

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

October 20, 1986

7:30 p.m. Meeting Convenes

1. Agenda
2. Minutes: September 22, 1986
September 29, 1986
3. New Metro Council Population Projections
4. Zoning Ordinance Revisions
 - A. Discussion of the Proposed Rezoning from RR to Ag
 - B. Revision of Proposed Zoning Map to Retain R-1 Zoning on 37 Acres West of Tartan Meadows

8:30 p.m. 5. Review of Comprehensive Plan Partial Draft

6. Other Business
7. Adjourn

APPROVED

LAKE ELMO PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

OCTOBER 20, 1986

Chairman Graves called the meeting to order at 7:33 p.m. in the City Council chambers. Present: Graves, Haacke, Moe, Novak, Williams, Reuther, Bucheck, DeLapp, Raleigh (arrived 8:22 p.m.). Absent: Hunt, Johnson

1. Agenda

Add: 6A. Annual Planning Institute

M/S/P Reuther/DeLapp - to approve the agenda for the October 20, 1986 Planning Commission meeting as amended. (Motion carried 7-0).

2. Minutes: September 22, 1986
September 29, 1986

M/S/P Reuther/Graves - to approve the September 22, 1986 Planning Commission minutes as presented. (Motion carried 7-0-1<Williams>).

M/S/P Haacke/Reuther - to approve the September 29, 1986 Planning Commission minutes as presented. (Motion carried 8-0)

3. New Metro Council Population Projections

In October of 1985, the Metro Council prepared housing, population and employment forecasts for the years 1990 and 2000 as part of their revised Metropolitan Development and Investment Framework (MDIF).

At that time, Metro Council statisticians forecast that the size of families would decrease in the future, from the current average of about 2.9 persons to a lower figure. Based in part on this lower rate for number of persons per household, the Metro Council staff devised housing and population forecasts. The Lake Elmo forecasts were as follows:

	Est. 1986	1990 Forecast	2000 Forecast
Housing Stock	1,935	2,100	2,300
Population	5,935	6,100	6,400

Revisions to the MDIF were made in April, 1986 and again in September, 1986. One of the most recent changes involved the Metro Council decision to raise the number of persons per household forecast for Lake Elmo. This change would start the rate at 3.06 persons per household in 1986 and gradually reduce the rate to 2.87 persons per household by the year 2000. The impact of this rate change is found in the forecasted population

change. More persons per household means more new residents per new house. The housing forecast was unchanged, but the population forecast changes as follows:

	<u>Est. 1986</u>	<u>1990 Forecast</u>	<u>2000 Forecast</u>
Housing Stock	1,935	2,100	2,300
Population	5,935	6,200 (+100)	6,600 (+200)

The net result is 200 more persons in Lake Elmo in the year 2000. This would mean approximately 66 more new houses, if you assume that family size stays at or near 3.00 persons per household.

Chairman Graves felt that the increase of 100 to 200 residents, who are actually being located in the same number of houses, would not have a significant impact on any of their planning. Commissionmember Novak explained that the proposed Future Land Use Map is based on available residential units which translates into population. If they are just changing the number of bodies in a house, it should not affect anything we have done today.

M/S/P DeLapp/Williams - to adopt for planning purposes the Metro Council's revised population and housing size forecasts. (Motion carried 8-0).

4. Zoning Ordinance Revisions

A. Discussion of the Proposed Rezoning from RR to Ag

The purpose of this discussion was for the individual members of the City Council to give the Planning Commission additional direction on the kind of zoning revisions they could support or would like to see adopted.

Chairman Graves thought the general concept was to put the land in a form that would leave it as rural in flavor and utilization as is possible. Leave it most protected so if there comes a time we want to change the utilization of this property it can be done most effectively with the best planning. Leaving it in RR would offer the best protection for a rural environment at this time rather than going Agricultural. The reason being that RR land has more restrictions as to the type of development that can be put on it or the way it can be utilized. Also, if the land is RR and it is subdivided into ten, twenty or fifty acre parcels there would be more property owners on a given 1,000 acre tract than there would be if there were four farmers each having 250 acres. If one farmer sold, it would be easier to put in a substantial development or change the utilization of that property than if a developer had to come in and talk to forty different individual property owners.

Councilman Christ started out the discussion with his thought that it wasn't necessary to do massive downzoning. Christ added that Rural Residential zoning does have restrictions that will not put the City into jeopardy and he does support reducing the density in cluster development from seven homes to four. However, he did bring up a problem with no transfer of density. For example, if you took an individual that had 160 acres of which are four-forties, you would have two forties on the road and possibly two forties in the back with no road access. If he would elect to not farm anymore and want to sell that property, you would have a problem with restrictions on length and width and road frontage. With no transfer of density, he would only be able to subdivide a forty into three lots because of the length and width. Christ felt that in certain cases it would be appropriate if we would look into transfer of density.

Tom Armstrong explained that in past discussions, it was talked about putting homes on three small lots and a fourth one. The fourth lot on the forty need not be rectangular in shape as long as it consumes the rest of the parcel. This would allow four lots per forty. It also was noted that the back lots would not be able to be sold, except to someone that wanted to buy a large parcel. This way you would get a mix.

Marge Williams found through her real estate experiences when people are buying large lots they do not want to be on a County road, one house off of it or want close cluster development. Williams found problems with clustering three or four homes right together on a cul-de-sac and having all that acreage out there behind it. Marge felt this was like saying we are going to allow Rural Residential living, but you live as though you are in Oakdale.

Chairman Graves stated that part of the reason for allowing a large part of the forty to remain undeveloped because that way a person might want a horse or other activity of a rural nature. This way they could sell off the front part of the forty and put them in a position where they can afford to do what they want with the back half. Another concept Graves brought up was instead of 1 1/2 acre lots in RR land, permit transfer of density where the minimum lot size would be five acres. For example, take 160 acres and put 16 houses, with 5 acres a piece, would be eighty acres. This would be larger lot sizes and you would not have the defacto R-1 zoning.

City Administrator Overby explained that the Metro Council prefers that communities with rural areas limit density to four homes per forty and they don't like cluster development because that could be something leaning to urban-scale development later with demand for services. The Metro Council describes Rural Residential as a permanent zoning classification and applies it to wooded, hilly and other areas that could not be cultivated. In our case it would be agricultural areas and other "open space" areas, because we take in a much larger land type than what they limit it to.

Councilman Christ ended the discussion feeling comfortable that the Planning Commission had thought out the transfer of density very well and he had no additional problems. Graves did ask how the Council felt about permitting transfer of density, but where you have a larger minimum lot size requirement as a compromise. DeLapp felt this would work in a lot of cases and 5 acres versus 10 acres isn't that much when you still have another 20 acre parcel sitting there. Christ added that when you have excessive wetlands in an area, it might be conducive in allowing a five acre versus a ten to get four lots spread out nicely with a ponding area. This issue will be discussed at the next Planning Commission meeting.

Councilwoman Armstrong asked "How did you reach the conclusions that are proposed, aside from the statistics"? At the joint meeting in August, the general trend that the Planning Commission was going on was presented. The purpose was to find out the directions that the City Council would support. Graves was left with the impression that the City Council was supportive of a general and further massive downzoning of land. This was the direction that the Planning Commission took. Graves asked the Council for clarification if this is not the direction they want the commission to take.

Marge Williams felt there were arguments on both sides of the issue. For downzoning, we are going along with the Metropolitan Council forecasts, taking more land out of usage for building, essentially lowering our population projections and keeping it low density. Therefore, downzoning it from RR to Ag means there would be fewer houses being built. The problem, in about 20 years, you have massive amounts of land which can be available for high density development because it would be easier in the future for a developer to come in. Williams felt what needed to be determined was what do we want for the City in the future, not just 5 or 10 years down the road.

Novak expressed his feelings for keeping and retaining large open spaces which would be equally just as much a deterrent to allow sewer to come in. The City has fought long and hard and has managed successfully to keep sewer out. If sewer were to come in, it would have to go through the SW corner of the City and traverse 2-3 miles before it came to the first home. This would have a devastating effect on all that land we tried so hard to keep open.

As the primary author of the Future Land Use map, Novak felt there was clearly an overall strategy that was followed. Key assumptions that were made: want to retain our open spaces; clearly reflects progressive growth--it allows six times as many residential units as the 1979 Comprehensive Plan states we need; it represents limited expansion of police and fire; it provides for growth from the Old Village and the Tri-Lakes area outward. By putting all the land that is shown in blue in Agriculture, they reserve that for five or ten years and there was nothing stated

that they cannot change their minds in the future. Novak believes that the Agricultural category is much more restrictive and protective than Rural Residential.

Bruce Dunn asked Novak for what is he reserving this land? Novak would like the City to retain its open spaces, but this doesn't mean a gravel pit, dump or high density housing. If they are going to institute alternative Ag uses, Novak saw no need for the rezoning action if you don't have any agricultural and/or small amounts of it. Novak defined open spaces as the Regional Park and 4 sq. miles in the SW corner of the City which should be preserved.

Commissionmember Novak explained their land use summary to Councilman Mazzara. There are 363 (174 platted and 189 undeveloped) available 1 1/2 acre lots in the City. This number has to be qualified because the biggest part of the number comes from the Washington County records and they may not be current, possibly up to 12 months out-of-date. Also, Linda Larson's nine RR lots are not reflected in these numbers so there are some homes that have been missed. City Administrator Overby added that this shows the relative quantity of potential building sites compared to the number of people that might come in during a period.

Councilman Mazzara felt there have been some good, well-planned developments in the City since 1979, and they are not a burden on the City. He added that there is Ag land that should be encouraged to be kept in Ag, but there is also land that is not good Ag which could be developed and should not be prohibited from doing so by being zoned Ag. Mazzara gave Lake Elmo Heights and down on Minnehaha by the Hammes' property as potential areas for nice development.

Steve DeLapp asked what can be done for Highway 36 and 94? Mazzara felt that the I-94 Overlay district set criteria and boundaries which should be used as a guideline for the City. There should be enough restrictions or standards that should be set up for the good of the City.

A suggestion was made by Tom Armstrong to change some of the areas zoned RR to Ag up around the "old landfill". This would be a wise choice, because this is a questionable area for building houses. Agricultural uses could be encouraged around the potential landfill in the Regional Park when there is a possibility of pollution.

Bruce Dunn felt that RR has been a good holding zone for years, and he doesn't see that the massive rezoning to Ag is going to do anything but irritate people. Dunn felt if somebody had a plan for their piece of land they would come in and ask for it to be rezoned, irrespective if it is RR or Ag. The City Council would respond to this request without regard to what the zoning was. Dunn stated that we should plan for the potential landfill, because the only way we can stop it is on an environmental-basis so Ag does look good in those areas.

Steve Raleigh brought up a concern regarding residential development around the airport. These parcels are the most successfully farmed areas in the City. Dunn responded that the Met Council does have recommendations on land use within a certain radius of the airport and this should be taken into account.

Williams talked to the Attorney General regarding the airport situation and found if you do leave this Ag, you essentially are saying it is less of a problem to expand an airport because there are fewer people and homes and therefore a good area to expand an airport. When Marge talked to a County Commissioner he replied that, had there been some RR development near the current landfill site, it would not have gone through. The more rural it is, the less it will affect anybody. Graves felt that RR could be used as a basis for holding it as potential development; yet without putting a development in.

Tom Armstrong brought up that if it is zoned RR and someone came in with a subdivision, you have no choice. RR is not a holding zone for RR development, because if the subdivision meets the subdivision requirements it should be approved.

An objection Rose Armstrong raised was when leaving land in Ag there is a potential of a "monster" falling into it, for example, the Regional Park with a proposed landfill in it. Armstrong believes that RR will tie it up and 10 acre lots are open space.

Chairman Graves summarized that Dunn, Armstrong, and Mazzara felt that there is nothing to be gained by downzoning from RR to Ag. Armstrong clarified that she didn't mean everywhere. Christ felt that RR has worked for us and suggested leaving it as it is. He would be open to valid reasons for putting RR land into Ag, but could not live with the rationale, "just because we do not need this property, therefore it is going to Ag". He expressed no desire to upgrade anything, but doesn't necessarily feel we need to downzone as proposed. Graves summarized, in general, the consensus of the City Council was to not downzone nearly as drastically as has been proposed. They could not support that action at this time, even with the information that was presented. The City Council would prefer seeing most of the land left in its current zoning.

DeLapp stated that any type of housing near a gas pipeline or powerlines should not be encouraged, but it would be a good place to raise corn. Graves did not feel this was wise planning because it was strip zoning. This would say that farmers can only farm this piece of land or hold it only for Ag purposes inspite of the fact you cannot grow weeds on it. In this case, you are telling them you can only use the land for Ag when it is not suited for it.

Chairman Graves had no concern with showing the Future Land Use map with a large Ag area, but feels it is a mistake downzoning that much RR land to Ag at this time, so the two maps would not

look the same.

M/S/P Graves/Haacke - to reconsider the proposed rezoning map (Motion carried 8-1 <Novak: if they do not reflect the principles of each other, it makes the Future Land Use map a benign document).

By a show of hands the Planning Commission was in favor of downzoning the area bounded on the West by 13, on the South by 10 and the North and East by the Regional Park to Ag from RR. Williams wanted to see it continuing beyond 13 where it is Ag and Ag Preserve.

The entire area (turquoise blue) bounded on the South by Downs Lake and on the North by Highway 5 should be downzoned to Ag. Williams and Bucheck voiced their concerns on the water and noise problems.

Novak commented on the NE Quadrant. It is 5 square miles, 53% of it is Green Acres and when you add Ag land it adds up to 63%, add to that RR land that is farmed, it comes up to 80-85% Ag land. On the prime soils map it is prime Ag soil. By a show of hands Novak, DeLapp and Raleigh were in favor of downzoning to Ag and Williams abstained from the vote. The majority were opposed to this downzoning.

M/S/P Haacke/Moe - to rezone from RR to Ag the above discussed areas (See Proposed Rezoning Map Appendix A) and retain the areas as currently zoned on the map that was previously accepted. (Motion carried 8-1 <Novak>).

B. Revision of Proposed Zoning Map to Retain R-1
Zoning on 37 Acres West of Tartan Meadows

There are 37 acres located west of the Tartan Meadows subdivision which is currently zoned R-1. This parcel and the land which became Tartan Meadows was all rezoned to R-1 several years ago for a proposed housing development on the 80-acre site. Due to financial problems, only the eastern 40 acres were platted and are currently being developed. There was a proposal in 1982 to downzone the western 40 acres from R-1 to RR. The City Council decided against doing so. Now, the developer of Tartan Meadows (Willard Morton) indicates that he is preparing preliminary plat information for eventual review by the City on this 37-acre parcel of land. Mr. Morton wants to develop approximately 19 homes on this site.

There was some question whether the developer (Mr. Morton) has an option or clear title on these 37 acres.

M/S/P Graves/Haacke - to reconsider the zoning on the 37-acre parcel west of Tartan Meadows. (Motion carried 8-1 <DeLapp>).

This 37-acre parcel on the west end of Tartan Meadows was acted upon previously by the Planning Commission to downzone from R-1 to

Ag, but it is currently zoned R-1. It is already zoned Ag on two sides of the property.

Buccheck stated her reason for wanting RR zoning was because it is R-1 there, Ag zoning is around it, and RR would be a buffer zone.

M/S/F Novak/DeLapp - to rezone the 37-acre parcel west of Tartan Meadows in Section 25 from R-1 zoning to RR zoning. (Motion failed 4-5).

M/S/F Buccheck/Moe - to rezone the 37-acre parcel west of Tartan Meadows in Section to R1 zoning (Motion failed 4-4-1<Buccheck>. DeLapp doesn't want R1 by Ag.

Haacke expressed her view of a buffer zone was more like spot zoning and is totally inappropriate to put RR in the middle. Graves stated they are granting a zoning nobody wants.

5. Review of Comprehensive Plan Partial Draft


City Administrator Overby presented a draft of the revised 1986 Comprehensive Plan for the Planning Commission's consideration. Comments that the Planning Commission members may have should be brought into the office by Thursday morning in order to be in the Planning Commission meeting packets.

6. A. Annual Planning Institute

There will be an Annual Planning Institute for planning commissioners and elected officials held on December 12 (Friday) and January 21 (Wednesday) at the Earle Brown Center. Planning Commission members that are interested should send in their registration, and they will be reimbursed by the City.

M/S/P Moe/Reuther - to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 10:30 p.m. (Motion carried 9-0).

Planning Commission Revised Recommendation
 PROPOSED REZONING - October 20, 1986 Draft

R1 to RR 
 RR to Ag 