

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

SEPTEMBER 22, 1986

7:30 p.m.

#### MEETING CONVENES

1. Agenda
2. Minutes: September 8, 1986
3. Revisions to the Proposed Future Land Use Map and Proposed Zoning Map
  - A. Springborn "Green Acres" Subdivision
  - B. Metro Urban Service Area (Sections 32-33)
4. Local Ordinance Revisions
  - A. Approve Draft Amendment to the Agricultural Zoning District to Allow Alternative Uses
  - B. Consider Draft Amendment to Change the Process for Appointing and Re-appointing Parks and Planning Commission Members
  - C. Consider Draft Amendment to the Rural Residential Zoning District to Limit the Number of Homes When Clustering to 4 Homes Per 40 Acres; and to Eliminate the Transfer of Housing Densities.
  - D. Other
5. Adjourn

APPROVED

LAKE ELMO PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 22, 1986

Chairman Graves called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:31 p.m. in the City Council chambers. Present: Graves, Haacke, Moe, Novak, Raleigh, Reuther, Bucheck, DeLapp, and City Administrator Overby. Absent: Williams

1. Agenda

Delete: 4B. Consider Draft Amendment to Change the Process for Appointing and Re-appointing Parks and Planning Commission Members because this does not have direct bearing on the moratorium and extra items should not be added to the agenda. Raleigh and Novak felt the appointments to the Planning Commission is the responsibility of the City Council. Graves felt it was an appropriate item for the Planning Commission to clarify, but should come up at another time.

M/S/P DeLapp/Raleigh - to delete 4B. Consider Draft Amendment to Change the Process for Appointing and Re-Appointing Parks and Planning Commission members on the September 22, 1986 agenda. (Motion carried 6-1<Haacke>).

M/S/P Raleigh/Haacke - to approve the September 22, 1986 Planning Commission agenda as amended. (Motion carried 8-0).

City Administrator Overby reminded the Planning Commission of the Joint Meeting with the City Council and the public hearing for consideration of the Moratorium Extension scheduled for Monday, September 29, 1986 at 7:30 p.m.

Chairman Graves explained that the Planning Commission will have to reschedule the October 13, 1986 meeting date because it falls on Columbus Day which is a holiday. The Planning Commission will meet at 7:30 p.m. on Monday, October 20th and Monday, October 27th, 1986.

2. Minutes: September 8, 1986

M/S/P Reuther/DeLapp - to approve the September 8, 1986 Planning Commission minutes as amended. (Motion carried 8-0-1<Abstain: Bucheck>).

3. Revisions to the Proposed Future Land Use Map and Proposed Zoning Map

A. Springborn "Green Acres" Subdivision

City Administrator Overby informed the Commission that the Springborn Green Acres Subdivision concept plan and preliminary plat were approved in 1978. On this basis, the Springborn property should remain in the R-1 future land use and zoning designation.

M/S/P Moe/Graves - to approve changing the proposed Future Land Use map and the proposed zoning map to indicate that the Springborn "Green Acres" development is an R-1 area. (Motion carried 8-0).

B. Metro Urban Service Area (Sections 32-33)

City Administrator Overby suggested that it was not prudent to "upzone" this area and allow numerous types of permitted uses that are part of a General Business or Highway Business zoning district. The recommended procedure is to leave this area in its current zoning (Rural Residential) until such time when a landowner or developer applies for rezoning.

Steve Raleigh stated that he would like a chance to review the package and give an opinion on the overall use.

M/S/P DeLapp/Novak - to approve changing the proposed zoning map adopted at the 9-8-86 Planning Commission meeting to indicate that the current zoning for that part of Lake Elmo that is within the MUSA (Sections 32-33) be retained as Rural Residential. (Motion carried 8-0).

4. Local Ordinance Revisions

A. Approve Draft Amendment to the Agricultural Zoning District to Allow Alternative Uses.

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to be in favor of permitted non-agricultural uses for the Agricultural land. Based on this, the following Ag uses were proposed and the rationale for conditions in alternate use CUPs are stated. (See Appendix A and B).

City Attorney Knaak had stated that he liked what Tom Armstrong suggested and it was just a matter of incorporating them where you want.

Commissioners Raleigh and DeLapp wanted to eliminate the long skinny lots and encourage straight boundaries. There was some

concerns of noise and odor pollution and the setback requirements from adjacent R-1 through R-4 district. The main goal of permitting these uses is to try to allow someone to permanently keep their land in Agricultural.

M/S/P Moe/Haacke - to accept the local ordinance on Agricultural Districts. (Motion carried 8-0).

M/S/P Raleigh/Reuther - to amend the above motion to add as 6A. All of the landowners contiguous real estate within the City must be zoned agricultural and be included within the granted CUP. (Motion carried 8-0).

M/S/P Moe/Haacke - to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 10:05 p.m. (Motion carried 8-0).

## APPENDIX B

### RATIONALE FOR CONDITIONS IN ALTERNATE USE CUP:

The reasoning behind the various limitations placed in alternate use CUPS is as follows:

1. The limitation of area being no more than  $1\frac{1}{2}$  acres per 40 acres is taken from the one house per 40 requirement of the zoning code. While the alternative CUP does not limit the one house per 40 rule, it adopts as an equivalency that area for nonagricultural use. Transfer of density is allowed up to 4 units or a total of 6 acres. Six acres should be sufficient for any nonagricultural use.
2. The requirement that the landowner own and operate the business and live on the contiguous real estate was adopted for the purpose of assuring that minimal police protection will be required for any nonagricultural use. A business in a rural area is much harder to police than a business in a built-up area. Requiring the landowner to be the owner and operator gives him a vested interest in the safety of the business. Requiring that person to live on the premises assures that patrolling by police in off duty hours will not be necessary.
3. The rationale behind outside storage of 150 square feet or one vehicle for every 2.5 acres is based on densities in RR zones and R1 zones. The average household has two automobiles and possibly one boat or RV. At a density of four per 40 in RR this would be 12 vehicles per 40. This is probably a conservative number. In R1, using a density of approximately 20 houses per 40 this would be a conservative number of 60 vehicles. Since the purpose of alternate use is to allow uses of the property in addition to that which would normally occur on a one-per-40 basis, the adoption of 16 vehicles per 40 is a liberal application of the approximate number that would be found in an RR zoned area.  
  
The use of 150 square feet as the equivalent of a vehicle is fair in that it represents a space 7.5 feet wide by 20 feet long. This area would be large for a car or truck but small for an RV or larger boat.
4. The 200-foot setback would assure that any business usage would be further back than the normal house setback line and far enough from the road so that screening would be more effective.
5. The other requirements that there be no signs, paved parking areas, no exterior lighting and only agricultural style buildings are in line with the intention with the ordinance to maintain a rural atmosphere and the appearance of an agriculture area.