

City of Excelsior  
Hennepin County, Minnesota  
Minutes  
Planning Commission  
Monday, February 22, 2021

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

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

Commissioners Absent: Black, Craig

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

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a) Planning Commission Meeting of January 25, 2021

Motion by Holste, seconded by Harrison to approve the January 25, 2021 Planning Commission meeting as amended. Motion carried 5-0.

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

***(a) 220 West Lake Street Residential Review Permit (RRP) for Screen Porch Addition and Storage Room Under Deck (PC No. 21-02)***

Becker presented the report. Harrison asked if any neighbors had commented on the application prior to the hearing, and Becker said that there were none. Noll asked if the blue notes on the application were from the applicant. Wallace opened the public hearing at 6:06pm. Lynne Shears spoke in place of the applicant. Harrison asked where the HVAC was going to be relocated, and Shears indicated that it was per the plans shown in the packet. Noll asked if any conversations took place with the neighbors, and Shears said that there weren't since it would have minimal impact on the neighbors. Larson commented that the applicant submitted a preliminary review application, and that was encouraged, and that the drawings were very descriptive and clear. Peter Hartwich, 186 George Street, stated that he wanted the Residential Review Process to succeed. He felt that speaking to neighbors was an important part of the process. The public hearing was closed at

6:16pm. Harrison questioned if we had any rules for compatibility with the lake side of the property and questioned if the porch would be considered a front porch. Motion by DiLorenzo, seconded by Noll, to approve the Residential Review Permit. Motion carried 5-0.

***(b) 220 Bell Street RRP New Construction (PC No. 21-04)***

Becker presented the report. Harrison asked what the height of the adjacent property at 214 Bell Street was, and Becker stated that that was not a submittal requirement and so was unsure. Applicants are required to submit how many stories adjacent properties are, and Larson commented that houses with the same number of stories could have different heights. Andy Porter, applicant, explained that saving as many trees as possible was a goal of the design of the home as well as not wasting space. Wallace opened the public hearing at 6:34pm. Hartwich asked if there was some software that would simulate height and size of a proposed building. The public hearing was closed at 6:40pm. Harrison noted the following: this will be the largest and widest house in the vicinity; the prevailing homes on the block do not tend to be two stories, and the garages tend to be one stall; the Good Neighbor Guideline (GNG) #1 is not met, as the width does not match the prevailing structures on the block; concern about the impact of privacy, sunlight and shade as a result of this proposal; and the impact of the proposed amount of concrete on the property. Holste feels that there are a significant amount of architectural details on the proposal. DiLorenzo believes that the design is two story and has four-side architecture. Noll felt that the lot was unique in that it was L-shaped, supports the ground level plane, struggles with what can be done with the second story, and believes that it is too large of a house for the lot. He suggests stepdowns on the second story and breaking up roof planes and reducing the roofline in the rear. Wallace feels that the upper level of the house is the most successful part of design of the house but would have liked to see the rear roof line broken up. Motion by Harrison to deny the Residential Review Permit so that the front massing of the house can be reduced. Motion did not carry for lack of a second. Motion by DiLorenzo to approve the Residential Review Permit. Motion failed for lack of a second. Noll felt that the width and height were not compatible with adjacent properties. Motion by Harrison to continue the item, ask that the applicant speak with the neighbors (specifically 214 Bell Street), get the height of 214 Bell Street (or tallest neighboring structure), get the height of the wall from the proposed grade to the top of the house and garage, seconded by Noll. Holste feels that the applicant has provided stepdowns to be respectful of neighboring properties. Motion failed 3-2. DiLorenzo motioned to approve the Residential Review Permit, seconded by Holste. Motion carried 3-2.

***(c) 810 Excelsior Blvd ZTA, ZMA, CUP, Variances, Admin. Subd., ROW Vacation, Lot Consolidation and Design Standards Review (PC No. 21-03)***

Wallace asked if there were any issues with the Zoning Text Amendment or the Zoning Map Amendment, and the Planning Commission did not see any issues with it. DiLorenzo asked if there should be some forgiveness with the landscaping based on safety. The Planning Commission was amenable to grant some forgiveness on screening and street trees given the use as a daycare. Harrison liked that they were saving the crabapple trees. The Design Standards were then discussed. There wasn't any concern with how the project meets the Design Standards. Lighting was discussed, and there was no concern with the base of the poles at the proposed height nor the proposed design of the lights nor the light bulbs. Peter Hilger, architect, spoke regarding the landscaping and lighting. He said that there could be different temperatures of LED lighting. He asked about the requirement to convert proof of parking spaces to actual parking spaces. He also noted that the applicant would prefer a vinyl black chain link fence in lieu of what was in the plans. Harrison asked where deliveries would be made, and Hilger stated that they would be to the front door. She also asked if there was discussion keeping with the circular drive, and Hilger stated that there would be more stacking if there were not the two separate points of access. She then asked why there was a need to deviate from the lighting standards, and Hilger stated that the proposed lighting would meet dark sky requirements, whereas City standard lighting does not because they are not full cutoff fixtures. Ann Hersman, 823 Hidden Lane, asked about the parking lot lights and was concerned with the lights overnight. Andrew Punch, 561 Third Street, felt that the proposal of lighting was appropriate as acorn lighting can be intrusive. Hartwich was concerned about potential damage to trees and questioned what would happen to the building if it could no longer be used as a daycare. The Planning Commission did not feel it was necessary to require that the proof of parking spaces be converted to parking spaces should the staff exceed 18 at a time. Harrison moved to approve the Zoning Text Amendment, Zoning Map Amendment, variance from lighting standards, Conditional Use Permit, Design Standards Review, and Lot Combination with conditions as recommended, removing the requirement of converting proof of parking spaces to parking spaces, approving the landscaping as presented in the plans along with consideration to the trees affected along Adele's and to allow the three sided chain link fence around the playground and proposed fence along the cemetery, seconded by DiLorenzo. Motion carried 5-0. Holste wanted to add that the lighting should simulate the tone of the City standard lighting.

Minutes

Planning Commission

February 22, 2021

Page 4 of 4

5. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by DiLorenzo, seconded by Holste, to adjourn at 8:48 pm. Motion carried 5-0.

Respectfully submitted,

Emily Becker

Planning Director

DRAFT