

**APPROVED**  
**Minnetonka Beach Planning Commission Meeting Minutes**  
**March 19, 2018**

**1. Call to Order**

Vice Chair Haag called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

**2. Roll Call**

**Present:** Vice Chair Haag, Commissioners Anderson, Halverson, Moriarty, and Council Liaison Kozloski.

**Absent:** Breazeale, Council Liaison Bartel

**Staff in attendance:** City Administrator Susanne Griffin, City Planner Ben Gozola

**3. Approve Agenda**

**(Anderson Motion, Halverson second to approve the agenda; all ayes).** Motion passed.

**4. Approve Minutes: February 26, 2018**

**(Halverson motion, Anderson second to approve the minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting of February 26, 2018; all ayes).** Motion passed.

**5. Election of Chair and Vice Chair**

Commissioner Anderson nominated Jim Haag as chair. There were no other nominations.

**(Anderson motion, Halverson second to elect Jim Haag as Chair; all ayes).** Motion passed.

Commissioners decided to table the election of vice chair until Commission Breazeale was in attendance.

**6. Public Hearing**

**6.1. Comprehensive Plan-**

Mike Bloom from the Long Range Planning committee provided information on the Comprehensive Plan update process. He explained that the existing Plan was divided into sections and then each section was assigned to appropriate city committees and commissions for review and input. That input was compiled and the Long Range Planning committee reviewed that input and agreed on a final draft.

Administrator Griffin explained the next steps in the process. She stated that outside of the community specific character statements, policies and strategies that the Long Range Planning committee worked on by incorporating input from all city committees and commissions, the last plan had an Implementation Section, a Transportation Section and engineering components for Water Supply and Conservation Plan, Sanitary Sewer Plan and Stormwater Plan. The City engineer is working on the engineering components. Council Member Lindstrom and Griffin updated the Implementation Section with input from the City's zoning administrator. Griffin is working on the Transportation Section and is contacting the Met Council Sector Representative for assistance as the last plan had 10-year old information in it. Griffin intends to provide the Long Range Planning committee with the final draft as soon as possible, and prior to the April 9<sup>th</sup> City Council meeting.

Aside from holding the public hearing, there is an issue with the Land Use map (provided by the zoning administrator) and the language in the plan which are inconsistent, and Mike Bloom wanted the group to discuss it. The map in the draft plan showed general land use classifications such as residential, public lands, country club, etc. but the verbiage in the plan broke the classifications down into large lot residential and residential, and large lot residential lakeshore and non-lakeshore.

Chair Haag asked Zoning Administrator Gozola to explain his information on the different residential classifications related to the land use map being used for the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Gozola stated that he prepared the land use map and subsequently sent an email explaining his thoughts on the different verbiage in the plan that the City can reflect. His concern had to do with aligning the city zoning code with the comprehensive plan, and currently the zoning code doesn't reflect these classifications. In other words, if the comprehensive plan stated something about a particular land use, the City code needs to be consistent with that, and if not, a legal challenge could be made. He stated that if the City wants to keep the lot distinctions in the plan, it should be clearly stated that the City doesn't intend to create new zoning districts but that these are existing characteristics. He understands that these are the existing densities and lots, but he cautioned against giving the impression that the City will provide those densities in the future.

Mike Bloom provided background behind the zoning code which was written in anticipation of the development of the Lafayette Club. They wanted to protect the character of the Lafayette Club and the character of the community. He stated that the City is starting to move away from having space between houses. He stated that the City has to keep safety in mind as it relates to firefighting and side setbacks.

He stated that they want to maintain the low density and that should be captured in the comprehensive plan. He stated that the previous zoning administrator introduces the concept of "character zoning" to maintain these character features. He agreed with Gozola that the language could be massaged to allow the concepts to stay in the comprehensive plan.

**The Commission reviewed each page of the plan that was affected and made the following recommended changes:**

Page 13-14:

With this Plan and previous Plan, the City ~~has established~~ ~~recognizes~~ four possible residential living categories (Residential, Residential Lakeshore, Large Lot Residential and Large Lot Residential Lakeshore) to relate to the appropriate existing density levels, type of existing homes and existing lot sizes of the community. Residential is the area of the city, providing a which typically exists at a density range between 1 and 3 units per acre. Large Lot Residential is a low-density range between 0 and 1.0 units per acre. The two lakeshore categories (Residential Lakeshore and Large Lot Residential Lakeshore) are less dense to maintain the shore land impact and open space between buildings and the lakeshore.

Page 15:

**Strategies:**

Minnetonka Beach's character depends on sustaining a physical landscape that expresses community characteristics through the following elements:

- Differentiate land use areas. Existing Eexamples are: 1. the large lots and large homes both on and off the Lake, and 2. smaller lots with smaller homes both on and off the Lake and 3. public spaces, country club, and other places of assembly church.

Page 22:

**Strategies:**

- Develop small town zoning standards for neighborhoods that are pedestrian mobility friendly and enhance the character of the neighborhood:
  - Lots in the Large Lot Residential Area should be large and have wide frontages and larger yard.
  - Lots in the Residential Areas should be smaller and have narrower frontages.
  - Existing tax lots and structures should be considered legal non-conforming.

- ~~Establish the following density levels for the neighborhoods:~~
  - ~~Large Lot Residential density 0 to 1.0 dwelling units per acre~~
  - ~~Residential 1.0 to 3.0 dwelling units per acre~~

Page 26:

**Land Use Classifications:**

The following land uses are ~~allowed and planned~~ examples of possible land uses the City could adopt in the community:

Page 28:

- This Plan and the future zoning ordinances may recognizes the differences of each neighborhood and of each home. The performance standards ~~will~~ may reflect these differences, encourage proportionate improvements and protect the community and neighbors;

Page 29:

- Retain Yards: Side ~~Yards~~ yards in the community vary from 1 foot to 20 feet or more. Yards are open with generally the only obstructions being natural landscaping. In a number of cases in the ~~Small Lot Residential~~ area, the home's garage is in the non-lake rear yard adjacent to the street. Lake ~~Yards~~ also vary in the community. Generally, lake ~~yards~~ are a least 75 feet deep (State standard) or the average of the surrounding neighbors if greater.

The Commission decided to keep the updated land use map that was already completed, and not reflect large lot residential, etc. on the map.

Chair Haag opened the public hearing at 7:45 p.m. and closed same time seeing no one wishing to speak on the plan.

**7. Old Business**

7.1. Sign Ordinance

Gozola explained that the Planning Commission held a public hearing last month and the commission discussed the proposed ordinance. Gozola made the changes to the draft sign ordinance as requested by the Commission at the last meeting. He reminded commissioners that the changes to the sign ordinance were being made to reflect recent case law. He stated that he was asking the commission to review those changes, and either recommend approval or table the ordinance to allow the new city attorney to conduct a legal review.

Resident Nell Mathews offered input into the ordinance. She asked that the new city attorney review the proposed ordinance and ask him to specifically review to make it as restrictive as legally possible knowing the residential nature of the community including that there are no commercial businesses. She stated concerns about having to allow contractor signs in yards which could be quite numerous.

**(Anderson motion, Moriarty second to table the Sign Ordinance amendment until new City Attorney can review and offer comments; all ayes).** Motion passed

**7.2 Work Plan for future zoning code changes based on the To Do List**

Discussion occurred around how to define the work plan.

**Priority One**

1. Patio Setbacks
2. Detached garages and other Accessory Structures – height standards

**Priority Two**

- 1. Enhance Outdoor Storage with “beauty of city” in mind

**Moderate to Low Priority**

- 1. The commission may look at whether additional regulations are needed to control the permitted Regional Trail use
- 2. Minimum standards for floor area and width of dwellings (review other city’s language)
- 3. Planned Unit Developments
- 4. Gravel driveways

**No Further Action Recommended**

- 1. Specialized Lakeshore Setbacks
- 2. Home Occupations
- 3. Fence Height

**Referral to Park Commission**

- 1. Landscaping and Tree Preservation regulations may be examined in the future.

**In Progress**

- 1. Sign Ordinance – refer to city attorney for review to make as restrictive as possible for “advertising” signs

Moriarty asked about items that are not part of the list, but that come up in discussion (parking lot to store these items). The zoning administrator will keep a parking lot list.

**(Moriarty motion, Anderson second to recommend the Zoning Code work plan as stated above; all ayes).** Motion passed

7.3 – Transportation

Commissioner Halverson brought members up to date on additional study for speed bumps. Her understanding was that council wanted more bids for the speed bumps. The area of concern is still the stretch of Lafayette Road, and the curve, which she wanted to clarify. If that is still the scope of work she will contact other vendors to assist with a study of type of speed bumps, and distance between. The map of the area was distributed. She is contacting WSB, and Sambatek for additional bids.

Moriarty asked about the request to move the speed bump on Old County Road. Staff was asked to contact public works superintendent Brian Berent about moving it.

Chair Haag asked staff to ask Brian Berent if he was aware of companies that do traffic studies for speed bumps. Halverson reviewed the Spack proposal to get clarification on the scope of the project when talking with other companies. They agreed that the Spack proposal was still accurate.

Commissioners then discussed parking signage and traffic calming (speed bumps) which were deemed high priority issues. Commissioners went through transportation study spreadsheet starting with signage and identified an action for each comment. Commissioners were provided with the map of city showing where current no parking or restricted parking signs were.

Starting with the Signage category the group discussed and prioritized as follows:

Item	Action
Deer crossing sign needed on Shoreline	Low priority
Add street sign at Northwood Avenue	Not a through, developed street, no addresses on Northwood Ave. No plans to place sign at this time.

Improve signage at Woodbridge Road near Lafayette Club	no plans for additional sign (Lafayette Club installed additional sign last year stating "no access" to Lafayette club)
Remove stop sign at Lake Rd & Brooks Lane	Commissioners not in favor of removing
Beach Lane – no right turn from Lafayette to Beach sign – not followed	no PC action to be taken
Additional stop sign at Huntington Point Rd W at Lafayette	will be included in Transportation Study
additional signage needed to slow traffic from 2315 to 2452 Lafayette Rd –	speed bump list
Appropriate speed and kids at play signs throughout the neighborhood	Portable signage more effective

Halverson will add the Huntington Point Road/Lafayette Rd stop sign to the scope of the transportation study to ask vendors.

Parking to be discussed at the next meeting.

## 8. Reports

- 8.1. Chairperson – No Report
- 8.2. Commissioner Reports- No Reports
- 8.3. Council Liaison Kozloski – reviewed hot topics from Council meeting which were the crossing and the fire service contract
- 8.4. Planning and Zoning Administrator – no report
- 8.5. Building Permit Report – No report to date

## 9. ADJOURNMENT

**(Halverson motion, Moriarty second to adjourn; all ayes).** Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

**PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE** – The following individuals signed the sign-in sheet: Patty Rezabek, Nell Mathews, Mike Bloom, Joe Pagano

Minutes respectfully submitted by City Administrator Susanne Griffin.

---

Susanne Griffin, City Administrator