

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

AUGUST 8, 1988

-----6:30-7:30 p.m. Review/Discussion: Comprehensive Plan-----

7:30 p.m. MEETING CONVENES

1. Agenda
2. Minutes: July 11, 1988  
July 25, 1988
3. Final Plat: Brookman 3rd Addition
4. Discussion: Preliminary Plan Concept (T. Maistrovich)  
(Off Lake Jane Rd.; So. of Springborn 2nd Addition;  
R-1 Zone)
5. Discussion/Recommendation: General Business Zone;  
Density Standards
6. Update: 1.) Proposed Ordinances:  
a) Residential Estates  
b) Signage Standards  
2.) Accessory Structures (RR Zoning Dist.)
7. Adjourn

APPROVED

LAKE ELMO PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

AUGUST 8, 1988

Chairman DeLapp called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in the City Council chambers. Present: DeLapp, Kunde, Stevens, Hunt, Enes, Johnson, Haacke, Bucheck (arrived 7:35). Absent: Williams, Johnston

1. Agenda

M/S/P Stevens/Kunde - to approve the August 8, 1988 Planning Commission agenda as amended (Reverse the order of Item 5. and Item 3.). (Motion carried 7-0).

2. Minutes: July 11, 1988

M/S/P Hunt/Stevens - to approve the July 11, 1988 Planning Commission minutes as amended. (Motion carried 7-0-1<Abstain: Haacke>).

Minutes: July 25, 1988

The consensus of the Commission was to approve the July 25, 1988 Planning Commission worksession as amended.

3. Discussion/Recommendation: General Business Zone; Density Standards

The City Council, at their meeting of July 19th, after discussion of the Preliminary Plat for Brookman Addition, determined it was necessary to review the reasonableness and practicality of the density provisions required in the General Business Zoning District, as adopted by the Council, upon Planning Commission recommendation, in November of 1987. As noted in the Council's motion, they would like suggest the commission to ~~recommend~~ <sup>look at</sup> an impervious surface factor for General Business between 35% and 50%.

Bruce Folz advised the Commission that in the Brookman 3rd Addition Final Plat, Brookman felt that 20% coverage of impervious surface was not acceptable. Ten years ago they brought in this plan, in good faith; and a 67% coverage of impervious surface was determined suitable in the Brookman 1st and 2nd Additions, and, consequently, drainage provision was computed on this basis.

City Administrator Morrison provided a survey summary of the zoning ordinance requirements of the surrounding communities.

The Commission opinions varied, anywhere from 20% to 50% coverage. The following motion was made in order to cut discussion.

M/S/F Stevens/Buckeck - to recommend the maximum density allowed for a commercial development as follows:

- 35% coverage up to 1.5 acres
- 25% coverage 1.5 - 5 acres
- 20% coverage 5 - 10 acres
- 15% coverage 10 - 20 acres
- 10% coverage Over 20 acres

(Motion failed 2-6<Buckeck, Johnson, Stevens, Kunde, Enes, Haacke>).

Barb Haacke stated she would like 35% coverage, no sliding scale, and see adoption of more stringent landscape requirements and architectural design. Rob Enes suggested 45-50% and make parking requirements more negotiable. Dave Johnson suggested 50% with with a stop on maximum building size. He did not like the sliding scale.

As a compromise, the Commission made the following motion based on reasons that they considered 35% coverage consistent with the rural character of Lake Elmo. They considered the density requirements of the surrounding neighbors; such as Mahtomedi which they felt was similar to Lake Elmo and required 30% maximum lot coverage. \*

M/S/P Hunt/Stevens - to recommend to the City Council the maximum density allowed for a commercial development is as follows:

- 35% coverage for 1.5 acre lot
- 25% coverage for 1.51 - 5 acres
- 20% coverage for 5.1 acres and over

and to adopt more stringent landscape and architectural design requirements and recommend the Planning Commission review these requirements. (Motion carried 5-3<Johnson, Haacke, Enes: for reasons stated above>).

#### 4. Final Plat: Brookman 3rd Addition

The Commission considered allowance of impervious surface coverage with this plat in the above discussion.

City Engineer Bohrer made a comment, in reference to the letter from Washington County dated July 21, 1988, in which it was stated that 60 feet of right-of-way be dedicated along CSAH 17 measured from center line rather than 50 feet shown on the plat).

Bruce Folz advised that a permanent easement from the Lake Elmo Business Park Company has been requested from Washington County for highway purposes over the West 10 feet of Lot 1, Block 1, and Lot 1, Block 2 of Brookman 3rd Addition.

The Planning Commission suggested the City find out why they want this right-of-way. If they cannot prove the need for a r-o-w of 10 additional feet, the City should not approve it.

M/S/P Hunt/Haacke - to recommend to the City Council approval of the Final Plat for Brookman 3rd Addition and to include the PZ recommendation that the developer not dedicate the additional 10 feet on Hwy 17 to the County. (Motion carried 8-0).

\* CORRECTION: Mahtomedi: 30% is building only; code does not address overall impervious surface density.

5. Discussion: Preliminary Plan Concept (T. Maistrovich)  
(Off Lake Jane Rd.; So. of Springborn 2nd Addition; R-1 Zone).

Bruce Folz presented a sketch plan of a preliminary plat application from Tony and Alice Maistrovich. (The code requires that the applicant provide a concept for the remainder of the contiguous property.) The property is zoned R1 and the applicant wishes to proceed with a one lot plat. This plan meets all the code requirements for 1 1/2 acre lots. The applicant will not proceed with more than one lot at this time. The Commission had no problem with the concept. A public hearing has been set for August 22, 1988.

6. A. Lee Hunt and Ann Bucheck, as Planning Commission members on the Committee reviewing the Residential Estates Ordinance, provided the Commission with an update on the current status of the Residential Estate Zoning.

Dave Johnson suggested that RE zoning should be allowed along R1 zoning, not floating here and there in the City. Other members did not want to see it for the northeast quadrant and would like to keep the 10 acre zoning. There was discussion on what the impact would be on services with opening RE throughout the City.

The Commission liked the idea of a test market of an RE development in the City and discussed allowing a cut off, such as 3 developments a year or by the number of building permits. They were in favor of requesting erosion control and grading plans, 24' (or less) road width, and a minimal set of landscape guidelines checked by the City Forester.

The Commission is to call Ann or Lee with their comments. The Committee will meet in September.

B. Chairman DeLapp reported there was no update on the sign ordinance due to the full PZ agendas.

7. Other

At the July 11th Planning Commission meeting, Ann Bucheck asked the Commission to recommend to the City Council that the City Engineer not be the designer for any project in the City because the City needs a person to be able to check and review another engineer's plan.

M/S/P Bucheck/Enes - to recommend to the City Council that the City Engineer not provide the design for any project submitted by a private developer because the City loses the benefit of review by another engineer. (Motion carried 8-0).

M/S/P Enes/Johnson - to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 10:10 p.m. (Motion carried 8-0).