

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.

## AGENDA

### LAKE ELMO PLANNING COMMISSION

FEBRUARY 24, 1986

- 7:30 p.m. Meeting Convenes
1. Agenda
  2. Minutes: February 10, 1986
  3. Reconsider Rezoning Request from A.M. and Paul Palzer
    - a. Land Use Concept Map
  4. Section 32-33
    - a. Comprehensive Sanitary Sewer Plan
    - b. Feasibility Reports on Sanitary Sewer, Water and Storm Water Drainage Systems.
  5. Comprehensive Plan Update
    - a. 1979 Goal and Policy Statements
    - b. 1986 Planning Issues List
    - c. Comparison and discussion of 5(a) and 5(b)
    - d. Select review items for 3-10-86 meeting.
  6. Adjourn

APPROVED

LAKE ELMO PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

FEBRUARY 24, 1986

Chairperson Prince called the meeting to order at 7:31 p.m. in the City Council Chambers. Present: Novak, Raleigh, Williams, Bucheck (departed 9:00 p.m., Haacke, Moe, Schiltz (departed 8:15 p.m.), Reuther, City Administrator Overby, City Engineer Bohrer and City Planner Rob Chelseth. Absent: Graves, Martens.

2. Minutes: February 10, 1986

M/S/P Williams/Novak - to approve the minutes of the February 10, 1986 Planning Commission meeting as amended. (Motion carried 7-0-1<abstain: Bucheck>).

3. Palzer Rezoning Request

At the February 18th City Council meeting, the City Council voted to remand the Palzer Rezoning Request to the Planning Commission based on the additional information required.

A petition with twelve signatures opposing the Palzer rezoning because this rezoning would not be in keeping with current land use policies (pages 89 & 93) of our existing Lake Elmo Comprehensive Plan was presented to the Planning Commission. None of the petitioners attended the meeting.

Williams - I would oppose this rezoning primarily because this zoning is against the current comprehensive plan which had been approved by the City Council and the Metropolitan Council. To rezone this would be essentially amending our comprehensive plan. Because of the fact that we have many unused platted lots already in the City, this would just be opening up more land for residential building. We are trying to preserve open land whether or not it is used for Agricultural land or actual farming.

Moe - I would approve this rezoning because I interpret the request as meeting the comprehensive plan.

Palzer - This land is within 1/8 of a mile of Foxfire which is one of the major developments in Lake Elmo. Based on the County soils map, none of the soils are good for farming. This land was zoned rural residential before 1979 and Ag is a requested zone.

Schiltz - The amount of unused lots in the City should have no bearing on whether or not this land is rezoned.

City Engineer Bohrer explained the map that the Palzers handed out was a copy of an aerial photograph showing the Palzer's concept providing a cul-de-sac street west of Keats Avenue, 6 approx. 1 1/2 acre lots and the remainder in the seventh outlot.

Bohrer went over the soil numbers and stated that he uses these numbers for relative suitability of septic systems. The soil classification does not give the final approval because that comes when the building permit is applied for and the actual soil borings and perc tests are taken. Bohrer was encouraged by the general layout of the lots because we try to discourage driveways having access onto thoroughfares. With The cul-de-sac street that they provided, each lot has frontage on this minor local street.

Novak - As far as I am concerned the soil conditions are a secondary consideration. I feel it is against the comprehensive plan. We have some 200 platted lots in the City which is adequate to meet the population forecasts which we voted for.

Raleigh - I agree that the addition of seven more lots to Lake Elmo is not necessary at this time and would go against two policy statements in the comprehensive plan which were stated in the petitions. I believe that the creation of isolated urban developments is not only contrary to the comprehensive plan but poor judgment because if they would require urban services, the cost would be outrageous.

Prince - I feel you can interpret our comprehensive plan either way. The map indicates that this area is for a general rural use which could be used in either direction. There are clear goals in our plan that state that we should be trying to preserve our "open space".

Moe - When we were changing some of the areas from RR to Ag, it was done with the intent that if at any point in time somebody wanted to come in with a use, then we would be open to that.

Schiltz - We should be objective and take a look at a man's property and ~~if it is the best suited use for that area. It is 1/8th acre away from Foxfire and it is conforming.~~ Amended 3-10-86

References were made to Pages 89 and 93 of the comprehensive plan.

M/S/P Moe/Schiltz - to recommend approval to the City Council for a rezoning from Ag to Rural Residential by A.M. and Paul Palzer. (Motion carried 5-4 <Buckcheck, Williams, Raleigh, Novak>).

### 3. Concept Plan

City Administrator Overby brought to the attention of the Planning Commission a concept plan of a party that was interested in putting in a business that manufactures medical electronics components with a 10,000 sq.ft. building and employing 12 people. Novak commented that he would not be in favor of encouraging such a business for the center of the City because they could have a solvent disposal problem. The Commission suggested that the interested party look into Section 32 for light industrial development.

4. Section 32-33

a. Lake Elmo Comprehensive Sewer Plan

A draft copy of the proposed Lake Elmo Comprehensive Sewer Plan was included in the Planning Commission packets. City Engineer Bohrer stated that the purpose of the Comprehensive Sewer Plan is to satisfy the Metropolitan Agencies' requirements to provide estimates of anticipated sewage flows. In this way, the Metropolitan Agencies can plan for any needed metropolitan sewers or sewage treatment. In this case, the expansion of sanitary sewers into Lake Elmo will have no affect on metropolitan facilities. A reserved capacity of 458,000 gallons/day has been set aside by the MWCC for Lake Elmo's use. The Comprehensive Sewer Plan shows that this quantity will not be exceeded.

City Engineer Bohrer brought special attention to the Table of Projected Flows on page 4 of the plan. Bohrer assumed straight-line growth, beginning in the year 1987, through the year 2000. At the year 2000 it is anticipated that Section 32 will reach its capacity sewage flow. He also pointed out that this is equivalent to a yearly development of 27 acres.

Bohrer stated that if Lake Elmo predicted that it would not use all of its sewer allocation by the year 2000, the Metropolitan Agencies may consider giving some of the sewer allocation to another City which has already requested additional capacity. On the other hand, if Lake Elmo showed that it would need more capacity before the year 2000, it is unlikely this would be approved.

b. Feasibility Reports on sanitary sewer, water and storm water drainage systems.

City Engineer Bohrer distributed the feasibility reports prepared for the installation of sanitary sewers, water system and storm drainage system for Section 32 and the South 1/2 of the Southwest 1/4 of Section 33. This review is in preparation for the public hearing scheduled for February 25, 1986 at 7:00 p.m. Bohrer reviewed in detail the proposed improvements, the estimated cost, and the recommended method of financing the project.

Bohrer stated that the whole planning area consists of 470 acres, but after subtracting the road right-of-ways, ponds and wetlands, there are 375 acres available for development. Also mentioned was the fact that if the City builds sanitary sewers in this area, Oakdale would like Lake Elmo to investigate the possibility of oversizing these pipes for Oakdale's flow and Oakdale would pay these additional costs. There would have to be an intercommunity agreement describing who maintains it and how these costs are split.

Bohrer advised the Commission that as far as the Metro Council is concerned, this is a local issue and doesn't involve any metropolitan significance to supply sewer to Oakdale. Oakdale has asked Lake Elmo to consider this because they can see that this is a more economical route for them, but it doesn't affect Lake Elmo sewer capacity at all. We have talked to Oakdale before about the possibility of supplying water to the affected landfill area and these discussions are ongoing. This area will need some sort of water supply, and we also have been asked to look into the possibility of getting water from Oakdale.

Williams asked how much of a favor are we doing for Oakdale and what is the cost of the whole thing. Bohrer does not see it as either a benefit or a liability if Oakdale is provided service.

Reuther asked if there is a possibility of renting water from them as a trade-off. Bohrer advised that this is the primary advantage to the people who live in this area. If the City can cooperate with Oakdale in this matter, Oakdale might be more willing to cooperate in providing municipal water which may be a cost savings to the people in this area. Reuther would like to see a provision that they would extend their water and stub it out as part of the sewer package agreement.

There was some concern expressed regarding Mr. Enrights's future plans for his 160 acres that are in Green Acres. Commission member Novak expressed a concern about the trunk line running through the marshy or wetlands area by the Kirvida property. Also discussed was the possibility of Mr. Kirvida being forced to develop his property if the Section 32 Plan was approved.

M/S/P Novak/Williams - to recommend to the City Council that Branch B of the trunkline be rerouted because of the concern of the wetlands area (water, wildlife) being infringed upon. (Motion carried 4-2-1<Prince, Haacke><Abstain: Moe>).

Bohrer stated that the City has a wetland ordinance which prevents excavation, etc. from certain designated wetlands and believes this is one of those designated wetlands.

## 5. Comprehensive Plan Update

### a. 1979 Goal and Policy Statements

Under Agriculture pg. 88

Moe questioned the use of "commercial" farming operation as to how many farmers does Lake Elmo have that actually live here and farm. Who are we protecting this land for and from? What do the farmers want to see done with their land? Novak felt that we are protecting our open space via agricultural preservation.

Under Policies for Agricultural Development

-Future non-farm development in commercial farm areas with large concentrations of prime agricultural land or areas of substantial "open space" will be limited to a maximum density of one non-farm home per 40 acres.

Chelseth - In the past one home per 40 acres in Ag zoning, has been strictly a voluntary zoning. When the original plan was written, the ordinance was developed at the same time and the tool of one per 40 was very popular. It was a tool suited to where the communities are large areas with many forties that have no homes on them, just farmsteads. It didn't really fit the Lake Elmo situation because you have a lot of fractured land ownership. The solution was that it was a nice tool, but because we have such weird ownership patterns we will offer it to people that want to participate in it. There is no problem in leaving the policy as it is, as long as when you go to use those tools you use it effectively.

Williams - They saw this as an interim situation and were looking toward the future. One home per 40 may have seemed out of scale, but it was a way of setting aside certain amounts of land and preventing an immediate clustering. One of the ideas of reserving the land for a longer period of time was trying to keep away from exurban situation where you develop lots of little developments and eventually they demand services. We were trying to prolong our need for metropolitan services and we have the support of the Metropolitan Council.

-Commercial and industrial uses that preserve the "open space" and are compatible with Ag operations will be allowed.

It was decided to delete the word "prime" when referring to agricultural land and delete the section on notifying the county and state tax assessors.

M/S/P Prince/Raleigh - to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 11:05 p.m. (Motion carried 7-0).

-----

Amended 3-10-86

pg 2. Schiltz - We should be objective and take a look at a man's property and see if it is the best suited use for that area. It is 1/8th of a mile away from Foxfire and it is conforming.

APPROVED

LAKE ELMO PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

FEBRUARY 10, 1986

Chairperson Prince called the meeting to order at 7:32 p.m. in the City Council Chambers. Present: Williams, Raleigh, Moe, Graves, Novak, Martens, Haacke, Schiltz (arrived at 7:38), Reuther (arrived 7:42) and City Administrator Overby. Absent: Bucheck

2. Minutes: January 27, 1986

M/S/P - Williams/Graves - to approve the minutes of the January 27, 1986 Planning Commission meeting as presented. (Motion carried 6-0-2<Moe, Haacke>).

3. Conditional Uses in Ag Zones

Prince - This is a work plan item for the year because when the Planning Commission does receive an application from someone who has Ag land or a good size parcel we would be ready with some interim uses.

Tom Armstrong presented some ideas and articles were given out on raising strawberry crops and regarding a Christmas tree operation. He has talked to Jim Schoettler on the Metro Council Staff and the author of the Agricultural Preserves Act. In the seven county metro area, the additional uses on Ag land are across the board. The most common is a machine shop, but another suggestion is a feed corn business. Farming right now is not a profitable business and if we are going to save open farm land in the City, we have to offer opportunities to use a part of it for something else.

In the Ag Preserves Act, there is a section permitting small on-farm commercial and industrial uses. Tom Armstrong asked Schoettler what he meant by this and was told that it would be whatever the local authority wanted it to be and it was to allow some small usage.

There are only three farmers in Ag Preserve in the City, but the City should encourage others to apply for that classification. The landowner is required to maintain his remaining land or farm in the required practices of the Soil and Water Conservation District. You cannot tax Ag Preserve land more than 105% of the average rate of rural Minnesota. The State picks up the difference so the City, County, and School District do not lose any money. The City cannot assess for sewer and water.

Tom Armstrong offered a method whereby the City Council may, at its discretion, allow nontraditional agricultural uses and nonagricultural uses in ag zones by contract between the landowner and the City. There were 15 requirements listed that would be applicable for all contract uses in Ag zones.

Commission member Graves suggested making an explicit list of uses that can and cannot be done in the City. The Planning Commission will look into this and put it back on the agenda at a later date.

It was also suggested to extend an invitation to resident landowners to get their input and to let them know we appreciate them being here and will actively work with them on any problems they may have.

#### 4. Comprehensive Plan Update

##### A. List of Planning Issues

The list of planning issues were discussed and firmed up. See Item A.

M/S/P Graves/Williams - to approve the amended Lake Elmo Planning Commission Planning Issues and submit this draft for the public hearing. (Motion carried 10-0).

A supplementary issues list was added which contained public sewer and a need to establish waste disposal systems.

Williams asked if we could obtain a copy of Afton's Comprehensive Plan on erosion in order to get some direction.

Raleigh suggested to add septic system inspections on our work plan.

##### B. Population Forecasts

The population growth forecast for Lake Elmo for the 1986-2000 time period has to be selected. The Planning Commission had the Metro Council's current projections (in their MDIF document and in our Comp. Plan Summary of 12/85) and City Administrator's rough trend analysis based on actual growth since 1970.

Metro Council's forecast:	6,400	2000
	6,100	1990

City Administrator's forecast:	6,300	1990
--------------------------------	-------	------

Novak stated that he was in favor of accepting the Metro Council's forecast because this is the first step in keeping Lake Elmo small.

M/S/P Martens/Novak - to accept the Metro Council's forecast in the MDIF document of 6,100 in 1990 and 6,400 in 2000. (Motion carried 10-0).

##### C. Comments on Metro Council Development and Investment Framework

The Planning Commission will have their comments ready for the March 10th Planning Commission meeting.



5. Discussion on Development Moratorium  
Public Hearing on 3-4-86 City Council meeting at 7:30 p.m.

The Planning Commission will break down into a small group to review and discuss a section, approx. 20 pages, and bring back their comments to the commission.

City Administrator Overby will check into the pending plats and report back to the Planning Commission.

Bob Dreher asked if this moratorium goes into effect, could they exclude Section 32-33?

Prince indicated that we already talked about Section 32 and it is finished regarding the Planning Commission's input and wouldn't have a problem excluding Section 32 at all.

M/S/P Williams/Martens - to recommend to the City Council that the Planning Commission would support a moratorium not longer than six months and starting after the public hearing, but to exclude Section 32-33 (the area of the City inside of the MUSA line.)  
(Motion carried 10-0).

6. Map for I-94 Impact Overlay Zone

City Administrator Overby handed out a map of the I-94 overlay district and he and the City Attorney will draft the ordinance text for publication.

7. Upcoming Workshops on Land Use Controls

City Administrator Overby urged the Planning Commission members to attend the series of workshops on landuse controls offered in February and March. The City will reimburse the registration fee.

M/S/P Moe/Schiltz - to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 10:20 p.m.

-----  
Amended 2-24-86

7. "use" was misspelled

LAKE ELMO PLANNING ISSUES

- I. What kind of community do we want Lake Elmo to be?  
Desired local character of the community.
- II. Future Land Use Management Planning
  1. Agricultural use preservation.
    - a. use of large lots
    - b. alternate uses for farmland
  2. Alternate forms of managing growth.
    - a. zoning
    - b. control land development in unsewered areas
    - c. lot sizes in residential and other zones
    - d. temporary moratorium on residential and/or commercial development.
  3. Business and industrial development, location.
  4. Appropriate or desired commercial uses.
  5. Selection of population forecasts.
- III. Planning for Efficient Public Services and Facilities
  1. Provide adequate City facilities and services.  
(police and fire)
  2. Target population for cost effective provision of services.
  3. Targeted mill rates and assessed valuation.
  4. Capital Improvement Program for existing road and future right-of-ways.
  5. Improved use of existing facilities and services.
- IV. Environmental Planning
  1. Surface water management.
  2. Protection of lakes, wetlands, soils, and floodplains.
  3. Solid Waste Disposal Systems (landfill, recycling).
- V. Economic Development Planning
  1. Review area for and nature of commercial and industrial development.
- VI. Planning Process
  1. Need to inform and involve the public about the planning program.
  2. Continuity of the long-range planning programs.

APPROVED

LAKE ELMO PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

JANUARY 27, 1986

Chairperson Prince called the meeting to order at 7:32 p.m. in the City Council Chambers. Present: Graves, Novak, Buccheck, Martens (departed 9:15 p.m.), Reuther, Williams, Raleigh, City Administrator Overby. Absent: Moe and Schiltz.

2. Minutes: January 13, 1986

M/S/P Graves/Reuther - to approve the minutes of the January 13, 1986 Planning Commission meeting as amended. (Motion carried 8-0).

3. Palzer Rezoning

This had been tabled for two weeks from the public hearing held at the January 13, 1986 Planning Commission meeting.

Steve Raleigh - I am concerned about the vague future plans presented by Palzer. To rezone to RR would allow Palzer a number of choices. I believe he could build a house and that the current zoning should stay until more concrete plans are presented. I would like to refer to the following Rezoning Amendment; (b.) Such plans shall contain sufficient information for the City to determine whether the proposed development is in keeping with the intent and purpose of this Ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan. I could not determine this by Mr. Palzer's presentation. I urge Mr. Palzer to come in with more information to see if he could not work within the Ag zoning.

Palzer - We are requesting a rezoning at this time and not a consideration for a cluster development. To not get a rezoning and go ahead with a cluster development I would have to invest \$10,000-\$30,000 through your engineer and soil samples. I don't see that this is feasible unless I get the rezoning.

Raleigh - Requesting RR zoning allows you more privileges than Ag zoning. A request for rezoning without more specific plans makes my job very difficult.

Palzer - I have checked with the surveyor and he suggested we get the rezoning first before he will do any surveying and then he will come to you for approval. I have a total of seven children and want to give them each an opportunity to build a home even if some own homes already.

Graves - I feel that the intended use is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and with the general plan that has been developed. Everything around the quarter section is zoned RR.

Prince - We have to take into consideration that some of the neighbors object to the rezoning application because they are farming and prefer it to stay in an Ag zone.

Buchek - Even if they wanted to build one home first and still had thoughts of building seven homes, they still could build one home under this zoning without requesting rezoning or a subdivision.

Prince - However, this is an application before us that we have to act upon. If we feel that this meets the requirements of the City Ordinance and fits with the planned land use, we could approve it. If it doesn't fit with the Comprehensive Plan and land use, we can turn the application down.

Williams - Even though I don't like to see us losing farmland, I do not see any reasons to turn this application down based on what is currently on the plan unless we were willing to review the Comprehensive Plan and change our policies and set aside more land in Ag Preserve.

Graves - The owner has to come in and request Ag Preserve.

Raleigh - Part of my concern about the vagueness of the plan had to do with the topography of the property. The steep hill on the back around the pond would provide an erosion problem when taken out of pasture land. This would probably cause additional flooding to the Klawitter property.

Graves - The drainage and run off concerns are reviewed prior to development.

Palzer - You cannot make a living off that land. Only one part has ever been tilled in the last eight years. The other part has been pastured. The neighbor to the south did voice concern about the land being vacant because he is raising horses and is concerned about people riding dirt bikes out there.

Martens - Under the Prime Soils map, this property is not a prime area and there are only a couple spots on it that would cause problems under soils for severe development limitations.

Novak - The maps you refer to are reference points only. One of many factors that should be taken into consideration if you look at Lake Elmo, you would see alot of prime Ag soils that have homes on them.

Buchek - It bothers me to put RR zoning in the middle of an Ag zone.

Steve Ziertman, 10193 60th St. N, asked where the water would be going when the seven homes are built.

M/S/F Graves/Martens - to recommend approval to the City Council for the Palzer rezoning from Ag to RR. (Motion failed: 4-4<Novak, Raleigh, Williams, Bucheck>).

Novak - I voted against the rezoning because this area is targeted in our Comprehensive Plan for General Rural use. As this is defined in the Comprehensive Plan, it is open to some subjectivity. However, the opening paragraph states that continued piece meal encroachment of non-farm development into these areas will be greatly restricted. I feel that this rezoning request is in conflict with that.

### 3. Simple Lot Subdivision - Patricia Anderson

Chairperson Prince described in detail the Patricia Anderson Simple Lot Subdivision application and brought the Commission up-to-date as to what action had been taken in the past.

Novak - How many homes do you want to build. Pat Anderson answered that she wanted to put up a home back there and her brother eventually would like to put one on Lot 41. Her brother is in the process of financing the family home and he has purchased the Schultz property.

Prince - In the DeMontreville Area and Old Village we do look at lot sizes in the area. We don't have to restrict ourselves with the 1.5 acres. I don't feel that the problem is with the size of the lot because we have other lots in the neighborhood this size. The main thing we have to decide is whether we want to put another house or another two houses on this private road.

Novak - I am in favor of permitting two houses as long as we don't get another septic tank problem in the village.

Pat Anderson - Russell stated that it would pass perk tests because the whole back is sandy.

Prince - I don't think by adding Andersons Lot 47 to this piece would protect ourselves for having adequate septic system because it is under water most of the time.

Graves - Before they can build they have to prove that there are two septic system sites on the property in addition to room for a house.

Williams - There have been instances that after someone has purchased the property there is pressure to allow them to build on it because they have already spent the money for it regardless if the land is appropriate for septic systems.

Williams - What happens if these people move and sell their homes and these people wouldn't be on the Fire Dept. and maintain the road.

Prince - This was brought up the last time when it came up. The Eders advised them that they always maintain the road and they can get in and out with the fire truck with no problem, but it always won't belong to the Eder family. We asked that anything they do goes with the land, not with the Eder family and that is something we should remember.

Raleigh - Are Lots 43, 44, 45 and 46 targeted with septic problems? Anderson stated she lives on lot 44 and has no problem with her system.

Graves - Even though an easement is not formally granted but as long as the road has been used for common access for seven years, it cannot be withdrawn from that purpose by the landowner.

Prince - We should consider where we want to split the property. City Administrator Overby advised them of the City Engineer's report dated April, 1985 addressing this subject.

Graves - In the August 8, 1985 letter to Mr. Bill Eder from the City, it was stated that a "Hold Harmless" statement absolving the City of any responsibility for the maintenance of the existing private road be added to the property. This should be a continuation of what we did before as long as we do make sure there is this provision in the owners abstract.

This will be on the February 4, 1986 City Council meeting agenda.

M/S/P Graves/Novak - to recommend approval to the City Council of the Simple Lot Subdivision for Patricia Anderson contingent upon the "Hold Harmless" statement provided with the owner's abstract. (Motion carried 8-0).

5. Future Land Use for Co. Rd. 15/I94 Intersection:  
Dennis Scheel

Mr. Scheel is a real estate agent for Century 21, Kinnic Valley Realty, Inc., River Falls, Wisconsin. He represents a group of investors who own/control the land on all four quadrants of the I-94 Intersection. The northwest quadrant is in Lake Elmo, the northeast quadrant is in West Lakeland Twp., the southeast quadrant is in Afton, and the southwest quadrant is in Woodbury. Also attending was Mr. Lee Guerke who is one of eleven owners of the property and Mr. Carl Dale is the Planner representing the group of owners.

Mr. Dale explained that the area in Lake Elmo which the owners are interested in is approximately 63 acres. We are meeting with each community to get a feel of what development you would like to see here. We can show that certain types of development in the rural service district could be a net economic asset to

the community not creating traffic or other problems affecting the agricultural area or housing areas. We would like to propose developments that are not likely to go back into the urban service district in any event. We would like to get your input and come back with detailed proposals.

Prince - A copy of the I-94 Overlay District would be helpful. It covers 500 feet back from the freeway right-of-way and a quarter mile east and west and north of the intersections.

Williams - Of course, you are aware of the school there and any commercial development would have to be compatible with Oakland Jr. High.

Graves - There would be no generation of urban services with respect to fire or police protection that would be a tax strain from the rest of the community. There is no intention at this time to be putting in sewage facilities.

Prince - The County does consider County 15 their main north-south road for their long range planning for road transportation systems. Also, our City Planner has reminded us that we have plenty of commercial property planned already. In Section 32 we have a lot of commercial property planned. The County planner would like to get together with the towns around us so we can look at how much commercial land use is planned along I-94.

Williams - On the part of Lake Elmo, the tendencies are to maintain a rural atmosphere. Any commercial development that we would probably look favorably on would have to fit to this particular philosophy. We are not like some of the western suburbs who really relish a very busy commercial area.

Graves - We don't want fast food restaurants or a strip of motels, but want good stable, high quality development.

Prince - I think if the development that would come before us would be with the intent to service the people using the highway and not take away from the kinds of business the townspeople would use and keep downtown. We do have a large commercial area downtown that hasn't been filled.

Raleigh - Another concern is that there is alot of open land on that corner and the parcels they are interested in working with do not comprise the entire section on any of those corners and the rest of the portions would remain in its current use for some time. They should address compatibility with their immediate neighbors.

Dennis Scheel - We've had a number of calls for semi-high density retail to an office warehouse complex of 50,000-80,000 sq.ft. with up to 120 employees. There have been calls wanting to speculate on investing in the land and holding it until a future date.

Prince - I would think that the Planning Commission would be more in favor of listening to an office warehouse application than a retail application.

Lee Guerke - I look at this like having inventory on the shelf that nobody wants and if you are in the retail business you would peddle it and get on with inventory that somebody would want to use. You cannot change the fact that you have an important intersection and there is going to be a demand for that type of property. Having commercial property someplace else is not a good argument for closing other areas that are superior commercial property.

Williams - We have a community goal and this goal may not be what the developer wants. We as a Planning Commission are looking out for our citizens primarily.

6. 1986 Planning Commission Work Plan

1. Review, comment and make recommendations to the City Council on zoning and subdivision applications.
2. Overall review of Comprehensive Plan.
3. Review Section 32 sewer assessments.
4. Large Lot Subdivision (look at Afton regulations)
5. Regional Park (update)  
(potential landfill site & bike access from City).
6. Speed sign, traffic light or some kind of traffic control on Highway 5 and CSAH 17 (near the school).
7. Restrictions (stronger) for accessory structures in the R1 zone - the size and number of parcels of less than five acres. Definition of garage and storage accessory structures. Size and number of accessory structures in RR zone on parcels of twenty acres more mre.  
(Check amended ordinances).
8. Procedure Sheet development for Planning Commission to correspond to the existing route sheets.
9. Cluster Development in AG Zone (pg. 301-31 of Code).
10. Conditions or possible restrictions on residential subdivisions where large accessory structures exist.
11. Meet with the County and adjacent community planners to come up with a unified plan. (commercial)
12. Define tighter "Commercial recreation of a rural nature".



13. Index for Code Book
14. Lake Jane water contamination problem (update)
15. 201 Project (update)
16. Future Road Plan (update)
17. Watershed 509 Plan (update)

M/S/P Williams/Graves - to approve the Planning Commission's 1986 Work Plan as designated. (Motion carried 7-0).

Alternate uses for farm land and discussion of the denial of the Industrial use of the Hutchinson property will be discussed when working on the Comprehensive Plan.

7. Metro Council Development & Investment Framework

This will be discussed at a later date.

8. Local Training Session for New Members

City Administrator Overby will have a training session for the new Planning Commission members on January 30th at 7:30 p.m.

9. Zoning Authority, Responsibilities Procedures Seminar  
(1-13-86 St. Paul)

If you are interested in attending this seminar, registration should be phone into the Extension Service Office by January 28th. The registration fee is \$18 and the City will reimburse you.

M/S/P Graves/Reuther - to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 10:25 p.m. (Motion carried 7-0).