

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

DECEMBER 22, 1986

- 7:30 p.m. MEETING CONVENES
1. Agenda
 2. Minutes: December 8, 1986
- 7:45 p.m. 3. PUBLIC HEARING: Request for Rezoning from Industrial to General Business, SE corner of TH5 and Laverne Avenue N.; Richard J. Kosman, 3828 Lake Elmo Avenue N.
- 8:15 p.m. 4. PUBLIC HEARING: Request for Preliminary Plat Approval of a three-lot subdivision (Lots 790-811, 836-865, and 894-942, Lanes DeMontreville Country Club Addition) at 8151 Hill Trail North, John Hanner.
5. Adjourn

APPROVED

LAKE ELMO PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

DECEMBER 8, 1986

Chairman Graves called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers. Present: Graves, Haacke, Moe, DeLapp, Bucheck, Novak, Reuther, Williams, Raleigh, Johnson, Hunt, City Attorney Knaak and City Administrator Overby.

1. Agenda

Add 2A. Scheduling of December 22, 1987 Planning Commission Meeting, 6B. Update on Overlay District.

M/S/P Moe/Raleigh - to approve the December 8, 1986 City Council agenda as ammended. (Motion carried 9-0).

2. Minutes: November 24, 1986

M/S/P Moe/Haacke - to approve the November 24, 1986 City Council minutes as presented. (Motion carried 9-0).

A. Scheduling of December 22, 1986 Planning Commission Meeting

Chairman Graves asked if the December 22, 1986 meeting could be cancelled. Because of two public hearings already scheduled, the meeting cannot be cancelled. It was then suggested to limit the agenda to only these two items.

M/S/P Williams/Graves - to limit the December 22, 1986 Planning Commission meeting agenda to the two public hearings already scheduled. (Motion carried 9-0).

3. Site and Building Plan Review: Brooks' Superette
(tabled from the 11-24-86 meeting)

This subject was discussed at the last meeting (11/24/86). Action on the plan review was tabled until the next Planning Commission meeting in order to have the staff consider the following concerns:

1. Define the existing and new parking lot areas.--
The City Engineer felt that these parking areas are shown adequately on the site plan. The new parking area of seven spaces is indicated on the plan as being located north of the existing building.
2. A more detailed analysis of the parking space requirements.
--Section 301.070 D.7.b. of the Lake Elmo Code provides for off-street parking requirements in the GB district. The proposed addition will provide space for two retail or commercial businesses. If both businesses are retail,

then 15 parking spaces would be needed. If both businesses are in the "other commercial uses" category, then only 8 spaces are needed. The parking space requirement depends upon the intended use, which could change to another GB use in the future.

3. Check on what was approved in 1980.--The Planning Commission minutes indicated that "Phase Two will add another 1,540 square feet, and that parking will be increased from 23 to 48 stalls. Phase Two may require ponding for run-off. One-fourth of the store is storage which would reduce the required parking, and possibly reduce the number of stalls required when Phase Two is built. This would eliminate the need for ponding at that time." The minutes indicate that 18 parking stalls and 5 stalls on the pump island would be provided in Phase One.
4. Lot size variance.--The total area owned by Brooks' is approximately 0.85 acres. However, lot size is not applicable in this case because the lot is served by private sanitary sewer and water systems from Cimarron Park.
5. Concern about septic system capacity.--Not applicable, since the lot is served by sanitary sewer.
6. Concern about overlap of fire exit doors by the rest room doors at the east end of the addition.--Building Inspector Jim McNamara said that the fire exits are not actually required for a building of this size. He also said that there are two ways to handle the design concern: move the fire exit door locations or put automatic door closers on the restroom doors.

Ed Mackie, Architect from the Scotland Company was present to answer any questions for Brooks' Superette. He stated that statistically speaking, these convenience centers have less than 1 car in 10, which is considered new traffic; most of the trips are made by people already driving by.

Don Moe suggested that the yield sign be changed to a stop sign because those are private roads and the public is using them. At congested times it is very dangerous because people ignore the Yield sign.

Dan Novak views this as "Other Commercial Uses" and questions whether or not they want to proliferate expansion of business in this area at all. Novak interprets the Comprehensive Plan as saying we are going to try and focus expansion of business in Sections 32 and 33 and the Village area. Novak would have no problem approving this application if it was for expanding the business that was there. There is enough traffic in that area, and this will clearly add to it.

Marge Williams had the same concern. On three corners there will

be more dense R1 development and she is not sure if allowing this would be doing the homeowners a favor by putting in more businesses so close to their homes. Other concerns were the increased traffic, and expanding a commercial area beyond what is recommended in an R1 area which is spotzoning.

M/S/P Haacke/Moe - to recommend to the City Council approval of the site and building plan for an addition to Brook's Superette contingent on granting them a setback variance and put on the 1987 Work Plan to discuss what kind of business use is desired along there. (Motion carried: 6-3<Novak, Williams, Raleigh>).

Williams explained that the fact you have to grant a variance indicates to her that we are not obligated to approve the application.

Novak stated his reason for voting against it was that the addition would increase an already non-conforming situation and had concerns about the proliferating of business uses in an area not designated as such.

4. PUBLIC HEARING: Request for Rezoning from Rural Residential to Industrial or other appropriate zoning to allow a truck trailer storage site at the SE corner of TH 5 & Co. Rd. 6 (Stillwater Blvd); Joseph D. Rogers.

Chairman Graves opened up the public hearing at 8:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers.

Bruce Folz represented Mr. Rogers who owns approximately 17 acres of land on the south side of TH 5, immediately west of CSAH 6 (Stillwater Blvd.) and north of the Chicago & Northwestern railroad tracks. Folz stated, that looking at the property the land should be used for something other than single family residential because you have a major highway on one side and a railraod on the other with a roadway along the east side.

Mr. Rogers is requesting rezoning of this property to Industrial park in order to allow Brockman Trucking, Inc. to store up to 50 truck trailers. Also, there are plans to construct a building for the repair and servicing of these truck trailer at some future date.

The Future Land Use Plan adopted as part of the 1986 Comprehensive Plan indicates a rural residential future land use for the Rogers parcel. The land is currently zoned Rural Residential. A truck trailers storage facility is not an allowed use in the RR zone.

Mr. & Mrs. Wyn John, 8883 Jane Road N., voiced concern on the annoying beeping noise the trailers make when they back up and the concern on potential spillage of oils right next door to a major drainway that goes into the St. Croix. Another concern is the road safety in regard to the access off of Stillwater Blvd.

Lester Vanscyoc, 3412 Jamaca Avenue, built his house 23 years ago

and has put up with a gravel pit which was changed into a dump, and we have the problem of the water pollution. Now you can't sleep at night because of the freeway noise. Another concern is with the diesels running all hours of the day and night particularly in the Winter to keep the trucks warm.

David Price, 9089 Jamaca Court, questioned how many trailers will be stored and how frequently will they be moved. Brockman answered that sometime there will be 50 trailers, and they will go out and come back in 2-3 months so the average would be 1 or 2 a day. Five years from now, Brockman would be using this as a base for his operation.

Steve Raleigh asked what the plans were for security. Brockman answered that there would be a fence or a 6' berm. If the people wanted lights, they would install them.

The surrounding residents were in agreement that this activity was not appropriate in this section or in Lake Elmo.

Howard Michaels asked if RR was an appropriate use of that land with the noise pollution. Another resident felt it would be a terrible place for a house.

Jerry Bartel, 3415 Jamaca Avenue, stated that it took his supervisor a year to sell his house and sold it at a 10% cut because his house was situated by Brockman Trucking in Oakdale.

Scott McDonald, attorney for Mr. Rogers, felt you had to look at what you can do with this land because you have to be able to have some reasonable use of that property. It is not a bad investment if you can make a reasonable use of it. Certainly people would prefer to live next to a piece of vacant land for their viewing pleasure or for your own use, but they don't happen to own the land and Mr. Rogers does. He has to be able to do something with it and would like to make it the least intrusive use on anyone else. Mr. Brockman is willing to select hours of operation, location on the parcel and away from the road and restrict the number of vehicles that will be going in and out.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. There is a potential traffic problem due to limited vision for drivers approaching the area from the south on CSAH 6, poor access to the site, and the fact that the intersection is already congested and dangerous.
2. The proposed rezoning is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
3. The proposed use would add more noise pollution to an area that is already more noisy than what the residents would prefer.
4. The potential for spillage of oils and other liquids at the site could lead to contamination of surface and groundwater since

the Valley Branch Watershed storm drainage project passes directly along the eastern edge of the site.

5. The site is currently zoned Rural Residential.
6. The proposed rezoning would constitute "spot zoning" which is not a recommended or desirable planning practice.
7. The Industrial Park zoning district has already been eliminated.
8. Road safety in the area is a major concern.
9. The proposed use is inconsistent with the neighborhood.

Chairman Graves closed the public hearing at 8:24 p.m.

M/S/P Raleigh/DeLapp - to deny the rezoning request by Joseph D. Rogers from Rural Residential to Industrial based on the above nine Findings of Fact. (Motion carried 9-0).

5. PUBLIC HEARING: Request for Large Lot Subdivision of 34 acres located in the NE 1/4 of Section 3; Richard & Katherine Klawitter, 9839 60th St. N.

Chairman Graves opened up the public hearing at 8:35 p.m. in the City Council chambers.

The Klawitters own approximately 34 acres of land located at the southwest corner of the intersection of TH 36 (60th Street) and Keats Avenue. The land is zoned Agricultural. They are requesting a Large Lot Subdivision which would allow them to split the 34 acres into two parcels; one of 10 acres and the other of 24 acres.

Their purpose in making this subdivision request is so that they may meet the restrictions for the Farm Foreclosure Act, which prohibits the financing or use for collateral of your homesite and more than ten acres. The Klawitters want to create a 10-acre land parcel so that they can get refinancing of their mortgage and remain in their house on the 10 acres. They have no desire to sell off any of the remaining 24 acres.

City Attorney Knaak pointed out that the difficulty this presents is determining a non-economic hardship given the fact that the reason for the request is purely economical. The code states that economic conditions alone do not constitute a hardship.

Chairman Graves added that they would be creating two non-conforming lots out of one non-conforming lot.

Chairman Graves closed the public hearing at 8:37 p.m.

Steve Raleigh expressed the difficult time he had with this application because he realized what type of a spot the State

Legislature has put people like the Klawitters, but he cannot see creating two non-conforming lots.

Chairman Graves recapped the discussion with the fact that there is already a non-conforming lot in Ag land that consists of 34 acres and that a request is being made to us to allow subdivision of this to more non-conforming lots than the original parcel, with no purposes relating to development or the use of the land itself. He does not see justification for rezoning that is permitted by the ordinances.

M/S/P Reuther/DeLapp - to deny the request for a Large Lot Subdivision in the Ag District by Richard and Katherine Klawitter, but encourage them to meet with the staff to see what other options are available. (Motion carried 9-0).

M/S/P Williams/Raleigh - to modify the agenda because Mr. Armstrong was not in attendance at this time. (Motion carried 9-0).

6. PUBLIC HEARING: Request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow an existing storage business to operate as an Alternative Use in the Agricultural zoning district; Thomas G. Armstrong, 8291 15th St. N.

Chairman Graves opened up the public hearing at 9:06 in the City Council chambers.

Thomas G. Armstrong is applying for a Conditional Use Permit under the Alternate Uses Section of the Agricultural zoning district to allow the operation of an existing storage business (indoor and outdoor), and to allow for the future construction of two additional agricultural style buildings or storage use in the areas designated in the site plan. The proposed CUP is requested to apply to the entire 254.6 acres of agricultural real estate owned by Thomas G. Armstrong. Under the ordinance an area up to six acres can be put aside for an alternative agricultural use. According to Mr. Armstrong the existing business, which is already there and is legal, concerns three buildings that he has items of storage in. He also has some outside storage. Under the new ordinance requirements you can have outside storage of up to one vehicle per 2 1/2 acres which means up to 100 vehicles could be put outside this area. Now there is approximately 41 or 42 vehicles in that particular area.

PROPOSED CONDITIONS FOR ARMSTRONG CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT:

Add: _____ Delete: -----

1. This CUP shall apply to the 254.6 acres of agricultural real estate owned by Thomas G. Armstrong, hereinafter referred to as "landowner".

The staff raised the question whether the two major land parcels

located north and south of 15th Street can be considered as contiguous? Contiguous is defined in Blacks Law Dictionary indicates in close proximity or near though not in contact, etc.. The road is not owned by the City, but the City has an easement over that road. To the center of the road is owned by the adjoining property owner which is the Armstrong farm on the north and south. This road does not constitute a division of ownership. Armstrong gave the City Attorney copies of cases, words and phrases and definitions. It is contiguous by any legal definition and meets that standard.

2. The area of the actual alternative use shall not exceed six acres and shall be within the approximate general limits of the attached site plan.

The area that was outlined on the map was about 4.75 acres, but this could be continued down to six acres. Six acres were put down because if a building would be put in, it would be further south because of soil conditions or the lay of the land.

3. The alternative use shall be:

A. The storage of cars, trucks,, boats, trailers, recreational vehicles and other vehicles and goods inside agricultural style buildings.

B. The outside storage of cars, trucks, boats, trailers, recreational vehicles and other vehicles in the area designated on the site plan. The number of said vehicles shall not exceed 100. This is computed as one vehicle or 150 square feet of occupied space per 2.5 acres within the total CUP area of 254.6 acres.

4. Landowner shall not construct more than ~~two~~ one additional agricultural style buildings not to exceed 15,000 square feet for storage use in the areas designated in the site plan.

Ordinance 301.130.C.1.e. was presented to the Planning Commission. Armstrong stated that this building would be an accessory building and is used or intended to be used on an active commercial food producing farm and meets that definition which is in this part of the ordinance. Although builing permits are not required for agricultural buildings because this would have a double usage, Armstrong would be willing to get a permit.

At this time Armstrong has no plans to put up a building on the two proposed sites. If he should get a good price on a building and enough phone calls to justify this, he then has two areas for potential buidling sites at some point.

A suggestion was made for the planning Commission to look into Section 301.130.C.4. because any farmer that would put a passenger car in one of his buildings is in violation of the ordinance. This should not apply to a large agriculatural style buildings. (No accessory building use or intended for storage of passenger automobiles shall exceed 1000 sq.ft. of gross, etc.)

City Attorney Knaak as he reads paragraph #4 it is essentially defined in the language as a detached residential garage and does not apply.

5. Landowner shall maintain his remaining land or farm his remaining land in accordance with the required practices of the Soil and Water Conservation District.

Armstrong has been doing this and it continues to be done.

6. Landowner shall comply with the proposed and existing landscape plan as attached. The purpose of said plan is to provide natural vegetation equivalent to five feet in height by June 1, 1992, and the equivalent of eight feet in height by June 1, 1995. The planting shall consist of existing pine and spruce plantations and proposed pine and spruce plantations. Some of these trees will be harvested for Christmas tree sales but at least three six rows of trees shall remain and allowed to grow to maturity. The lilac hedges shall be maintained so as to provide screening for any outside storage areas.

Mr. Armstrong raised it to six rows of trees from his last proposal which included three rows of trees.

7. There shall be no signs and no paved parking areas. All outside storage areas, driveways and building aprons shall be of grass or lime rock.

8. The water runoff from any existing agricultural buildings or proposed agricultural style buildings shall meet the one percent rule as to rate and volume. The requirement shall be met to the satisfaction of the City Engineer by October 1, 1987.

City Engineer Bohrer stated that a 1.5 foot dike is needed, but Mr. Armstrong will build a 3-foot dike for ponding.

9. Except for outside storage which may be partially visible from public roadways until said landscape plan reaches maturity, all buildings and farm area will be maintained so as to give a rural farm appearance.

10. Landowner shall reside on the contiguous real estate and be the owner and operator of this storage business.

11. Alternate uses shall not cause pollution and hazardous materials shall not be stored.

12. Hazard to the health or welfare of the City would be grounds for permit revocation.

Mr. & Mrs. Robert Thomas, 7982 15th St. N., stated that their property adjoins Armstrong's property and they have had no problems with the business in regard to traffic or noise and feel this building or business is no detriment to them or the City.

Mr. James Hrlyar, 3687 Hadley Avenue N., stated that his Boy Scout Troop used Armstrong's storage space free of charge and thanked Mr. Armstrong for letting them use his woods for camping.

Hugh Madson handed out copies of the Armstrong Metropolitan Agricultural Preserves Restrictive Covenant and section of the Metro Agricultural Preserves Act and a copy of Armstrong's classified ad. Mr. Madson was present to try to convince the Planning Commission to not issue this CUP because it is not in the best interest of Lake Elmo. Madson added, that the County has Armstrong's building, which was built without a permit because it was a farm building assessed as commercial and the land under it as commercial. The City of Lake Elmo is collecting commercial taxes on that land, but the law states you are not allowed to do this (having commercial land in Ag Preserves).

Mr. Jim Schoettler, representative from the Metropolitan Council dealing with the Ag Preserve, visited Armstrong's site and received a copy of the CUP information. He indicated that the lawsuit is frivolous because this does meet the requirements, a small on-farm commercial operation that is important to farming because it is to the City's benefit to keep 254.6 acres out of development. Mr. Mazzara had also talked to Mr. Schoettler and received a different opinion. Mazzara added, that if this is allowed tonight, it affects all of Lake Elmo and starts a precedent. There will probably be areas in Lake Elmo where this type of thing is not desirable and suggests the Planning Commission use caution.

Mr. Armstrong felt that Mr. Madson does not care about Ag Preserves or what is done on the Armstrong Farm, but is purely personal. Armstrong asked Mr. Madson who did he collect the money from to start the lawsuit? Mr. Madson stated that every penny that went into this lawsuit to get it started was paid by him. Mr. Madson answered that it was not personal. He questioned the planning process when laws are passed by the State and you have an Ag Preserve law tougher than the City's ordinance.

City Attorney Knaak encouraged the Commission to disregard consideration for deliberation regarding the lawsuit. The City's position is that it is a frivolous lawsuit at this time. The City has filled its obligations under the statute. Chairman Graves asked what if the lawsuit is found to be valid and the City is required to do what is requested. Knaak felt it was unclear and does not specify a resolution to the problem. Knaak suggested the Planning Commission focus on the Ag building definition.

Mrs. Helen Meehan asked if she would be able to come in with the same application. Raleigh answered that this is an alternative ag use and Ag zoning is required where Meehan is in RR zoning. The Commission answered if Meehan was rezoned to Ag she could apply for a CUP for storage buildings.

Joe Delaney stated he would rather live in Lake Elmo than Oakdale because he loves to see green space. He feels these alternate Ag

uses are a good idea to help preserve open space. He has a car stored on Mr. Armstrong's proerpty and added that this is not unusual for a farmer to do.

A letter was handed out from Mr. John Body, 8155 15th St. N., stating he ws in full acceptance of the Conditonal Use Permit under the terms stated in the applicaion. Mr. Armstrong has talked to the neighbors, Olson and Pierre, and they had no problems with the application.

Chairman Graves closed the public hearing at 10:25 p.m.

Dan Novak felt that this type of application was clearly allowed within the Ag Preserves Act. He was very much in favor of it and felt it was a very small price to pay for the 254 acres that will be kept out of development.

City Attorney Knaak suggested deliberating on one building at a time. The Planning Commission discussed that two buildings of not more than 15,000 sq.ft. would be permitted, but that one building could be constructed at this time. They did not want to give out blanket approval. This would give the City more control. Mr. Armstrong was free to come back and apply for a second building later. Paragraph #4 will read "landowner shall not construct more than one additional Ag style building, not to exceed 15,000 sq.ft. for storage use or use designated in the site plan.

Chairman Graves felt that the contiguous question had been answered, but still questionned the definition of good vegetative screening in regard to trees that will not reach 5 feet in height until 1992. DeLapp felt a landscaping plan had to be brought in as DC Sales came in with. Bucheck would rather see smaller trees rather than a fence. Armstrong stated that the view is minimal to begin with and the neighbors had no objections. Novak and Reuther both felt Armstrong had clearly demonstrated good intentions for providing proper screening.

Building permits in Ag zones and the definiton of Ag style buildings under Accessory Buildings will be 1987 work plan items.

M/S/P DeLapp/Novak - to recommend approval to the City Council for a request for a CUP to allow an existing storage business to operate as an alternat use in the Agricultural zoning district by Thomas G. Armstrong, 8291 15th St. N.; with the inclusion of Items 11 and 12 and the alteration of Item 4 (change two buidlings to one and add 15,000 sq.ft.). (Motion carried 8-0-1<abstain: Moe>).

Haacke stated her concern about going ahead with the CUP approval with the lawsuit in process, but is doing so based on the City Attorney's opinion that it is permissible.

6B. Overlay District Update

City Administrator Overby reported that last week the City

Engineer Larry Bohrer, City Attorney Fritz Knaak, City Planner Rob Chelseth and City Administrator Bob Overby met to look over the Overlay District Ordinance. They discussed procedures that might be appropriate for development proposals along the corridor of the I-94 Interstate and have come up with some ideas on how to strengthen the Overlay District. This will be brought back to the Planning Commission in January.

7. City of Oakdale Comprehensive Plan Amendments

The purpose of the amendment to the Oakdale Comprehensive Plan is to update the plan to the year 2000. The City had reviewed a similar plan amendment in February of 1986. A copy of the City Engineer's comment letter of 2-10-86 and his letter of 11-26-86 were provided.

One change since the February 1986 review is that Oakdale has taken out sewer districts 18 and 19. This area has now been removed from their request for MUSA line extension. The City Engineer felt that the previously planned rapid development could have forced premature sewer extensions through Lake Elmo to service that area of Oakdale. Oakdale does not intend to provide sewer to this area before the year 2000.

A second concern is Oakdale's request for an extension of their MUSA line to include sewer district 12A-generally that area east of I-694 and between 40th Street and the Chicago & Northwestern RR tracks (excluding the Zycad development). Oakdale plans to serve this area through its own sewer system, and no connection through Lake Elmo would be needed at this time. However, Oakdale would like to connect service district 12A to a sewer line in Lake Elmo, if a line should become available here. This potential impact on metropolitan sewer services would be beyond the year 2000 planning period, since Lake Elmo has not indicated any intention to provide such service to its west-central end of the community. If a request was made by Oakdale to extend sewer service through Lake Elmo prior to the year 2000, it would be totally inconsistent with the Lake Elmo Comprehensive Sewer Plan.

A third concern is Oakdale's desire to route sewage flow from district 13 (between Eagle Point School and 10th Street) through a connection to new pipes to be installed in Section 32 of Lake Elmo. The Lake Elmo Comprehensive Sewer Plan indicates that this is feasible, if Oakdale wants to pay the additional pipe costs. However, the related question is the fact that the City of Lake Elmo has declined to make any commitment towards construction of any sewer, water or storm drainage facilities in Sections 32-33 until development projects in that area show that the service is warranted, and that the City agrees with the proposed system design, location and financing methods. This City policy indicates that Oakdale should not expect to get consideration or approval of a sewer pipe connection through Lake Elmo until after the City of Lake Elmo has decided that installation of sewer pipe up to 10th Street (the proposed connection point) is warranted. Pressure to get sewer pipe extended through Section 32 to 10th

Street ahead of the City's approval would be inconsistent with the Lake Elmo Comprehensive Sewer Plan and would potentially affect metropolitan systems. (The City of Oakdale indicates on page iii of their worksheet that metro systems would not be potentially affected by this proposed plan amendment.)

A fourth concern pointed out by the City engineer is that the number of households forecast by Oakdale is "far in excess of Metro Council forecasts" and discrepancies show up between projections in Oakdale's Sewer Plan and its Comprehensive Plan. City Administrator Overby felt it was worth asking why Oakdale's analysis of household demand starts in the base year 1980 and continues to the year 2000. It would seem necessary to start from the base year of 1986, when the plan amendment is requested and subtract growth in the number of households between 1980 and 1986. This would provide a more accurate representation of the projected growth in households in Oakdale between 1986 and 2000.

Steve DeLapp raised the concern that Oakdale should clearly understand that "Lake Elmo has defined its MUSA Line for now and forever; that the City has no intention to open up Lake Elmo for Oakdale's sewer lines through the central part of the City of Lake Elmo."

M/S/P Williams/Haacke - to recommend to the City Council that the City Administrator draft a letter, including Steve DeLapp's and the City Engineer's comments, to the Metro Council which will address the City's concerns in regard to the Oakdale plan amendments and also that the 90-day review period should not be waived. (Motion carried 9-0).

Dan Novak mentioned that map 19 on page 65 and map 20 on page 67 of the 1979 Comprehensive Plan should be updated, because they show the entire western third of Lake Elmo being sewerred. This will be handled during the revision of the Appendicies in Chapter V of the 1986 Comprehensive Plan.

8. 1986 Comprehensive Plan Amendments

- A. Population
- B. Housing
- C. Local Economy

M/S/P Moe/Williams - to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 11:45 p.m. (Motion carried 9-0).