

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

SEPTEMBER 12, 1988

-----6:30 - 7:30 p.m. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REVIEW/DISCUSSION-----

7:30 p.m. MEETING CONVENES

1. Agenda
2. Minutes: August 8, 1988
August 22, 1988
3. PUBLIC HEARING:
 - A. Preliminary Plat: Tony & Alice Maistrovich
(Off Lake Jane Road, S. of Springborn 2nd
Addition)
4. CONCEPT PLAN:
Apostolic Church, 10th Street, 1/4 mile East of Inwood
County Road 13
5. CONCEPT PLAN: Large Lot Subdivision
Lawrence Kleis, 9241 60th St. N.
6. Discussion/Review/Recommendation:
 - a. Landscape Requirements/Architectural Standards-
General Business District
 - b. Park Dedication fees - All Zoning Districts
7. Adjourn

APPROVED

LAKE ELMO PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

SEPTEMBER 12, 1988

Chairman DeLapp called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in the City Council chambers. Present: DeLapp, Enes, Haacke, Williams, Kunde, Johnston, Bucheck (arrived 8:00 p.m.), and City Administrator Morrison. Absent: Johnson, Stevens, Hunt.

1. Agenda

M/S/P Enes/Williams - to approve the September 12, 1988 Planning Commission agenda as presented. (Motion carried 6-0).

2. Minutes: August 8, 1988

M/S/P Haacke/Enes - to approve the August 8, 1988 Planning Commission minutes as amended. (See 3. General Business Zone). (Motion carried 4-0-2<Abstain: Williams, Johnston>).

Minutes: August 22, 1988

M/S/P Williams/DeLapp - to accept the August 22, 1988 Lake Elmo Planning Commission Workshop minutes as presented. (Motion carried 4-0-2<Abstain: Haacke, Johnston>).

3. PUBLIC HEARING:

A. Preliminary Plat: Tony & Alice Maistrovich

Chairman DeLapp opened up the public hearing at 7:45 p.m. in the City Council chambers.

Public notice was duly sent and published.

Tony and Alice Maistrovich, 8880 Jane Road North, are requesting preliminary plat approval of a one-lot subdivision. Bruce Folz provided a preliminary plat of the (one-lot) subdivision known as "Firefly".

City Engineer, Larry Bohrer, has reviewed this application and has no problem with its concept. The DNR has also reviewed this application, as it is within the Shoreland District, and they have no problem with this subdivision.

A petition was presented to the Commission, which was signed by the surrounding neighbors, stated they were not in opposition of Tony Maistrovich splitting off the two acres surrounding his house at 8880 Jane Road North.

Dan Collyard, 8896 Jane Road N., commented that he did not want to see an improved road. Mr. Maistrovich stated that it was not his intention to put a road in at this time.

Chairman DeLapp closed the public hearing at 7:55 p.m.

The Planning Commission felt the subdivision was in conformance with the City Code and the house met all the setback requirements and did not create any non-conforming lots. The Commission commented, that although they recommend approval of this preliminary plat, it is not a guarantee that the rest of the property can be developed.

M/S/P Williams/Enes - to approve the preliminary plat, as presented, of a one-lot subdivision known as "Firefly" for Tony and Alice Maistrovich, 8880 Jane Road North. (Motion carried 6-0).

4. CONCEPT PLAN: Apostolic Church
10th Street, 1/4 mile East of Inwood County Road 13

Mr. Joe and Jeff Roos provided an architectural rendering of the Apostolic Church proposed to be constructed on a 38 acre parcel located on 10th Street, approximately one-quarter mile east of Inwood Avenue. This property is currently zoned Rural Residential. Churches are an allowed use in the Public Facility zoning district. Therefore, a rezoning from RR to PF is the first step in processing this application.

Mr. Roos explained the church would be low profile esthetically blend with the topography. As far as long term expansion plan, no parsonage or dormitory is planned and they do not anticipate subdividing the 38 acres. They are planning on a church and Sunday school facility. The sanctuary would seat between 500-700 people.

Ann Bucheck commented that the land around the church is zoned RR and felt the neighbors would not look favorable at a church with a high steeple. Mr. Roos responded the steeple was eliminated and the church would be a good distance from the nearest home and bordered on the northeast by Linder Greenhouse.

A concern was brought up on the traffic flow on 10th Street. The County had stated 10th Street could carry between 1200-1500 cars a day. Mr. Roos expected 400 people on Sunday mornings which would be approximately 150 cars. On Thursday night there would be Bible study from 6:30 to 9:30 p.m.

Mr. Roos stated that the landscape requirements of the city have been looked at and the architect didn't feel our requirements could not be met.

A concern on lighting was raised. Rob Enes felt the City was loosing one of their natural resources, which was darkness. Mr. Roos stated that they now have 4 lights which are used as sensors for security.

Steve DeLapp commented that it was not in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan of 1986. The goal of the Planning Commission is to provide high^{quality} rural residential living for people in Lake Elmo. The church would be a ^{more intense} higher use than RR zoning and would double the impervious surface coverage.

Mr. Roos responded that the church did not have a detrimental affect on the property, was compatible to the area and had almost a semi-park environment. Roos added that most schools and churches are permitted under a CUP in other cities, but Lake Elmo requires a rezoning to Public Facilities. Roos asked how many Comprehensive Plans take into consideration church facilities and sets aside land for churches.

Marge Williams raised the point that the church would have a tax exempt status and would not pay for services. She also had a concern on the impact on the area with the amount of cars traveling 10th Street and questioned if adequate on-site system is planned. Mr. Roos responded they would have kitchen facilities, but it still would be a low sewage demand facility.

Ann Bucheck added that the Commission has to decide if they want to change the use of this land and how does the church benefit the Lake Elmo residents.

Dean Johnston commented he would welcome the church and found it compatible with the area. Al Kunde asked if they would consider rezoning only the area the church would need.

If the applicants have any questions or in need of clarification, the Commission suggested they call the City staff.

5. CONCEPT PLAN: Large Lot Subdivision
Lawrence Kleis, 9241 60th St. N.

There was no representation for the large lot subdivision, but a concept drawing of the 40 acre lot split proposed by Mr. & Mrs. Kleis was provided. The property proposed to be subdivided, which is in the Rural Residential zoning district, does not have the required frontage on a public road. However, access can be gained off the 55th Street cul-de-sac which dead ends at this property line, if a variance is granted.

The Planning Commission commented, according to City code there is no restriction on the length of the driveway, and it would become a private drive at the owner's responsibility. A stipulation could be made for only one house off the private road.

A public hearing has been called for September 26th on this application.

6. Discussion/Review/Recommendation

A. Landscape Rquirements/Architectural Standards--
General Business District

1. Landscape Requirements:

Administrator Morrison felt our current landscape requirements (Section 504-5, as delineated under our site and building plan review process), appeared to be quite adequate, but was not sure how closely the requirements are followed.

The General Business requirements also require buffering when contiguous to residential zone. Morrison suggested two aspects the Commission may wish to address:

- (1) delineation of the amount of the landscaping security bond or, a letter of credit in lieu of a bond;
- (2) Follow-up on landscaping to make sure requirements have been met after planting; that landscaping materials have not died, etc. before bond is released.

The Commission will discuss the landscape requirements at their September 26th meeting.

2. Architectual Standards: for General Business Zone.

A copy of Edina's architectual standards were provided for the Commission's consideration.

After much discussion the Commission came to a consensus on all exterior wall finishes on any building shall be one or a combination of the following materials:

- (1.) Face brick
- (2.) Natural Stone
- (3.) Wood, provided the surfaces are finished for exterior use and wood of proven exterior durability is used such as cedar, redwood, etc.
- (4.) Masonry Stucco
- (5.) Cast in-place concrete
- (6.) Glass (50% of a building or less)

Quonset huts and pole buildings will not be allowed. An Historical Overlay for the ~~Main Street~~ Old Village will be discussed at a later date.

3. Park Dedication Fees:

Park dedication requirements for several other cities were provided for the Commission's review. Administrator Morrison recommended that our requirements be increased to 10% of overall land area, or, 10% of undeveloped land market value; the option to be determined by the Council.

Steve DeLapp suggested setting aside 10% of the land the developer has for a permanent bird sanctuary where trees could be planted, not used as a recreational park.

Ann Bucheck was in favor of increasing the park fee rather than seeing little pockets of park land.

Dean Johnston liked the idea of requiring the developer to commit the land in a planted fashion. The money will come and go, but the land will be there forever.

M/S/P Williams/Johnston - to recommend to the City Council developers be required to pay a park dedication fee of 10% of overall land area in a maintenance free preserve where feasible and wherenot feasible 10% of the undeveloped land market value. (Motion carried 7-0).

M/S/P Williams/Kunde - to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 10:30 p.m. (Motion carried 7-0).