

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

WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION
WORKSHOP MEETING MINUTES
February 7, 2022

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

5:00 p.m. Introduction

Chair Parkhill called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. Present: Parkhill (Chair), Douglas, Schwalbe, Severson, Sorenson. Absent: Merriam, Stockton. Staff: Community Development Director Emily Goellner, Assistant Planner Valerie Quarles, City Attorney David Schelzel, Planner Consultant Eric Zweber.

Assistant Planner Quarles presented on proposed residential and commercial zoning district changes. The presentation included a review of the schedule, the distinction between the Zoning Map and the Future Land Use Map, accessory dwelling units, height changes in C-2 and C-3, townhome support in R-4 and R-4A, and R-5 allowances.

Commissioners asked for more context around the limited zoning changes around C-2 and C-3 and how they fit with the future of Wayzata Boulevard. Staff responded that these changes are meant to be a placeholder for potential development before the Wayzata Boulevard Corridor Study is complete. Additional explanation was also given for the relationship between the Zoning Map and the Future Land Use Map, as well as the history of accessory dwelling units in Wayzata.

Commissioners asked for more background around accessory dwelling units (ADUs). Staff answered that ADUs inquiries come in 1-2 times per month and that while arrangements similar to ADUs currently exist in the least dense residential districts, that there was not a formal rental license program for that type of property. Assistant Planner Quarles also clarified that ADUs are meant to be accessory to the main structure and that was where a lot of the proposed code language was coming from. Commissioner Douglas asked that rental licensing requirements be noted within the ADU code.

The discussion around R-5 allowances centered on whether allowances should be granted administratively or through a Conditional Use Permit. Staff presented the CUP as an option, but chair Parkhill stated that if the point of allowances is to simplify the process and allow PUDs, there is little reason to put applicants through the public process to get them anyway. Assistant Planner Quarles said that she would pose that question at the public hearing. Commissioners also asked about the policy plans cited within the proposed code language. Assistant Planner Quarles stated that they were a more flexible way to keep current, relevant parameters in place for allowances without having to go through the code amendment process. Staff also clarified that the only allowance involving parking is a density bonus for underground parking, and that parking reductions are not a reward for any of the proposed allowances. Commissioners asked about projected population growth in Wayzata and staff answered that population growth had recently exceeded expectations by being at 4,400 people today. However, they also noted that the seasonal population changes in Wayzata made this number difficult to nail down. Lastly, staff mentioned that despite few properties being purely zoned R-5, upper-story housing regulations referencing R-5 and rezoning opportunities in the future would make these regulations more impactful than initially perceived.

During the R-4 and R-4A portion of the presentation, staff also added a note about the difference between suburban-style townhomes (north of Hollybrook Road) and urban-style townhomes in the Wayzata core currently achieved through PUDs.

1
2 Commissioners asked why now was the time to implement these changes to the code. City Attorney
3 Schelzel emphasized that staff's time is in high demand and that there wasn't a strong reason to delay the
4 changes further. Staff added that inquiries and development proposals will continue to come in no matter
5 where the City is in planning or studies.

6
7 Staff and commissioners briefly discussed whether ADUs alone should be delayed one Planning
8 Commission meeting in order to provide for more community engagement.

9
10 There being no further discussion, Chair Parkhill asked for a motion to adjourn. The motion passed on
11 voice vote, and Chair Parkhill declared the meeting closed at 6:10 p.m.