was stopped and the
4 City is requiring approval of a PUD amendment for the new structure to continue with the
5 construction.

6
7 **b) Planning Commissioner Liaison Schedule and City Meeting Calendar**

8
9 **AGENDA ITEM 7. Adjournment.**

10
11 There being no further business on the agenda, Chair Plantan asked for a motion to adjourn.

12
13 Commissioner Bashioum made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Stockton, to adjourn the
14 Planning Commission meeting.

15
16 Director Goellner completed a roll call vote on the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

17
18 The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 7:56 p.m.

19
20 Respectfully submitted,

21 Kayla Atkins Rokosz

22 *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*

23