

The Planning Commission is an advisory body to the City Council. One of the Commission's functions is to hold public hearings and make recommendations to the City Council. The City Council makes all final decisions on these matters.

Lake Elmo Ordinances require that certain documents and information be included in applications. The Planning Commission may postpone consideration of an application that is incomplete and may for other reasons postpone final action on an application.

For each item, the Commission will receive reports prepared by the City Staff, open the hearing to the public, and discuss and act on the application. If you are aware of information that hasn't been discussed, please fill out a "Request to Appear Before the Planning Commission" slip; or, if you came late, raise your hand to be recognized. Comments that are pertinent are appreciated.

PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

JULY 8, 1985

1. Minutes: June 24, 1985

2. Simple Lot Subdivision for Leroy Augustine at 2490 Manning Avenue South.

3. Work Plan
 1. Signs (continue discussion)
 2. Hutchinson Property
 3. Other

July 3, 1985

To: Planning Commission Members

From: Marilyn Banister

Re: Agenda Memo for July 8, 1985 Planning Commission Meeting

1. Attached are the June 24, 1985 Planning Commission minutes.
2. Simple Lot Subdivision for LeRoy Augustine at 2490 Manning Ave.

Attached is the application, site map and letter from the DNR regarding this application. Larry Bohrer's report will be sent to you under separate cover. The site map is not as complete as the map that will be shown at the Commission Table.

What Mr. Augustine is proposing to do is actually two simple lot subdivisions. He proposes to create parcel's A and B, while at the same time adding a parcel of land to the existing parcel (2500 owned by Mr. Schmidt). Mr. Schmidt has asked to purchase this parcel of land from Mr. Augustine as there was some confusion when his house was built and it appears that his house was constructed very close to the property line. Mr. Schmidt would like this property to prevent a house from being constructed on this parcel, close to his existing house, in the future. Mr. Augustine has indicated that the property that would be added on to the Schmidt property would be of no use to anyone else.

The City Code states that "Platting shall be required for the subdivision of a tract of land which is to be divided into two or more lots or parcels for the purpose of transfer of ownership, building development, or for tax assessment purposes and anyone of the resulting lots or parcels will have a land area of less than five (5) acres".

Mr. Augustine will be before the council for a variance to this section of the City Code on July 16, 1985, (along with a request for a shoreland permit and simple lot subdivision) but this is something the Planning Commission should be aware of when considering this application. This platting requirement has been waived by the City Council in the past and a letter to this affect is attached for your review.

3. Work Plan

1. Signs (continued)

Carol and Fred may want to continue this discussion.

2. Hutchinson Property

Attached is some correspondence regarding the Hutchinson rezoning issue from a few years back. The Commission may not want to discuss this issue as (1) This property is in the Comp Plan as future Industrial use. (2) Does the Commission want to change this. (3) If the Commission does want to change this, how is this done (with or without the property owners permission). (4) Should the Commission get a legal opinion on this issue.

OTHER INFORMATION

1. Attached is a letter received at city hall regarding the 201 Program.

2. The action of the City Council on 7-2-85 is as follows:

- The composting site will be at the maintenance garage.
- Approved the I-94 Overlay and Comp. Plan Amendment on a 5-0 vote.
- Invited the County Commissioner's in to the July 16th city council meeting to discuss the municipal water system for the residents around the old landfill.
- Approved two variances for Ed Ryan at 4384 Kimbro Ave. North. (To allow the accessory structure to be placed in front of the primary structure and to allow up to 3 horses on 7-1/2 acres of land).
- Approved the site plan for Hecla, Inc.
- Granted a shoreland permit to Citadel Homes at Lot 9, Block 1 Eden Park 2nd Addition (for a new home).
- Granted a shoreland permit to Daniel Lindstrom, 7959 Hill Trail North (for an addition to an existing structure).
- Granted a variance for road frontage to Bill Eder.
- Called a public hearing for July 24, 1985 at 8:00 p.m. for interim emergency pumping of 300 acre feet from Lake Jane to Shafer gravel pit. The cost of this pumping will be assessed to property abutting the three lakes (Jane, DeMontreville and Olson) and ponds.

APPROVED

LAKE ELMO PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

June 24, 1985

Chairperson Nazarian called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. in the Council chambers. Present: Schiltz, Lyall, Kuettner, Graves, Novak, Lundquist, and Johnston. Absent: Prince, Lang, Moe

1. Minutes: June 10, 1985

M/S/P Graves/Lyall - to approve the minutes of the June 10, 1985 Planning Commission meeting. (Motion carried 6-0-2<Johnston, Lundquist>)

2. Public Hearing for proposed Overlay District and Comp. Plan amendment along I-94 corridor.

Pursuant to published notice, this public hearing was opened at 7:13 p.m. in the council chambers.

A correction of ownership for J & W Boat Works to Bethel Marine was noted on the list of addresses of neighbors, or people owning property within the I-94 corridor and adjoining the I-94 corridor.

Rob Chelseth, City Planner, presented the comprehensive plan amendments and reviewed the proposed interstate corridor district for the zoning ordinance. Basically, these changes describe the creation of two areas along the I-94 corridor. The Section 32-33 area is identified as Lake Elmo's principal area for "long term" urban commercial/industrial developments requiring public sewer/water services. The remaining portion of the corridor (from eastern Section 33 east to County Road 15) are identified as suitable for "interim" commercial and light industrial uses subject to a number of performance standards. These standards are designed to insure development is kept at low densities consistent with rural areas where urban services will not soon be made available.

Uses not served by public sewer and water that are not intensive (urban) land uses, and demand negligible increases in public services, may be approved as "interim uses." The two most critical performance standards are the minimum lot size of ten (10) acres, and no sewer discharge exceeding eight SAC units per ten acres. SAC unit calculations will be based upon the criteria established by the Metropolitan Waste Control Commission which state that one SAC unit is equivalent to 274 gallons of flow per day. Additional requirements involve traffic generation, a provision for off-street parking, that noise is not a potential problem, the compatibility of the land use in regard to adjacent land uses, and site plans that help minimize land use compatibility problems.

Uses that are urban and require public water and sewer service, as well as other major public services, shall be classified as

"long-term uses." The main objective of the "long-term use" is to make sure the public sewer and water extensions are made, and there are parking and traffic considerations. All of these requirements are applied in addition to the existing zoning. The existing zoning does not change, but what happens is the existing zone is used or another rezoning is requested. In addition to that, the corridor district lays on top of that zoning and that rezoning or current zoning is examined in terms of these characteristics to make sure it can perform to these maximums that have been set forth. Building type and construction guidelines are to promote a more natural design and avoid a lot of steel buildings.

John Kline, consultant for Robert and Grace O'Neil owners of Vali-Hi Drive In, have a conditional use permit and wanted to make the Planning Commission aware of the large sewage disposal system they have on their property. Mr. O'Neil has a question as to what degree will he be restricted if he were to come in with a general business use and sell it as a Drive In. Chelseth answered he would be subject to the interim district standards as it stands now. It depends on the type of commercial use, and we would calculate the SAC units and the City Engineer would make the determination.

Bruce Folz questioned what type of architecture would be allowed. Chelseth answered that manufactured housing is not grossly prohibited, but there might be treatments that would have to be made to become more attractive to be acceptable.

M/S/P Kuettner/Graves - to recommend approval of the changes for the Interstate Corridor Overlay District. (Motion carried 7-1<Novak> Concerned about the impact of the surrounding area in Section 32, specifically the swampy areas, and felt there was not adequate information available)

3. Presentation by Sam Emerson and Associates for a proposed golf course and home in Sections 33 and 34 (property currently owned by Dayton/Hudson Corporation).

Sam Emerson presented a preliminary concept plan for a golf course, about 70 homes, and a horse boarding center on the property currently owned by the Dayton/Hudson Corporation in Sections 33 and 34. They are proposing to utilize approximately 400 acres of land in the following manner:

1. 225 acres to construct a Public Championship Golf Course of 18 holes and a Public Executive Golf Course of 9 holes.
2. 29 acres to be left as open land and be used as a park with or without tennis courts.
3. The balance of land to be used in the construction of approximately 70 homes using lot sizes of approximately 200 ft. x 300 ft. and 200 ft. x 400 ft. per home site. These sales will be required to help offset the costs

incurred by the purchase of land and construction of the golf course.

The installation of four ponds will assist the watershed by reducing immediate runoff and at least two of the ponds will be used for the watering system on the course.

A club house is proposed to be built on this site and will house the following: a pro shop, a small restaurant or snack center and a lounge for serving alcoholic beverages. They would like to start construction in the fall and be completed by next August.

Novak - asked what the estimated patronage would be. Emerson answered the estimate patronage would be 35,000 per season. A season is considered seven months or 170 days to play; Monday is the weakest day and peak periods are early morning. Emerson estimates about 200 rounds on Monday and 300 rounds on Saturday and Sunday with the cost of \$10 a round.

Lyall - likes the idea of a public golf course coming into the area, but has a few questions that should be considered. When you line your lots up like that, the code only allows a cul-de-sac to go 800 ft., the ordinance requires a secondary drainfield be available on every site, a park donation is required in land or in cash, and the displacement of water for homes being built should be considered.

Chelseth - a few potential problems in doing this. The objective of the concept for cluster development as adopted was to preserve agricultural land or natural type land. Here you have two uses, a residential and commercial recreation use. The ordinance as written does not allow double count. You cannot use the land for commercial recreation use and count it as open and unused space. To clarify the zoning, Chairperson Nazarian suggested Marilyn give copies of the appropriate ordinances for RR to Mr. Emerson.

Kuettner - likes the idea and realizes it is not within our zoning regulations at this time. It looks like an appropriate use being as close to the park as it is. The roads that will be used for the golf course are the same used for the Regional Park and it is her understanding that they anticipate between 4,000-8,000 people a day on the weekends, so the amount of traffic generated from the golf course would not be a great burden.

Schiltz - thinks it is in an excellent location especially because it is close to the park and would be very accessible. Would be willing to work with them to make things as feasible as possible. Schiltz questioned the amount of jobs that would be needed, and Emerson felt between 8-15 people. There would be a \$300,000 a year budget for the golf course.

Nazarian - likes the idea of the golf course, but is concerned about the density of the houses and advised Emerson to get together with Rob Chelseth and discuss the impact of the overlay. Another concern was about the club house road being a dead end and

that might present service type problems unless they take care of the maintenance themselves. Nazarian suggested Emerson talk to the City Engineer because the City has frowned upon private roads, and the city would probably want the road blacktopped in case of a water problem in that area. He suggested to the partners that realistically the time needed for all the background work that has to be done and for required hearings that this might not be accomplished by the proposed Fall date. Nazarian also informed Emerson that the City Planner was on a retainer for the City so any work that is done by Rob for him will be at his expense. The Planning Commission would also like to know the actual confines of the parcel of land that this will be on, how much property is involved, the legal description, and who will this have an impact on.

Graves - agrees that this is a good use of the land and has no problems with it except for the technical details of the ordinances.

Lundquist - in favor of the concept, but wish you would reserve more imagination in arranging the house lots instead of in a straight row. Also, suggested looking into our Planned Unit Development.

Novak - likes the idea of a golf course. Concerned about the driveways of the 27 homes that would enter onto Minnehaha which would necessitate a rezone and he would oppose this for this reason. Novak informed Emerson that the Planning Commission is in the process of reviewing their sign code and according to the guidelines under discussion an advertising sign may not be permitted at all.

Johnston - In general, he likes the idea and has no new concerns.

4. Sign Ordinance - Discussion
Fred Nazarian and Carol Kuettnner

Fred and Carol went through the Woodbury Zoning Ordinance 401 for their sign definitions and compared it to Lake Elmo's and came up with some differences.

Preliminary discussion on Lake Elmo's 505 Signs.

- D. Business Sign instead of an accessory sign. Note the difference of the inclusiveness of the Woodbury Ordinance. For example, we don't necessarily treat accommodations.
- E. Electric Sign - Woodbury does not have a working definition for an electric sign. However if you go down to Item H.
- F. Flashing Sign - does not have this exact definition in the Woodbury Ordinance.
- G. Ground Sign - For Woodbury it is classified as a free standing sign. The intent is basically the same, but

the wording is different.

- H. Illuminated Sign - Woodbury also has an illuminated sign, and the intent is the same.
- I. Identification Sign - Woodbury has a nameplate or identification sign that was the same. Our Item K., nameplate sign, would be the same and we could combine these two, I. and K.
- L. Pedestal Sign - would be the same as Woodbury's free standing sign.
- M. Real Estate Sign - is covered under Woodbury's temporary sign.

Woodbury did not treat the following:

- R. Sign Structure - It should be sign structure with the comma eliminated (sign, structure).
- U. Warning Sign

Kuettner read off some of the notations that were made on the Woodbury Zoning Ordinance.

- a. Accessory Sign - indicated that the Lake Elmo designation is business.
- c. Crossed out c. because it was covered under p.
- d. Lake Elmo's definition shows Shopping Center or Industrial Park. We don't have a definition for shopping center or industrial park that is within our code.
- e. Work on auxiliary sign. Not sure what to do with this.

No changes made until j.

- j. Crossed this out because of "district".
- k. In Lake Elmo it is ground.
- l. Does Lake Elmo's warning sign and Woodbury's Governmental sign mean the same?
- m. Crossed out because we have an illuminated sign and it means the same thing.
- n. Left this in because we don't have a definition for institutional signs.
- o. Keep our Motion Sign definition because it is more inclusive.
- p. Preferred Woodbury's definition because the Lake ELmo's

nameplate and identification sign could be combined.

No changes until v.

- v. Crossed out Woodbury's definition because we have a definition for roof sign.
- x. Crossed out Woodbury's definition because we liked our sign area definition better.
- z. Liked Woodbury's temporary sign, but would like a list of temporary signs under this definition. Political and garage sale signs would fall under this.
- aa. Liked Woodbury's Internal Traffic Directional Sign because Lake Elmo does not have one.
- bb. Liked Woodbury's Wall Sign because it stated it cannot exceed the roof lines of the building. Lake Elmo's definition was not real explicit.

Carol brought up that Woodbury does not have advertising signs unless they advertise a Woodbury product or service.

Nazarian would like the commission to look over these notes on the definitions and come up with any additions or deletions.

Nazarian brought up a sign on Highway 5, west of Klondike, advertising MSI Insurance and WLOL on the reverse side. The sign ordinance was passed on March 3, 1981 in its current form and talks about signs in a commercial zone but this sign is in an R-1 zone. As of March 3, 1986 this sign will be a non-conforming sign and does not grandfather in. Chairperson Nazarian will inform the City Council about this advertising sign.

5. Work Plan

Kuettner would like the Planning Commission to look at Item 15 on the Work Plan, uses permitted for farm buildings for non-farm uses, and to act on this as soon as possible.

Nazarian brought up Item 16 - Hutchinson property, discussion regarding the denial of the industrial use of that property. This property is still target zoned for industrial.

Chairperson Nazarian suggests the Planning Commission work up their thoughts on these items because they are still out there and they do need to be treated.

M/S/P Graves/Lyall to adjourn the meeting (9:45 p.m.)
(Motion carried 8-0)