



City of Lake Elmo

Phone: 651-777-5510

Fax: 651-777-9615

3800 Laverne Avenue North / Lake Elmo, Minnesota 55042

The Lake Elmo Planning Commission will meet at 7:00 p.m. on
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2001
in the Council Chambers of City Hall,
3800 Laverne Avenue North, Lake Elmo, Minnesota.

AGENDA

1. Agenda
2. Minutes – October 22, 2001
3. Public Hearing: DaVern – II, Inc. & United Properties
 Preliminary Plat
 Eagle Point Townoffice
 Eagle Point Planned Unit Development
 Hudson Boulevard and Inwood Avenue
4. Discussion: Amendments to Section 300 - Zoning Code
 Architectural Standards – General Business, Limited
 Business, and Business Park Zones
5. Other
6. Adjourn

Nov
14
2001

Approved November 26, 2001

**Lake Elmo
Planning Commission**

**Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, November 14, 2001**

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 Deziel, Sessing, Helwig, Sedro. Absent: ~~Commissioners Berg, Herber, Taylor, Mandel, and Ptacek.~~ Also Present: Planner Dillerud.

1. Agenda

**M/S/P Sessing/Sedro - to accept the agenda, as presented.
(Motion Passed 5-0).**

2. Minutes

**M/S/P Helwig/Sessing - to approve the Minutes from October 22, 2001, as presented.
(Motion Passed 4-0-1). Abstain: Armstrong**

3. PUBLIC HEARING:

**DaVern II, Inc. & United Properties
Preliminary Plat
Eagle Point Drive**

Planner Dillerud discussed the Final Plat of Eagle Point Business Park 2nd Addition, which created the proposal lot of 632 acres, and was approved by the City Council at its September 4, 2001 meeting. He noted that an amended Planned Unit Development Plan and Site Plan for a 9 building/54,000 square foot "condominium" office complex were also approved by the City Council on September 24, 2001. He explained that the Preliminary Plat echoed the previously approved Planned Unit Development/Site Plan. He also stated that the application would not be forwarded to the City Council until such time that comments from the City Attorney and City were both received. Planner Dillerud said staff recommends approval of the Preliminary Plat of Eagle Point Townoffice Park based on compliance with the approved Planned Unit Development and Site Plan, subject to the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the recommendations of the City Engineer;
2. Unimpeded access easement to the City through the parking/drive area of the common outlot from Eagle Point Boulevard to Outlot D (City Well #3), Eagle Point Business Park 2nd Addition;
3. Review and approval by the City Attorney of Association Declaration and Covenants.

Chairman Armstrong opened and closed the comment portion of the Public Hearing at 7:14 p.m. NO COMMENTS

Chairman Armstrong stated his previous concerns about multiple buildings on the site.

M/S/P Armstrong/Deziel – to recommend the City Council approve the Preliminary Plat of Eagle Point TownOffice Park based on compliance with the approved Planned Unit Development and Site Plan, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Compliance with the recommendations of the City Engineer;**
- 2. Unimpeded access easement to the City through the parking/drive area of the common outlot from Eagle Point Boulevard to Outlot D (City Well #3), Eagle Point Business Park 2nd Addition;**
- 3. Review and approval by the City Attorney of Association Declaration and Covenants.**

(Motion Passed 5-0).

Commissioner Helwig asked the Planner to discuss Well #3 on the site.

Planner Dillerud explained that the well pump will be hydraulic, and looped with Eagle Point, no tower, to serve the Planned Unit Development and High Pointe Medical Center, and some adjoining businesses, but would stay valved with Oakdale water. He said the City Council decided to do this because it is best to “take care of ourselves”; water rates; and, a financing package is tied together with old village package at Carriage Station. He explained that the only downside of hydraulics is that the pump will run constantly.

4. Performance Standards – GB, LB, and BP

Planner Dillerud said after the Planning Commission recommended deletion of the term “or equivalent” from the Business Park, Limited Business, and General Business zoning districts performance standards for exterior building surfaces at its October 10, 2001 meeting, the City Council adopted that recommendation at its October 16th meeting, and that the Municipal Code has been amended to permit “brick, stone, or glass” exterior surfacing. He noted that the City Council directed staff to compose some alternative approaches that would broaden the range of acceptable materials beyond brick, stone, or glass.

Planner Dillerud discussed the options available by other cities, and stated some cities don’t even touch the matter. He noted some “variety” is aesthetically more interesting than all the same, which might be appropriate. He asked, “how many times do we want to change the code?” Planner Dillerud indicated an argument with some language as a % factor. He noted the Commissioners may wish to use the language “acceptable or prohibited”. Planner Dillerud said before he begins to draft an ordinance, he requested direction from the Commission regarding a series of basic questions as found in the Summary of the staff report.

Commissioner Sessing explained he did some research with architects he has worked with over the years, and presented a memo (attached) which detailed possible solutions for building materials. He suggested going with a percentage formula using 70% as wood, stone or glass, then permitting the remainder surface as other optional surfaces from a list. He said the Commissioners need to give the architects some flexibility and creativity.

Chairman Armstrong stated it might possibly be easier to list what we [Planning Commission] don't want, rather than what would be allowed.

Commissioner Deziel asked what the purpose was of this discussion. He asked if anyone requested input from the building official in this regard. He asked how this issue is relative to the health, safety, and welfare of Lake Elmo citizens. He said the Commissioners were setting out their likes and dislikes. He noted he has seen some very attractive and appealing proposals, and they have been lambasted, and to state wood is not in keeping with the rural character, when a typical barn is wood, with masonry at the base is inconsistent. He said he would like to see a reason for this, not just create laws. He asked what is the basis of the word "quality".

Commissioner Sessing said quality is a matter, and he was suggesting other materials that would give a good accent look which would beautify the structure.

Planner Dillerud said cities have the right and responsibility to focus on architectural standards, and it is in the public's welfare to create a higher tax base.

Commissioner Armstrong state the City is responsible for to maintaining high quality commercial districts, which creates a higher tax base, and also protects adjacent businesses by requiring higher architectural standards.

The Commissioners discussed the questions, as found in the Planner's staff report, and answered, as follows:

1. Do we want to insert substitute language for "or equivalent" at all?
Yes
2. Should the substitute language address primary exterior surfacing of just trim components?
Yes, just trim (4-1) opposed: Deziel); replace with accent materials; specify non-roof; define roof.
3. If just trim components can be other than brick, stone or glass, what percentage of each building elevation can be of the trim material(s) – in sum?
70/30 (Deziel 40/60) on a 3/2 vote in past, do not count door area.

4. Do we want to specify which trim materials are allowed, or which are prohibited?
Yes
5. If we develop a list of those specifically allowed, do we want to attach a percentage of each allowable, or simply specify that the percentage specified by #3 above applies to any trim material, or any combination of allowable trim materials?
Use Commissioner Sessing's list as a guide; request City Council input. Make all percentages equally 30% with no more than 20% of one, with the exception being wood.
6. Do we, or do we not want to allow enhanced/integrally colored concrete block as a primary exterior surface?
Not
7. Do we need to in some manner distinguish (by definitions) between enhanced concrete block and "oversize brick"?
Yes
8. Should we exempt additions to existing structures from the terms of the standards as long as the addition proposes an exterior surfacing identical to that of the existing structure?
Yes
9. Should we reorganize the Code to place all common commercial architectural standards in a single spot in the Code?
Yes

Planner Dillerud stated he would Planner Dillerud review the comments and bring a report back to the Commissioners as soon as possible.

Chairman Armstrong adjourned the meeting at 8:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Cynthia Young-Planning Secretary