

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

AUGUST 18, 1986

***** NOTE EARLY STARTING TIME *****

7:00 p.m. MEETING CONVENES

1. Agenda
2. Minutes: July 28, 1986
August 11, 1986
3. Comprehensive Plan Update
 - A. Future Land Use Map
 - (1) Review Land Use Inventory Data
 - (2) Discuss Proposed New Map
 - (3) Action to Recommend New Map for Inclusion in the Updated Comprehensive Plan
 - B. Other
4. Zoning Ordinance Update
 - A. Draft Amendment to the Agricultural District for "Alternative Agricultural Uses"
 - B. Other
5. Resignation by John Schiltz
- g. Adjourn

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

AUGUST 11, 1986

7:30 p.m. Meeting Convenes

1. Agenda
2. Minutes: July 28, 1986
(Will be handed out at the meeting)
3. Comprehensive Plan Update
 - A. Development Moratorium Extension -
Public Hearing, September 16, 1986
 - B. Future Land Use Map
 - (1) Land Use Inventory *(to be handed out)*
 - a. Purposes
 - b. Methodology
 - c. Data Analysis
 - d. Future Land Use Map Proposals
 - e. Select a proposed new Future Land Use map.
 - C. Other
4. Adjourn

APPROVED

LAKE ELMO PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

AUGUST 11, 1986

Vice-Chairman Haacke called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:32 p.m. in the City Council chambers. Present: Haacke, Novak, DeLapp, Reuther, Bucheck, Raleigh, City Administrator Overby. Absent: Graves, Williams, Schiltz, Moe

1. Agenda

Add: I-94 Overlay (if time permits)

M/S/P Bucheck/Reuther - to approve the August 11, 1986 Planning Commission agenda as amended. (Motion carried 6-0).

2. Minutes:

The July 28, 1986 minutes were tabled until the August 18, 1986 Planning Commission meeting.

3. Comprehensive Plan Update

A. Development Moratorium Extension-Public Hearing, September 16, 1986

Based on the discussion at the last meeting, the City Council has agreed to extend the Development Moratorium until December 2, 1986. Additional Planning Commission meetings were discussed in order to meet their work schedule.

M/S/P Reuther/Bucheck - to meet at 7:00 p.m. for all remaining Planning Commission meetings that are within the Development Moratorium period. (Motion carried 6-0).

M/S/P Reuther/Bucheck - to add an August 18, 1986 Planning Commission meeting at 7:00 p.m. (Motion carried 6-0).

B. Future Land Use Map

City Administrator Overby and Planning Commissionmember Novak presented an inventory of existing land use. The purpose was to obtain up-to-date information to help answer the following five questions.

1. What is the existing land use pattern for the City of Lake Elmo in 1986?

2. How many residential building sites are currently available (platted) or potentially available (unplatted and undeveloped) in Lake Elmo?

3. Are there enough platted lots in the R-1 and R-R zoning districts to accommodate new housing demand over the next 15 years (1986 to 2000)?
4. Develop a Future Land Use Map, based on the previous analysis and discussion. Some questions here include:
 - a. Should the Highway Commercial future land use designation between County Roads 13B and 15 be removed and replaced with either residential or agricultural designations?
 - b. Should undeveloped and unplatted property in the R-1 and R-R zoning districts be changed to agricultural future land use?
5. Decide what zoning changes or additions are necessary, based on the new Future Land Use Map.

Methodology

The existing land use pattern was analyzed based on the current zoning in all 25 sections of the City, since all land in Lake Elmo is zoned for its current use. The amount of acreage in each zoning district was calculated for every half-section and by full-section and citywide. Also calculated was the amount of acreage used for highways, water, railroads, and state-owned land. To anticipate the new zoning district for Public Facilities, county and state-owned land was put into this category. Acreage in the Agricultural district was put into farm, non-farm or Agricultural Preserve. The amount of acreage in Green Acres was also calculated.

Special emphasis was placed on calculating the acreage that is used for existing homes, acreage platted but not developed, and acreage not yet platted nor developed. The latter two figures provide the basis for determining the existing and potential supply of home sites available for new residents. In the undeveloped areas, the minimum acreage for lot size (1.5 or 10 acres) was arbitrarily subtracted from the balance of the property and placed in the category of "platted with a home". The number of remaining acres would theoretically be available for new home development, based on minimum lot size and the owner's willingness to sell or develop the land.

A major element of the discussion centered on the number of existing platted lots and potentially available lots in undeveloped land for both the R-1 and R-R zoning districts. The analysis shows that there are 174 existing platted lots and 189 potential lots yet to be developed for a total of 363 lots in the R-1 zoning district. There are 530 potentially available (undeveloped) and 83 existing platted lots, for a total of 613 lots in the R-R zoning district.

The proposed future land use map has been prepared on the basis of conclusions reached from the land use inventory. The purpose of the inventory was to compare the number of existing and undeveloped housing sites (on lots) to the housing demand over the next 15 years (1986-2000). The Planning Commission is using the Metro Council's estimated population figures of 6,100 or 1990 and 6,400 for 2000 as their reference figures.

City Administrator Overby explained that based on these population "targets" 200 new homes would be needed between now and the year 2000 to accommodate 600 new persons in Lake Elmo (assumes average of 3.09 persons per household). The land use inventory estimates that there are 257 platted lots already available at this time. This would theoretically be enough to handle the 15 year demand, however, it would make sense to include the 189 potentially available (undeveloped) lots in the R-1 zoning district. The new total of 447 housing sites would theoretically provide for a population increase of 1,338 persons in the City. This is over twice the projected rate of population growth (600 new persons in 15 years).

Lake Elmo resident Gene Peltier asked if the Metropolitan Council dictates to the City. City Administrator Overby answered that when the Met Council looks at a comprehensive plan of a City, their concern is the impact of that plan on metro systems, such as highways, sewers, parks, airports. Beyond that, it is up to the given community.

Novak read the following quote out of the Metro Council Investment Framework which should be considered, "The new figures, population forecast, require those who plan for the area to adjust their previous perceptions of growth."

Planning commission member Novak handed out and explained the "Lake Elmo Acreage Inventory" using Section 13 as an example. See Table A and B. This summary comes directly from the Inventory and Green Acres Maps.

Significant totals at the bottom include:

1. Green Acres-4,500 acres. a. By county definition, Green Acres must be actively and exclusively used for Ag purposes.
b. There is significant incentive to get into Green Acres and even more incentive to remain there since the "local assessments are deferred with interest."
2. Undeveloped RR - over 5,600 acres of undeveloped RR, most of which is farmed.

3. The number of potential homesites is 447. We need only 200 to see us to the year 2000. This does not include sections 32 and 33 which, if developed as currently proposed, includes another 882 homesites for a grand total of 1195 units, 6 times more than we need.

The Lake Elmo Acreage Comparison was handed out. See Table C.

Future Land Use Map:

Novak made significant comments on the proposed future land use map.

1. The good correlation in farm land between the inventory map, the prime Ag soils map and the proposed future land use map should be noted.
2. The northeast section is a 5 square mile rectangle, 53% of which is green acres. If you add to this, land which is zoned Ag, but for some reason is not in Green Acres, 63% of this rectangle is farmed. This does not include undeveloped RR acreage in this area. This proposal downzones this section to its current use.
3. The northwest section remains with one exception. There is a 60 acre parcel which is currently unplatted R-1. This proposal downzones it to RR because of too much residential acreage.
4. The central part of the City has only two changes which both are RR going to Ag because of the contaminated landfill and the airport.
5. In the southern part of the City approximately 60-70% of this land is currently farmed. The same situation as in the northeast section. It would be a downzone to the current use which is Ag. A number of changes affecting this area have occurred since the future land use map was published in 1979. The freeway is no longer coming through, Sections 32 and 33 concept plan has been approved by the City, the population forecast is down from 13,000 in 1979 to 6,000. Based on the above facts and the fact that we have so much residential acreage, Novak suggests this area remain open.

Novak summarized that this proposal includes six times as much acreage for residential units, and over 5 times as much business acreage as we need to meet the population forecast for the year 2000. It maintains our RR and Ag acreage at their present levels and is consistent with the strategy outlined at the joint meeting with the Council on July 28, 1986.

Kathy Crombie, 8120 DeMontreville Trail, questioned the validity of their figures. She further added that this proposed Future Land Use Map gave the people no options and could be considered

confiscation of their property.

Lake Elmo Residents Dorothy Lyons and Paul Emerson voiced their objections to the proposal. Basically, they felt that the Planning Commission should be representing the people, but they were doing them a disservice.

After much discussion, the Planning Commission took the following action:

M/S/P Raleigh/Novak - to table for further consideration the proposed Future Land Use Map and data until the next Planning Commission meeting. (Motion carried 6-0).

I-94 Overlay District

Based on the City Council's recommendations at the Joint meeting regarding the I-94 Overlay, the following motion was made.

M/S/P Novak/Raleigh - to recommend the I-94 Overlay District be repealed in its entirety. (Motion carried 4-2 <Bucheck: she would like to have the other three members here to vote, Haacke: she feels that I-94 is the best place to start with commercial>).

Hans Stocksted, Real Estate Broker in Stillwater, asked the Commission to reconsider some form of an I-94 Overlay District.

Gene Peltier objected to this area being rezoned Ag because it was shutting the door on what the landowners could do with their property.

Other considerations that were tabled were to make this district RR or Ag and add the two criteria in the General Business ordinance of minimum lot size of 10 acres and no sewer discharge exceeding 8 SAC units per 10 acres.

M/S/P Raleigh/Bucheck - to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 10:45 p.m. (Motion carried 6-0).

AUGUST, 1986

TABLE A

LAKE ELMO ACREAGE INVENT.

SECT	GREEN ACRES	% OF SECT IN GREEN ACRES	ACRES			UNDEV RR	PLATD WITH RR	PLATD W/O DWELL RR	# OF PLATD LOTS AVAIL RR	UNDEV R-1	PLATD WITH R-1	PL W. DWI R
			NON- FARM AG A-NF A	IN FARM USE A-F A	AG PRES							
1	440.6	66%	19.0	37.5	0.0	378.4	136.5	1.0	0	0.0	0.0	
2	304.2	49	4.1	128.9	26.0	304.1	134.7	15.8	4	0.0	0.0	
3	253.5	41	23.5	127.1	43.2	184.7	79.7	5.6	1	0.0	105.7	4
4	132.5	21	72.5	0.0	0.0	42.9	34.9	13.5	5	86.3	108.9	4
5	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	140.5	2
8	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	20.6	
9	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0	0	39.1	366.6	20
10	388.2	61	0.0	0.0	0.0	334.6	34.3	0.0	0	40.2	50.5	
11	351.3	55	0.0	107.0	65.4	273.3	121.2	32.9	4	0.0	0.0	
12	292.5	46	0.0	137.1	0.0	413.5	58.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	
13	355.3	56	0.0	50.0	0.0	227.3	11.0	60.4	5	0.0	84.9	5
14	257.9	40	0.0	173.2	0.0	96.2	62.8	29.2	2	0.0	35.8	12
15	224.1	35	0.0	16.0	0.0	174.9	30.0	25.2	2	0.0	44.1	27
16	105.2	16	84.4	0.0	0.0	267.8	27.7	68.3	4	18.3	108.9	5
21	160.0	25	0.0	0.0	0.0	247.0	30.0	63.9	26	0.0	74.4	5
22	0.0	0	0.7	65.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	18.5	3
23	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.0	1	0.0	5.0	3
24	198.6	31	0.0	0.0	0.0	239.9	57.1	18.0	3	38.3	131.2	17
25	78.0	12	0.0	40.0	0.0	26.7	10.0	0.0	0	63.0	13.4	7
26	38.4	6	40.0	47.2	0.0	30.0	11.6	31.2	9	0.0	10.3	0
27	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	229.7	11.0	36.9	6	0.0	0.0	0
28	40.0	6	3.1	76.9	256.0	277.0	26.0	1.0	1	0.0	0.0	0
32	188.8	43	0.0	0.0	0.0	281.3	37.6	60.3	4	0.0	4.4	0
33	142.3	22	0.0	0.0	0.0	603.7	0.5	10.6	0	0.0	4.7	0
34	78.6	12	70.9	0.0	0.0	466.4	3.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0
35	408.3	64	72.3	49.6	0.0	320.0	33.4	55.2	5	0.0	0.0	55
36	59.2	9	34.6	0.0	0.0	231.1	27.7	14.9	1	0.0	0.0	0
TOT	4467.5	N/A	425.1		390.6		981.2	552.9	83	285.2		275
				1055.5		5650.5					1330.2	

1,871.2

7,184.6

1,891.2

LAKE ELMO ACRI COMPARISON:

	ACRES IN CURRENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:	ACRES IN CURRENT ZONING DISTRICT MAP:	ACTUAL CURRENT EXISTING USAGE:	ACRES NEEDED TO MEET THE PROPOSED POP. FCST. FOR THE YEAR 2000 - 6,400:	ACRES IN PROPOSED FUTURE LAND USE MAP:	ACRES IN PROPOSED ZONING DISTRICT MAP:
AGRICULTURAL (AG)	0	1,871	7,427	0	8,443	~7,500
RURAL RESIDENTIAL (R-R)	6,730 (Gen Rural Use)	7,185	2,246	0	1,902	~2,200
RESIDENTIAL (R-1)	3,145 (Residential)	1,891 (447 units \equiv 2.2x; w/o Sects 32 & 33) (1,329 units \equiv 6.6x, w/ sects 32 & 33)	1,606	1,606	1,338 1,338 \rightarrow (313 units \equiv 1.6x, w/o Sects 32 & 33) (1,195 units \equiv 6.0x, w/ Sects 32 & 33)	~1,750
HIGH DEN RESIDENTIAL (R2, R3, R4)	760	195 (Cimarron)	195 (Cimarron)	195 (Cimarron)	372 (Cimarron and Sects 32 & 33)	195
BUSINESS (GB, HB, CB)	745 (9.9x)	216 (2.9x; w/o overlay and Sects 32 and 33) 1,035 (13.8x; with overlay) 509 (6.8x; w/ Sects 32 & 33)	216	75	97 (1.3x; w/o Sects 32 & 33) 390 (5.2x; w/ Sects 32 & 33)	~225
INDUSTRIAL (IND)	340	8	4	0	0	~4

TABLE B

POTENTIAL HOMESITES IN LAKE ELMO -- July, 1986

Sect.	R-1 Zoning District			R-R Zoning District			GRAND TOTALS		
	UNDEV.	PLATTED	TOTAL	UNDEV.	PLATTED	TOTAL	UNDEV.	PLATTED	TOTAL
1	0	0	0	36	0	36	36	0	36
2	0	0	0	39	4	43	39	4	43
3	0	16	16	18	1	19	18	17	35
4	59	23	82	3	5	8	62	28	90
5	0	14	14	0	0	0	0	14	14
8	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2
9	25	17	42	0	0	0	25	17	42
10	26	4	30	33	0	33	59	4	63
11	0	0	0	26	4	30	26	4	30
12	0	0	0	40	0	40	40	0	40
13	0	3	3	22	5	27	22	8	30
14	0	8	8	8	2	10	8	10	18
15	0	19	19	17	2	19	17	21	38
16	12	4	16	26	4	30	38	8	46
21	0	5	5	24	26	50	24	31	55
22	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2
23	0	2	2	0	1	1	0	3	3
24	25	14	39	15	3	18	40	17	57
25	42	5	47	2	0	2	44	5	49
26	0	0	0	3	9	12	3	9	12
27	0	0	0	21	6	27	21	6	27
28	0	0	0	26	1	27	26	1	27
32	0	0	0	25	4	29	25	4	29
33	0	0	0	60	0	60	60	0	60
34	0	0	0	46	0	46	0	0	46
35	0	36	36	32	5	37	32	41	73
36	0	0	0	8	1	9	8	1	9
TOTALS	189	174	363	530	83	613	719	257	976