



**City of Lake Elmo
Planning Commission Meeting
Minutes of August 8, 2016**

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

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Dunn, Fields, Dodson, Kreimer, and Lundquist

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Haggard, Williams, Larson & Griffin

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Director Wensman

Approve Agenda:

M/S/P: Dodson/Lundquist, move to approve the agenda as amended, ***Vote: 5-0, motion carried Unanimously.***

Approve Minutes: July 25, 2016

M/S/P: Lundquist/Fields, move to approve the July 25, 2016 minutes as amended, ***Vote: 5-0, motion carried Unanimously.***

Business Item – Zoning Text Amendment Open Space Amendment

Wensman stated that the changes that the Planning Commission recommended at the last meeting were incorporated in the new version in green. Rather than go through each one, he would entertain questions.

Dunn asked how many 40 acre parcels are left that could be developed as OP and how many 20 acre parcels are there that can be developed as OP. Dunn feels that this is a very important ordinance and wants to have all the information available before making such a big decision. Wensman stated that at the 6/27/16 meeting, a map was presented showing the number of 40 acre parcels available and the number of 20 acre parcels available. Wensman brought this map up again for discussion.

Dodson stated that what he recalls is that the Planning Commission was interested in keeping the OP ordinance at 40 acres, but it was the desire of the City Council to drop down to 20 acres. Wensman stated that he believes that the Council went this way because people in RR are kind of stuck at the 1/10 density.

Dunn is wondering what the OP overlay is. Wensman stated it is just a different way to apply the OP ordinance vs. applying a Conditional Use Permit. This would allow for OP

PUD. Wensman stated that the PUD process allows for more give and take with the individual developments. They can start with the City Standards and then there is give and take with the developer and City.

Dunn feels that this is such an important document that the full Planning Commission should have the opportunity to view the changes to make sure that everything was included before it goes to the City Council. Kreimer asked if there was any time constraints on moving this forward. Wensman stated that there are no time constraints.

Kreimer asked about eliminating the creation of easements for the required buffers. Wensman stated that with the PUD, each development can have different setbacks based on the unique circumstances of the site and might have different buffers.

M/S/P: Fields/Dodson, move to table the Open Space Development Ordinance to the next meeting to get feedback from the missing Commissioners, **Vote: 5-0, motion carried unanimously.**

Business Item – Discussion for Royal Golf Project

Wensman stated that this is a discussion for informational purposes. The public hearing will be held at the next Planning Commission meeting. There are a lot of issues related to the planning of this development. At this point, the City Engineer and the Contract Planner have been reviewing it.

Dodson asked if this is the normal process for developments. Wensman stated that the public hearing is for a concept PUD, which would be the normal process.

Clark Schroeder, working for Hollis, gave background regarding the site and what they are doing in regards to the golf course and clubhouse. They are looking for feedback before this goes to public hearing.

Rick Packer, president of HC development, he is coordinating the technical aspects of the development. He explained that they had 3 guiding considerations when they put together this development. 1) to create a high quality, high amenity neighborhood with recreational facilities forming a strong sense of identity 2) respect for existing conditions 3) Use of a PUD

They are using a PUD because this gives them flexibility. This site has some unique situations including shorelands and some other restrictions. They are planning for 5 unique housing types with 9 different custom builders. There are currently around 300 units on the plan, which may be tweaked along the way. There will be HOA maintained Villas with private streets and traditional single family detached homes with public streets. The clubhouse and golf course will be public, but they have not yet decided if

the par 3 will be strictly for the neighborhood or open to the public. The lot mix is broken up by lot size and width.

Packer stated that he anticipates the home prices to be as follows:

80-85 foot wide lots - \$650,000 - \$800,000

90 foot wide lots - \$800,000 - \$1,200,000

100 foot wide lots - \$1,500,000 plus

Lundquist asked about setbacks on the outside edges for buffering. Packer stated that they have not looked at the buffering yet. They are working with some of the surrounding neighbors to address some of their concerns with buffering. Packer went through some other specifics regarding the lot mix.

Fields asked if they have determined how many units there would be at if they met all the setbacks. Packer stated that they have not as it depends on what zoning they are looking at. If it is OP, they definitely would lose lots, but that has not been determined yet.

There is currently a transportation study underway in conjunction with an EAW which is mandated by law. That should be ready for when this goes to council. There will be approximately 74 acres of private open space. Included in this will be the youth golf course, swimming pool and fitness center. The public trails will be discussed and there will be no public parkland, but dedication will be via fees.

Lundquist asked if there have been any discussions with the fire chief or police if only having 2 entrances with that much traffic will be problematic. Packer stated that the difficulty with having a road down to 10th street is that there is a protected wetland that cannot be filled in. There were discussions with Terry Emerson regarding a possible land swap, but those negotiations failed. The developer is trying to make the golf course and residential area as sustainable as possible. They expect the phasing to be West to East and to take 3-5 years, building 50-60 units per year.

Lundquist does not feel that the developer is giving enough consideration of the traffic impacts for that many homes and the golf course. She does not believe that 20th street can sustain it as it is not wide enough. It would need to be improved. She feels that there should be easier access, especially for emergencies. Packer stated that they are waiting for the EAW and the transportation study and it is all reviewed by the City Engineer.

Kreimer asked about the trails, both internal and external. Packer stated that they need to have more discussions with the City regarding where the City would like them to hook into the existing trails and internally they will have trails to connect the neighborhoods to the clubhouse and golf course. Kreimer asked if there is any protection for the people that buy in this development that the golf course will stay a

golf course. Packer stated that he has never seen a covenant as such. He thinks it is a pretty tough thing to require of an owner.

Kreimer asked about the setbacks when it is adjacent to another community. Wensman stated that there are some buffer requirements in the comprehensive plan for sewer to unsewered area considered like a greenbelt. In other areas, there are not those requirements, only in OP, which this is not proposed to be. Wensman stated that there is an opportunity through the PUD process to negotiate that. Ben is still working on the zoning with the developer.

Kreimer asked about possibly putting a stub road to the adjoining City. Wensman said he will talk to the City Engineer regarding that.

Dunn stated that buffers are a big thing for her and there are larger lot developments around this that should be buffered from the more intense development. Dunn also said that this area has had a lot of problems with flooding. Dunn thinks the intensity of this development is too dense. She feels that this could be done well, but be less dense.

Fields stated that the development is done in a good and respectful fashion looking into the golf course. It has a good quality that will be beneficial to the golf course, but by the same token, it is part of the larger community. Looking outward to the community, it also needs to be respectful and fit the community. He feels that the outer boundaries look very different looking from the outside and there needs to be discussions on how those buffers will be established. Packer stated that they are using four sided architecture and that they are very cognizant of how the development will look from the outside.

Dunn asked about the 2 wells on the property. She would like to know how deep they are and what aquifer they run into.

Dodson is concerned about the quarter acre lots with the long cul-de-sac. He is concerned about this in regards to an emergency. He is concerned with the density without better access points. He would like better buffers or agreements from the adjacent land owners.

Kreimer brought up some of the concerns that Commissioner Williams had, since he was not able to attend the meeting. Williams is concerned with having only one entrance to the golf course. Current regulations for golf courses require at least 2 entries and he is wondering if there are other possibilities for that. Dunn stated that there were 2 entrances, but one is now closed.

Dunn thinks the EAW is very important as this is a very sensitive area. She is happy they are working with an arborist and are paying attention to the surface water.

The developer stated that they are not interested in reducing the densities because the development has to be economically feasible. Fields stated that the City has no obligation to weigh the economics, but it is their job to apply ordinances and make sure the development is compatible with the community.

Wensman stated that this will require a Comprehensive Plan amendment and the Met Council will need to approve that. Wensman stated that the City did receive preliminary feedback from the Met Council. Kreimer stated that for perspective, the Single Family homes in Savona are on 50 – 55 foot wide lots, so in comparison, what is proposed is not unreasonable.

City Council Updates – August 2, 2016 Meeting

- i) Hunting Ordinance - passed.

Staff Updates

1. Upcoming Meetings
 - a. August 22, 2016
 - b. September 12, 2016
2. Arbor Glen is having a ground breaking ceremony on 8/24/16 at 10:30 am. There will be a reception afterwards in the Council Chambers.

Commission Concerns

Lundquist is concerned about the negative press that the City has been receiving and is concerned that facts are not being portrayed accurately. She would like to see an article that is done in a more positive fashion that reflects what we are trying to accomplish as a City.

Dunn asked about lowering the forecasts for Met Council. She is wondering if the Planning Commission should take the initiative for that. Wensman stated that the City Council has not given clear direction on what they want to do. Wensman stated that the Planning Commission certainly could give a recommendation to the City Council.

Meeting adjourned at 9:01 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Ziertman
Planning Program Assistant