

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 28, 1989

7:30 p.m.

Meeting Convenes

1. Agenda
2. Minutes - August 14, 1989
3. Simple Lot Subdivision - John Hanner
8151 Hill Trail N.
4. Simple Lot Subdivision - James Palecek
2798 Jamley Ave. N.
5. Large Lot Subdivision - Concept
Will Stenzel (50th Street)
6. Subcommittee Reports
 1. Residential Estates Ordinance
 2. Freeway Ordinance
 3. Other
7. Other
8. Adjourn

APPROVED

LAKE ELMO PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

AUGUST 14, 1989

Chairman Enes called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in the City Council chambers. Present: Enes, DeLapp, Stevens, Dick Johnson, Haacke, John. Absent: Dave Johnson, Johnston, Bucheck, Conlin.

1. AGENDA

Add: 5. PZ Comments on Larry Bohrer's letter of July 28 dealing with road standards for Residential Estates, 6. Comprehensive Plan

M/S/P Stevens/DeLapp - to approve the August 14, 1989 Planning Commission agenda as amended. (Motion carried 6-0).

2. Minutes: July 24, 1989

M/S/P Stevens/Enes - to approve the July 24, 1989 Planning Commission minutes as amended. (Motion carried 6-0).

Minutes: August 7, 1989 PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSHOP

The staff indicated a quorum was 6 members, therefore this was not a legal PZ meeting. Steve DeLapp referred to an '83 Resolution he had read which stated a PZ Quorum consisted of 5 members. The Planning Commission approved, by consensus, the August 7, 1989 Workshop minutes as submitted by Ann Bucheck, PZ Secretary.

3. Public Hearing: Packard Park 3rd Addition, Preliminary Plat

Chairman Enes called the Public Hearing to order at 7:45 p.m. in the City Council Chambers.

Notice was published in the legal newspaper on August 2 and affected property owners have been notified of this public hearing and received the written comments from the City Engineer.

Bruce Folz submitted a preliminary plat for Packard Park 3rd Addition which contains 13 lots and is generally located east of Lake Elmo Avenue and west of Packard Park 2nd Addition. The subdivision consists of 25.4 acres and is properly zoned R-1 for the proposed 13 lots which all meet the 1.5 acre minimum lot size. All of the lots have at least one acre of land suitable for septic system purposes and will have land sufficient for two separate drainfield sites. All lots have at least 125 feet of road frontage.

The subdivision will contain two streets: 24th Street will connect that portion of 24th Street in Packard Park 2nd Addition to Lake Elmo Avenue and will be a "through" street; Lansing Avenue will be constructed from 24th Street to the north line of the subdivision. These streets are planned to be constructed as an urban design in accordance with existing city standards. City Engineer Bohrer has met with the Washington County Highway Dept. and the Developer regarding the County's requests for

Packard Park 3rd Addition. These requests are stated in Bohrer's letter, dated August 14, 1989, to the Commission.

Debra Wilfong, 2229 Legion Avenue, presented the Commission a list of concerns and questions regarding this continued development and pictures (dated 7-9-89) showing erosion and sedimentation of the holding pond and the outlet pipe. (See handout).

Bruce Folz explained that the improvements for the 3rd Addition will provide a storm sewer system of catch basins and pipes in 24th Street from 24th Street Court directly into the pond. This storm sewer system will eliminate erosion and sedimentation in the pond. The storm sewer and pond proposed for the 3rd Addition can meet the requirements of the City's Stormwater Control Ordinance subject to the modification in pond size described in Bohrer's letter, dated August 4, 1989, to the Planning Commission.

Jean Durand, lives on the property below the holding pond, as long as they are putting these pipes toward the lake, why does the pipe for the overflow still have to come down onto their property. They have lived on this property for 40 years and never had water there...Durand Pond was created by people that have built there.

Chairman Enes closed the public hearing at 8:45 p.m.

Dick Johnson asked if we could put an outlet into the storm sewer that is going on down to Lake Elmo and use the pond as a storage pond, but have the outlet to go to Lake Elmo. Folz responded that the VBWD and the City's rule state "we cannot transfer water from one watershed to another".

Steve DeLapp asked if the Parks Commission wanted park land from this development. Administrator Morrison responded the Parks Commission has not meet yet this summer to review this development, but they have looked at the Future Land Use Map and this is not a designated park area.

M/S/P Stevens/DeLapp - to recommend to the City Council that approval of Packard Park 3rd Addition be deferred until the design problem of the holding pond be addressed and the drainage from this pond be routed to Lake Elmo lake or that the level of Downs Lake be controlled (or if the City can find a solution to the problem) and recommend the City Council hold up approval of the property in this plat which drains toward the Durand's property. (Motion carried 4-2: Haacke: The City Eng, VBWD, DNR have approved this preliminary plat, no variances are required, you cannot approve only half of this developmet; Enes: He sympathized with the homeowners, but agreed with what Barb stated. He would have preferred a motion for the proposal to be passed and a second motion made recommending the Council look into changing the waterflow of the holding pond into Lake Elmo. Also, the City should look into percolation of holding ponds because no where in the Code do we require developer's have percolation tests on the pond; therefore, we cannot hold one applicant hostage).

4. CONCEPT PLAN - DRIVING RANGE: Scott Blasko

Scott Blasko submitted a concept plan for a driving range proposed on 18

acres, zoned Rural Residential, west of Manning Avenue and South of Oakland Jr. High School (from the propertyline to the school is approx. 110'). Blasko indicated the entrance would be the driveway used by the school because he talked to Jack Nelson, Wash. Cty Eng., who stated that this was a joint driveway to be shared with the school. Blasko plans on a 30 car parking lot and a 2 1/2 car garage with wood siding. There would be no lighting planned, hours would be 8 a.m. to 8p.m.

Wyn John supported the concept and felt it was an appropriate use of the land. He suggested addressing fencing because of possible litigation for striking a student with a golf ball.

Rob Enes was in favor of the concept plan.

Ed Stevens would not comment until he heard from the school. Ed assumed this was a low revenue producer and questioned if the PZ should consider the balance of services required by the city and the tax income that the City would derive from this proposal.

Steve DeLapp recommended Public Facility Zoning as it is defined in our Comp Plan. Steve requested comments from school and setbacks addressed.

Dick Johnson saw the application as low traffic useage, appropriate useage for a rural area. The septic system should not be a problem based on useage. Dick suggested Blasko review our requirements for the parking lot in regard to a variance needed for the requested Class 5 driveway. Dick voiced a concern on location to the school and he reserved final judgement after receiving input from the school.

Barb Haacke was generally in favor of the concept, but had a concern on fencing and landscaping to the South for the proposed large lot RE.

5. Road Standards/Residential Estates

The Planning Commission discussed the comments submitted by Ed Stevens on Larry Bohrer's letter of July 28th dealing with road standards for Residential Estates. The Commission deleted the 1st paragraph, page 3 and inserted: The City Engineer's last argument is contradicted by the fact that surrounding communities in Washington County have narrower roads.

Wyn John indicated that the Tri-Lakes residents preferred the narrower roads, but they would like bicycle paths and the vegetation should be cut back.

M/S/P Stevens/John - the Planning Commission supports their original motion on road widths recommendations (dated June 12, 1989) and submit their additional comments, as amended, on Larry Bohrer's letter of July 28th dealing with road standards for RE. (Motion carried 6-0).

6. Comprehensive Plan

Steve DeLapp presented copies of the Comp Plan (8-8-89) submitted by the Comp Plan Sub-Committee.

Barb Haacke found nothing offensive in this plan, but nor had she found

anything offensive in the staff's comp plan.

Rob Enes supported the plan in order to get the process done rather than see the continuance of the staff's plan versus the PZ's plan.

Ed Stevens found this plan more easily readable than the previous plan and liked the appearance better.

Steve DeLapp indicated the Sub-Committee took care of the section on the airport. Steve added this version of the Plan was not determined by him, it was set up by the the vote of the PZ, which Marge Williams put together and sets a more professional image for the City.

Based on his limited experience with working with the Comp Plan, Wyn John found this version more understandable.

M/S/P Haacke/Stevens - per City Council direction, the PZ proposes the 8-8-89 PZ draft version of the Lake Elmo Comprehensive Plan to the City Council. (Motion carried 5-1: Dick Johnson: He voted against the motion on principle---He felt the format was not important, this was a senseless duplication of effort---it was a matter of pride of authorship).

M/S/P Haacke/Stevens - to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 10:15 p.m. (Motion carried 6-0).

SUBMITTED TO THE PZ AT THEIR AUGUST 14, 1989 PZ MEETING

Comments of the Lake Elmo Planning and Zoning Committee on Mr. Bohrer's letter of July 28, dealing with road standards for Residential Estates.

Minnesota roads are divided into five classes, from the most heavily and fastest travelled (Interstate) to the least heavily and hopefully most slowly travelled (local). The city has control over design of only collector and local streets, as the design of the other classes is the prerogative of MinDot. Collector streets are or may be available for cost sharing by MinDot, and in such a case their design is determined by MinDot. Local streets are not available for cost sharing, and their design is not mandated by Mindot. The fact that collector and local streets are not subject to the same standard would indicate that their design need not be identical.

It seems reasonable that standards for local streets, like standards for the other classes of roads, be suitable for the level of traffic to be expected, and conducive to a speed no higher than that desired. The city engineer's recommendation for 32' wide urban type street in the RE 2 1/2 acre area appears to us inappropriate, in view of the lower traffic to be expected in those areas. The fact that RE 2 1/2 may be adjacent to existing R1 developments is no more a reason for continuing R1 roads into RE developments, than the adjacency of collector streets to minor arterial streets is a reason for upgrading collector streets to minor arterial standards.

We also question the city Engineer's second argument, that "estate type development may not find ditches and culverts for drainage (the alternative to curbs) aesthetically acceptable compared to storm sewers and curbs." With storm sewers the question arises as to where the sewer outlet would be placed, and what the aesthetic consequence of the outlet would be. As far as ditches are concerned, it seems that their width would not have to be as great as that on collector streets; while trees in ditches are not acceptable, shrubbery at the outer edge of ditches is, and provides both a visual buffer and a safety stop.

For RE 5 acre lots the city engineer recommends a 24' wide blacktop with 4' wide shoulders, a total of 32' plus ditches. Aside from the slightly narrower black top for the RE 5, both designs encourage higher than desirable driving speeds for residential areas.

If the city had no experience with narrower roads, the city engineer's arguments might be more persuasive, but we have experience with narrower roads. The Tri-Lakes Area is probably the most attractive residential area in Lake Elmo. Even though lots are generally smaller than 2 1/2 acres, the streets are 22' wide, with shrubbery practically to the edge of the street. School buses have apparently managed for decades to negotiate those streets. If 22' wide streets work in the Tri-Lakes area, there is every reason to believe that they will work in both RE zones.

*Delete
Entire
Paragraph

~~We are not sure the city Engineer's last argument, that Washington County requires a minimum of 32' wide road bed on a 60' wide right of way. If Washington County can enforce such a standard, we recommend that Lake Elmo acquire only 59' wide rights of way, so that we can design roads in keeping with the low density population which we wish to maintain.~~

It is understandable that an engineers main concern is fast and efficient movement of traffic, just as a school bus driver's concern is ease of driving, and the fire chief's concern is quickest and easiest access. The question is, though, for whose benefit are the roads designed. We submit they should be designed for the benefit of the residents who live along those roads. We hope the council will vote for the narrower roads, and we believe the new residents will like them as well as those residents in the Tri-Lakes area like their roads.

Amended 8-14-89; Replace with this paragraph:

The City Engineer's last argument is contradicted by the fact that surrounding communities in Washington County have narrower roads.