

City of Excelsior
Hennepin County, Minnesota
Minutes
Planning Commission
Monday, May 24, 2021

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Black, Craig, Harrison, Holste, Noll, Wallace

Commissioners Absent: DiLorenzo

Also Present: Interim City Planner Mullin, City Architect Larson and City Attorney Staunton

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a) Planning Commission Meeting of April 26, 2021

Noll would like to amend the minutes under item 5(a) - Communication Improvement Proposal with the addition of "It was suggested that perhaps the Planning Commission hold some kind of event that would solicit feedback, including some kind of social event, **such as staffing a booth or tent at Apple Days and other events.**"

Motion by Noll, seconded by Craig to approve the amended April 26, 2021 Planning Commission meeting as amended. Motion carried 6-0.

Mayor Carlson swore in Chair Wallace and Commissioner Holste at this time.

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

(a) 101 Center Street RRP and Front Yard Setback and Impervious Surface Coverage Variances (PC No. 21-12)

Mullin noted a change to the staff report, the existing impervious surface is 51.5% and the proposed coverage is 48.9%. The staff report had incorrect numbers. Mullin presented the report.

Larson noted that the plans he used to create his report were not the most recent ones. Larson questioned if the rear screen porch shown on the plans had been previously viewed by the Commission. Noll said there had been no discussion of the screen porch at the previous meeting.

Wallace questioned if the back porch would need any additional variances. Wallace questioned if there had been any motion regarding this project at the last meeting. Mullin said it appeared as though there was a motion to approve the Residential Review Permit, there was not a motion to approve any variances. Holste mentioned that the plans that had been approved did not have a covered rear porch. Eric Hill, the builder commented that the rear screen porch was a new addition.

Wallace recommends the Planning Commission meets again in two weeks to give staff proper time to review the application.

The owner of the property commented that the change in impervious surface coverage has already included the rear porch. Mullin does not believe any additional variances would be needed. Larson, given the information he has, recommends approval of the RRP without a full review. Wallace asked the Commission if anybody has concern with moving the application forward. Holste wants the assumptions that no other variances are needed to be verified by staff before the City Council sees it. Noll wants verification if the deck will allow water to pass through it, and what will happen underneath the deck in terms of the impervious surface.

Wallace suggested tabling the discussion until the Commission has all the information. The applicant will need to provide a proposed site survey or plan. Craig made a motion to continue discussion this project at a special meeting in two weeks. The motion was seconded by Harrison. Motion carried 6-0.

(b)162 West Lake Street Residential Review Permit New Construction (PC No. 21-14)

Mullin presented the report. Larson presented a report for the Residential Review Permit. Harrison wondered what will happen to the fire lane which is adjacent to the property. Black comments it appears the property has an existing access point from the

fire lane. The commission wondered if the setbacks from the fire lane are the same as another private property, or if there is a distinction. Mullin considered the fire lane as public right-of-way, and will look into it for future applications. Staunton said the fire lane would be considered the same as public right-of-way.

Wallace opened the public hearing.

Rennie Piontek, 177 West Lake Street, questioned how the height will visually change any views of the water from her property, or others.

Larson answered that the proposed footprint is not significantly different than the existing. The largest difference is the garage is proposed to be attached. Larson does not know how exactly that will change the diagonal views.

Piontek asked how many stories the proposed garage will be. Larson said it is a one-and-a-half stories. The builder, Jon Monson, commented that moving the garage away from the street should open up the oblique view.

Peter Hartwich, 186 George Street, asked Larson how the footprint doubled in size if the report states it is nearly the same. Larson answered that the figures in the report is referring to the footprint and Hartwich is referring to the living space. Hartwich asked Monson if they tried to persuade the homeowner to reduce their home to 3,000 square feet. Monson answered that the proposed home reduces the overall volume of the structure when compared to the existing structure.

Wallace closed the public hearing.

Craig asked what the overall length of the garage is, as it looks very long. Wallace said it appears to be 110 feet long. Monson said the structure will not look massive and referred to a sketch in the plans.

Harrison made a motion to approve the Residential Review Permit with the findings and conditions as proposed. Black seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

5. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a) 106 Center Street Sketch Plan Review (PC No. 21-11)

Mullin presented the report and notified the council that the Heritage Preservation Committee nominated the structure on this property to be a designated landmark. Mullin reminded the Commission of the ordinance that states no site alteration can be done on the property as the Landmark Designation process is happening, unless there is a Site

Alteration Permit issued. Wallace questioned if it makes sense to discuss the project at this time. Craig suggested the public's feedback should be communicated to the applicant.

The applicant, Rick Denham, spoke about how they came up with the plans shown. Denham agreed that it does not make sense to discuss the site plan at this time. Craig mentioned that most of the public's comment was concerns about the density of the project. The Commission expressed concern over the density, minimum lot size, and the size of homes.

b) Zoning Items Discussion

Wallace started the discussion and has no concerns over what is on the list. Harrison brings up the point that the State has requirements that the City cannot change, and isn't sure how much the City can legally require.

Black questioned if solar panels are counted as impervious coverage. The Commission directed staff to look into if the City counts solar panels as impervious coverage, and if not, to bring back language that would include it. Harrison cautions to be careful with the legality around regulating solar panels.

The Commission discussed the possibly of increasing structure elevations by one foot, which would increase drainage. Staunton cautioned about unintended consequences that might come up when trying to regulate fill. Harrison suggests to monitor the next few builds and see if there is an fill that needs to be fixed before changing anything.

Holste suggests waiting to see what the Council decides on tree regulations before the Commission decides anything. Noll expressed concern over losing trees on lots due to projects on adjacent lots. Harrison seconds that sentiment. Harrison suggests prioritizing tree removal based on size in the code or requiring a visit from the city arborist. Staff was directed to bring language to add to the existing tree ordinance back to the Commission. Harrison recommends looking at the City of Deephaven's tree ordinance. Craig has concern over making it too difficult to reasonably remove trees.

6. COMMUNICATIONS & REPORTS

a)Next City Council Meeting - June 7, 2021

b)Next Planning Commission Meeting - June 28, 2021

Minutes

Planning Commission

April 26, 2021

Page 5 of 5

7. MISCELLANEOUS

a)Recent City Council Actions

Mullin discussed the Maynards Tree Removal. Staunton gave a brief summary of various recent actions, such as the continuation of a declaration of emergency.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Craig, seconded by Holste, to adjourn at 8:00 pm. Motion carried 6-0.
Respectfully submitted,

Julia Mullin

Interim Planning Director