



# City of Lake Elmo

777-5510

3800 Laverne Avenue North / Lake Elmo, Minnesota 55042

The Lake Elmo Planning Commission will meet Monday, September 25, 2000, at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 3800 Laverne Avenue North, Lake Elmo, Minnesota.

## AGENDA

1. Agenda
2. Minutes: August 28, 2000 & September 11, 2000
3. **PUBLIC HEARING:** Archnet (Architectural Network)  
39<sup>th</sup> Street  
Variances to setback requirements; Site Plan
4. Other
5. Adjourn

Lake Elmo  
Planning Commission

Approved  
10-11-00

Meeting Minutes  
Monday, September 25, 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, Brass, Deziel, Mandel, Ptacek, Sedro, Sessing and Taylor. Absent: Commissioners Herber and Helwig. Also present: Planner Dillerud.

1. Agenda

M/S/P Sessing/Sedro - to approve the agenda, as presented.  
(Motion Passed 9-0).

2. Minutes

M/S/P Taylor/Deziel - to approve the Minutes from the August 28, 2000 meeting, as presented.  
(Motion Passed 8-0-1). Abstain: Deziel

M/S/P Sedro/Sessing - to approve the Minutes from the September 11, 2000 meeting, as presented.

(Motion Passed 8-0-1). Abstain: Brass

3. PUBLIC HEARING: Site Plan & Zoning Variances

Architectural Network

39<sup>th</sup> Street (North of Lake Elmo Bank)

Planner Dillerud said the proposed site is a 1.5 acre portion of the 6.60 acre Lot 2, Block 3 Brookman Third Addition, platted 15 years ago, including City water service. He noted the fee owner had not applied for a minor subdivision of this parcel. He explained that the Village Commission had informally reviewed the proposal at its April 26, 2000 meeting, with comments forwarded to the applicant. He noted that the applicant has applied for variances relating to; a) City Code specifies that there shall be no more than one principal building on any one parcel. Two principal structures are proposed, and, b) City Code requires a minimum rear yard setback of 50 feet. A rear yard setback of 25 feet is proposed.

He explained that the applicant has not applied for, but City Staff has detected on plans submitted by the applicant variances relating to; a) City Code specifies that all off street parking, except "Handicap" spaces shall be at least 10 feet wide and 20 feet long. The applicant proposes all parking spaces (including handicap) to be 9 feet wide and 18 feet long, b) City Code provides that not less than 10% of the interior of a parking lot shall be landscaped. The landscape plan submitted proposes a single landscaped parking lot island of 600 square feet. By the formula found in the Code, at least 1,500 square feet of landscaped islands is required for the proposed 50-car parking lot, c) City Code requires that the exteriors of all structures in the General Business Zoning District shall be faced with brick, stone, glass, or equivalent. The majority of the exterior facing is proposed to be wood lap siding, d) City Code requires a 100-foot buffer where a site abuts residential districts. The land abutting this site to the North is zoned RR (Rural Residential), but is not developed. A variance from this requirement **may not be required**, and a determination by the Planning Commission is requested, and, e) the applicant proposes a Master Sign Plan for a multi-tenant

building. The proposed sign is non-compliant with the standards set forth in Section 535.07 of City Code.

**Mike Hoefler**

**Mike Diem**

Architectural Network (applicants)

The applicants explained that they are an architectural design firm, employing 10, and a growing business doing much of their work in the area. They want to be a part of the Lake Elmo community. They explained that the 1.5-acre parcel is the only property in Lake Elmo, which fits their needs. They said they would change their plans in order to comply with the sign ordinance and the buffer issue. They noted the reason for requesting the variance from the setback requirement was the snowmobile traffic, and the creation of two buildings was more practical for the site. They said they felt the "Prairie School" design was more applicable to the site, and presented graphics, which illustrated stone in the corners and other areas at different elevations.

Commissioner Deziel asked the applicants if they had considered an "L" shaped design. The applicants said they had explored that idea, but found it to create "dead areas" within the site, and did not lend itself to efficient parking lot design.

Commission Mandel asked if a 2-story design was considered. The applicants said that was not economically feasible.

**Chairman Armstrong opened the comment portion of the Public Hearing at 7:45 p.m.**

**Peter Schiltgen**

**10888 Stillwater Blvd.**

*Mr. Schiltgen urged the Planning Commissioners to uphold the current setback requirements for this site by limiting the setback from the North property line to 100'.*

**Chairman Armstrong closed the comment portion of the Public Hearing at 7:46 p.m.**

**M/S/P Sessing Berg - to adopt Resolution No. PZ 2048-A denying zoning variances to Architectural Network based on the following findings:**

1. There are no exceptional or extraordinary circumstances. The applicant has not demonstrated that a structure of the same floor area could not fit the site within the standards of the General Business District. The applicant could expand the site without conflict with existing structures.
2. The special conditions or circumstances claimed by the applicant are the direct result of other proposed actions of the applicant himself. Both the size of the proposed site and the site design are the applicant's; and not dictated by physical characteristics of the site or the City. The claimed hardship is self-imposed.

**(Motion Passed 9-0).**

**M/S/P Armstrong/Sessing - the Planning Commission determines the setback from RR Zoning to the North of this parcel is 100', as found in the Municipal Code.**

**(Motion Passed 7-2). Opposed: Berg, Deziel.**

M/S/P Mandel/Sessing – to recommend the City Council adopt Resolution No. 2048-B, denying Sign Code Variances to Architectural Network.  
(Motion Passed 9-0).

M/S/P Armstrong/Sessing – to recommend the City Council deny the proposed site plan for Architectural Network, based on non-compliance with the Municipal Code.  
(Motion Passed 9-0).

Chairman Armstrong complimented the applicant on their proposal, and said the Planning Commission is not in a position to negotiate site plans, which would result in the reduction of requirements found in the code. He said the applicant might choose to appeal the Planning Commission decision to the City Council.

Commissioner Deziel requested the Planner look into the provision in the code that limits property owners to re-build on non-conforming lots.

Planner Dillerud said he would make every effort to expedite the on-going review of the issue by staff.

M/S/P Deziel/Mandel – to request staff review the restoration of non-conforming building or structure provision of the Municipal Code.  
(Motion Passed 9-0).

Chairman Armstrong adjourned the meeting at 8:00 p.m.

---

Respectfully submitted, Cynthia Young-Planning Secretary