



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, April 10, 2000, in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 3800 Laverne Avenue North, Lake Elmo, Minnesota.

6:00 p.m. - Workshop AGENDA

1. Tower Ordinance – *(continued from March 27, 2000)*
2. AG Zone Amendments

Commissioners: Please remember to bring your Code Books

7:00 p.m. AGENDA

1. AGENDA
2. MINUTES – March 27, 2000
3. D & T Development/Tjosvold-Zehrer
8890 15th Street
Open Space Residential Development – Concept Plan (Revised)
4. Other
5. Adjourn

April
10
2000

Approved: 4/24/00

Lake Elmo
Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes
Monday, April 10, 2000

6:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.

The Commissioners discussed the amendments to the Tower Ordinance, and AG Zoning Ordinance, and Chairman Armstrong said he would present revised drafts of both documents at the April 24, 2000 meeting.

7:00 p.m.

Chairman Armstrong called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 3800 Laverne Avenue North, Lake Elmo, Minnesota. Present: Commissioners Brass, Gerard, Helwig, Lipman (7:05 p.m.), Ptacek, Sedro, and Sessing. Absent: Commissioners Berg, Herber, and Mandel. Also present: City Planner Dillerud.

1. AGENDA

M/S/P Sedro/Sessing – to accept the agenda, as presented.
(Motion Passed 7-0).

2. MINUTES

M/S/P Sessing/Gerard – to approve the Minutes from the March 27, 2000 meeting, as presented.
(Motion Passed 7-0).

3. D & T Development/Tjosvold-Zehrer
8890 15th Street N.

Open Space Residential Development – Concept Plan (*revised*)
Tabled from the March 27, 2000 meeting.

Planner Dillerud explained that the Planning Commission had tabled the plan until this meeting to allow the developer's representative time to respond to their comments, and direction received from the testimony presented at the public hearing on April 27. He presented the site plan, original concept drawing, and revised Concept Plan. He noted that the new plan appears to reveal few modifications, other than the elimination of the 16th Street extension to the East property line. He detailed the preliminary findings on the amended Concept Plan, as found in the staff report.

Tim Freeman

Folz, Freeman & Dupay

(*Applicant's representative*)

Mr. Freeman said he felt strongly that the proposed "flag lot" should not be an issue, and questioned as to how it destroys the "open space." He noted that negotiations with the property owner to the East had broken down, resulting in less acreage for this plan, which indicated lessening the density from 18 to 17. He said his attitude toward the street widths remains firm-stating 18' feet wide at the one way points is preferable. He also said leaving the extension of 16th Street seemed most logical, but had altered the plan to reflect the recommendation of the Planning Commission.

He commented that Outlot "B" would be less disturbed by the applicant's driveway, protecting the wooded viewshed, rather than installing a "gravel road" or street.

Commissioner Brass said she felt the plan did not represent the true concept of conserving open space as it was intended that open space be contiguous; the buffering should be 200', natural as opposed to installed; the "dropping" of one unit was the result of the applicant losing acreage-not a concession to lower density; and, she cannot support the approval of this plan with merely discussion of further development to the East.

Sue Siverson

(Property owner to the East)

Ms. Siverson presented a letter (attached).

Ed Forliti

1743 Ivory Avenue N.

Mr. Forliti stated that he feels the 200-foot buffer is important, and invited the Planning Commission to visually inspect the site, indicating the Tjosvold's proposed flag lot would allow for more intrusion than what they experience at their current homesite. He said, to the best of his knowledge, neither the developer nor his agent had contacted any of the adjoining property owners in an attempt to listen to their concerns.

Don Jeske

8996 15th Street

Mr. Jeske stated that he thought the current property owner wanted the "best of both worlds" by developing their property, and creating the flag lot.

Jeff Iverson

Resident - Parkview Estates

Mr. Iverson expressed his concerns that traffic levels may increase on 16th Street because 15th Street is currently gravel base, and expects motorists will avoid 15th until after it is paved.

M/S/P Ptacek/Lipman - to recommend denial of the revised D & T Development/Tjosvold-Zerher Open Space Residential Development Concept Plan, based upon the findings presented in the City Planners April 6, 2000, staff report.

Chairman Armstrong said he would support the motion, noting it is very difficult for a developer to work within the limitations of the ordinance, and suggested conventional platting may fit in better with this site.

Commissioner Lipman called attention to the idea of the village greens in this plan, and said the Planning Commission has been fundamentally opposed to offering a bonus for village greens, when they appear to be no more than a median. He explained that the developer had met the village green code requirements, but stated the ordinance does not appear to serve the communities understanding of "village green", and further, this is a regrettable part of the code that needs to be changed., and is not in the long term planning interest of the City. He credited Mr. Freeman for his fine work and knowledge of the code, but said the ordinance does not serve the community in the way it should and inspires a bizarre and regrettable set of concessions.

Mr. Freeman said, dimensionally, the village green in this plan was exactly the same as what was approved in The Fields of St. Croix I and Second Addition, and, the plan presented meets the requirements of the code.

(Motion Passed 7-1). Opposed: Gerard; feels the plan meets the requirements of the code.

4. OTHER – Status of OP

Planner Dillerud said the City Council discussed modifications to the OP Zoning requirements, and indicated, in motion form, 1) the OP zoning should be retained in some form, and, 2) they were dissatisfied with the current density bonuses. He explained that he had suggested the City Council re-focus on the “rural aspect” of the OP by: a) repeal the current bonus density system; and base density bonuses on the scale of the project, b) increase minimum size for OP Open Space from the current size of 3 acres, to 10 acres, c) “internalize” the OP to itself by clustering without creating a “tract platting” appearance. He said the concept of rural character has been lost with the current OP standards.

Commissioner Helwig stated that the Open Space we are trying to preserve seems to become a holding pond, and not agricultural land.

Planner Dillerud said the concept of the preservation of rural character does not necessarily only go to preservation of producing cropland.

Planner Dillerud announced a joint meeting with the City Council and Village Commission, scheduled for Monday, May 1, 2000, at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers of City Hall, in order to discuss the Village Area Land Use Plan. Jane Harper from Washington County will be presenting information on the County PRD Ordinance and the Green Corridor Project. He said notices would be sent.

Chairman Armstrong adjourned the meeting at 8:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Cynthia Young-Planning Secretary

ORIGINAL

To: Chuck Dillerud
Lake Elmo City Planner

From: Neil & Susan Siverson vs. SS
Adjacent Landowners

Re: Proposed Concept Plan
Tjosvold Property

Date: March 27, 2000

RECEIVED
MAR 27 2000
CITY OF LAKE ELMO

-We are in favor of the roads, as proposed. They provide for comprehensive future development.

-The concept plan does not appear to meet the required "Buffer Zone" as stated in Section 301.070D.16, Subd. 7., of the Lake Elmo Municipal Code. (Buffer zones of at least one hundred (100) feet shall be required between residential structures and agricultural uses.....). Preliminary plans do not show a barrier separating yards from fields and pastures. Also, dwelling locations need to meet the 100 foot setback from Agricultural property.

-A number of Walking Trails appear to be going nowhere and dead-ending at Agricultural property. We would like to see the trails "buffered" from Agricultural operations, also.

cc: Planning Commission
Tim Freeman