

City of Excelsior  
Hennepin County, Minnesota

Minutes  
Planning Commission

Monday, August 24, 2020

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Wallace called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

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

Commissioners Absent: DiLorenzo, Craig

Also Present: City Planner Becker and City Attorney Staunton

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a) Planning Commission Meeting of July 27, 2020

Motion by Hersman, seconded by Harrison to approve the July 27, 2020 Planning Commission meeting as amended. Motion carried 5-0.

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

**a) *6 Third Street Variances (PC No. 20-8)***

Harrison asked about the side yard setback height increase and if the proposed driveway is the full width of the lot. She also asked Staunton if the fact that the property is a landmark property could make it unique. Staunton said that this could be part of the findings in order to not set a precedent. Noll asked if the building coverage had been increased, and Becker replied that it falls within the limits. Dan Brattland, applicant, explained that it was necessary to drive about 50 yards to get on to the property since it is not located adjacent to a street and is accessed through an easement over the adjacent property. He also said that the asphalt to the north side was needed in order to get out of the property, as it would be nearly impossible to turn around. Also, the additional added hard coverage would provide parking, as there is permit parking on Third Street, and the property is

unique in that it is not located on a street. Wallace asked about the width of the drive, and Brattland said it was necessary in order to turn around, and the current driveway went all the way up to the porch, whereas this did not. Wallace opened the public hearing. Suzy Thiss, 336 West Lake Street, said that she was in support, and that the proposed plan looked great. Wallace closed the public hearing.

Wallace asked if the Planning Commission had any comments on the proposed side yard setback. The Planning Commission had none. Wallace asked if there were any issues with the proposed impervious surface coverage. Noll said that he was struggling with the proposed impervious surface coverage. He explained that there are many other properties that have the same struggle with impervious surface coverage and wondered if all of the proposed coverage was needed in order to make a three-point turn. Brattland explained that he was reducing the amount of driveway coverage. He explained that he was not adding anything more than what is there right now. Hersman understood that the increased amount of impervious coverage came from the increase in the porch and was fine with it. Harrison also has a concern with the driveway and the impervious surface. Holste also has concerns about the impervious surface coverage but understands that the lot is unique. Noll asked if the applicant had considered pervious pavers to help mitigate the impervious surface coverage, and Brattland said that he had considered tracks for the driveway, but the track system would not work the way the driveway turns into his garage.

Motion by Hersman that approval of the requested variances be recommended, but that different driveway materials other than asphalt be explored. Wallace asked that the material be specified. Brattland said that he would not want to utilize asphalt for a driveway coverage. Brattland said that he had considered bricks, and Wallace said that that would let the water in more than asphalt would. Motion amended to add a condition that water permeable pavers must be utilized. Seconded by Holste. Harrison wanted to add findings that the lot was unique in that there is no direct access to the street, that it required a turnaround, and that the property is a landmark property. Motion carried 5-0.

***b) Construction Management Ordinance***

Becker presented the report. Holste asked if charging a fee for street use was common. Becker said it was not. Wallace asked if the cost could be spread out. Staunton said that the intent was to charge those that were causing the brunt of the damage. He also said that there would be justification to spread this cost amongst all the building permits issued as well. Harrison felt perhaps it should be

spread across the board, as large trucks are used for most construction and even landscaping projects. Hersman felt that larger remodels also bring in large trucks that cause damage. Staunton felt that this feedback that there are significant projects that also make an impact could be presented to the Council. Wallace opened the public hearing. No one from the public spoke. Wallace closed the public hearing.

Motion by Noll to recommend the proposed ordinance but that instead of a flat fee, that there be some sort of weighted measurement, possibly based on cost, of the street impact fee. Seconded by Hersman. Motion carried 5-0.

5. DISCUSSION ITEMS

*a) Process Discussion*

Becker presented the report. Wallace felt that the meeting content has been more complicated as of late but would like meetings to be limited to three hours. He would be willing to possibly move the meeting time up. In terms of efficiency, he feels that sometimes the Planning Commission may get off topic, but this is sometimes due to the Zoom format that has been utilized as of late due to COVID-19. Hersman would also be open to an earlier start time. She feels that citizen input should be provided at least as early as the Friday before the meeting, otherwise it will not be addressed.

Everyone seemed amenable to a 6:30 p.m. start time. Noll would like to not have a hard stop in case it is necessary to extend the meeting. Staunton suggested a required vote in order to extend the meeting. Wallace did not like hard stop time limits for topics but would like to at least try and adhere as closely as possible to adhering to estimated times. All were in favor of limiting the time limit to three hours with a vote to extend past that. All were also in favor of a start time of 6:00 p.m. unless Commissioners DiLorenzo and Craig were opposed. Wallace asked how we should communicate time limits to applicants to speak. Staunton suggested that Planning Director Becker prep the applicant on time limits and that the Chair reiterate the time limit at the meeting. The Planning Commission was also fine with placing time limits on the agenda for items but with the understanding that it may not always be adhered to.

*b) Planning Commission By-Laws*

Minutes

Planning Commission

August 24, 2020

Page 4 of 4

The Planning Commission was amenable to holding the second meeting for the Residential Review Process on the second Monday of the month and changing the start time to 6:00 p.m. or 6:30 p.m.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Hersman, seconded by Noll, to adjourn at 8:39 pm. Motion carried 5-0.

Respectfully submitted,

Emily Becker  
Planning Director

DRAFT