

Chairman Grace called the meeting to order at 7:40 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Lundquist, Moris, Michels, Novak, and Murphy.

HANLON-SJOBLOM - 2 SPECIAL USE PERMITS FOR 400 CU. YD. OF FILL TO PREVENT FLOODING AND LOSS OF TREES ON LAKE JANE.

Mr. Hanlon and Mr. Sjoblom desire to fill their back yard area with 200 cu. yd. of fill on each lot. The application of for 1 permit allowing 400 cu. yd. of fill. Grace said the key question is whether the fill will be below the normal high water mark of 924. They desire to continue the shoreline established by Richard Connors when he filled his property. Mr. Hanlon said the fill would be below 924 as is Connors. The Ordinance states fill is not allowed below the normal high water mark.

Mr. Hanlon stated they do not have approval from Valley Branch or the DNR. DNR will not consider the request without Valley Branch Approval. Valley Branch does not want to give approval unless they are sure the fill will do some good. If the pump will not maintain the lake level at 924 (Lake Jane is presently 923) then this effort is wasted according to Valley Branch. Mr. Hanlon said if the pump maintains 921 (the desired lake level) the fill would be 100 ft. from the shoreline. He and Mr. Sjoblom are trying to improve their property, get some use out of an area that is presently full of algae, sludge, etc.

Chairman Grace stated that granting this request would be in violation of the Ordinance and the PZC cannot recommend to the City Council such a request. The Administrator said fill cannot be placed below 924 in the Flood Plain Ordinance without a variance from the DNR.

Lundquist moved, seconded by Novak, to recommend denial of this request as it is in violation of the Ordinance. Motion carried 6-0. This request will go before the City Council on Tuesday, September 18.

The Administrator will talk with the Engineer about the Connors fill. They will determine if he complied with the ordinance and did only what was requested on his application. The Administrator will advise the Council of his findings.

ZONING ORDINANCE: Hearing Comments:

No changes can be made on the Comprehensive. The only changes that can be made are in the Zoning Ordinance and on the Zoning Map.

1. Hutchinson Property - No comments - Industrial is provided for a portion of this property post 1990, on the Comp Plan Map.
2. Hedges and Sovereign - These parcels to be included in the R-1 zoning.
3. Dayton Hudson - a. ok b. ok c. PZC agreed this area should remain as is. The Administrator will contact the DNR and see what is involved to change Goose Lake from a Natural Environment Lake to a Recreational Development Lake. The RR zoning cannot be changed to R-1 as it would be inconsistent with the Comp Plan.
4. DeCoster - The Conservancy Zones will be identified by the Planner. This will identify general areas of environmental concern.

City of Lake Elmo

PAGE TWO
ZONING MEMO
Sept. 7, 1979

P.O. Box J
Thirty-third and Laverne Avenue
Lake Elmo, Minnesota 55042
777-5510

7. Platting in RR zone - YES, ALL THE LAND HAS TO BE PLATTED. This would become, otherwise, an administrative nightmare. The whole parcel would, then, be shown on the map (like a PUD or SUP). If a person wants to sell one lot, it has to be 10 acres. If he wants to sell one of the clustered lots, it has to be platted into a cluster. And, as Floz said, the cost of doing one lot is not much less than doing all seven. I think it just has to be this way.
8. Gonyea - He, too, should wait until the demand is there, like Hutchinson. It is planned for the use he intends for it; but, there are no plans to use it.
9. Cimarron - There is some commercial in the club house now. (Laundry, bar, etc.) I've asked for a legal description. Perhaps the golf course should be in PUBLIC, as it is public.

CHANGES IN THE MAP:

1. We inadvertently excluded part of Green Acres, that part in the Preliminary Plat but not on the final. This, like Brookman, Wash. 37, Finnemann, and Beutel, should be R1.
2. The following AG designations should be added:
Wheeler - we have asked for legal
Kern - on map
Kindler - on map
Bergman - all that part not "under" the greenhouse should be AG. If he wants to expand the greenhouse operation, he should amend the SUP.
Frederick - we have asked for legal
Armstrong - Tom says his letter is coming.
3. Frederick property in Regional Park should be PUBLIC

CHANGES IN TEXT:

page	comment
7	(27) delete - defined in Flood Plain Ordinance
	(29) delete - defined in Districts
10	(69) change "public" to "repair" to be consistent with other definitions
12	after (89) Add: "Lot line, side - Any boundary of a lot which is not a front or rear lot line.
	(96) delete - in Flood Plain Ordinance
14	(117) Delete Advisory Commission, you are the Planning Commission
16	after (140) Define "Structure" from old Zoning Ord. (FFFF, p. 22)
27	506.09 - Add "notify Metropolitan Council and adjacent communities that they have 30 days within which to respond to a change in the Comp. Plan.
28	(f) add 2 foot contours required
	Section 6 correct typo. to reflect new districts RR, R1, R2, R3, R4
30	E(4) add - pro-rated to parcel, require to PLAT ALL
	601.02 Add - Farming, suburban and Farm, rural within provisions of 724 to permitted uses.
31	E(\$) add - pro-rated to parcel, requirement to PLAT ALL of parcel
33	601.05 B(\$) Do we want to permit Commercial similar to that in multi-family with access off interior street only???
36	601.07 We COULD add Limited Manufacturing as defined in the Ordinance, as was done in Old Ord....after (5) near the bottom of the page.

City of Lake Elmo

PAGE THREE
ZONING MEMO
SEPT. 7, 1979

P.O. Box J
Thirty-third and Laverne Avenue
Lake Elmo, Minnesota 55042
777-5510

CHANGES IN TEXT

PAGE Comment

- 42 602 NO MAP - reword paragraph. Take out estimated, put in "designed"
delete "specific" as it adds nothing to clarity of sentence.
delete - "as show on...herewith"
- 44 G(2) second column - delete "sq.", as it is feet, not square feet.
- 46 Delete reference to Special or Conditional Use Permits. This will be a
regular permit sent to Zoning Administrator, Engineer, and Council. Council
may call a hearing if the area is especially sensitive. All permits in
Flood Plain (the HIGH FLOOD) require public hearings, under that Ordinance.
- 58 603.02 (\$) note shoreland maximum for lot coverage is 33%.
603.03 Why do we set 180 foot maximum??? in (1)
- 59 603.03 (3) Setback from arterial streets is in Districts, delete here.
- 61 703.09 Refers to RR, not R1, now.
- 63 706.05 Add: outside coin operated machines need permit. County Section 726

Tha's All Folks.

Thank you.

LATE ARRIVALS:

1. Lawrence Kleis - I am not sure what zoning he is requesting. He is presently in A - or mostly so. We would not "zone him what Foxfire is" until there is plan for development.
2. Gilbert Sullwald - has asked for AG designation for property in Sections 2 and 11. We will ask for the exact legal description.
3. Maynard Eder is preparing a list of "deficiencies" for Monday.
4. Tom Armstrong brought in a letter requesting AG, it will be on the map.
5. Don Raleigh has, again, suggested a change in the permitted uses in C1. His letter is attached.
6. DeCoster is requesting R1, rather than RR, for the land indicated on his map. He also protested, in writing, the generalized conservancy zone. That is not an issue at this time. When the conservancy district is developed, we'll try to advise Mr. DeCoster.
I would not recommend R1 zoning for that parcel. It is not contiguous to any other R1, is not near essential City services such as fire protection, police and animal control services; nor it is in an area where we are currently maintaining streets and other public property. It would premature to zone it R1 at this time.

Zoning Ordinance Hearing, September 5, 1979

PZC members in attendance: Moris, Crombie, Michels, Novak, Lundquist, Prince, Dreher. Councilors included, Armstrong, Morgan, Pott and Johnson

Chairman Grace called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m.

Administrator Whittaker gave the opening introduction and outlined the changes in the Comprehensive Plan Map. He then reviewed the proposed Zoning Map.

Audience:

Mr. Grannis: Representing W. Hutchinson - Gave the background of the Hutchinson property and stated it has been zoned Industrial for over 20 years. He feels the use indicated on the zoning map is a change in zoning and a down zoning to another classification. (The map shows this property as RR, present use.) The property has been zoned Industrial during all of Hutchinson ownership and part of the property before he acquired it up to today had this zoning. They are here tonight because it is their understand that the PZC and the Council plan to change this zoning and down zone it to another classification. The reason they feel this property is properly zoned and should remain that way is because it is bordered on the North by 212, bisected by the CNW Railroad and on the East it is bordered by the Elmo Airport and the Fairground and also bordered on that segment of the property by Industrially zoned property. On the west adjacent to the buildt up portion of the City is also Industrial property. They feel it is ideally located and situated to be developed as Industrial property. In the event it is down-zoned they feel Mr. Hutchinson and also the residents of Lake Elmo will be deprived of an opportunity to make a major development, a sound tax base and it will be taking property without just compensation. Mr. Hutchinson purchased this property not as speculation, but for the purpose of developing it and he did it upon the assurance of the people of Lake Elmo and the former governing bodies that it would be and would remain industrial. He has maintained it and paid taxes on it with that idea in mind. He has had opportunities to sell part of his property for industrial purposes, but he has refused to do that until an overall plan suitable to the use of the property, suitable to an orderly development to the community came along. He has waited a long time for that and if the action that is proposed here tonight is taken you will be depriving him. Have stated their position to both the PZC and the Council previously .

Mr. Hutchinson: Would like to cover an aspect he does not think has been brought up in previous meetings. People on the Council or Planning Commission have said that if this does not show as Industrial Zoned property there is no problem. When you get a developer you merely come in with a plan, we will consider it and develop it. He feels the City has adequate protection that it will be developed properly in your Ordinance if it is zoned that way because it is the best industrial site in the township and has been so all these years. As you look at this property and stand in it you see commercially and industrially zoned property to the east, you see the fairgrounds to the northeast, in section 12 you see a filling station that is industrial, across the highway in Baytown the land is zoned industrial it will be industrial, further south where the airport is you have airport property. He bought this property in three pieces. In 1956 Mr. Hutchinson looked all over Washington County for a logical industrial site this land was the most desirable and still is. Shortly after purchasing the second parcel the land was zoned industrial by your predecessors and has been considered for industrial use since 1957.

Mr. Hutchinson continued: In 1965 purchased the third parcel when it was already zoned industrial. His intention was to buy this as an industrial development and he felt 200 acres was a minimum size for a good plan and organized industrial park. This site compared to other industrial areas in the township you will see this is the largest site that is suitable for industrial. It is also one of the best site in the whole of Washington County. When the City says this will be zoned industrial again when a buyer is secured and a plan brought in this does not help the person selling as it will have to go at a price of 30 to 40% because a developer will not want to come in and go through the whole rezoning process. He feels that if this parcel would have to be sold with seven (7) homes per 40 the property would soon become a mess, and it is only because he has held it for future industrial use that it is not a mess now. Has had many opportunities to spoil this property. Has sold 2.6 acres south of the railroad tracks to United Power and Land, subsidiary of United States Power Company. This area is no good for residential. He also sold 32 acres north of 212 in 1977 to Mr. Halliday. He did not purchase the land with the idea of farming. Feels the best thing to do is to keep the Industrial Zoning on the map and make it possible to go ahead with plans.

Mr. George Hedges: Read from a letter to the Lake Elmo Planning and Zoning Commission and the City Council. Regarding RR designation of their property in Government Lot 6. Their parcel is surrounded by R-1, residential. This letter to become part of these minutes.

Mr. Peter Hutchinson: Representing Dayton Hudson Corporation - Have a large parcel of land located in the southwestern part of Lake Elmo. This property is currently zoned SPU and the propose tonight would rezone this property to rural residential. They oppose that rezoning, they think it is inappropriate, believe residential use for this property is both logical and a likely use. Have in previous meetings covered the logic with respect to that belief. In addition, they believe sewer is a real possibility to this property, the only thing standing between its condition today and sewer in the near future is the City Council of Lake Elmo not the capacity of the system or the interest of the Met Council. It is on this basis that they formally request that this property be zoned R-1 that is generally consistant with its current single family urban classification. Following are some specific comments on the Ordinance as drafted. RR zoned - pgs. 30 & 31- Under the special requirements section with respect to each zone it is indicated that if it is likely or possible that the property might be sewerred in the future, 10 to 15 years, that it is your intention to require the property owner to indicate a stretch subdivision of how that might occur. It is their position that if you intend to require a property owner to indicate how that property would be subdivided if it were sewerred that you should zone the property so that it could be subdivided if it were sewerred. It seems illogical to require one and not permit the other. Pg. 31 - standard 7 - indicate the outlot in the 7 per 40 cluster must fall under a program of continual maintenance. No defination of this term in the text. Feel the City may be placing an unreasonable burden on the property owners. Page 28 - RR Zone is not listed on this page in the list of zoning districts. Defination section - page 5 - defination for area - Net Developable - this term is not used within the ordinance and if this is the case request that it be deleted as it performs no function. Page 44 - Lakeshore Zoning District - Indicate the area surrounding Goose Lake which is on Dayton's property would be dedicated to natural enviroment. This would be subject to the restrictions listed in the table on that page.

Peter Hutchinson, Dayton-Hudson: They believe the development of this area can be logically handled for residential development as it is known in Lake Elmo and would suggest and request that rather than the lakeshore standards applying to Goose Lake be natural environment that the recreational development classification be used. Have provided the City with many specifics with what their contentions on these matters; but reference that material for your benefit in considering the ordinance.

Ken Sovereign: Acknowledged the work the PZC has put into this Zoning Ordinance. 20 years ago the first Zoning Ordinance of East Oakdale Township was written at his kitchen table. At that time a philosophy was developed and said what do we want in zoning, where do we want to go and where do we want to be later on. We said we wanted slow development so they developed what they considered a residential area and all the rest was zoned agricultural. This area was never intended to be used only as as it was a zoning ordinance guideline to be used as future development came along. As a result of this type of planning many people moved in the area, moved in residential areas, residential areas were developed, farm areas remained farm areas and the farmer did as he liked with his property. It appears now that people who moved into this area want to deny others what they've enjoyed from this type of zoning. There are two philosophies that this zoning ordinance has. One, change what you had in the past without any logical reason and if you find a piece of open land, keep it that way and deny its future use. It appears that this zoning ordinance should state a purpose in what it is trying to accomplish and if they are trying to accomplish no development it should say so, if their trying to accomplish slow development they should say so, if you want to establish a certain percentage of industrial property it should say so. It appears this ordinance fails in this regard. In his particular situation he is surrounded with either 1 or $\frac{1}{2}$ acre lots. There has been no problem with either of these as far as he knows. Yet there is piece of open land that he owns and he is told there shall be 7 lots on 40 acres which in effect is saying this piece of property cannot be used for any future use. This appears to be illogical, spot zoning and borders on arbitrary action. This idea of lot size has been considered by many planning and zoning commissions not only in Lake Elmo but also surrounding communities in the metropolitan area. One philosophy develops that is if you get a lot too large, in the future it will be too small. He takes objection to $1\frac{1}{2}$ acre lots because in the future he feels this will be a $\frac{3}{4}$ acre lot and too dense for this area. The one acre lot makes sense, there has been no problem and should be continued. A written statement with further objections to this ordinance will be submitted.

QUESTION AND ANSWER:

Mr. DeCoster - property owner in section 28, 32 and 33 - Asked to have the conservation district defined. An area in 28 is indicated as such. A. Bad soils, steep slopes, natural wetlands, poor soil conditions the City should be aware of when considering an application for development. Presumed it may be a lower density on that property or special precautions to the Building Inspector or City Planner that that property should be looked at closely.

Jan Sovereign - asked for clarification for the procedure for rezoning and who must approve it, the PZC, the Council and the Met Council. She does not feel many residents understand this. Also if the Comp Plan shows that in the future this property is going to be a certain way is this a guarantee it will be rezoned. Who must approve it from then on? Must it go to the Met Council for approval. Duane Grace stated this plan has to approved by the Met Council and that as yet has not been done.

has not been done. If your property shows on the plan as residential (theirs is rural residential) it more or less tells you that this is what the City expects it will be when you request that type of zoning. It will have to go through the PZC and the Council for their approval. He does not feel this will be a problem.

Bruce Folz - Page 5, Statement 9 - Questioned if this statement means that all power line easements, all utility easements and all slopes grater than 12% have to be taken out before you start talking about the $1\frac{1}{2}$ acre minimum lot area. Suggests deleting the defination or remove the 12% slope, which he feels is arbitrary. Another point he feels is important is easements not only in lots but also in commercial properties. It is desirable to use easments under powerlines for parking lots many other uses for areas under powerlines; and should be counted as a useable part of that lot.

Martin Cohn - Federal Land Company - Questioned the set-back of 1320 from the highway r-o-w. From the present r-o-w a ramp takes up 300 ft. and the frontage road another 300 feet, thus from the 1320 they have an excess of 600 feet in highway r-o-w. Therefore, the actual highway r-o-w is farther back than indicated on the map. The Administrator indicated the 1320 is presently based from the current highway right-of-way. The 1320 is intended to be a noise barrier. This area has shown has appeared the same the last three times it went to hearing and the comment of where the r-o-w should be or is has not been made. Mr. Cohn disagreed and said this has been asked and is recorded. The Administrator stated that if an application to develop in this area came in the Council would have to consider if this should be extended from the 1320 ft. from the highway.

Mr. Harold - Questioned the percentage of homes allowed on less than 40 acres. Chairman Grace explained how the percentage formula works.

Mr. Whitman - Questioned what a property owner is to do with the remaining acerage after the 7 homes per 40 are developed. Grace stated one of two things can be done. 1. Put the balance of the acerage with one of the parcels of land or 2. you have to hold it until the zoning gets changed and designated for use. He feels this is a form of condemnation on the balance of the land. Does not feel it is economically feasible to put a road in to service a rear 40. The Administrator explained that if one owns an 80 acre parcel all the homes can be clustered together. Mr. Whitman feels the zoning is in error. There are many older people and many residents in the Northeast section of the City who are opposed to this zoning.

Bruce Folz - Questioned page 42 - section 602 - how far back from the lakeshore does the overlay zone go. 1,000 feet from the normal high water mark. There will be no map this will be dictated by the normal high water mark.

Peter Hutchinson - asked for the defination of continual maintenance, in reference to the outlot in the 7 per 40 zone, what does the owner have to do? A. Primarily keep garbage and noxious weeds controled. Basically the City does not want the area to become a dump. This should be defined in the text.

Mr. ? - owns 6 100 ft. lots in Tablyn Park. The new ordinance requires 125 ft. frontage can these lots still be sold as they are? Some varification may be needed. It was questioned whether he may not have to combine the six lots and resubdivide in order to meet the requirements of the ordinance. One lot apart is no question, but six contiguous lots poses a question.

Ken Sovereign - questioned how many homes can be placed on 11 A. Grace explained if you can divide your acreage by 7 and come up with an answer of more than 1.5, the City will be hard pressed to deny a permit. Jan Sovereign does not feel it is proper that they are designated RR - 7 per 40 - when all surrounding property is 1 and 1/2 acre lots. Grace stated the Comp Plan Map has them designated R-1 and all they need do is come in and request rezoning. The line was drawn at currently used platted property. Everything is zoned for use.

Bruce Folz - Lake Classification - page 44 - questioned who did the classification.

Duane Grace - read the ordinance pertaining to lots that are contiguous that do not meet the ordinance.

Bruce Folz - Questioned page 45, subsection J, item 4 - Feels the ordinance should state Lake Elmo's regulation is more restrictive than DNR, Valley Branch, Corp of Engineers, etc. Should have uniform regulations. If the regulations are reasonable from the other agencies than Lake Elmo should adopt them so they are uniform all the way through.

Mr. ? Questioned the advantage of Ag zoning. Chairman Grace explained.

Mr. Ward Halliday - owns 32 A on 212 portion of it zoned commercial - Is for sale now as a commercial parcel. This property was purchased as commercial with the investment in mind.

Ken Sovereign - questioned why you zone a parcel something different than is on the Comprehensive Plan which forces the land owner to hire lawyers to go and get it changed. Why not zone it to comply with the Comprehensive Plan. Grace explained this method of designation gives the City a better handle on controlling it than if it is zoned before a use is requested. In this plan nothing is zoned for its potential use, it will be zoned as people come in with a plan to do something with it. In order to get a variance from the Comp Plan it must be amended.

Dorothy Lyons - questioned what is involved to amend the Comp Plan map. Chairman Grace explained that if the PZC and the Council would agree to the change the Comp Plan map would have to be changed with a public hearing, then go the Met Council for their approval then it could be rezoned.

Bruce Folz - questioned what would happen if when the Met Council reviews the Comp Plan they make changes in the map does the city have to go through the whole process to change the Zoning Map. A. No since the Zoning Map is present use. If Met Council did make changes the City would let the public know. The Met Council cannot disagree with the zoning, they could disagree with the Comp Plan. Mayor Armstrong stated that if there is a change in the Comp Plan the City will put out another newsletter, there will be a new map and if it is something substantial another hearing will be called to let the people know what it is.

Peter Hutchinson - read from page 27 - 506.08 - If someone requests a rezoning that is not in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan the granting of that rezoning will automatically amend the Comp Plan. This section should include going to the Met Council.

Mrs. Meehan - Asked how much money has this total change in planning cost us. Twenty years ago residents were indoctrinated to a way of planning Lake Elmo. We have spent how much over the years on this plan and now we totally disregard it for a whole new concept. Mayor Armstrong explained this present plan is required by State law and past projections for Lake Elmo have not come to pass and it is time for a more realistic approach.

Mr. ? - Has attended all but one of the hearings. Has not heard many people speak up in favor of this plan. Every land owner who has spoken has been opposed. Why are you pushing this plan when no one is in favor of it. He feels when someone is dealing with other peoples property they should answer how and why it can be used.

Mayor Armstrong reiterated previous reasons that are the basis of this plan. Mr. ? feels the City is devaluing property residents have held for many years. Mayor Armstrong stated the City is trying to plan for a realistic influx of people; and this plan is the best tool we have. We are planning for the City as a whole and full scale development all over the City is not good planning. The 7 per 40 still allows as many lots as a 5 acre density. This seems a reasonable compromise. The PZC and the Council has not entirely ignored the property owners. These hearings are the process of getting to the public.

Martin Cohn - comments in objection to remarks made about land speculators and false land values - This is free enterprise and how it works. The beneficiary of these land prices, no matter what they are, is the land owner who has lived out here for 5, 10, 30 or 40 years. The objection here is you are taking the bubble away from these people. The objection is not being able to sell the extra 12 lots on 12 acres for possibly \$10,000 apiece, and being restricted to selling one now. This is taking money out of the land owners pocket. Land values can be equated to the stock market as far as its ups and downs. Many things dictate the price. He is a land speculator and has held his property for 10 years. D-H may sell for less, he will not; he will hold it for another 10 years, but he will not buy what is proposed.

D. Lyons - Residents in the past have been indoctrinated to plan for the future. This plan now says no growth. Going back 20 years or more. Only thing we are allowing is some residential. Since we are taking use away from the other land owners we should stop residential too. By placing these restrictions on the land the City is freezing the retirement of the land owners and farmers. Wants the City to tell the people what they must go through in order to amend the Comprehensive Plan in order to rezone and sell their land. Wants cluster development more fully explained. Questioned type of road that must be built, blacktop or gravel. Does not feel it is right that a farmer must have a 10 acre site if he wants to sell one lot, otherwise he has to go to a planned development, which is very expensive. The Administrator stated if the land were developed in five acre sites road costs would be more and they would have to still plat it. This would be much more than 7 per forty clustered in one section on a cul-de-sac. D. Lyon questioned if owners can build there 7 per 40 along existing roadways or do they have to be clustered. Administrator Whittaker explained factors such as the condition of the existing road and their plan that will best suit the use of the rest of the property. This cannot be predetermined. The City will not landlock the remaining property.

Mr. Herold - Asked if he sold his farm house and wanted to build a new house, does he have to sell 10 acres of land with the house?
A.: Yes, unless he clusters. The two homes would be within $1\frac{1}{2}$ of each other. You can cluster less than 7, 7 is the maximum. The intent of the ordinance is to plat all 7 even tho one does not sell all seven (7).

Mrs. Larson - questioned selling her house - will it have to be sold with 10 acres. According to the tax records the house or homestead is on $2\frac{1}{2}$ A. The remaining land will stay open. Grace said unless you plat 7 parcels of land between $1\frac{1}{2}$ and 2 acres then you must sell 10 acres. This is the way the Ordinance reads. Grace explained in all Ag land the home is placed on approximately $2\frac{1}{2}$ acres and assessed at a different rate than the rest of the parcel. This would also be done on 10 acres.

Mrs. Larson - Mayor Armstrong said it was his understand that a person did not have to put or plat seven (7) entire parcels at one time. They would put a plan in saying this was the plan not necessarily platted. The Administrator said this has to be done in a package, in order to guarantee no more than 7 per 40 and the outlot remains clearly an outlot. The expense of platting will still be there since state law requires platting anything under five (5) A. Administrator Whittaker - read letters from

requesting their property be placed in Ag Zoning; and a letter from Richard Bergman requesting the area of his special use permit be increased for agricultural use.

Dorothy Lyons - Questioned if property has to be zoned agricultural in order to qualify for a Special Use Permit. A. Yes. The ordinance does not want to allow uses in areas unless they are zoned for that use.

Mr. DeCoster - Should this plan not show flexibility for the future? The City is committing areas to residential by clustering.

Chairman Grace closed the hearing at 10 p.m.

City of Lake Elmo

P.O. Box J
Thirty-third and Laverne Avenue
Lake Elmo, Minnesota 55042
777-5510

AGENDA

PLANNING-ZONING COMMISSION

September 10, 1979

7:30 P.M. -- Meeting Convenes
Roll Call
Approval of Minutes

Terry Hanlon--9322 Lake Jane Trail
Norm Sjoblom--9302 Lake Jane Trail
2 Special Use Permits requesting
permission to add fill to each back
yard--approximately 400 cubic yards.
Fill to prevent flooding and loss of
trees in their back yards.

8:00 P.M. -- Zoning Ordinance