

VILLAGE OF LAKE ELMO  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF THE MEETING NOVEMBER 26, 1973

Meeting called to order at 7:45 p.m. Members present: Chairman Wm. Lundquist, B. Folz, C. King, D. Lyons, J. Sovereign, T. Torseth.

Minutes corrected as follows:

Page 1, paragraph 3: "1. Comprehensive plan doesn't call for commercial business in this area."

Page 1, paragraph 3: "3. There is not an adequate vehicle turn-around for commercial operation."

Minutes approved as corrected.

BOB GARRITY, C. O. GEORGI, MIKE DYKEMA, appeared re subdivision of 149 acres at Stillwater Boulevard and Inwood Avenue. They are now speaking of one-acre lots on a portion of the 149 acres. PZC inquired about curvilinear streets being incorporated into their proposed plan and requested that no individual driveway entrances be placed on Stillwater Road and County Road 80.

MR. WEEKS, CREST CONSTRUCTION CO., appeared representing Geo. Herbst property at Berschens Shores. Motion by B. Folz, seconded by J. Sovereign, to recommend to Village Council that building on Lot 16 and a portion of Lot 17 be denied for the following reasons:

1. The tract of land was not subdivided in accordance with Ordinance 14, Section 20, dated April 12, 1960.
2. The minimum road width at the lot set-back line is 96' which is below the 125' required minimum frontage.
3. The set-back from the lake to the garage is shown as 24' and it is the opinion of the PZC that no set-back should be less than 75'.
4. The building floor location must be a minimum of 3' above the "high flood mark", as established by the Valley Branch Watershed and the village engineer.

Motion passed unanimously.

NOTE TO VILLAGE COUNCIL AND VILLAGE ATTORNEY: Ordinance 129 has apparently omitted the minimum distance for a set-back of building structures. The State Shoreline Management Act requires a minimum

of 75' from the normal high water mark on this type of lake. PZC recommends that the Village Council consider this and add it to our established ordinance.

MIDWEST PLANNING PROPOSAL was discussed. PZC recommends acceptance of the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd proposal submitted by Midwest Planning. There is some question re the 4th point. Those points recommended for acceptance are:

1. Updating comprehensive plan.
2. Review PUD ordinance.\*
3. Technical review of Dayton project.

Meeting adjourned at 11:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandy Phernetton  
Rec. Secretary

---

\* It is our understanding that George Hite, Dayton Development Corp., is in favor of having the PUD Ordinance reviewed and that Dayton's has offered to finance such a project.