

1 **WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION**
2 **MEETING MINUTES**
3 **APRIL 19, 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 91012293735 and press 9 to speak. Callers will be placed on
18 hold and muted until the appropriate time of the meeting is reached. At that time, each caller will
19 be 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, and Stockton. Community Development Director Emily Goellner, Assistant Planner
33 Nick Kieser, and City Attorney David Schelzel were also present.
34

35 Absent at roll call were Commissioners: Parkhill and Bashioum
36

37 **AGENDA ITEM 3. Approval of Agenda**
38

39 Chair Plantan asked for a motion to approve the agenda for the meeting.
40

41 Commissioner Douglas made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Stockton, to approve the April
42 19, 2021 agenda as presented.
43

44 Director Goellner completed a roll call vote on the motion. The motion carried unanimously.
45
46

1 **AGENDA ITEM 4. Consent Agenda**

2
3 **a.) Approval of the April 5, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes**

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

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

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

13
14 Director Goellner completed a roll call vote on the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

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

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

20
21 Director Goellner reminded the Commission that they began the discussion on the updates to the
22 City’s Design Standards at their April 5, 2021 meeting. She introduced Andrew Faulkner from
23 Van Meter Williams Pollack, the City’s consultant on the project. She noted that Assistant Planner
24 Kieser had compiled information about feedback the City had received from the public on the
25 proposed changes, and noted that he will summarize the comments after Mr. Faulkner’s
26 presentation.

27
28 Andrew Faulkner, Project Manager with Van Meter Williams Pollack, continued his presentation
29 on the proposed Design Standards which touched on Public comment received so far; proposed
30 Additional Site Standards; and proposed new Building Design Standards. He noted that there were
31 comments made at the last meeting that the new Design Standards document may seem overly
32 detailed or complicated. He noted that their experience is that this level of rigor and clarity will
33 help applicants get on the same page with the community much earlier in the process, will allow
34 more issues to be resolved administratively, and will bring about fewer variances and
35 modifications. He stated that Van Meter Williams Pollack doesn’t just operate within the
36 ‘planning realm’ but are also architects of multi-family housing projects in three states, which
37 means they have spent a lot of time looking at design standards of the various cities that they are
38 working in. He stated that because of this, they feel this document should be organized from big
39 issues to small issues, and highlight the type of information that different audiences need. He
40 stated that they have reorganized the design standards to begin with the most general items, and
41 then increasing in detail towards the end of the document. The ‘introduction’ section will include
42 information on the community priorities as well as submittal requirements. The ‘site design’
43 section will cover scale and configuration. The ‘building design’ section will move into significant
44 building mass requirements, design and material standards. He stated that they consciously tried
45 to use the same organization and format for the entire document and each page has: General
46 Statement; Intent; Applicability; Standards; and Guidance. He explained that the guidance section

1 turned into kind of the Swiss army knife of the document. He stated that this section allows there
2 to be suggestions, not requirements, that would exceed zoning and ordinances. He shared
3 examples and explained that the goal for this document is that it will be clear and will reduce the
4 need for deviations. He stated that there is also the possibility of guidance items being changed
5 into standards, and shared some examples. He stated that they met with the Zoning Task Force on
6 April 12, 2021 where several changes were recommended. The Task Force also voted
7 unanimously to recommend approval of the proposed draft of the Wayzata Design Standards, and
8 send them to the Planning Commission. He reviewed the proposed new revisions based on
9 feedback from the Zoning Task Force and the Planning Commission.

10
11 Mr. Faulkner reviewed the public comments that were received prior to the day of the meeting,
12 and the responses to them from Van Meter Williams Pollack. He stated that their suggestions for
13 Usable Open Space Design would ensure that the open space that is required will provide a good
14 quality amenity for residents and is something that can actually be used, which means: the ground
15 should be sloped less than 6.25% or terraced; for private - be accessible from a dwelling unit and
16 have a minimum 5-foot dimension in order to qualify as usable; for shared use - have a minimum
17 area of 250 square feet. He reviewed the short- and long-term focus items for the standards and
18 gave examples along Wayzata Boulevard. He gave a brief overview of the additional landscape
19 standards that were included. He reviewed the proposed building design standards, including roof
20 design; façade design; material application; and material character. He stated that they have
21 designed all of these standards to work together to create an integrated system of proportions that
22 help break down the buildings.

23
24 Assistant Planner Kieser noted that they had received 9 public comments ahead of the meeting.
25 Two were in general support of the work that had been done thus far, one comment asked for more
26 green space to reduce the heat island and implement sustainability practices, and another comment
27 related that the ‘charm’ of Wayzata was gone. He noted that there was a detailed comment that
28 went over the history of Wayzata’s development, and asked that the design standards be kept clear
29 and simple and specific to the City. There was a comment that the buildings should feel like they
30 “belong” in the City and it should be communicated to architects that this is taken seriously. This
31 commenter also felt that the Tree Preservation Ordinance should be revisited. He noted that there
32 were three additional comments that the Tree Preservation Ordinance should be revisited and
33 updated to help preserve and protect the trees in the City. Planner Kieser gave an overview of the
34 next steps in the process of reviewing the proposed new Design Standards, and when it may be
35 presented to the City Council. He stated that since there were so many comments surrounding the
36 Tree Preservation Ordinance, the Zoning Task Force and Environment Committee will be taking
37 a closer look at this item with the hopes of bringing an update to the City Council around October
38 of 2021.

39
40 Chair Plantan asked if the Commission had any questions for Staff.

41
42 Commissioner Douglas asked Mr. Faulkner about Usable Open Space, and asked how the
43 measurements were calculated.

44
45 Mr. Faulkner noted that this amount is in another section of the current Zoning Ordinance, but
46 noted that in their experience 500 square feet per unit is a bit on the high side.

1
2 Commissioner Douglas agreed that this number seems high to her because the City does not have
3 large lots.
4

5 Mr. Faulkner stated that this may be a good thing to keep in mind during the zoning update, and it
6 may be helpful to look at some recent proposals and see whether that is in line with what they have
7 actually provided. He stated that he agrees that this would be a lot of space in the in-fill conditions
8 around the Lake Street District, and feels as though it may have been written more for a duplex or
9 tri-plex situation and probably not a 40-unit project.
10

11 Commissioner Douglas asked whether the photo of Lake Street on page 41 of the document from
12 the lake, and if it could be changed to a summer photo so there isn't ice being shown on the lake.
13 She noted that on page 40 there is a statement that says the City "has sustained its strong small
14 town Midwest character for 120 years". She asked where they came up with 120 years, because
15 the City is 167 years old.
16

17 Mr. Faulkner stated that is a good point and suspects that he had pulled information from multiple
18 sources. He noted that they have a screen check version that they will go through before this is
19 brought to the Council and encouraged anyone that may notice things like this to bring them to
20 their attention.
21

22 Commissioner Merriam asked for clarification on the two-foot sidewalk extension requirement
23 proposed in the Wayzata Boulevard District. She asked if that was meant to be in addition to the
24 existing sidewalk within the County right-of-way.
25

26 Mr. Faulkner stated that was correct, and explained that since Hennepin County controls the right-
27 of-way, the City cannot control what sidewalk they are doing in their right-of-way and this was
28 just an effort to get a bit more sidewalk width for those properties.
29

30 Commissioner Merriam asked what 'human scaled materials' would be.
31

32 Mr. Faulkner stated that he thinks they could probably do a better job communicating that meaning,
33 but explained that the intent was materials like masonry materials, such as brick and tile, that are
34 broken down into units the size of a human hand rather than materials that come in big 4 x 8-foot
35 sheets.
36

37 Commissioner Merriam stated that he had touched on the color and material transitions which she
38 thinks are great, but stated that this information sounded more like guidance than a standard
39 because the word 'should' was used.
40

41 Mr. Faulkner stated that was a good point, and should probably be made into a standard.
42

43 Commissioner Merriam noted that she has a lot more questions but suggested that the Commission
44 may want to reopen the public hearing up for comment before she goes through them all.
45

1 Chair Plantan asked about page 23 of the document, and for some clarification on the sidewalk
2 standard because it says ‘Lake Street District 12 feet inclusive of a 6-foot planting zone’, but then
3 Standard S3 on page 23 says ‘5-foot minimum’. She asked if there was an opportunity to make
4 the sidewalk wider so there can be two people walking side by side passing each other.
5

6 Mr. Faulkner stated that he thinks the requirement may have to be 5 feet at the bluff and 6 feet at
7 Lake Street because it should be 6 feet at Lake Street. He stated that he sympathizes with her
8 second point and shared an example of when he lived somewhere that had 12-foot sidewalks. He
9 stated that the difficulty is that so much of the frontage on Lake Street is now built, so to require a
10 larger sidewalk may mean you are butting out into the street and possibly removing street parking
11 or setting new buildings back from where the existing buildings are, which could also pose some
12 challenges. He stated that they had hoped to address that with the building breaks and recesses to
13 open up small rooms that provided more space, but it could be something discussed for the zoning
14 ordinance update.
15

16 Chair Plantan noted that she would be very concerned if they did not incorporate the standards
17 regarding aesthetics, versus the energy goals, for solar panels into the building design standards.
18

19 Mr. Faulkner stated that they would like to see where the discussion goes with the Zoning Task
20 Force and if necessary, could come back and make an amendment to the document.
21

22 There being no additional questions for staff from the Commission, Chair Plantan re-opened the
23 public hearing on the application at 8:05 pm.
24

25 Polly Anderson, 230 Chicago Avenue North, stated that she feels these design enhancements will
26 leave a positive and indelible legacy in the City for generations to come. She stated that she is the
27 chair of the Energy and Environment Committee, and their charter is to recommend sustainable
28 advancement; so they would like to find ways to include language to promote the use of
29 sustainability. She noted that an Energy Action Plan was approved by the City Council a few
30 months ago, and its overarching goal is to position the City as a leader in sustainability in the Twin
31 Cities. She reviewed the 4 specific areas where the City can support sustainability in the design
32 standards. She stated that she would like the City to be forward looking and create public EV
33 charging stations because they will be critical for residents and visitors. She stated that under 2.E.
34 of the proposed application submittal requirements, she feels the City should find a way to promote
35 solar and other renewable energy technology. She noted that with Site Design/Lighting standards
36 for parking lots and walkways, lighting has been shown to significantly disrupt pollinators. She
37 noted that pollinators are referred to in Landscape Design standards, and she feels it should be
38 carried over to lighting in order to be consistent. They would like to see references to pollinator
39 friendly habitat lighting for pedestrian walkways and parking lots. She stated that her final point
40 is to the proposed sec. 2.B.4. Guidance for Landscaping, where it refers to trees, gardens, grasses,
41 hedges, and perennials, but only mentions native plants in passing. She stated that she feels the
42 City should heavily promote native plants because that is sustainable and the most environmentally
43 sound practice. She stated that she would like to see a required percentage called out, such as
44 80%. She stated that the enhancements to the proposed standards she mentioned will help create
45 a positive legacy for tomorrow and will be seen as far-reaching leadership for today.
46

1 There being no other public comments, Chair Plantan closed the public hearing at 8:12 pm.

2
3 Chair Plantan asked for the Commission to share their questions and feedback.

4
5 Commissioner Merriam stated that in looking at this document, she wants to make sure nothing is
6 overlooked because it will be put into the City's policy. She stated that she had a number of
7 questions, and asked to begin with the Applicability section and the three design districts. She
8 noted that there had been discussion about the Wayzata Boulevard District stopping at Superior
9 but noticed that in the chart on page 8, the cutoff point was at Grand instead. She asked how that
10 decision was made.

11
12 Mr. Faulkner stated that they have not revised this chart and can split the District at Superior, and
13 thinks the original idea was to capture what is now the Wells Fargo site within the district. He
14 stated that if it is desirable to the Planning Commission, the boundary can be revised before this
15 goes to City Council and have it extended to Superior.

16
17 Commissioner Merriam stated that her concern is that there are a lot of residential areas along that
18 stretch, as well as the VFW. She stated that she would just like to make sure it is considered. She
19 stated that there is also one little piece of property on the Comprehensive Plan zoning map that is
20 west of Barry that is zoned mixed use along Wayzata Boulevard, and she would prefer to see that
21 property fall under the Bluff District standards, rather than Wayzata Boulevard District. She noted
22 that on page 19 there were four phases, but admitted that she did not really understand what the
23 diagrams were showing.

24
25 Mr. Faulkner explained that this was provided as an example of guidance for how a large retail
26 property may be transformed over time into a mixed-use property. He stated that this section just
27 provides guidance for which items should be focused on first as they are making the transition
28 from commercial to mixed use as guided by the Comprehensive Plan. He stated that it may be a
29 sort of memo to future staff members, and noted that this type of property typically does not
30 transform all at once.

31
32 Commissioner Merriam asked if underground parking was part of phase 4 of this transitioning.

33
34 Mr. Faulkner noted that in the examples shown, phase 3 and phase 4 show structured parking, and
35 noted that one of the secrets to this sort of development is that it often requires parking shared
36 between uses.

37
38 Commissioner Merriam stated that page 20 talks about usable open space with very little slope or
39 space that could be terraced. She asked if there is any reason to put a size of the terrace in this
40 section so people don't simply have steps.

41
42 Mr. Faulkner noted that this was a great comment and they could consider putting more
43 information about the size.

44
45 Commissioner Merriam noted that on page 24 there are pictures of bicycle parking and explained
46 that neither of the photos presented seem like a practical solution to her. She stated the top photo

1 makes it appear as though the tire will protrude out into the street and the bike will be blocking the
2 sidewalk, and the other photo shows orange and green which are not the colors of what the City is
3 striving towards. She asked about the meaning of two points of locking.
4

5 Mr. Faulkner explained that there is a set of bicycling parking best practices that they reference.
6 He noted that both of the pictures Commissioner Merriam is referring to provide two points of
7 locking. He explained how two points of locking would work compared to the old fashion racks
8 which only allow locking the front of the bicycle, which makes it easier to steal the bicycle. He
9 suggested that they could find a diagram to illustrate that point, and agrees that there should be
10 better images for this page.

11
12 Commissioner Merriam asked if the two points of locking means that a bicyclist would actually
13 have two locks with them.
14

15 Mr. Faulkner explained that the bicyclist would not necessarily need two separate locks, but could
16 have a U lock and a long cable, and run it through both parts of the bike frame.
17

18 Commissioner Merriam referred to page 27 on parking lot landscaping and noted that one of the
19 standards was a decorative solid masonry wall between 3 and 4 feet in height. She asked if the
20 City really wants masonry walls at all of the parking lots.
21

22 Mr. Faulkner stated that this item comes back to the point he made in his presentation. As it has
23 been implemented now, there are spaced tree plantings which look good, but many of those die
24 back in winter. He stated it then becomes tree/hedge and in their observation, the hedges are not
25 doing that well; so they do not provide much visual screening between the parking lot and the back
26 of the sidewalk. He explained that their thought with the wall is that it would provide a visual
27 barrier regardless of whether the hedges are thriving or there are leaves on the trees. He stated that
28 they called out masonry because of its proximity to a parking lot where they would be concerned
29 about the long-term durability of a wooden fence.
30

31 Commissioner Merriam stated that she wonders about the possibility of using what is called
32 “Wayzata Fencing”, which is the black wrought iron with circles at the top, rather than a masonry
33 wall. She stated that she has seen this along parking lots along Lake Street by the TCF building.
34

35 Mr. Faulkner stated that wrought iron would be a good compromise.
36

37 Commissioner Merriam stated that on page 35 it talks about applicability for upper story setbacks
38 and asked if 60 feet was too long.
39

40 Mr. Faulkner stated that he believes that number came from the existing design standards and
41 explained what he perceived as the reasoning behind using 60 feet. He further explained that they
42 are pretty confident that this is a good measurement to use.
43

44 Commissioner Merriam asked what would happen if there was a 60-foot-long building, then a few
45 feet, and then another 60-foot building.
46

1 Mr. Faulkner explained that could be an issue in a zero-lot line condition like Lake Street. He
2 stated that other than the Ventana project, he cannot think of any other recent development that
3 was even close to 60 feet wide and most have been 200-300 feet wide.

4
5 Commissioner Merriam stated that this page lists guidance about winter time sun orientation and
6 that building height not negatively and significantly impacting neighboring properties. She asked
7 whether this item should be a standard rather than a guidance point.

8
9 Mr. Faulkner stated that they had considered that but worried about the enforceability of it.

10
11 Commissioner Merriam stated that on page 37 it talks about applicability for buildings that exceed
12 80 feet in length, and then it talks about articulation elements with a maximum spacing of 40 feet.
13 She stated that if someone had a 79-foot building, they would not be required to have any type of
14 articulation elements. She wondered if it should just be for all buildings and not have something
15 that exceeds a certain width.

16
17 Mr. Faulkner stated that he agrees that this is a good clarification and can be revised in that
18 direction.

19
20 Commissioner Merriam stated that page 39 has a few photos of buildings that she does not really
21 feel are suited to Wayzata, especially the photos shown in figures 3.45 and 3.46.

22
23 Mr. Faulkner noted that he believes those were included because they were focusing on the stoop
24 and fence, and not so much on the architecture, but they can look for better images.

25
26 Commissioner Merriam asked for clarification on page 41 under standards at the top bullet point.
27 She stated that she feels that the language should actually say “ ‘more than three feet tall’ shall be
28 fully concealed”.

29
30 Mr. Faulkner stated that is correct and they will be changing to only refer to Wayzata Boulevard
31 because the Bluff and Lake Districts will only require mechanicals to be placed on the ground, or
32 not on the roof.

33
34 Commissioner Merriam stated that on page 48, the photos do not fit with the City because they
35 look very ‘standard’, especially the one in figure 3.64.

36
37 Mr. Faulkner noted that figure 3.64 is actually located in Wayzata and is the back of Wayzata Blue.

38
39 Commissioner Merriam stated that overall she found there were other photos that didn’t seem to
40 fit, but noted that perhaps it is the same type of thing as the ones that show the back of Wayzata
41 Blue. She stated that she loved the picture of the balcony on page 50. She asked about discussion
42 of architectural features, such as arched windows, and a way to create more interesting buildings
43 with the use of arches and other more interesting features.

44
45 Mr. Faulkner stated that they made a decision to be kind of agnostic about specific features like
46 that because if people are following all the rules for massing and making buildings that fit within

1 the community, they hoped that the designers would be smart enough to design good buildings
2 that will fit in. He stated that they were also struck by the debate around brick in the City right
3 now, and noted that it appears as though brick was highly emphasized in the current design
4 standards from the early 2000s, and what they received in the public comments is that there is a
5 big backlash against all of these large brick buildings that feel out of place. He stated that the hope
6 is that in allowing architects to make their own decisions about individual projects, there will be
7 less of that type of blanket aesthetic that may feel as though it is imposed by these design
8 guidelines.

9
10 Commissioner Merriam stated that on page 61 it talks about neon signs only on the inside of
11 windows. She stated that she is unsure if she even wants to see them on the inside of the windows.

12
13 Mr. Faulkner noted that this came from the existing standards and noted that he had also raised an
14 eyebrow when he saw it.

15
16 Commissioner Douglas stated that she appreciates how Commissioner Merriam really does her
17 homework, and thanked her for being so thorough. She stated that early in the presentation, it
18 talked about guidance vs. standards, and stated that she would like to have a bit more information
19 on guidance and how it figures into the Planning Commission's deliberations when they are
20 considering an application. She stated that she likes that there will be a checklist for applicability
21 because it makes it more cut and dry what everybody needs to do. She stated that the guidance
22 statements are not firm standards, and asked what would happen if someone came in and said this
23 is just guidance and not one of the City standards, so they don't have to do it. She asked if the
24 Planning Commission could turn down a project based on guidance principles and if so, could the
25 developer come back and argue that it is not one of the City's standards.

26
27 Mr. Faulkner stated that they designed the guidance to be deliberately 'squishy' which is why they
28 used the term guidance and not guidelines. He stated that he does not believe the Planning
29 Commission could reject an application because of something included in the guidance, and
30 explained that the guidance section was something that, as staff is working with applicants early
31 in the process, they could point to it and say this is something that the community really wants to
32 see. He stated that their view on this was that it would help give a bit of flexibility to get things
33 that are beyond what the standard could require, or things that would be unique for each site that
34 are hard to legislate across the entire town. He stated that he thinks the guidance points are
35 something that will be more of a conversation point between staff and the applicant, and less about
36 something that would come to the Planning Commission.

37
38 City Attorney Schelzel stated that he thinks Commissioner Douglas' question is a good one, and
39 that Mr. Faulkner did a good job of explaining that standards are binding for an applicant whereas
40 guidance is not. He stated that it makes sense to ask why people would follow the guidance, but
41 that it could help with the dialogue between staff and the applicant, particularly on the larger
42 projects. He added that a step further would be to ask what incentives the City could provide to
43 developers to follow that guidance.

44
45 Commissioner Stockton noted that she is part of the Zoning Task Force and that the questions
46 being raised tonight by the Planning Commission are very thorough and thoughtful. She stated

1 that the comment about the Bluff District extending to Ferndale makes a lot of sense, as does the
2 catch regarding neon signage. She stated that the things that are coming up are very detailed, and
3 she appreciates that the Commission took the time to think through how this will be applied in real
4 time. She stated that she likes the comment made regarding how the guidance can be used more
5 specifically, so it is not just a high hope but also an incentive.

6
7 Chair Plantan noted that she had a question regarding sidewalks, and referred to page 58 of the
8 presentation regarding bike racks, and asked how they will fit in if there are only 5-foot-wide
9 sidewalks. She asked if they were needed at every entrance to every building.

10
11 Mr. Faulkner stated that he will have to double check the details, but believes that they may be
12 required in the existing zoning language, so the question is how it can be applied. He stated that
13 generally, it is harder for buildings that just have a straight frontage on the street and noted that
14 what is often seen is that one bike rack would be located parallel with the street between the street
15 trees or in the boulevard which keeps the bikes off of the sidewalk. He stated that would be within
16 the public right-of-way, so that would have to be coordinated at the City level. Ultimately, with
17 the design standards, building recesses should be adequately sized so a bike rack should be able to
18 be in there without compromising the space. He stated that this may be a good example for
19 guidance regarding places that would be acceptable for bicycle parking.

20
21 Chair Plantan stated that she just does not want to encroach into the 5 feet of sidewalk for
22 pedestrians.

23
24 There being no further discussion, Chair Plantan asked for a motion on the application.

25
26 Commissioner Merriam asked if, with everything that was discussed tonight, whether the
27 Commission is ready to make a motion to send this to the City Council or if changes should be
28 made first and then have the Commission review it again before making a final recommendation.

29
30 Director Goellner stated that she thinks staff and Mr. Faulkner can work on the changes that were
31 suggested. She stated that she sensed consensus around those issues, and they could make the
32 changes and bring them back at the May 3, 2021 Planning Commission meeting for their review.

33
34 City Attorney Schelzel stated that the normal procedure would be a motion to direct staff to prepare
35 a draft report and recommendation for the Zoning Ordinance amendment, but because this is so
36 large with a lot of moving parts including the recommended changes brought forward tonight, he
37 thinks the Commission will have to pay close attention and review a lot of information prior to the
38 next meeting. He stated he does not see a problem moving forward, as usual, with a motion to
39 direct staff to prepare the draft report with the attached proposed Design Standard document and
40 zoning ordinance amendment updated. He stated that he would not suggest putting that on the
41 Consent Agenda at the next meeting but rather as a New Business item so the Planning
42 Commission can discuss and make sure that all the I's have been dotted and the T's crossed before
43 it is sent to Council for final approval. He noted that there is no real deadline with this, but he
44 likes the idea of staying on course if staff and consultants feel they can get it close to what has
45 been discussed by the next meeting.

46

1 Director Goellner and Mr. Faulkner both expressed their comfort with proceeding in this manner.

2
3 There being no further discussion, Chair Plantan asked for a motion on the application.

4
5 Commissioner Douglas made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Merriam, to direct staff to
6 prepare a draft Planning Commission Report and Recommendation with appropriate findings
7 reflecting a recommendation of approval of the Design Standards for review and adoption at the
8 next Planning Commission meeting, incorporating all of the feedback heard at tonight's meeting
9 as an item under New Business.

10
11 Director Goellner completed a roll call vote on the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

12
13 **AGENDA ITEM 6. Other Items:**

14
15 **a) Review of Development Activities**

16
17 Planner Kieser stated the next Planning Commission will be May 3, 2021 and, on the agenda, will
18 be the Design Standards that were reviewed tonight and also a new development application for
19 the Rice Street townhomes.

20
21 **b) Planning Commission Liaison Schedule and City Meeting Calendar**

22
23 It was noted that Chair Plantan would attend the next City Council meeting. She also expressed
24 her appreciation to staff and the consultants for their hard work on getting the Design Standards
25 ready for discussion.

26
27 **AGENDA ITEM 7. Adjournment.**

28
29 There being no further business on the agenda, Chair Plantan asked for a motion to adjourn.

30
31 Commissioner Douglas made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Stockton, to adjourn the
32 Planning Commission meeting.

33
34 Director Goellner completed a roll call vote on the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

35
36 The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

37
38 Respectfully submitted,

39 Kayla Atkins Rokosz

40 *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*

41