

DRAFT

LAKE ELMO PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

NOVEMBER 23, 1987

Chairman DeLapp called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers. Present: DeLapp, Haacke, Simpson, Hunt, Williams, Enes, Kunde, Bucheck (arrived 8:45 p.m.) and City Administrator Overby. Absent: Johnson, Stevens

1. Agenda

Add: 10. Planning Workshop meeting

M/S/P Williams/Hunt - to approve the November 23, 1987 Planning Commission agenda as amended. (Motion carried 7-0).

2. Minutes: November 9, 1987

M/S/P Williams/Hunt - to approve the November 9, 1987 Planning Commission minutes as amended. (See page 2-5. Public Hearing, page 4-7. Comprehensive Plan Amendment, page 6-B. Chapter III-Future Land Use Section and 10. Other Business.) (Motion carried 6-0-1<Abstain: Simpson>).

3. Upcoming Requests

December 14, 1987

Section 32-33 Discussion
Comprehensive Plan Update

December 28, 1987

This meeting was cancelled by motion at the 11-98-87 meeting. A work committee may meet at this time if they so desire.

4. City Council Update

5. Presentation by Andy Kass, Stillwater Area Economic Development Corporation

Andy Kass, head of the Corporation's Marketing Committee, was present to discuss the work done to-date by SAEDC. The purpose of SAEDC is "to encourage, promote and guide the retention, establishment, development and expansion of business, industry and community in the Stillwater area". To finance SAEDC and its level of need, including start-up and operating costs, Dave Wettergren, Superintendent of District 834 Public Schools introduced a new investment opportunity (\$100 certificates of investment) for the citizens of this community.

Kass discussed the merits of the Star Cities Program and how participation in the program strengthens a community's potential for attracting new businesses and retaining existing business as well as its potential for selection as a business expansion site. Areas that want more development can work with these businesses in more development, thus directing the growth where it best fits in. Local

marketing efforts, including information brochures, as well as video and slide presentations, will provide needed information to give developers the facts they need. Communities that have agreed to be in the Star Cities Program are Baytown Township, Grant Township, Oak Park Heights, Stillwater, Stillwater Township and West Lakeland Township. Afton and Marine were not asked and the City of Lakeland turned it down.

Kass stated that it was his understanding that Lake Elmo's City Attorney had received a joint powers agreement to review prior to Council action, but that there has been no response from the City to SAEDC thus far.

Chairman DeLapp asked why was SAEDC emphasis for job creation on low paying non-head of household positions such as light manufacturing and retail stores. The reason was given that these jobs were most easily attracted. If Section 32-33, which is outside the stated ISD 834 boundaries of SAEDC, DeLapp asked if it would be inside the target area of SAEDC and Mr. Kass's answer was "yes" although there was no explanation as to why. Rob Enes responded the reason for that was they didn't want to break the City up.

Commissionmember Lee Hunt commented that light assembly type work is the first to go when there are signs of a troubled economy. Hunt would like to see how development might impact the schools with the increase in population. The area would grow if we have industry or not. Hunt would like to see this correlation and 1-5-10 year program before they get his support.

6. Metro Urban Service Area (Sections 32, 33):
Study of Available Services and Financing Options from Lake Elmo and Oakdale. Report to City Council.

At the November 17, 1987 City Council meeting the Council decided to charge the Planning Commission with the task of studying the issue, look at available facts, the costs and benefits, and report back with a recommendation. The people who volunteered to serve on the economic development committee, Section 32-33 landowners, and anyone else who resides in Lake Elmo will be encouraged to participate in this discussion.

City Administrator Overby explained that the City of Oakdale had indicated that it will provide data on the costs it would charge to Section 32-33 landowners in order to provide water service from its existing system, and sewer service from the I-94 interceptor (assuming that the land was annexed to Oakdale). Oakdale will include its method of financing such services and assess the degree of risk the City would have to encumber in order to make the land "economically competitive". The Lake Elmo City Council expects to have a report from the Planning Commission within 60 to 90 days from now.

The following were present for the discussion:

David Draz, 8036 Hudson Blvd.
Mr. & Mrs. Warren Gravink, 8071 1st St. N.
Robert Henry, 8018 Hudson Blvd.
Bernard Hawkins, 8031 1st. St., N.
David Johnson, ConnCo Shoes
Bob Dreher, 7515 10th St. N (owner of 30 acres)
Mr. & Mrs. Joe Brockman
Mr. & Mrs. Harvey Brockman

Rob Enes asked, "why does your land have to be sold to a developer? If the landowners brought the land price down low enough it would sell." Mrs. Brockman responded that more has to be considered, roads have to be put in, sewer and water installed and they are not a big enough operator to do this. They donated seven acres of land to the City of Lake Elmo in 1964/1965 for the SE ramp of the I694-10th Street interchange with the idea of commercial coming in. Bob Dreher explained that back when the City Council put in Helmo Avenue a year before because they wanted to jump the gun and put in a service lane for 694. The landowners did not ask for this but had to pay for it.

David Johnson, Connco, asked if this community was willing to do things to allow it to become competitive or not. The property owners have determined that there are other things that can be considered. The land has been sitting as it is for many years with nothing happening. The land hasn't sold because of the price (they are willing to hang on to it because they recognize the potential), and they have been encouraged by the City in identifying the land use plan that this is a commercial area and no one would know this is Lake Elmo.

Marge Williams has heard from people that are average homeowners of Oakdale who are experiencing very high taxes and uncomfortable with the tax increment financing. These are not the large lot owners who have been able to go in and make some money off of the tax increment financing. There are two sides to the coin; if you are a small landowner your taxes are probably going to be higher than your benefit. If you are a large landowner, your benefit would probably be higher than your taxes.

Barb Haacke asked why does Lake Elmo want to keep Section 32 & 33 if there was 100 percent support to have them annexed to Oakdale. Marge Williams responded that there was not 100 percent support and there was some interest in tradeoffs of land. Steve DeLapp felt the question "What is the advantage to Lake Elmo in keeping Section 32 & 33?" needed to be addressed.

Lee Hunt would like to discuss the risk to both the property owners and to the City. He suggested as a work item to try to work out a concept based on timeline, what kind of development, if it would require many services and what sewer capacity is needed.

Marge Williams felt another consideration was the effect of population growth in Lake Elmo with the associated police, fire and other

extended services which increase taxes. Also, how much is the Planning Commission willing to amend (changing our goals and policies in the City) the Comprehensive Plan to accommodate this type of development and how will this affect our overall comprehensive plan.

The goals were summarized as:

1. Timelines.
2. Tax effect on overall millrate in Lake Elmo.
3. Advantage to City to keep Section 32 & 33 with appropriate measures needed to keep it.
4. Creative alternatives to Tax Increment Financing
5. Risk to City and landowners.
6. How much would development be affecting our Comprehensive Plan (population and school growths, police & fire demand).
7. Marketing Strategy.
8. How will this transition affect the small resident property owner.
 - A. Affect on drainfield and possible replacement
 - B. Would it increase the property value so that they could sell their land for more than it is worth keeping their house.
 - C. What their cost share would be for water and sewer.

After information is received from Oakdale, a schedule will be made up and notification will be sent to the property owners.

7. Comprehensive Plan Update

A. Chapter III, Future Land Use Section

The Planning Commission was to discuss the draft of the combined City Staff information and the Work Committee information. City Administrator Overby included a copy of the City zoning map with the proposed R-E future land use areas. A correction was made to the map to include a 23 acre parcel as R-E along Highway 36. With this correction the Planning Commission thought the R-E overlay was reasonable as presented.

The revised draft will be submitted to the Planning Commission at the next meeting for them to vote on it.

B. Appendix G, Transportation Facilities--
Highway Transportation Section

The Planning Commission discussed the Traffic Assignment Zones data at the 11-9-87 meeting. City Administrator Overby and Commission member Marge Williams were both going to contact the Metro Council for a definition of their employment forecasts.

City Administrator Overby had learned that the employment data represents actual jobs that will be available within each planning zone in the year 2000 or 2010. The employment projections were based in part on 1980 Census data and in part on the Lake Elmo population and housing projections. The Metro Council used the baseline data to

calculate how many jobs would be needed/created in these planning zones in Lake Elmo, according to their statistical formulas. Obviously, the employment data are totally out of line with Lake Elmo's planning policies and bear no relation to actual conditions in the community.

The City Administrator had revised the narrative explaining the TAZ table to indicate that Lake Elmo does not agree with or support the employment forecasts and will not honor such data in making local decisions about local road needs. A copy of the revised text was submitted to the PZC for consideration.

Marge Williams had talked to Robert Paddock from the Transportation Section of the Metro Council who told her that the Traffic Assignment zones are totally incorrect. The projected figures in the column "Year 2000" were generated from a data base that goes back to the 1970 census and Metropolitan Plans at that time. The column headed 2010 were generated from data off the 1980 census and even those are perceived to be incorrect since the growth throughout the Metro area is seen as being lowered in 1987 as was projected in 1980.

Marge felt the most interesting part of the information is that it is not even done with consideration of the Comprehensive Plan of Lake Elmo.

The Commission felt it was not necessary to do anything with these figures. Therefore, the following motion was made.

M/S/P Hunt/Buchek - to recommend that the City Council approve the Highway Transportation Section of Appendix G, as amended 11-20-87 (with the elimination of the last two pages) for submittal to the Metro Council as a Comprehensive Plan Amendment. (Motion carried 8-0).

8. Metro Council "Metropolitan Significance" Rule Changes

The Metro Council is looking for input on the proposed rule changes. The rules are part of a process that allows Lake Elmo to comment on projects in adjacent cities that would be studied and reviewed by the Metro Council.

A comment was made that the economic issues the Council were concerned about are not valid to Lake Elmo. Environmental issues, the quality of life, the impact of low income housing and school district growth in our community were comments from the Planning Commission, but were not unanimous.

9. Purchase of Planning Books

Four Planning Commission members and the City Administrator attended the zoning workshop held on November 14th. Several good planning-zoning reference books were made available for viewing. The Commission is requesting purchase of one of each book available at the workshop.

M/S/P Simpson/Hunt - to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 11:15 p.m. (Motion carried 8-0).

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

NOVEMBER 23, 1987

7:30 p.m. MEETING CONVENES

1. Agenda
2. Minutes: November 9, 1987
3. Upcoming Requests
4. City Council Update

7:45 p.m. 5. Presentation by Andy Koss, Stillwater Area Economic Development Corporation

8:15 p.m. 6. Metro Urban Service Area (Sections 32,33): Study of Available Services and Financing Options from Lake Elmo and Oakdale. Report to City Council.

8:45 p.m. 7. Comprehensive Plan Update

- A. Chapter III, Future Land Use Section
(Bring your complete draft)
- B. Appendix G, Transportation Facilities--
Highway Transportation Section

9:45 p.m. 8. Metro Council "Metropolitan Significance" Rule Changes

9. Purchase of Planning Books
10. Other Business
11. Adjourn