

City of Lake Elmo

777-5510

3800 Laverne Avenue North / Lake Elmo, Minnesota 55042

The Lake Elmo Planning Commission will meet at 6:00 p.m. on Monday, June 28, 1999 in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 3800 Laverne Avenue North, Lake Elmo, Minnesota.

PLEASE NOTE: 6:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m. continued discussion – Comprehensive Plan.

AGENDA: 7:00 p.m. meeting

1. Agenda
2. Minutes - June 14, 1999
3. **PUBLIC HEARING:** Robert Engstrom Companies
Conditional Use Permit &
Open Space Residential Development Concept Plan
Fields of St. Croix – Phase Two
4. **PUBLIC HEARING:** William Zintl
Open Space Residential Development Concept Plan
Tana Ridge
5. **Eagle Point Business Park**
Development Stage Plan & Preliminary Plat
(continued from June 14, 1999 meeting)
6. **Higher Dimension Research (HDR) Site Plan Review**
(continued from June 14, 1999 meeting)
7. Other
8. Adjourn



DRAFT

**Lake Elmo
Planning Commission**

**Meeting Minutes
Monday, June 28, 1999**

*(The Planning Commissioners continued their discussion of the
Comprehensive Plan at its 6:00 p.m. meeting)*

Chairman Armstrong called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 3800 Laverne Avenue, Lake Elmo, Minnesota. Present: Commissioners Berg, Brass, Gerard, Helwig, Herber, Lipman, Mandel, Ptacek, Sedro and Sessing. Also present: City Planner Dillerud.

1. AGENDA

- 7.a Public Facilities Ordinance
- 7.b Comprehensive Plan – extend deadline

**M/S/P Lipman/Sessing – to approve the agenda as amended.
(Motion Passed 9-0).**

2. MINUTES

**M/S/P Armstrong/Lipman – to approve the Minutes from the June 14, 1999 meeting, as amended.
(Motion Passed 8-0-1). Abstain: Brass**

**3. PUBLIC HEARING: Robert Engstrom Companies
The Fields of St. Croix – Phase Two
Concept Plan**

Planner Dillerud said this site was originally part of the first Fields of St. Croix Concept Plan submissions in 1996 and the Emerson/Forletti Open Space Concept Plan, approved earlier in 1999. He said this concept plan proposes 52 single family detached dwellings situated on lots sized from 4/10 of an acre to 1.10 acre, a townhouse component of 12 attached units in 6 two unit structures and a farmstead and commercial area. He said the applicant advised staff that this area would serve as the relocated retail outlet for the CSA Farm currently located at Phase One of The Fields of St. Croix. He said there was some concern that a “commercial center” may be in direct competition with “downtown” Lake Elmo. He said the access to Highway 5 would be at a single point for all 64 proposed units.

Mr. Robert Engstrom and Mr. Tim Freeman each presented drawings of the two proposed development concept plans, The Fields of St. Croix and Tana Ridge.

Chairman Armstrong opened the comment portion of the Public Hearing for The Fields of St. Croix at 7:40 p.m.

**Robert Eischen
11674 Stillwater Blvd.**

Mr. Eischen said an earlier presented concept plan indicated the closure of his “private” driveway which he shares with Mary Jean DuPois. He asked if his road was going to be closed. He said the farming operation near his property has been very compatible and said Mr. Engstrom agreed to install a line of trees further accommodating him.

Mary Jean DuPois

Resident

Ms. DuPois asked how many feet were between her driveway and the entrance to the proposed development.

Mr. Engstrom said 425 feet.

Chairman Armstrong closed the comment portion of the Public Hearing for The Fields of St. Croix Concept Plan at 7:50 p.m.

Chairman Armstrong opened the comment portion of the Public Hearing for Tana Ridge Concept Plan at 7:50 p.m.

Reid Gilbertson

11421 50th Street

Mr. Gilbertson said he was still opposed to this development and said he was concerned about the lighting. He asked if he would be forced to develop his property in the future, would there be road extension to the west adjoining his property. He said he has a major concern about the addition of two more units to this plan.

Rich Smith

11514 Stillwater Blvd.

Mr. Smith said he was concerned about the possibility of run-off on his property created by the proposed holding ponds.

Chairman Armstrong closed the comment portion of the Public Hearing for Tana Ridge Open Space Concept Plan at 8:00 p.m.

M/S/P Berg/Herber - to recommend adoption of a resolution approving the Concept Plan for The Fields of St. Croix Phase Two including the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the recommendations of the City Engineer's memo dated January 4, 1999.
2. The Development Stage Plan shall include a proposal to legally guarantee that the open space and Public Park components (subject to Park Commission recommendations) and the common waste water treatment system, all of which require common actions with the adjacent OP project, will be accomplished completely and in a timely manner, as proposed by the Concept Plan.
3. Subject to any Park Commission recommendation regarding the proposed Public Park.
4. Any modifications to the Tana Ridge Concept Plan that results in adjustments to the aggregate Park or OP open space calculations shall void this recommendation.
5. The Development Stage Plan shall provide substantial detail with respect to the design of and proposed uses of the non-residential component adjacent to State Highway 5.

(Motion Passed 8-1). Opposed: Brass; opposed to the doubling up of open space/public park, lot sizes, not enough information provided regarding the commercial operation.

M/S/P Armstrong/Herber - to recommend adoption of a resolution approving the Concept Plan for Tana Ridge including the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the recommendations of the City Engineer's memo dated January 4, 1999.
2. The Development Stage Plan shall include a proposal to legally guarantee that the open space and Public Park components (subject to Park Commission recommendations) and the common waste water treatment system, all of which require common actions with the adjacent OP project, will be accomplished completely and in a timely manner, as proposed by the Concept Plan.

3. Subject to any Park Commission recommendation regarding the proposed Public Park.
4. Any modifications to the Fields of St. Croix Concept Plan that results in adjustments to the aggregate Park or OP open space calculations shall void this recommendation.
5. The Development Stage Plan shall provide substantial detail with respect to the design of and proposed uses of the non-residential component adjacent to State Highway 5.

(Motion Passed 8-1) Opposed: Brass; number of lots, and doubling up of open space/public park.

**5. Eagle Point Business Park
Development Stage Plan & Preliminary Plat
(continued from June 14, 1999 meeting)**

Planner Dillerud said United Properties had responded to most of the Development Plan issues addressed at the last meeting. He said it appeared that United Properties had moved closer to compliance with many of the Business Park standards.

The Commissioners, Planner Dillerud, Dale Glowa, Jon Pope, and Daniel Zelke (Mrs. Glowa, Pope and Zelke representing United Properties) reviewed the development standard table. At its June 14, 1999 meeting, the Planning Commission recommended several changes to the standards and Mr. Glowa said he had prepared an amended table which lists in the far left column those business park ordinance requirements that the Planning Commission asked to discuss further relative to the PUD changes which are listed in the second column.

ATTACHED IS THE TABLE OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS THAT REFLECTS THE CHANGES RECOMMENDED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION WHICH THEY ADDRESSED ONE BY ONE AND RECOMMENDED BY INFORMAL VOTE.

*(Commissioner Lipman exit at 9:00 p.m.)
(Commissioner Gerard exit at 10:10 p.m.)*

BREAK 10:05 – 10:15 p.m.

The Commissioners discussed sign height, specifically referencing their concerns regarding the pylon sign height.

Cheryl O'Donnel, representing United Properties, said the signage is the "jewelry" of a project and a way to accessorize and identify the business park.

Commissioner Brass said she felt it was important for Lake Elmo to stay consistent with the current sign ordinance and not make any concessions for this PUD. An informal vote was taken to follow the current sign code for this PUD resulted in 4 for and 5 opposed. The second informal vote to accept the applicant's plan for signage in the PUD resulted in 4 for and 5 opposed. The default is that the PUD will need to follow the current Lake Elmo Sign Ordinance.

**M/S/P Armstrong/Mandel – to recommend adoption of a resolution approving the Development Stage Plan and Preliminary Plat for Eagle Point Business Park substituting in condition number one the inclusion of the table of standards initialed by the City Planner and dated June 28, 1999.
(Motion Passed 9-0).**

6. Higher Dimension Research (HDR) Site Plan

Planner Dillerud said that at meeting time, no additional information had been submitted to the Planning Commission by the applicant.

M/S/P Armstrong/Sessing – to recommend approval of the site plan for Higher Dimension Research.

(Motion Passed 8-0-1) Abstain: Brass; did not attend the previous meetings regarding this plan.

M/S/P Armstrong/Sedro – to recommend extending the Public Facilities moratorium for 6 months.


(Motion Passed 8-1). Opposed: Helwig; he suggests extending one year.

M/S/P Sessing/Sedro – to recommend applying for an extension to the deadline for the Comprehensive Plan submission to the Metropolitan Council to December 31, 1999, and petitioning the Metropolitan Council to amend the Regional Blueprint to substitute “Permanent Rural” for “Urban Reserve” within the Northeast Annexed Area.

(Motion Passed 9-0).

Chairman Armstrong adjourned the meeting at 11:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Cynthia Young-Planning Secretary

6/28/99
P.C. Responses


**DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS TO BE CHANGED
 FOR
 EAGLE POINT BUSINESS PARK**

ORDINANCE REQUIREMENTS	PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS (5/28/99)	PLANNING COMMISSION'S COMMENTS (6/14/99)	PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS REVISED (6/23/99)
<p>300.12 subd. (1)(B) and 300.12(2). No Business Park structure shall exceed 60' in height. Parapet walls shall not exceed more than 4' above the height permitted of the building.</p>	<p>No limitation. Special City approval required for heights exceeding 100'.</p>	<p>Do not like the idea of no limitation.</p>	<p>No Change. Keep the 60' building height limitation currently in the City Ordinance. United Properties will request a variance if ever needed.</p>
<p>300.13 subd. (6)(A)(3). Parking spaces shall be 10' x 20', exclusive of access system. Size of parking space may be altered upon approval of Zoning Administrator. Parking spaces for the handicapped shall be minimum of 12' x 20'.</p>	<p>Parking spaces shall be 9' x 18'. Handicapped spaces will be changed to agree with the Minnesota State Building Code and the Americans With Disabilities Act.</p>	<p>Address parking spaces south of Hudson Blvd. where there might be higher turnover of spaces.</p>	<p>We propose 9' X 18' spaces at the developments north of Hudson Boulevard, 10' X 18' south of Hudson Boulevard, where commercial development is most likely to occur with the exception of the proposed hotel and restaurant transaction which is currently under contract (Heart of America), which needs 9' X 18' spacing. In addition, many communities allow up to 20% of the spaces in an office building development to be compact car sizes, 8' X 16'. The benefit for smaller spaces is to minimize hard parking surface areas.</p>
<p>300.13 subd. (6)(B)(6)(d). The primary landscaping materials shall be shade trees, with shrubs, hedges, etc., used only to complement trees, not as the sole means of landscaping.</p>	<p>Specific site landscape plans shall be presented and approved by United Properties and the City on a site-by-site basis.</p>	<p>Some members would like to see the landscaping along the berm to be done initially. Need to show approval letter from NSP.</p>	<p>We propose to install the berm initially as the material is available when building the loop road and the HDR sites. Landscaping and Irrigation will be done on a project-by-project basis. We prefer this approach because of the difficulty to maintain isolated landscaped areas, having no access roads, potential disease that could kill all of the material if planted at once, and the initial cost, especially since there is no existing development to the immediate northern and eastern sites. We will submit an approval letter from NSP regarding our plans for their easement area. <i>Developer will install landscape/irrigation</i></p>

OK
 20

OK
 22

90

to be completed within 18 months Final P.O.D. Plan

initially along Inwood and Hudson Pk' to west line of south side of sec.

<p><i>Permitted Uses.</i> Banks, medical clinics, offices, schools (businesses, professional private trade).</p>	<p>Add: Research & Development; Office/Showroom</p>	<p>Need to differentiate these classifications somehow; percentage of office, traffic volume, etc.</p>	<p>We would define R&D and office/showroom space to be the same. This space is typically used as general office space, laboratory space, testing, assemblage, and storage of supplies. Not permitted would be extensive inventory warehousing, or heavy manufacturing, which is defined by noise, odors, emissions, and heavy truck traffic.</p> <p>We assume that Lake Elmo objects to truck traffic, outside storage, industrial noises and odors, and how future tenants use the space once the initial tenancy turns over. The following is a response to each of those potential objections:</p> <p><u>Truck Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Limit the percentage of unfinished space (storage or warehouse) to 50% of building area. This can be policed with the permit process. ▪ Limit the number of truck docks to one dock or drive-in, per 10,000 square feet of building. ▪ Any delivery area is to be screened from street view, using landscaping and building layout. <p><u>Outside Storage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not permitted <p><u>Industrial noises, odors, and emissions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not permitted <p><u>Future Tenant's Use of Space</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Guided by this PUD ▪ City monitors through permitting process
<p><i>Conditional Uses.</i> Business services, conference centers, health clubs, hotels and motels, day care centers, limited retail, medical, dental and research labs, recording studios, restaurants and cafeterias, theaters, teleconferencing transmission facilities, veterinary clinics, similar uses approved by Council.</p>	<p>Add: Office/warehouse, office/light manufacturing, hotel without restaurant.</p>	<p>Need to differentiate these classifications somehow; percentage of office, traffic volume, etc. Hotel without restraint o.k.</p>	<p><u>Conditional Uses</u> 9-0 OK 10692-7</p> <p>Add: Hotel without restaurant and gasoline/convenience center. These are amenity services that will serve the business park tenants. As a conditional use, the City reserves the right to review and approve any and all plans on a project-by-project basis</p>

8-1

Shrey

<p><i>OK</i> <i>9-1</i></p> <p>Minimum Lot Area: 3.0 acres.</p>	<p>1.0 acres.</p>	<p>Do not want to see 110 1-acre lots.</p>	<p><u>Minimum Lot Area</u> Revise Minimum Lot Area to 2.0 acres. We propose having lots less than 2 acres approved as a conditional use. These could be a small bank building, daycare, restaurant, etc. The City would satisfy itself on a project-by-project basis.</p>
<p><i>No Change</i></p> <p>Minimum Lot Frontage: 200'.</p>	<p>50'</p>	<p>Same as minimum lot area.</p>	<p><u>Minimum Lot Frontage</u> No change. We propose that anything less than 200 feet must be approved as conditional use</p>
<p><i>OK</i> <i>9-1</i></p> <p>Lot Width/Depth Ratio: 1/3.5</p>	<p>No Requirement.</p>	<p>Same as minimum lot area.</p>	<p><u>Lot Width/Depth Ratio</u> We propose the elimination of this requirement, since it is really immaterial. If the City really wants to create a campus setting, a square-shaped site would be more advantageous. Site coverage, open space, and site circulation are more critical requirements than this existing ratio.</p>
<p>Minimum Building Setbacks:</p>			
<p><i>OK</i> <i>9-1</i></p> <p>Front: 50', plus 25' for each story above first. Side/Rear: 30', plus 20' for each story above first.</p>		<p>Front/Street: 50', Side/Rear: 10', 30' abutting residential uses.</p>	<p><u>Minimum Building Setback</u> <i>move to next</i> We propose 50' for front and street frontage, and 10' for side and rear frontage, <u>except where abutting residential uses where the current ordinance requirements will apply</u>. This seems like it is one of those interior PUD issues that pertains more to us than the City.</p>
<p>Minimum Parking Setbacks:</p>			
<p><i>9-0</i></p> <p>Front: 30' Side: 15' Side(street): 15' Rear: 15'</p>		<p>Front: 20' Side: 10' Side(Street): 20' Rear: 10'</p>	<p>We think that this is also an interior PUD issue that pertains more to us than the City, and we believe that the setbacks proposed are reasonable. Front 20' Side 10' Side (street) 20' Rear 10'</p>

<p><i>OK</i> <i>Section 535</i></p> <p>Minimum Building Foundation Size: 10,000 s.f.</p>	<p>6,000 s.f., except for approved, service-related uses.</p>		<p>No change. We propose keeping the City's standard of a minimum of 10,000 square feet. Anything less must be approved as conditional use by the City.</p>
<p><i>8-1</i></p> <p>Parking Ratio: One space for each 250 s.f. of office building area or one space per two employees, whichever is greater.</p>	<p>Add: One space per 2,000 s.f. of storage, warehouse; one per 1,000 s.f. of manufacturing space. <i>1000' (Shoreline)</i></p>	<p>Contingent upon allowable uses.</p>	<p><u>Parking Ratio</u> We propose adding the ratios for warehouse/storage/manufacturing <i>1000'</i> space as these relate to approved R&D/Office/showroom uses, for those cases that are approved by the City as a conditional use. <i>Shoreline</i></p>
<p><i>Revised</i> <i>PK</i></p> <p>Pathways:</p>	<p>5' wide bituminous</p>	<p>Would like to see 8'.</p>	<p>No Change. Pathways will be 8' wide. We propose giving the City R.O.W. for pathways. The City will install and maintain at their cost.</p>
<p><i>7-2</i></p> <p>Storm Water Control</p>	<p>To new holding ponds.</p>	<p>Incorporate into green corridor and innovative storm water control procedures.</p>	<p>Storm water management requirements should be averaged over the PUD area as a whole. The creation of ponds provide innovative storm water management solutions for water quality treatment and rate control.</p>
<p><i>OK</i></p> <p>Lighting Height: 30'</p>	<p>Variable; maximum permitted height to be 35'.</p>	<p>Show that there would be no spillover.</p>	<p>No change. We accept the City's current standard of 30' maximum. <i>Chapter 1350</i></p>
<p><i>SH</i> <i>No Recommendation</i></p> <p>Sign Height: Per Section 535</p>	<p>Variable heights; to be reviewed with City on an individual site basis.</p>	<p>Pylon sign only.</p>	<p><u>Sign Heights/Signage Plan</u> The City is concerned about the pylon sign height, specifically our reference to attracting traffic off the freeway, and the number of pylons that might exist. We propose that businesses can have signage on the building and a monument sign at the property's entrance, and that a pylon sign must be approved on a case-by-case basis by the City, however the size of the sign will match what we have proposed in our signage plan. The size, 12' X 6' signface and 25' height is designed primarily for Inwood traffic, not freeway.</p>

<i>Pond Maintenance</i> <i>Debate Council</i> ↓			
			<u>Pond Maintenance</u> We prefer that the City be required to maintain ponds and assess each property owner for their fair share, of the cost to do so.