

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 MEETING

March 28, 1988

7:30 p.m. MEETING CONVENES

1. Agenda
2. Minutes: March 14, 1988

7:45 p.m. 3. PUBLIC HEARING - 1% Rule
A handout will be provided at the meeting.

4. Apostolic Bible Church Concept Plan
5. Sign Ordinance - Steve DeLapp
6. Comprehensive Plan Update - Marjorie Williams

APPROVED

LAKE ELMO PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

MARCH 28, 1988

Chairman DeLapp called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:33 p.m. in the City Council chambers. Present: DeLapp, Williams, Bucheck, Enes, Kunde, Hunt, Johnson, Stevens, Simpson (Departed 9:00). Absent: Haacke, Johnston

1. Agenda

The Apostolic Bible Church requested a delay and will be rescheduled for the April 11th Planning Commission meeting.

Delete: 4. Apostolic Bible Church Concept Plan, Add. 4. RE Zoning

M/S/P Stevens/Simpson - to approve the March 28, 1988 Planning Commission agenda as amended. (Motion carried 9-0).

2. Minutes: March 14, 1988

M/S/P Simpson/Bucheck - to approve the March 14, 1988 Planning Commission minutes as amended. (Motion carried 7-0-2 <Abstain: Stevens, Johnson>).

3. PUBLIC HEARING: 1% Rule

Chairman DeLapp opened up the Public Hearing at 8:00 p.m. in the City Council chambers.

There was no one in the audience to speak for or against the One Percent Rule Ordinance.

Chairman DeLapp closed the public hearing at 8:03 p.m.

INTENT

The Commission recommended the following wording:

2. To restrict both the rate and volume of increased surface runoff due to new development.

3. To control increased runoff rate and volume due to new development.

This was changed because we say only 1% more and this is not eliminating it--elimination would be zero percent.

4. To limit the runoff volume to allow any increased surface water to evaporate or seep into the ground water system.

EXCEPTION

By consensus of the Commission, it was decided to delete the EXCEPTION.

Ann Bucheck felt there should not be any exceptions because we are

living in a City with a lot of problems with water. Ed Stevens brought up that we have the possibility of a variance request so there is no need to have an exception. Lee Hunt felt the only reason you might have an exception would be financial. They would have to come in with a good, technical reason for not providing ponding when they come in for a variance.

DEFINITIONS

The Commission suggested using as a base for the 1% increase in terms of a grassy field rather than plowed fields--"To limit surface runoff to no more than 1 percent of what the surface would permit if it were grassland".

Chairman DeLapp asked why are we excluding the Ramsey/Washington Metro Watershed District from this ordinance?

M/S/P Hunt/Enes - to send the Planning Commission comments to the City Engineer and ask him to comment on how we can make a concise ordinance that deals with the intent, is technically correct and be enforceable or has the greatest extent of clarity. (Motion carried 9-0).

The Commission asked if this could be completed in a reasonable time fashion such that a sub-committee could be appointed to look at the City Engineer's comments, together with this ordinance proposal, and comment to the entire Planning Commission before the next meeting.

4. RE Zoning

Chairman DeLapp brought up the question that was raised at the last meeting in regard to the desirability of having 22 foot roads permitted in RE zoning. DeLapp felt these roads would be more rural in character in terms of esthetics and cheaper for the developer.

DeLapp referred to the Cities design standards for roads. Our roads which show 32 feet are defined officially in the City as a "temporary road section". This means "as soon as sanitary sewer is brought into the City, the temporary road will be replaced with a permanent road with concrete curbs". He felt the intent of this is to allow a much greater density of housing.

Tom Simpson who lives on Jamaca Blvd N., which is a wide street with curbs, felt the street seemed to be kept cleaner as opposed to where Lee Hunt lives on 55th Street where you are walking in broken glass and smashed beer cans. ~~The Maintenance Dept. cannot keep it clean because it is a dirt road.~~ (Amended) 4-11-88 Tom felt that in R1 zoning the roads may not need to be as wide, but felt curbs keep it clean. DeLapp clarified that they were only talking RE zoning for now, but this could be discussed at another time.

Marge Williams brought up a negative aspect because when there are no curbs the asphalt tends to break off the edges because you tend to drive off the edges to park. However, most people try to mow their lawn to the edge of the asphalt. The thing she likes about it is the fact it does give somewhat of a rural flavor so you would have to

balance the maintenance problems.

DeLapp added that what Marge brought up is a strength problem. Usually when asphalt is laid they thin it out to nothing at the edge. We could require that the edge be thickened and if it is curved the water would go into catch basins.

Ann Bucheck felt a consideration should be given to the water runoff problem and the need to have curbs for the water to get into the ponding area.

Marge commented that you don't need wide lanes to pass going through a residential area. The narrow roads will slow down traffic. Marge felt there is a tremendous amount of land that goes into roads, and she was not so sure that it is necessary for keeping it rural residential.

Lee Hunt favored going with the smaller roads because of the slower traffic and more rural in character. He knows that keeping the traffic down would definitely be a plus, but he needed to be convinced that the roads would be safe for the pedestrians or bicycle traffic and that there are adequate walkways.

The Commission discussed putting in curve roads because these would slow down traffic, and it would make the neighborhoods more esthetically pleasing.

The Planning Commission had a tentative agreement on the basic text of the RE zoning under Draft 3 and are talking about 22 foot wide curve roads without curbs. Another consideration was given to require the developer plant a 1 inch caliber, 4 or 5 foot hardwood tree every 40 or 50 feet on either side of the road, inside the Cities easement, but outside the safety zone.

Dave Johnson felt they should check where they want to plant the trees because some people may prefer landscaping that does not include trees and had a problem specifying hardwood trees versus firs.

Ed Stevens suggested the Commission get copies of ordinances from other cities and volunteered to check on ordinances from other cities. Lee Hunt would like to have the various road proposals reviewed for safety factors by the police and fire department.

Marge Williams noted that the Metro Council is opposed to 2 1/2 acre lots. They would prefer that we would have no R1 zoning in the City, but only RR. Marge felt this would be a good compromise. The reason they are against us having ^{high} density zoning was because we do not have City sewer or water and they keep reminding us they are not going to give it to us.

DeLapp explained a floating zone is a zone that does not exist on the zoning maps at this time and we will also keep it off the Future Land Use Map because we are not saying we think this is something that should replace what is there, but it is an option we are prepared to recommend to the City Council that they allow as a replacement.

DeLapp gave the reason for coming up with the map was to show areas adjacent to highly visible areas, which include both where R1 as it exists now and where there is a heavy amount of traffic. Hunt stated one of the reasons for proposing this is because these areas can have access from current roads so they would not become a great expense or problem to develop.

Johnson stated if 2 1/2 acres is appropriate for Residential Estates along the freeway, he would like to see this zoning also allow along the freeway the same 2 1/2 acres zoned for commercial development.

M/S/P Simpson/Enes - to recommend approval by the City Council on Residential Estates Zoning as stated in Draft #3 with the exclusion of Item D1, and to include map dated 11-9-87 in the Comprehensive Plan, with follow-up discussion at the next PZ meeting on design standards for road width, curves and boulevard trees. (Motion carried 8-1<Buckcheck; not in complete agreement with the map>).

5. Sign Ordinance - Steve DeLapp

Chairman DeLapp stated the basic intent of the sign ordinance is to provide everyone in the town or business the opportunity to identify their property and their service, but not to advertise where it would detract the public's view. The Commission will look over the sign ordinance and to look at the signs that are now up in the City.

6. Comprehensive Plan Update - Marjorie Williams

Marge Williams handed out a draft of the Comprehensive Plan which now follows the proper format set by the Metropolitan Council. The Commission appreciated the efforts and the amount of time Marge has dedicated to reorganizing the plan.

M/S/P Hunt/Enes - to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 9:55 p.m. (Motion carried 8-0).