



City of Lake Elmo

651/777-5510

3800 Laverne Avenue North / Lake Elmo, MN 55042

MEMORANDUM

TO: City Council
FROM: Craig W. Dawson, Interim City Administrator
DATE: May 27, 2009
SUBJECT: Comments from Councilmembers regarding Further Updates of the Comp Plan

Last week, the City Council reviewed the staff memorandum regarding the process for amending the Comprehensive Plan after submitting the required updates for five elements in the City's Comprehensive Plan. The Council decided to have a special Council meeting this evening to begin its discussion about proceeding with further amendments to the Plan, particularly relating to the Land Use element. The Council decided that it should forward topics, questions, or comments regarding this element to me, so that they could be compiled for Council's review and consideration. The comments emailed to me as of this afternoon as they relate to Land Use updates are attached.

In summary, the issues are:

- It will be important to work with Met Council on changes to the sewer REC schedule, and everyone's time will be better spent once this is known.
- The Comp Plan calls for 8,727 housing units, but there are a variety of requirements in the City Code that could prevent us from meeting that number. Such information should be identified before discussing the Land Use element.
- The present land use map does not show the 320 acres required for the business park along I-94 between Manning and Lake Elmo Avenue. [Staff note: It currently shows ~280 acres.]
- In the Village area, the number of housing units in the current plan, or thought to have been intended in the current plan, is not clearly understood and needs to be clarified.
- In the Village area, the total number of RECs, not just those from housing units, needs to be considered.
- Is it necessary to consider the Village area and the I-94 corridor separately and phase their implementation separately?
- Consider, if possible, adding a policy statement that new development must pay for [all?] of the infrastructure up-front.
- Timing of development and penalties related to not achieving the timetable for required number of RECs needs to be addressed.
- Consider a three-year delay to the timetable for achieving required number of RECs and remove allocation of residential and non-residential hookups.
- Consider policy in Comp Plan to pursue permeable pavement for City streets and facilities.



printed on recycled paper

Craig Dawson

From: Dean Johnston [mailto:dandkjohnston@comcast.net]

Sent: Thursday, May 21, 2009 2:14 PM

To: Craig Dawson

Cc: Kyle Klatt

Subject: Discussions on Comprehensive Plan

Craig

Here is the information I believe is necessary for us to start discussions on modifications to the Comprehensive Plan:

1. Changing implementation schedule due to economic conditions

Staff should meet with Met Council to discuss the issue. We could waste a lot of time if we don't have some idea of what the Met Council sees as an appropriate process. It is my understanding that you have a meeting scheduled for early in June. Perhaps they could simply send us a letter suspending the development schedule for two years at which time Lake Elmo would provide a revised schedule in a revised Comp Plan amendment.

2. Changes in the Land Use Plan section

The Met Council has only a few major requirements for our Comp Plan; they are total REC units, population, housing units (calculated from population), and REC units for jobs. In order to ensure that we achieve the 8727 housing unit requirement we looked at how many housing units would be contributed by each acre in Lake Elmo. We have a variety of requirements in our code which could prevent us from meeting the 8727 units depending on how the calculations were made. For example, we do not allow parcels under 40 acres to be approved for OP development. We have restrictions on subdividing large lots. We have land which has been placed in Conservation Easements which is no longer available for development. Discussing the Land Use Plan without having this information could be a complete waste of time.

3. Land planned for jobs

Calculations for land being planned for jobs requires 320 acres for the business park on I-94 between Manning and Lake Elmo Avenue. The present land use map does not show 320 acres for this use.

Items 1 and 2 are really pre-requisites for any discussion including discussion of Item 3. Scheduling a workshop before information described in Items 1 and 2 is premature. I would like to see the workshop postponed until we have the information requested in Items 1 and 2.

Dean Johnston
651-777-4444

Craig Dawson

From: Brett Emmons [mailto:bemmons@eorinc.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 14, 2009 8:53 AM

To: Craig Dawson

Cc: Kyle Klatt; Brett Emmons

Subject: May Workshop - Comp. Plan

The issues I would like to discuss/address in this update include:

1. Village area - Clarify what does the current text mean for # of residential units – 450 or 600 (with bonus) units or other interpretation of 900+ units? I have heard that it says 450 units unless development is clustered, then 600 units is allowed. But I have also heard that there is another interpretation of this that says since we had the existing units wrong and also stated a total of over 1,000 units, the thought is that we must "absorb" the error with new units, so we need to have 900+ units to be consistent with the Comp. Plan. I would like more background on where that 900+ units came from and why that would be the number vs. the lower numbers (450/600), if those lower numbers are indeed stated in the Plan.
2. Village densities/units (discussion only) – I would like to better understand the total units/RECs when all development types are included, not just residential. This is informational for me & I do not think a change would be needed (pending understanding the numbers better). I am not currently proposing that we pick the development amounts for the village (600, 900, 1,200, or 1,600) at this time – but would be open to discuss if other council members feel strongly we should.
3. Phasing of Village area & I-94 Corridor – Why is the Village before the I-94 area, especially if the argument is that we are concerned about the financial burden of infrastructure costs for Village development and therefore we should be looking at high levels of development in the Village (ex. the AUAR #s of 1,200 & 1,600)? I am not promoting faster nor more growth, I just do not see why we would tie our hands to look at that option (i.e. not leap frog over the I-94 corridor in bringing utilities up to the Village). One possible option here would be to use the same time window (longer) for both areas.
4. Can we possibly add a policy statement clarifying that development must pay for the infrastructure - up front? Steve D. has brought this up, and that might address many of my financial concerns about the city paying for large infrastructure outlays/upgrades and then being left to make bond payments even if there is no development to pay for it (for example, like right now).
5. Timing of development – With the current recession, it seems logical to move the development timeframe out. I believe there are a few places where timing is discussed, including penalty text (see next point).
6. Penalties timing – From my preliminary look, the penalties for not meeting MC targets are significant costs to the city and are built into our Comp. Plan (we are proposing them – vs. being told we need to respond to a threat). I feel this puts us in a vulnerable situation. While I feel strongly we need to pursue aggressively the petition route to get these delayed, it also strikes me we could accomplish the same type of thing by redoing that penalty text to use different time frames (i.e., not go through all this petition process, paperwork, and red tape). Given the dramatic financial times, we might also be able to convince MC that some different wording would be more appropriate. By that I mean, the days of rapid, unending, limitless growth in which that was written may not be that realistic and a less heavy handed "accountability" clause may make more sense.

I will continue to go through the land use section and see if anything comes up, but those are the top ones on my list for now. Note that I think #5 & #6 might even be very good grounds to tell MC that we will be another few months later with our Comp. Plan as we address these.

Brett H. Emmons, PE, LEED AP

Water Resources Engineer

651.203.6003, bemmons@eorinc.com

Craig Dawson

From: Steve DeLapp [stevedelapp@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2009 10:08 PM
To: Craig Dawson; Kyle Klatt
Subject: Revision to Waste Water Section of Comp Plan
Attachments: Alternative to Page VI-2 5-18-09.xls

Craig and Kyle,

I'm no sewer expert, so I didn't spend much time going over the Waste Water Section of the Comp Plan, but I think it repeats a chart on page VI-2 of the current (unapproved) 2000 Comp Plan. If so, we will be far behind on mandated SAC units to the Cottage Grove and WONE interceptors.

I am proposing that we insert the following chart to replace the table shown in Topic 1. The chart does two things, up front and above board. It keeps our staffing levels and resident disruption no greater than shown in the 2000 plan. We will not have to try and pack an extra 3 years housing and jobs into the remaining years until 2030. We did not bring on the recession and near population freeze in the Region.

Secondly, I am combining REC's from jobs and housing. The Met Council staff told me last summer -- I have it in writing and sent it to the City, that they have no expectation we will come close to having 14,000 jobs in our City by 2030 (now 2033). This way, we get the freedom to allocate housing and employment anywhere south of 10th and in the Old Village as we choose. We just commit to the total REC's and the distribution between the WONE and Cottage Grove interceptors.

If this is approved, it should be submitted with the note that this chart supercedes any contradictory information in the 2000 Comp Plan (submitted in 2006).

It will make be happy because the City gets some freedom, the Met Council gets their sewer money and we no longer have any misunderstanding about the text. (In case the Excel Spred Sheet does not come through, I have pasted it below)

If the Met Council agrees, we are winners. I think they will.

Best, Steve

Requirements for Areas Served by the Regional Wastewater System

1. Community Forecast of Residential Equivalent Unit (REC) Usage by Regional Sewer Service Treatment Plant

Year	So. of 10th St. New REC's to W.O.N.E.	So. of 10th St. Existing and New REC's to Cottage Grove	Village Area Existing and New REC's to Cottage Grove
2005	100	0	0
2006	152	0	0
2007	152	0	0
2008	152	0	0
2009	152	0	0
2010	204	0	0
2011	256	0	125
2012	308	0	250

2013	360	0	320
2014	384	0	390
2015	688	0	460
2016	992	0	600
2017	1296	0	600
2018	1600	0	600
2019	1600	164	600
2020	1600	398	600
2021	1600	632	600
2022	1600	866	600
2023	1600	1100	600
2024	1600	1334	600
2025	1600	1568	600
2026	1600	1802	600
2027	1600	2036	600
2028	1600	2270	600
2033	1600	3400	1100

From: Steve DeLapp [mailto:stevedelapp@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2009 8:30 AM
To: Craig Dawson
Subject: Alternative road design

This design may not be nice for roller blades and may be tough on bikes, I don't know, but it show seems to make a mockery of the current urban design, which guarantees pollution. I'd like to see much of the winter salt water go under the road bed instead of killing the first 3-4 feet on the edges of our roads. Please share this article. We should have considered this for our Comp Plan as an approach we will pursue. Thanks, Steve

Shoreview experiment may eliminate storm drains

LAURIE BLAKE, Star Tribune

Shoreview is betting on a new "green" concrete paving method that lets rainwater pass right through the street surface to prevent damaging runoff.

Pervious concrete -- made of gravel and cement minus the sand that gives regular concrete its impenetrable density -- has the porous quality of a Rice Krispies bar.

Because it will allow water to drain straight to the ground below, Shoreview will install about a mile of pervious concrete streets without storm sewers in the Woodbridge neighborhood on Lake Owasso.

This \$1 million, all-in bet on the new pavement technology has many cities looking over Shoreview's shoulder, wondering whether they might try the same approach.

"This is the first complete commitment to using a pervious pavement on a residential street replacement" in Minnesota, said Shoreview Public Works Director Mark Maloney.

Over the past five years, other Minnesota cities, including Minneapolis and Richfield, have been experimenting with pervious concrete on parking lots and other hard surfaces, hoping for better storm-water management.

But in Shoreview, "We are completely replacing a storm drainage system with a pavement that will infiltrate" water to the ground, Maloney said.

Tests "have shown that it is as durable as standard concrete for low-volume roads," Maloney said. "The science behind that is very sound and supported."

But there are few examples of a local government saying "this is going to be our pavement in lieu of a sewer system," he said. "We won't have catch basins, pipes and [settling] ponds."

For the
archives —

It was distrib
@ Special Comm
mtg May 27