

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

JULY 14, 1986

7:30 p.m.

MEETING CONVENES

1. Agenda
2. Minutes: June 23, 1986
3. Comprehensive Plan Update:
1990 Future Land Use Plan and Map
 - a. Parks and Open Space
 - b. Airport Safety Zone
 - c. Highway Noise Impact Zone
 - d. Draft MUSA Category
 - e. 1990 Future Land Use Map
 - f. Other
4. Joint Planning Commission/City Council Meeting on July 28th: Briefly discuss what should be covered at that meeting.
5. Adjourn

APPROVED

LAKE ELMO PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

JULY 14, 1986

Planning Commission Secretary Don Moe called the meeting to order at 7:45 in the City Council Chambers. Present: Moe, Graves (arrived 8:07), Williams, Novak, Raleigh, Bucheck, Reuther, City Administrator Overby. Absent: Haacke, Schiltz, Martens.

1. Agenda

Add: 3F. I-94 Overlay, 4A. Summary of Goals, Objectives and Strategies for the Joint Meeting, 5A. Discussion of Property taxes (if time permits).

M/S/P Novak/Reuther - to approve the July 14, 1986 Planning Commission agenda as amended. (Motion carried 6-0).

2. Minutes: June 23, 1986

M/S/P Novak/Raleigh - to approve the June 23, 1986 Planning Commission minutes as amended. (Motion carried 6-0).

3. Comprehensive Plan Update:
1990 Future Land Use Plan and Map

a. Parks and Open Space

There was some confusion on this category because the keyword was (P) and it contained parks, churches, city-owned land and schools.

M/S/P Novak/Williams - to establish a common code between the comprehensive plan, city zoning map and the ordinance. (Motion carried 6-0).

M/S/P Novak/Raleigh - to redefine the following categories: Highway Commercial to Highway Business (HB), Neighborhood Commercial to Convenience Business (CB), and Commercial to General Business (GB). (Motion carried 7-0).

M/S/P Moe/Reuther - For purposes of conformity the redefining of these categories will be carried through from the very beginning of the Goals and Policy Statements. (Motion carried 7-0).

Commissionmember Williams suggested a Village Historic Area which would include Hwy 5 to 33rd St. Afton has this category, not to develop more business, but to protect what they have because of the uniqueness of the community. Chairman Graves brought up the concern of how would you implement or enforce this. The Commission decided that this concept will be pursued at some future time.

M/S/P Novak/Buchek - to redefine Limited Industry to Industrial (Ind) and Public Facility to Public Facilities (PF). (Motion carried 7-0).

There was some discussion on the definition of Parks, public and private.

M/S/P Graves/Moe - Parks/Recreation will become Public Parks (P) with the intention of zoning Tartan Park into Ag with a CUP. (Motion carried 7-0).

b. Airport Safety Zone and c. Highway Noise Impact Zone

Commissionmember Moe Suggested a Pipeline Safety Zone be established in order to make people aware of where the pipes are located.

M/S/P Moe/Novak - to establish a Pipeline Safety Zone which would restrict building within a defined distance of all pipelines, the keyword used would be (PSZ). (Motion carried 7-0).

Raleigh brought up the idea of having an Airport Noise Impact Area. In the Comprehensive Plan, this land is identified to indicate potential conflicts between aircraft noise and many types of land uses.

M/S/P Moe/Reuther - to leave the Airport Safety Zone and High Noise Impact Zone as written and using the key words of (ASZ) and (HNZ). (Motion carried 7-0).

d. Draft MUSA Category

M/S/P Williams/Buchek - to add to the proposed MUSA Draft the statement "Developers will be responsible for paying all costs of new or extended services." (Motion carried 7-0).

M/S/P Novak/Buchek - to add the statement "See MUSA Land Use Concept Plan". Urban Mixed now becomes MUSA Land Use Concept Plan. (Motion carried 7-0).

M/S/P Novak/Buchek - to accept the MUSA Draft category of 7-14-86 and revisions as amended. (Motion carried 7-0).

e. 1990 Future Land Use Map

FUTURE LAND USE MANAGEMENT PLAN (Amended 7-14-86)

Residential (R1)

Urban Residential (R2, R3, R4)

General Business (GB) was Commercial

Highway Business (HB) was Highway Commercial

Industrial (Ind) was Limited Industry

Public Facilities (PF) was Public Facility

Public Parks (P) was Parks/Recreation

Convenience Business (CB) was Neighborhood Commercial
MUSA Land Use Concept Plan (MUSA) was Urban Mixed
Airport Safety Zone (ASZ)
Airport Noise Impact Area (ANI)
Agricultural (A) was part of General Rural Use
Highway Noise Impact Zone (HNZ)
Powerline TOW
Future Highway ROW
Add: Pipeline Safety Zone (PSZ)
Rural Residential (RR) was part of General Rural Use

M/S/F Moe/Buchek - to use the Keyword (PP) for Public Parks.
(Motion Failed 2-5<Novak, Graves, Reuther, Raleigh, Williams).

M/S/P Williams/Novak - to amend the Future Land Use Map Plan as
modified to the legend as already enumerated. (Motion carried
7-0).

f. I-94 Overlay District

It was brought up by Commission member Dan Novak to review the I-94
Overlay. He suggested eliminating the overlay district from Co.
13B to Manning and restore this acreage to its current use which
is Agricultural. There was mixed discussion on this suggestion.
This item will be brought up at the Joint Meeting to get input and
some direction from the City Council.

4A. Summary of Goals, Objectives and Strategies
for the Joint Meeting

Dan Novak handed out a copy of his draft of Lake Elmo
Comprehensive Plan Revision Strategies to use as guide for the
July 28th Joint Meeting. City Administrator Overby will combine
this guide into his outline for the Joint Meeting.

5. Moratorium

Because of the amount of time it has taken for the Planning
Commission to revise the 1979 Comprehensive Plan, the proposed
deadline of October 2, 1986 may not be met. It was suggested that
the Moratorium be extended to February 2, 1987.

M/S/P Moe/Buchek - to recommend to the City Council to extend the
Development Moratorium to February 2, 1986. (Motion carried 7-0).

M/S/P Graves/Moe - to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at
10:55 p.m. (Motion carried 7-0).

APPROVED

LAKE ELMO PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

JUNE 23, 1986

Vice-Chairman Haacke called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers. Present: Novak, Raleigh, Graves (arrived 7:40), Reuther, Bucheck, Williams, Martens, Moe, City Planner Rob Chelseth, City Attorney Knaak and City Administrator Overby. Absent: Schiltz

1. Agenda

Add: 5. Planning Commission Member's Letter to the City Council

M/S/P Novak/Raleigh - to add to the agenda as Item No. 5-Discussion on Planning Commission Member Williams' letter to the City Council. (Motion carried 8-0).

M/S/P Raleigh/Bucheck - to approve the June 23, 1986 Planning Commission agenda as amended. (Motion carried 8-0).

2. Minutes: June 9, 1986

M/S/P Novak/Raleigh - to approve the June 9, 1986 Planning Commission minutes as presented. (Motion carried 8-0).

3. Comprehensive Plan Update:
1990 Future Land Use Plan and Map

a. Agricultural areas

Agricultural areas were discussed in a draft format at the last Planning Commission meeting. (See Appendix A). City Administrator Overby made additions to reflect that discussion and he did some minor editing and rephrasing to clarify the wording.

There was some discussion on eliminating the transfer of density and what the reasoning was for selecting 61 acres in size.

Williams stated that the intent of the farmers were not to build on each of their forties, but the intent was to farm on their forties. So if we are looking at this to strictly preserve Agricultural use, there is no point to cluster in Ag land. The goal is to try to preserve Agricultural land and there are alternative Ag uses.

Gene Peltier responded that he has been an active farmer for 38 years and it is becoming tougher to make a living at farming. He would like to develop his land rather than preserve the Ag land.

M/No Second/F Novak/ - to amend Ag addition to reflect non-transfer of densities.

Rob Chelseth added that when a farmer retires they want to build a home on the farm by their children and this would not give the farmer this flexibility.

M/S/P Moe/Haacke - to accept the Agricultural Use category as written. Motion carried 7-2<Novak: I have been proceeding under the assumption that we have been talking about eliminating the transfer of density and am very much in favor of preserving open spaces; Williams: I am concerned about the metropolitan framework guide regarding preservation of open spaces and disallowing cluster development so as to require more extensive services in the future.>)

b. Rural Residential areas

City Administrator Overby made some additions to the draft of Rural Residential areas which was handed out at the last meeting. (See Appendix B).

Administrator Overby asked with reference to the sentence "Although residences without accompanying uses are permitted, they must be strongly discouraged over the other uses", are we saying that we prefer to have homes come in on the large lot RR zone with the alternative uses as opposed to a home by itself in the zone. Novak added that the R-R zoning is a category where we put all other land which we do not know what to do with. Permitting total development with 1 home on 10 acres is a terrible legacy to leave the City. Novak clarified that the intent is to encourage 10 acre development not with just a home, but with other accompanying uses.

Rob Chelseth brought up the point that even in four acres you have to transfer the density because one of the lots are not going to be developed. The last sentence will be clarified as follows: The transfer of densities for clustered developments will ~~be~~ not exceed four homes on forty acres .

M/S/P Moe/Reuther - to approve the Rural Residential Areas draft as amended. (Motion carried 9-0).

M/S/P Williams/Buckheck - to amend the original motion to drop the last sentence in the fourth paragraph "Although residences without accompanying uses are permitted, they must be strongly discouraged over the other uses". (Motion carried 8-1<Novak>).

M/S/P Williams/Buckheck - to amend the motion by clarifying the last sentence to read: The transfer of densities for clustered developments will not exceed four homes on forty acres. (Motion carried 9-0).

c. Residential areas

City Administrator Overby drafted Residential areas per past discussions. (See Appendix C).

Consequently, further ~~urban~~ residential development ~~in~~ beyond the old village area will be greatly limited until a more complete range of utilities and services can be provided.

No major urban services are planned for these residential areas during the planning period (through ~~1990~~ 2000), and local services will be kept at rural levels.

Dan Novak suggested adding to the third paragraph Residential development (R-1) areas will be limited to a minimum of 1 1/2 acre lots.

A suggestion was made to start the first (1) level indented as a new paragraph.

M/S/P Moe/Ruether - to adopt the Residential category as amended. (Motion carried 9-0).

d. Urban Residential areas

City Administrator Overby handed out a draft of Urban Residential. (See Appendix D). There will be a page reference to the Future Land Use Map.

(1) The existing urban residential area (R-3) involves Cimarron.....

M/S/P Moe/Ruether - to adopt the Urban Residential category as amended. (Motion carried 9-0).

e. Commercial

M/S/P Moe/Ruether - to adopt the Commercial category as written in the Comprehensive Plan. (Motion carried 9-0).

f. Highway Commercial

M/S/P Moe/Ruether - to accept the existing Highway Commercial description, as amended, in the Goal and Policy Statements as shown on Page 2 of the 1990 Future Land Use Plan and Map handout. (Motion carried 7-2<Williams: we were not here two years ago and as a Planning Commission have not adequately investigated the I-94 Corridor Overlay District; Novak: we should resolve the issue of the I-94 overlay plan before we discuss this issue>).

Dan Novak brought up the issue that our current Comprehensive Plan identifies a ratio and states on Page 20 "Commercial Development will occur at the present ratio of population to commercial land use, one acre of commercial development per 85 people". Our Comprehensive Plan currently identifies approximately 745 acres in commercial which is 10.9 times more than the ratio states we need. (945 wth Overlay district and 14 times more). He would be in favor of reducing the amount of commercial acreage by reducing the I-94 Overlay District.

Rob Chelseth added that this should not be looked at as a cap, but to use this as a guide. He added that they tried to use this as a yardstick to judge the residential land use impact.

M/S/P Raleigh/Martens - to amend the sentence to read "Those areas adjacent to land planned for urbanization in Sections 32 and 33 are the logical next phases for expanded commercial development in the community". (Motion carried 9-0).

g. Neighborhood Commercial

Commission member Raleigh suggested a statement be added to reflect neighborhood support of zoning changes under examination by the Planning Commission and the City Council. Rob Chelseth stated that this is the plan and the future land use plan suggests where Neighborhood Commercial might go.

M/S/P Moe/Reuther - to accept the Neighborhood Commercial Category as written. (Motion carried 9-0).

h. Select review items for 7-14-86 meeting

Pages 95 and 96 will be reviewed and the Land Use Map will be addressed. City Administrator Overby volunteered to draft a new MUSA section for the next meeting.

4. I-94 Overlay District

Commission member Novak suggested at the last meeting that this be added to the agenda. He would like to "pull-back" the amount of acreage in commercial which is going to impact the Overlay District very much. The I-94 Corridor Overlay has gone through the review and approval process, but Novak is interested in feedback from the commissioners because there has been a change in constituency both with commission and council members. Chairman Graves requested that Administrator Overby ask the City Council if they had accepted the I-94 Corridor Overlay District as it presently exists.

M/S/P Williams/Reuther - to modify the June 23, 1986 Planning Commission agenda to allow the commission to go back and discuss Item 3. Comprehensive Plan Update. (Motion carried 9-0).

i. Limited Industry

M/S/P Raleigh/Novak - to eliminate the Limited Industry Category (page 95) from the Comprehensive Plan. (Motion carried 9-0).

There was discussion on eliminating the Limited Industry Category, this would be creating non-conforming uses.

City Attorney Knaak advised that you have to be careful in zoning when you want to freeze current uses because this could cause problems. This is not the zoning ordinance.

M/S/P Williams/Martens - to reinstate the Limited Industry Category as described in the following sentence: In the case of Lake Elmo, the industrial uses are limited to existing uses. (Motion carried 9-0).

j. Public Facilities

M/S/P Williams/Haacke - to accept the Public Facilities category as written in the Comprehensive Plan. (Motion carried 9-0).

City Administrator Overby will research whether opposition to landfills was mentioned in the Goals and Policies Sections.

k. Conservation

There was discussion that this category was poorly worded, non-functional and should be deleted. The original intent was a way to preserve areas in private ownership, but to allow some uses.

M/S/P Williams/Haacke - to delete the Conservation Category as written in the Comprehensive Plan. (Motion carried 8-1<Novak: category should include a reference to conservation>).

5. Planning Commission Member Marge Williams' Letter to the City Council

Commission member Williams reported that at the Afton City Council meeting the Planning Commission members actually sat at a table and referenced agenda items that were being discussed. Being that the Commission spends a large amount of time on these items, Williams felt the Council should be informed when there is citizen input to the Commission, and they should pay attention to it. Chairman Graves pointed out that the Council does get the Planning Commission meeting minutes, the City Administrator attempts to represent what has transpired at the meetings and this should be sufficient.

M/S/P Graves/Moe - to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 9:50 p.m. (Motion carried 9-0).