

City of Excelsior
Hennepin County, Minnesota
Minutes
Planning Commission
Monday, January 25, 2021

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Wallace called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Wallace, Black, Craige, DiLorenzo, Holste, Harrison, Noll

Commissioners Absent: None

Also Present: City Planner Becker, City Architect Brian Larson and City Attorney Staunton

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a) Planning Commission Meeting of December 22, 2020

Motion by Holste, seconded by Black to approve the December 22, 2020 Planning Commission meeting as presented. Motion carried 7-0.

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

(a) 444 West Lake Street RRP (PC No. 20-22)

Becker presented the report. Kurt Wehrmann, applicant, spoke regarding the project and said that he would be amending the survey to show the four-foot setback as well as update the impervious surface calculations. He asked if a window on the north side of the house was really necessary and if he could propose smaller windows, possibly doing single windows on all sides. Petra Cripe, 450 West Lake Street, felt that the design feels very bulky and didn't see any other three car garages in the neighborhood facing the street and was concerned about the runoff that would be created by a three-car garage. Wallace asked if there were plans to include a gutter and downspout, and Wehrmann said that that plans wouldn't include a downspout, but his grade is lower and so the water will run from West Lake Street to the north. Cripe asked what the setback was and what the overhang was, and it was restated that the setback was four feet, and the eave encroached one foot, which is an allowed encroachment. Peter Hartwich, 186 George Street, asked if Wehrmann

considered moving the garage closer to the east than proposed, and Wehrmann explained that moving it closer to the east would hinder views from the street side of the house, and its current position would provide added privacy to the neighbor to the west. Noll felt that the three-car garage is within the bounds of the Zoning Code but felt that the mass could be broken up. Wallace did not believe that this was required by any of the Good Neighbor Guidelines. Harrison felt that the proposal was reasonable and did not block lake views. Motion by DiLorenzo, seconded by Craig, to adopt Resolution 2021-03 and approve the Residential Review Permit (RRP) with recommended conditions. Motion carried 7-0.

(b) 366 Oak Street RRP and Variances (PC No. 21-01)

Becker presented the report. Harrison asked how the tall wall would affect adjacent properties. Becker said that the property to the east would be virtually unaffected because of the positioning of the commercial structure and the tree buffer in between the properties. Further, while it would affect the house across from Grathwol Lane, the garage is setback a significant distance from Grathwol Lane (39.3 feet), and the house across from Grathwol Lane is located approximately 40 feet away from the subject property, so there are approximately 80 feet in between the wall and the affected property. Tony Larson, applicant, noted the existing tuck under garage that was only a single stall garage. Motion by DiLorenzo to adopt Resolution 2021-02 approving the Residential Review Permit, seconded by Harrison. Motion carried 7-0. The Commission then went on to discuss the requested variances. The Commission had no issues with the proposed setback, setback of the garage with non-street facing garage doors, and proposed area of accessory structures and garage, and wall height. Motion by DiLorenzo, seconded by Craig, to recommend approval of the requested variances. Motion carried. 7-0.

(c) 678 Pleasant Street RRP and Variances (PC No. 20-21)

Becker presented the report. Mark Knapp, applicant, spoke regarding the application and explained that he would be moving the garage further to the west in order to accommodate the fire hydrant near the driveway. Hartwich asked how long ago the existing garage was built, and Knapp said around 1950. Brian Halloran, 636 Pleasant Street, felt that the variance was in line with the general character of the neighborhood. Craig Rossebo, 662 Pleasant Street, commented that he felt that the height was appropriate as well as was the design. Holste asked about the landmark tree that was to the west of the garage and if there would be any impact on the tree if the garage were moved three

feet to the west. Noll believed for this property the garage (doorface to street property line) setback should not be measured as a side yard setback (only three feet required) but instead as a front yard setback (20-30' setback required). The Survey showed the curved line identifying side yard setback as 25' minimum. Motion by Craig to approve the Residential Review Permit, seconded by Holste. Harrison was concerned that the new garage would sit forward of the front of the adjacent 700 Pleasant Street house to the south and impede its views. It was determined that the garage to the south would be significantly taller than the proposed garage. Harrison felt that the lot was unique in that it was located on a cul de sac. Wallace did not see an issue with the square footage of accessory structures, as the other accessory structure is located so far away from the proposed garage. Motion by Harrison to recommend approval of the variances, seconded by Holste. Motion carried 7-0.

5. DISCUSSION ITEMS

Becker asked for feedback on the Residential Review Process. Holste asked if perhaps there could be some sort of way to show what the applicant said versus the City Architect. Wallace would like to see both the opinion of the City Architect and Planning Director but perhaps in a different format, and Holste agreed. The Planning Commission wished to keep the public hearing portion of the meeting in which applicants are able to speak during the meeting open unless something changes in the future.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by DiLorenzo, seconded by Holste, to adjourn at 8:30 pm. Motion carried 7-0.

Respectfully submitted,

Emily Becker
Planning Director