

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 27, 1986

7:30 p.m. Meeting Convenes

1. Agenda
2. Minutes: October 20, 1986 (to be handed out)
3. Site Plan and Building Review:  
DC Sales Company
4. Zoning Ordinance Revisions
  - A. Revised Amendment to Industrial Park District
  - B. Amendment to Rural Residential District,  
Clustered Development Standards
  - C. Amendment to Rural Residential District,  
Minimum District Requirements
  - D. Amendment to Agricultural District,  
Minimum District Requirements
5. Review of Comprehensive Plan - Partial Draft
  - A. Chapters I, II, III, IV
  - B. Chapter V: Appendix A - Population  
Appendix B - Housing
6. Other Business
7. Adjourn

NOTE: The next Planning Commission meeting on Monday, November 10, 1986 will include the Public Hearing for the 1986 Comprehensive Plan and Ordinance Amendments.

APPROVED

LAKE ELMO PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

OCTOBER 27, 1986

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

1. Agenda

Add: 3B. Federal Land Company, 6A. Proposed Alternate uses for Ag Zoning

M/S/P Moe/Raleigh - to approve the agenda for the October 27, 1986 Planning Commission meeting as amended. (Motion carried 9-0).

2. Minutes: October 20, 1986

M/S/P Moe/Haacke - to table the October 20, 1986 Planning Commission minutes. (Motion carried 9-0).

3. Site Plan and Building Review: DC Sales Company

The DC Sales Company, represented by Jon Ruggieri, Dean & Greg Dovolis, wishes to construct a 17,000 square foot addition to its building located at 9242 Hudson Boulevard. The intent of this addition is to be used as a warehouse for their products. The site is currently zoned General Business, and the owner has occupied the building for several years along with two tenants, White Wolf Ski Shop and BRS, Inc. The proposed building addition will meet the expansion needs of DC Sales and the White Wolf Company.

City Engineer Bohrer has reviewed the proposed addition onto the DC Sales Building for conformity to the City Code and offered the following comments in his letter of October 27, 1986:

1. The property is zoned General Business. The retail and warehouse activities proposed are allowed in the GB zone. The abutting property to the west is zoned GB; the abutting property to the north and east is zoned Rural Residential.

The applicants stated that warehousing will take 70% of the space and the remaining 30% will be office and over-the-counter sales of heating and air conditioning equipment. Novak reviewed the permitted uses in GB and found warehousing is not permitted. It was pointed out that storage of products for retail and wholesale sales is allowed in the GB Zone.

2. Lot size is 5.16 acres, of which 0.57 acres is right-of-way for the frontage road, leaving 4.59 acres. Minimum lot size in the GB zone is 1.5 acres.
3. Access to the site is by the North Frontage Road of I-94.

Application for driveway permit must be obtained from MnDOT.

The applicants contacted MnDOT, who have no recordings of an easement being placed on this property. MnDOT believes this was a temporary easement set in place back in 1979 and the County has not vacated that easement on there records. Also, MnDOT stated that they had no plans to do any additional substantial work in that portion along DC Sales frontage. If they did, they would not go any further to the north.

4. This property is in the Cottage Grove Ravine Water Management Organization; therefore, rate and volume must be controlled. The site plan provides a holding pond between the parking lot and the frontage road. The storage volume provided meets the City's requirements and the 1% rule.
5. The overflow from the pond will enter the ditch and drainage system provided by MnDOT.
6. Bohrer understands the existing septic system will be replaced because of the location of the new addition. There is sufficient area in the rear of the building for two separate drainfield sites. This system cannot yet be designed, because soil tests cannot be run until the grading in the rear of the property is completed. After soil tests can be completed, the septic system must be designed and submitted to the Building Official for review based on 20 gallons per employee per day plus some allowance for customers.

The applicants have provided the City with a soils report. Bohrer has made preliminary investigation and verbally told the applicants that he found the soil suitable for the drainfield.

Marge Williams felt that adequacy of septic systems when ownership changes should be a future work plan item. The City Administrator agreed, and will note this as a future work plan item.

7. Based on the 6,300 square feet of retail floor space shown on the floor plan and Section 301.070 D.7.(5) of the City Code, 51 parking spaces are required. The applicant proposes to construct 40 spaces now and reserve an area for 48 more spaces for the future.

Mr. Dovolis explained the reason why they didnt go with the 51 parking spaces was because the White Wolf Company feels that too large a parking lot makes a business look bad (parking lot up-front with a few cars). If the demand dictates, they will add the additional parking spaces.

Marge Williams stated she would rather see fewer parking places, considering if they are not going to be used, because of extra water runoff into ponding areas from this large asphalt parking lot. After polling the Planning Commission, an interpretation was that the plan met the parking ordinance. The purpose is to keep cars off the street.

8. The new addition meets all of the required setbacks. The existing building is only 4.5 feet from the east property line where 20 feet is required. This is considered an existing non-conformance.

Section 301.070, D.7.d., of the City Code provides that where a GB zone abuts a residential zone, a 35 foot landscaped buffer strip is to be provided. This would apply along the east property line. This cannot be met because the site plan proposed a driveway within 13 feet of the property line.

The applicants responded to this by approaching it in more logical fashion considering the restraints. They came up with a dual entry at each end, east and west. This is the safest and most efficient parking arrangement one can have.

9. The landscaping plan shows the site will be restored with a combination of seeding, sodding and plantings.
10. Section 1504.010 of the City Code requires screening where business use abuts a residential zone (along the east side) and at loading docks (along the west side).

Novak would be much more in favor of giving up parking places in a buffer areas. City Administrator Overby stated the issue is if the addition does not make it more non-conforming, then the addition should be approved. Whether you can do anything to change the loading dock area can be addressed under non-conformity. Graves encourages the people to provide for heavier screening not only in front, but along the backside of the structure.

11. The exterior finish is proposed to be painted concrete to match existing finish. Some pre-finished metal panels and awnings will be used for accents. The Highway Overlay Zoning District does not permit painted block as an allowable exterior finish.

Graves asked if the City Administrator would check out how the exterior finish is addressed in the Highway Overlay Zoning District.

M/S/P Moe/Haacke - to recommend approval by the City Council of the DC Sales Site Plan and Building Review as presented contingent upon the following conditions if they may need variances: a letter from MnDOT stating a road easement was recorded, exterior finish of painted block being approved, screening made around the total east and north side, obtaining the driveway permit from MnDOT, actual final approval of perking out of the septic system, and meeting the landscaping requirements and 35' buffer zone requirements. (Motion carried 9-1<Novak: has problems with making non-conforming use more non-conforming and sooner or later we will have to start enforcing our code or let it go>)

B. Federal Land Company Proposal

Several years ago, the Federal Land Company filed an application for Planned Unit Development at Cty Rd 19 and the Interstate Hwy which was tabled because the highway plans were not firmed up. Now that these plans are firmed, the Federal Land Company is asking this application be taken off the table and considered. Graves acknowledged the request and told the applicant that this application could be considered in the early part of 1987.

4. Zoning Ordinance Revisions

A. Revised Amendment to Industrial Park District

At the meeting of September 29, 1986, the Planning Commission reaffirmed its desire to retain the existing industrial uses in the Industrial Park district. All other new uses would not be permitted. The City Administrator was asked to revise the ordinance amendment. City Administrator Overby presented the revised amendment for the Planning Commission consideration. Novak asked if this issue has been reviewed by the City Attorney because Attorney Knaak had some concerns about it. Overby replied that Knaak has not seen the draft as such.

M/S/P Raleigh/DeLapp to accept the revised Industrial Park Zoning district ordinance amendment. (Motion carried 9-0).

B. Amendment to Rural Residential District,  
Clustered Development Standards

At the October 20th Planning Commission meeting, the City Administrator was asked to prepare a draft amendment to the R-R zoning district ordinance to include language which would allow the transfer of housing densities with lot sizes of at least 5 acres. City Administrator Overby presented the proposed amendment to the Rural Residential District, Clustered Development Standards.

Novak was not in favor of upping the acreage size on clustered R-R development to 5 acre minimum, but would like it remain 1 1/2 to 2 acres. Novak stated he does not like 1 home on 5 acres or 1 home on 10 acres.

City Administrator Overby asked where do you want this to happen in Lake Elmo: contiguous to R-1 or do you want it spread all over. By a show of hands a minimum lot size of 5 acres was preferred, and no transfer of density allowed. The language of E(4) will be changed according to September 29th minutes: E(4) All new lots created by the clustered development within each 40 acre parcel or part thereof, shall be contiguous. The transfer of housing densities between forty (40) acre parcels or part thereof, shall be prohibited.

M/S/P Novak/Raleigh - to approve the amended Rural Residential

District, Clustered Development Standards with modification of E(4). (Motion carried 9-0).

C. Amendment to Rural Residential District,  
Minimum District Requirements

At the Planning Commission meeting of September 29, 1986, the City Administrator was asked to prepare a draft ordinance amendment to the Rural Residential zoning district which would incorporate the desired 3:1 ratio of lot dimensions. City Administrator Overby presented the proposed ordinance amendment for their review.

The Planning Commission suggested changing the minimum district requirements to : (7) all lots must be rectangular in shape and any two adjacent sides must have an aspect ratio not exceeding 4:1.

M/S/P Haacke/Graves - to accept the amended Rural Residential District, Minimum District Requirements as modified. (Motion carried 8-1-1<Buckheck: The 4:1 ratio didn't sound bad and would like to consider it further> Abstain: Williams

D. Amendment to Agricultural District,  
Minimum District Requirements

At the Planning Commission meeting of September 29, 1986, the City Administrator was asked to prepare a draft ordinance amendment to the Agricultural zoning district which would incorporate the desired 3:1 ratio of lot dimensions. City Administrator Overby presented the proposed ordinance amendment.

City Administrator Overby pointed out that this would apply to the area where you would put the farm dwelling. Graves replied that this applies to the one lot which has a 40 acre minimum so you don't need a 3:1 aspect ratio. Since you cannot have 3:1 ratio on 40, he didn't see any purpose of considering this.

M/S/P Buckheck/Graves - to reject the proposed amendment to Agricultural District, Minimum district Requirements. (Motion carried 9-0).

5. Review of Comprehensive Plan - Partial Draft

- A. Chapters I, II, III, IV
- B. Chapter V: Appendix A - Population  
Appendix B - Housing

City Administrator Overby had presented the Partial Draft of Chapters I-IV at the last Planning Commission meeting and asked for any corrections or additions.

Page 1:

This was done in order to take into account the slower growth rate

and smaller family sizes forecasted for the next ~~fifteen~~ fourteen years. Also, the City believes that new development in Lake Elmo must be carefully regulated in terms of location and density to prevent the premature demand for costly levels of municipal services.

Page 2:

...for growth and change during the next ~~fifteen~~ fourteen years.

The City is committed to following this plan in order to achieve and maintain the type of community that is desired by the ~~people-residents~~ (and local elected officials. Amended 11-10-86)

Page 3:

These issues are not necessarily listed in order of rank or priority. However, it is logical to first consider what kind of local community is envisioned for Lake Elmo, since the entire plan is ~~(or should be)~~

Add: ....based on economics, but also on the broader image of Lake Elmo as continuing as a rural residential community with large lots and low density development

...(Much of which is ~~still~~ cultivated)

Page 4:

Add: Lake Elmo provides services to other residents of the State, Washington County, and Hennepin County. Included in these services are an airport safety zone, interstate freeway, state and county roads, access to several city lakes, a major regional park, a corporate recreational park, gas pipelines, high voltage power lines, and a railroad mainline. None of these services were built by or at the request of the City. However, they are accepted as an integral part of the city's infrastructure. Other services, such as business and entertainment establishments, governmental facilities are restricted to those which benefit the local residents.

...providing alternatives to those wishing to maintain their farms, yet needing additional source of incomes other than farming.

Page 5:

Commission member Don Moe felt that there was no need for alternate Ag uses because we are not downzoning as much land to Ag as originally proposed. The reason we went to alternative uses was to give the people that we were downzoning a chance to do something with their property and at this time there is no need for it. Raleigh explained his reason in favor of the Alternate

uses was as long as the Comprehensive Plan and City Ordinances allows anyone to enjoy the priviledgs of an Ag zone, that they also be allowed the alternative uses.

M/S/P Raleigh/DeLapp - to keep the proposed Alternate Ag Uses. (Motion carried 8-1<Moe>).

Page 11:

Add: The Planning Commission, as a body, represents a cross-section of the community both geographically, economically and philosophically.

Page 13:

(b) Commercial and ~~industrial~~ uses that preserve the "open space" and are compatible with agricultural operations will be allowed.

(c) ~~An expensive level of urban services will not be provided by the City over the next ten to fifteen years.~~ Service levels will be aimed at satisfying the needs of rural and agricultural land uses.

Growth must be controlled because there are no plans to provide urabn services beyond the MUSA line during the planning period, and because residential development poses many problems for rural areas.

Page 14:

(e) Multi-unit residential developments in R4 zones will be permitted in areas within the MUSA zone.

Page 15:

Although there will continue to be a need for commercial operations they should serve the community and should be carefully evaluated to avoid.....

Page 28:

...2,494 acre feet landfill facility.

M/S/P Raleigh/Graves - to adopt the Comprehensive Plan as amended. (Motion carried 8-1<Moe: Alternate Ag Uses are not needed>).

M/S/P Moe/Buccheck - to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 10:50 p.m. (Motion carried 9-0).