

CITY OF WACONIA
August 3, 2023

1) Call meeting to order and roll call

Pursuant to due call and notice thereof, the regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Waconia was called to by Leshner.

Members Present:	Leshner, Zellman, Polunc, Genz, and Paulsen
Member Absent:	Sarcletti
Alternate Present:	Paulsen
City Liaison Present:	Yetzer
Staff Present:	Braaten, Nelson, Stein, Havlik

2) Adopt Agenda

Braaten had no changes.

MOTION by Zellman, seconded by Paulsen to adopt the agenda.

MOTION CARRIED.

3) Minutes Approval

3.1 July 6th, 2023, Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

MOTION by Paulsen, seconded by Zellman to approve the minutes

MOTION CARRIED.

Cover Page

July 6th, 2023, Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.pdf

4) New Business

4.1 PUBLIC HEARING - Comprehensive Plan Amendment - 7845 County Road 10 North, Waconia Township

Cover Page

1_Location Map.pdf

2_Comp Plan Letter_Klinkner.pdf

3_Klinkner Sewer Eval.pdf

4_Public Hearing Notice.pdf

Braaten explained the background of the Comprehensive Plan and explained the process, which includes updating the Plan every 10 years. Braaten showed how the property was bisected by CRD 10 and located north and west of the current city limits. Braaten explained the criteria to annex into the city. The approximately 80-acre parcel is guided rural, and the applicant is requesting the property be guided low density residential. The action in front of the Planning Commission was to make a recommendation to City Council regarding the proposed change from rural to low density. Braaten explained the criteria for comp plan amendments.

Leshner asked for guidance for property outside the city limits that have uses that are different than what they are slated for. There was further discussion about that, and the steps needed for that to happen.

Genz asked about when the current Comp Plan originated which was March of 2021. He asked why this wasn't included in the Plan. Braaten indicated that staff was unaware at the time of the existing sewer capacity.

Leshner opened the Public Hearing.

Comments and Concerns:

Paul Otto from Otto Associates representing the owner:

His company developed Waconia Landing and he referenced that development to what is being presented tonight. He stated that the area proposed is the next area to the north that will be developed.

Commissioner Paulsen asked about doing it now and what benefit to the taxpayers is there by doing it now. More discussion followed.

Pete Mitchell, 1687 Sandbar Circle

He stated that the city should look at the possibility of having 4 or 5 acre lots with a border around the city and the use of green space within the lots.

Jeff Mair, 1432 Beachcomber Blvd

Stated his concerns about not wanting the amendment passed. He feels that the sewer is at capacity Also why past Council's haven't looked at this property to come into the City He also went through the comp plan amendment criteria and stated why he thought the project didn't meet said criteria.

Kurt Schutte, 11855 78th Street

He spoke about his concern about the road traffic around the school. Also talked about the current developments that are going on now. Summarize the growth that is going on and he is not in favor of the amendment.

Jim Cousin, 11875 78th Street

Jim explained his disapproval of the proposed amendment. He stated that with the buildable lots left that there isn't a need to have more lots available for building.

Lynn Zupan, 7335 West Shoreline Drive

She asked if the amendment passed, what about other landowners that would want to sell and develop their properties. She said she doesn't want to see this development.

David Thun, 8075 Paul Ave

Comments about the City buying the property East of 10 and turning it into a park. He stated that he wouldn't have the opportunity to build. Even though he doesn't want to.

Sue Dressen, 7325 West Shoreline Drive.

She had a question for the audience if anyone was for the project. She was inferring that the people that live out there don't want this.

Bruce Dahlke, 8275 Paul Ave

Asked why the applicant would be the one to receive the sewer capacity?
He is torn between developing now or later and trying to figure out when.

Lynn Zupan, 7335 West Shoreline Drive

Addressed the Planning Commission again and stated if one landowner gets the opportunity all landowners should be able to have the same choice.

John Klinkner owner of the property 7845 County Road 10 and

Steve Grotting, 6064 Drake Drive Maple Plain, MN. 55359

Steve summarized the previous statements about the amendment. He asked would it be better to have the County or the City control. They are coming to the city for guidance. John could sell it to a developer who could do a completely different plan. John stated that it is time for him to sell and wants to do something with the property.

Leah Weinrich, 1778 Braunwarth Circle

She has a gate valve in her yard and is concerned about what happens with that in the future. Discussion followed.

Kurt Schutte, 11866 78 Street

Came up again and asked if the Township has provided any comments.

Jim Cousin, 11875 78th Street

Mr. Cousins came up again and said that he spoke to the chairman of the Township and was told that they want the property to remain rural.

Mary Blackmore, 1433 Whitecap Lane

Questioned the sewer capacity and where it came from. Additionally, she wondered about the comments of the current owner stating that he didn't want to develop now and why we want to change it if that is the case.

Leshner explained the engineering capacity in question.

Burce Dahlke, 8275 Paul Ave.

Mr. Dahlke came up again to ask about his 51-acre property and how this amendment could affect the sewer capacity for his property.

Leshner entertained a motion to close the Public Hearing. Genz made the motion to close the Public Hearing, seconded by Polunc. MOTION CARRIED.

Added comments by Commission members:

- Knowing what we know today would we have done anything differently when reviewing and adopting the 2040 Comprehensive Plan.
- Wondering what the next steps would be if this was approved for the annexation process.
- There was discussion about the Comp Plan process which included public meetings being held and public input taken. With the information regarding additional sewer capacity, there may be more time and consideration needed in order to make a final determination on this issue.
- There was reference to pages and exact examples in the Comp Plan steering direction for future growth.
- Comments about the infrastructure regarding traffic and safety in the area and around the schools that need to be addressed. With us having other developments that need to be developed.
- Can the township develop this property. It was noted that they could do it, but it would be much less dense and would be served by private wells and septic systems.

Leshner moved forward with a motion to deny the Comprehensive Plan Amendment for 7845 County Road 10, seconded by Polunc. MOTION CARRIED 4-1 with Commissioner Paulsen voted against the motion as stated.

With further discussion, Commissioner Paulsen is concerned that the property could be developed without our control. Recommending that we develop the East side of CRD 10 with the setbacks and shoreland overlay along with using just a partial capacity of the sewer available, saving the other part of the capacity for future growth in that area. Would the landowner be able to resubmit a proposal? Which they could, but there are time restraints in doing so.

This recommendation will now go in front of the City Council on August 21st.

4.2 PUBLIC HEARING - Site Plan, Design Review & Variance - 219 Frontage Road East

Cover Page

Location Map.pdf

Applicant Statement.pdf

Variance Request Letter Property Setback.pdf

Crusher CrossFit Site Plan & Design Review Plan Set.pdf

Braaten introduced the Site Plan and Variance request showing the location and usage of the existing property. They are proposing the following variances:

- One for material. Nothing is in the ordinance for metal shipping containers.
- The second part is the setback for the rear lot line.
Braaten showed the location of the proposed new building addition and how it encroached into the rear setback. Other setbacks and landscaping requirements are met. Additionally, Braaten brought up the parking which requires 41 parking spaces and they have shown 42 with 2 being proof of parking. Proof of parking requires an application and public hearing, which were not included in this application for review.

Leshar opened the Public Hearing

Comments and Concerns

Kelsey Jarett with HTG Architects

Stated that updating the existing building materials has not yet been decided. If they were updated, they would conform with the Highway Design Standards District. The only metal proposed as part of this application would be the new shipping containers. She went on to explain the material that is used on the containers that it doesn't corrode, for the most part it is maintenance free. The reason for the setback variance is because the containers come in standard sizes, and they want to align them with the back of the building otherwise moving it ahead three feet it would protrude into the parking lot. They were also able to conform with the parking spaces so no need for a CUP for parking. Further discussion followed.

Motion by Leshar to close the Public Hearing, seconded by Genz, MOTION CARRIED.

Additional comments:

Discussion followed regarding the use of metal shipping containers as a building material. Also, the existing setbacks compared to what the applicant is proposed.

Motion by Leshar to approve the Site Plan, Design Review, & Variance for Crusher Cross Fit located at 219 Frontage Road East with the 9 Conditions Listed with a 10th being that there is no outside storage. Seconded by Genz. MOTION CARRIED 5-0 IN FAVOR OF THE Site Plan, Design Review and Variance with the 1 condition added.

4.3 PUBLIC HEARING - Variance (After-the-Fact) - 150 Stacy Circle

Cover Page

Location Map_150 Stacy Circle.pdf

Campbell Written Comments.pdf

Certificate of Survey_Campbell.pdf

Stormwater Plan_Campbell.pdf

City Engineer Stormwater Plan Comments.pdf

Cover Page

Location Map (1 Page)

Narrative & Application (4 Pages).pdf

Proposed Site Plan (10 Pages).pdf

Staff Review Comments (3 Pages)

Braaten introduced the after-the-fact Variance for 150 Stacy Circle. Showing the property location and that it is in the Shoreland Overlay District. The district allows a maximum hardcover of 25% and the applicant is requesting approximately 30% hardcover. The property owner added a parking area along the north side of the house and driveway. Along with the Variance, they are required to submit a stormwater plan. The latest plan has not been reviewed by the City Engineer.

Leshner opened the Public Hearing

Will & Gretchen Campbell 150 Stacy Circle-Applicant

Will mentioned that the gravel in the back has a lining and is not considered hardcover and should not be included in the hardcover calculation. Mr. Campbell stated that for the revised raingarden plan they got help from a friend of theirs Bob Bean who works at Bolton & Menk and he thought that the new plan would work. There was more discussion on the raingarden plan.

Commissioner Polunc stated they don't have enough information to decide on the Variance as the City Engineer has not yet had an opportunity to review the revised raingarden plan.

Leshner reiterated his thoughts about being "after the fact" and the criteria for that wouldn't warrant the Variance requested.

Mr. Campbell asked if there was anything they could do to get this done besides removing the concrete. Discussion continued regarding the issue. Gretchen Campbell restated their position on the proposed raingarden.

Nate Albee, 134 Stacy Circle

Stated the Campbells have a good plan and was generally in favor of the proposed improvements.

Commissioner Paulsen moved to close the Public Hearing; Seconded by Commissioner Zellman, MOTION CARRIED.

Additional Comments:

Discussion about if the Variance meets the criteria for Variances.

MOTION of continuance by Commissioner Polunc to the Variance (After The-Fact) for 150 Stacy Circle, seconded by Commissioner Genz, to allow the revised stormwater plan to be reviewed by the City Engineer. MOTION CARRIED 3-2 in favor of continuance of the Variance (After-The-Fact)

The new plan will be submitted to the City Engineer for review.

Commissioner Paulsen asked about application fees and if they are the same for After-The-Fact Variances and regular Variances. He indicated it may be necessary to charge additional application fees for an after-the-fact request.

4.4 Site Plan & Design Review – New Creations Child Care – 150

Sparrow Rd

Cover Page

Location Map (1 Page)

Narrative & Application (4 Pages).pdf

Proposed Site Plan (10 Pages). Pdf

Staff Review Comments (3 Pages)

Nelson presented the Site Plan & Design Review application for New Creations Child Day Care at 150 Sparrow Road. He showed the location and indicated that all the setback requirements and hardcover requirements have been met. Nelson clarified the pedestrian circulation requirements, which included sidewalk along Sparrow, sidewalk entering the property and extension of the sidewalk to the north property line. Nelson explained the parking for the new day care, and that they are proposing 41 spaces, which falls within the recommended number of spaces based on his research. The landscaping plan is generally conforming.

Nelson explained to the Commission that the applicant had received a last-minute change from the future business owner, which they hoped the Planning Commission would review. Nelson presented Option 2, with the difference being more of a flat roof versus a gable roof design.

Bruce Heiler with Amcon Construction – Applicant

Explained that the flat roof design is the only significant difference. He also answered questions about the parking and other general site questions. Discussion followed regarding landscape screening, and possibly requiring a fence.

Leshner made a motion, seconded by Paulsen to approve the Site Plan & Design Review for New Creation Child Day Care – 150 Sparrow Road with the revision to #6 stating that the sidewalk continues to the northern property. line and along Sparrow Road, also #7 mandating a maintenance free fence along Sparrow Road. MOTION CARRIED 5-0 in favor of the Site Plan and Design Review with the amended conditions added above.

It will now go to the City Council on August 21, 2023.

5) Old Business

5.1 Ordinance Amendment – Park Dedication – Continued

Cover Page

Proposed Site Plan (10 Pages).pdf

Amendment to Park Dedication Ordinance.pdf

5.1 Ordinance Amendment – Park Dedication – Continued

Braaten talked about the Park Dedication fees proposed by the Park Board. He explained the difference between residential and commercial park dedication fees. The Park Board wanted to modify the existing fee to fair market value. The City Attorney drafted an Ordinance regarding the Park Dedication that Braaten stated covers what was previously talked about. Discussion followed.

Motion by Paulsen, seconded by Genz to approve the proposed Ordinance Amendment for Park Dedication. MOTION CARRIED.

6) Other

1) Staff Update

The Valvoline site plan has been approved by the City Council. The building permit has been submitted.

Body Grays Variance was approved the City Council.

The TCO project has submitted their Building Permit Application.

37 New Home Permits have been issued this year. The Otto apartment should be ready for fall move-in.

Nelson passed out a digital signage handout for Commissioners to read before next month's work session.

Motion by Genz, seconded by Zellman to adjourn. MOTION CARRIED.

Adjourned at 9:40 PM

Respectfully submitted by.

David Havlik

Office Assistant