



City of Lake Elmo

777-5510

3800 Laverne Avenue North / Lake Elmo, Minnesota 55042

The Lake Elmo Planning Commission will meet at **7:00 p.m.**, Monday, May 8, 2000, in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 3800 Laverne Avenue North, Lake Elmo, Minnesota.

AGENDA

1. Agenda
2. Minutes - April 24, 2000
3. Old Village Land Use Plan
4. Tower Ordinance
5. AG Zone Amendments
6. Other
7. Adjourn

May
8

Approved 5/22/00

Lake Elmo
Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes
Monday, May 8, 2000

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 Berg, Helwig, Lipman (7:25 p.m.), Mandel and Sedro. Absent: Commissioners Brass, Herber, Ptacek and Sessing. Also present: City Planner Dillerud, Councilman DeLapp and Village Commission Vice-Chair Emmons.

1. Agenda

M/S/P Sedro/Berg - to approve the agenda, as presented.
(Motion Passed 5-0).

2. Minutes

M/S/P Armstrong/Sedro - to accept the minutes from the April 24 meeting, as amended.
(Motion Passed 5-0).

3. Old Village Land Use Plan

Planner Dillerud presented overhead graphics, which illustrated the Planning Commission and Village Commission "Old Village Land Use Plan." He noted the Planning Commission idea depicts relatively the same strategy, but on a smaller scale. He explained that the timing of the Comprehensive Plan Update submission to the Met Council remains, but has provided them with evidence of the city's progress. He urged the Commissioners to "get it right", rather than hastily make a recommendation regarding the future land use plan for the Old Village area.

Commissioner Mandel said he recognizes the differences in the Planning Commission and Village Commission plans, but suggested the Planning Commission plan focuses more on the revitalization of the Old Village area, and not as much on the green-belt. He explained that he felt it was important to have a population that could support a viable downtown area, and suggested 1200 new residents may be a good number to consider. He noted his opposition of PDR's, i.e. tax dollars to purchase land. He said he wanted to see a realistic plan.

Commissioner Berg said he felt the Village Commission may have misunderstood the Planning Commission's plan, and presented several overhead graphics that depicted overlays of the old village area. He said he felt the Planning Commission had arrived at a good decision to limit the south boundary of the old village plan area to 30th Street. He said he felt the Planning Commission plan for the old village was good, but may be "tweaked."

Commissioner Lipman asked how important it was that the green-belt area be uniform in size. Planner Dillerud said the size of the green-belt was not the only factor, stating the primary reason for the green-belt was to define an edge to the old village to avoid "leak"; a wider green-belt offers less opportunity for development; the green-belt could be used for other purposes, such as wetland treatment systems, stormwater holding areas, and finally, the location of the green-belt preserves some viewsheds.

Councilman DeLapp urged the Commissioners to think of the downtown area as a “walkable” location from surrounding developments, and encouraged them to “think big” in terms of planning the green-belt.

Commissioner Sedro said she was leaning toward the Village Commission Plan because: 1) The number of new units is less in the Village Plan; 2) The Village Plan has more receiving units available than the number of transfer units; 3) The Village Plan green-belt is sufficient to accommodate water run-off for existing and proposed development; 4) 1/8 mile green-belt as in the Planning Commission Plan would be imperceptible; 5) The Village Commission green-belt location had a lot of thought put into it (lot by lot), whereas the Planning Commission Plan did not take many specific circumstances into account-it’s more of a concept plan than an implementation plan; 6) I prefer to put the new units inside the green-belt, as in the Village Commission Plan, i.e. I can see that a certain minimum density is required in order to have a viable business center, but I would not like to see those units outside of the green-belt; 7) Although I don’t want the city-county to raise taxes in order to purchase the green-belt, since Chuck Dillerud believes that PDR/TDR will work here, I’m willing to defer to his experience on this issue even though I personally don’t know all the details of how it would work – recalling that the Planning Commission Village Land Use Plan came out of a desire to avoid PDR’s).

Planner Dillerud suggested there may be tax abatement dollars available for PDR’s.

M/S/P Armstrong/Berg – to limit the old village area in the Planning Commission recommendation to north of 30th Street, consistent with the current guiding.
(Motion Passed 6-0).

M/S/P Armstrong/Mandel – to recommend the City council consider a wider green-belt version of the village plan, provided this is accomplished through PRD’s & TDR’s or grants from outside sources, and not supported through local and county tax increases.
(Motion Passed 5-1). Opposed: Helwig.

M/S/P Helwig/Armstrong – to encourage City promoted obstacles that would result in the State of Minnesota NOT expanding the width of Manning Avenue in Lake Elmo.
(Motion Passed 4-2). Opposed: Mandel, Lipman.

M/S/P Berg/Lipman – to request the Village Commission provide the Planning Commission with evidence of which areas in the green belt take priority over others.
(Motion Passed 6-0).

Commissioner Lipman stated he would attempt to gather some information regarding population estimates that could support a viable downtown area.

M/S/F Sedro/Lipman – to amend the Planning Commission Village Plan illustrating all residential development occur inside the green belt.
(Motion Failed 2-4). Opposed: Helwig, Berg, Armstrong and Mandel.

M/S/P Helwig/Sedro – to send current revisions of the Planning Commission Old Village Land Use Plan to the City Council at its June 6, 2000 meeting.
(Motion Passed 6-0).

M/S/P Armstrong/Lipman – to direct staff to provide Planning Commissioners with City Council agenda staff reports as they relate to the Old Village Land Use Plan.
(Motion Passed 6-0).

4. Tower Ordinance

Planner Dillerud said the City Council reviewed the proposed amendments, and their comments were included in the staff report.

(Commissioner Helwig excused himself from the dais, and made the following responses to the City Council directions, *(italics)*).

1. **The City Council was concerned about signal interference from towers of the height proposed with electronic devices in the neighborhood - TV's radios, garage doors.**

The FCC licenses amateurs, and interference could occur at any height.

2. **There seemed to be a general Council feeling that 120 feet was too high.**

FCC allows 175 feet, and 120 feet is necessary for optimum efficiency to operate four frequencies. 120 feet is currently allowed for wind generators, and cellular service towers in the City.

3. **The Council appeared to favor a CUP for each tower, and perhaps limiting the towers to the larger lot residential zones - certainly NOT in R-1 districts.**

Ok, add a section on CUP's for Towers.

4. **The Council suggested that inclusion of solar panels in this ordinance was not appropriate.**

Remove solar panels from the ordinance.

**M/S/P Armstrong/Lipman - to direct staff to call a Public Hearing at its Monday, May 22, 2000 meeting, regarding the proposed Tower Ordinance.
(Motion Passed 5-0-1). Abstain: Helwig**

5. AG Zone Amendments

Chairman Armstrong reviewed the current draft AG Zone Ordinance.

The Commissioners discussed amendments, and made the following motions:

**M/S/P Lipman/Berg - to add Rural Agricultural Uses-garden plots, tree farming, game refuge and horticultural services; Recreational Services - miniature golf/driving ranges; and, Farmstead Occupation Uses - nature farm/museum, farmers market, office, inside storage and brewery/winery as permitted uses in Section 3.
(Motion Passed 6-0).**

**M/S/P Sedro/Mandel - to add Section 3 - limited vehicle trips generated per day.
(Motion Passed 5-1). Opposed: Lipman; unduly restrictive, and can be regulated within the CUP process.**

M/S/P Lipman/Sedro - to present the amended draft AG Zone Amendments to the City Council at its May 16, 2000 meeting.
(Motion Passed 6-0).

6. OTHER

M/S/P Lipman/Armstrong - to direct Chairman Armstrong to compose a letter of thanks to Commissioner Gerard for his service on the Planning Commission.
(Motion Passed 6-0).

Chairman Armstrong adjourned the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Cynthia Young-Planning Secretary