



**City of Lake Elmo
Planning Commission Meeting
Minutes of August 24, 2015**

Chairman Dodson called to order the meeting of the Lake Elmo Planning Commission at 7:00 p.m.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Dodson, Dorschner, Williams, Fields, Haggard, Griffin and Kreimer

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Larson

STAFF PRESENT: Community Development Director Klatt

Approve Agenda:

The agenda was accepted as presented.

Approve Minutes: August 10, 2015

M/S/P: Williams/Kreimer, move to approve minutes as amended, ***Vote: 6-0, motion carried with Haggard abstaining.***

Public Hearing: Final Plat and Preliminary and Final PUD Plans – NE Metro 916 Intermediate School District

Klatt began his presentation regarding Independent School District 916 proposing to construct a public school within the Eagle Point Business Park, with minor amendments. This will be in compliance with city design standards for buildings within a Business park.

Fields asked if the service agreement is comparable to what the City would receive in tax revenue if this was a commercial development. Klatt stated that the service agreement is \$30,000 which is comparable to what the City would receive.

Williams asked about adding a condition stating that all of the conditions in the City Engineers letter dated August 21, 2015 be met.

Dodson asked if it is necessary to have condition 10 regarding the sign. Klatt stated that he feels it is. Dodson asked about a possible trail. Erickson responded that these kids do not leave the site during the day. There is no public access to the park which is why the parkland fee is being paid.

Haggard asked if this facility will be used in off hours by other entities. Erickson stated that because of the special nature of this school, it would not be used for other purposes like other schools are.

Public Hearing opened at 7:43 pm

The only correspondence the City received was a letter from ISD 916 stating that they have been in contact with Bremer Bank regarding some issues.

Public Hearing closed at 7:44 pm

M/S/P: Williams/Haggard, move to recommend that all changes and modifications of the plans requested by the City Engineer in review memo dated 8/21/15 shall be incorporated into these documents before they are approved, ***Vote: 7-0, motion carried unanimously.***

M/S/P: Williams/Haggard, move to recommend deleting conditions 3 and 7 which deal with the service agreement and lighting plan as these issues have been resolved, ***Vote: 7-0, motion carried unanimously.***

Dodson feels that the parkland dedication should be waived as this is a school and has a public purpose. Dorschner and Haggard disagree because it is a regional school that benefits students in multiple cities and our City is losing the ability to develop this as commercial.

Dorschner does not feel that a school belongs in the business park. He feels that if the CUP had not already been issued, he would have voted to deny this as there are other more appropriate areas to locate this school.

M/S/P: Williams/Kreimer, Move to recommend approval with findings as drafted and with the amended conditions as discussed and recommended, ***Vote: 7-0, motion carried unanimously.***

Business Item: Final Plat – Inwood 2nd Addition

Klatt began his discussion regarding the final plat for Inwood 2nd addition. This final plat does not include any specific development or PUD Plans. It only re-subdivides a larger outlot that was platted with 1st addition. The proposed final plat includes 21 single-family detached lots covering outlot E of Inwood 1st addition.

Dodson asked if condition #2 regarding the Common Interest Agreement, is really necessary. Klatt stated that it should be covered from 1st addition, but it is a blanket condition just to cover the City.

Kreimer asked when the switch will happen from sewer coming from Oakdale vs. the new collector. Klatt stated that he believes it is the Woodbury interceptor. Klatt stated that the timing is based on the Met Council timing. Kreimer asked if with all the development, we would run short of the overall number that would be allowed to hook up before our interceptor is completed. Klatt stated that he believes the engineers are keeping an eye on that and would let us know if we are coming close to that number.

M/S/P: Williams/Fields, Move to recommend approval of Inwood 2nd addition Final Plat with the conditions of approval and the findings of fact as listed in the Staff Report, **Vote: 7-0 motion carried unanimously.**

Business Item: Savona Third Addition – Final Plat

Klatt began his discussion regarding a final plat request from Lennar for the 3rd phase of a planned 310 unit development. This phase will include 21 single family lots and 99 single family attached units, all of which will be accessed via the 5th street Parkway off of Keats Ave. The city previously approved a conditional use permit that allowed the single family attached units to be accessed via a series of private roads.

Williams asked why the HOA agreement was only for 1st and 2nd Addition and not all subsequent additions. Klatt stated that it is a condition so that they have a chance to review it.

Klatt mentioned that staff would like to see an additional condition added that any assessments due would be due prior to the recording of the final plat.

Paul Tabone, Lennar, stated that there are 2 HOA's, 1 for the single family homes and 1 for the townhome area. The homes in 3rd addition will be added to the appropriate HOA document.

Klatt stated that there is a separate maintenance agreement spelling out what the HOA is responsible for such as landscaping and meters in common outlots and center medians.

M/S/P: Kreimer/Haggard, Move to add condition 11 to read "Park Commission will review and approve plans for a tot lot which shall be installed when block 11 of the townhouse area is built", **Vote: 7-0 motion carried unanimously.**

M/S/P: Williams/Haggard, Move to add the words "and safety fencing" to condition 8 so it reads "The proposed retaining wall east of Block 13 must be designed by a professional engineer registered in the state of Minnesota and must comply with all applicable building codes and any other authorities with jurisdiction for the wall and safety fencing and proposed grading adjacent to the wall", **Vote: 7-0 motion carried unanimously.**

M/S/P: Williams/Haggard, Move to add condition 12 to read “all special assessments due for the entire Savona 3rd addition shall be paid prior to the recording of the plat”, **Vote: 7-0 motion carried unanimously.**

M/S/P: Williams/Kreimer, Move to add condition 13 to read “the City Landscape Architectural consultant shall review the plans for the retaining wall around the pond at the SE corner and make recommendations for landscaping which will soften the view and/or screen the wall from Keats Ave”, **Vote: 7-0 motion carried unanimously.**

M/S/P: Williams/Dodson, Move to recommend approval of the Final Plat for Savona 3rd Addition with the 13 conditions of approval and conditions listed in the staff report, **Vote: 7-0 motion carried unanimously.**

Business Item: Future Household Projections Discussion

Klatt started his presentation regarding future household projections. He stated that the City has also been looking at pro-formas as well to look at financial numbers to pay for water and sewer. Klatt went through the approved number of 1829 combined units in the I94 and Village Planning Areas. The future potential under the current comp plan is a combined total of 2485. Total approved and potential under Comp Plan is 4314. With the new system statement, there is potential for a reduction of 1278.

Dodson asked if the BRT played into the systems statement. Klatt stated it has not been adopted into the regional plan yet and therefore, would not be a factor.

The city is no longer under a mandate from Met Council to achieve certain population densities under a certain time frame. There is no longer a memorandum of understanding. These are target numbers and we have more discretion on how we grow.

Fields would like to see us be as aggressive as possible in using the I94 corridor for commercial. Possibly Business Park or light industrial. It will employ more people and bring more tax revenue to keep property taxes down. He also doesn't want us to fall into a trap with the BRT to have high density housing along that to feed nodes of employment in other areas.

Williams asked if with this analysis they have looked at the payback of the utility costs. Klatt stated that they have not looked at that with this analysis, but the Council has asked for additional analysis with the pro-formas.

Klatt brought up a map regarding the rural area and potential for future development. He looked at the parcels over 40 acres which would be eligible for OP development.

Calculated out, it ends up with just under 700 housing units. If you add in 20 acre parcels, you would add an additional 300 housing units. This did not take into consideration sites that have water bodies or land owners that have no intention of ever developing. Tartan Park is not part of this calculation as it is currently guided as a Public Facility.

Klatt went through the rural areas and what was projected and how those numbers could be rebalanced.

Klatt stated that the next step for the Planning Commission would be a conversation regarding how to proceed with Comp Plan updates. How should we rebalance with the new system statement, and to start gearing up for the 2018 Comprehensive Plan amendment. Once the system statement is released, we can start planning against that and adopting Comprehensive Plan Amendments.

Kreimer would like to state that south of 10th Street needs to get significant relief as the people that live down there also came to Lake Elmo for the rural character as well.

Dodson would like to see a workshop in place to start the discussion for the planning.

Williams asked if the system statement talks about rec units or just population and households. Klatt stated that it talks about both, but is primarily focused on households and population.

Council Updates – August 18, 2015 Meeting

1. Preliminary Plat/Plan and PUD Plat/Plan – Auto Owners – Passed.
2. Zoning Text Amendment – Subdivision Identification Signs – Passed with Changes.
3. Projected City Growth Analysis – Update.

Staff Updates

1. Upcoming Meetings
 - a. September 14, 2015
 - b. September 28, 2015

Commission Concerns

Haggard is concerned that preliminary and final plats are being brought forward together. She would prefer to see them separate. She thinks there is some risk for the city. Klatt stated that the Commission is able to approve just the preliminary and not the final or they can table it. Kreimer stated that he is glad to know that they can separate it.

Williams has a concern regarding affordable housing. There have been a couple of recent articles regarding the lack of affordable housing in the metro area. He is wondering if in the sewer areas we could require a certain percentage of affordable housing. There was some discussion by Commission, but no solution was decided. Klatt stated that he has participated in discussions with Washington County. There is the livable communities act which means we are obligated to meet certain things, but we are also eligible for funding. Williams would like to see it addressed at a future date.

Meeting adjourned at 10:50 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Ziertman
Planning Program Assistant