



**City of Lake Elmo
Planning Commission Meeting
Minutes of February 11, 2013**

Chairman Williams called to order the meeting of the Lake Elmo Planning Commission at 7:05pm

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Larson, Kreimer, Reeves, Morreale, Haggard and Williams;

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Obermueller, Fliflet and Hall; and

STAFF PRESENT: Planning Director Klatt and City Planner Johnson

Approve Agenda:

The agenda was accepted as presented.

Approve Minutes: *January 14, 2013*

Williams asked for a correction to the discussion concerning parliamentary procedure.

M/S/P; Williams/Reeves to accept the minutes of January 14, 2013 as amended; **Vote: 5-0, with Haggard not voting.**

Business Item: *Zoning Text Amendment - PUD Ordinance*

City Planner Johnson reviewed proposed amendments to the Planned Unit Development Ordinance with the Planning Commission, and noted that the Commission had postponed taking action on this matter at its last meeting. He reviewed the changes that have been made to the document since the last meeting, which included editorial changes and corrections, further clarification concerning residential density bonuses, allowances for a range approach to awarding amenity points for two site amenities, changes and corrections to the standards of site amenities, and adding on site amenity description for sprinkler systems.

Johnson stated that Staff is recommending approval of the proposed PUD ordinance as amended.

Williams asked how the sprinkling amenity would be addressed in cases where only a small portion of the buildings would meet this criterion. It was suggested that a minimum percentage be established within a development in order to award this bonus.

Reeves stated that a range might be appropriate for additional amenities beyond those currently drafted with a range of values. He noted this was especially true for those measurements that were more subjective.

Williams expressed concern that there is no quantifiable measurement for determining the amount of underground or structured parking that could achieve an amenity bonus. He suggested tying a percentage of surface parking reductions to the bonus calculation.

There was a general discussion concerning the application of the bonus system and how much detail should be incorporated into the document.

The Commission reviewed the draft document and the specific elements of the ordinance.

Kreimer asked why there was flexibility allowed under the open space provisions. Johnson replied that this provision would likely apply more to redevelopment situations in which it might not be possible to provide additional open space on developed sites.

Williams suggested that the underground parking requirement include a qualifier that would grant a larger bonus for reducing a larger number of surface parking stalls. He suggested that reducing surface parking by 25% be worth 5 amenity points, and reducing by 50% and above be worth 10 amenity points. Johnson recommended that a separate amenity be added for contained parking hidden from the view of the public right-of-way.

There was a general discussion concerning the meaning of landscaped outdoor open space under the open space bonus section. Klatt noted that the City Code generally defines landscaped areas as those portions of a site that are not hard-surfaced.

Larson asked if the open space provision would allow for unique uses that might serve a public benefit. Johnson indicated that an earlier section of the PUD ordinance provides a more thorough description of open space.

Larson asked if the PUD ordinance could incorporate additional density bonuses to encourage developers to provide additional pedestrian crossings of Highway 5 and other major roadways. The Commission suggested that the Village Comprehensive Plan amendment should include a discussion of pedestrian crossings and include some incentives for private developers to include these amenities as a part of their project.

The Commission directed Staff to incorporate a general statement that allows the City to consider other amenities not listed, which could include roadway or pedestrian improvements, as a potential density bonus.

Reeves suggested that the bonus for sprinkling buildings be limited to only those buildings in a PUD that would not otherwise require a fire sprinkling system. It was noted that all eligible buildings must be sprinkled in order to achieve the bonus.

Williams asked that the ordinance include a definition of plaza if it is not already defined in the City Code.

Haggard questioned how theming would be incorporated into private developments, and whether or not this theming was going to be a requirement for developers. Johnson noted that the theming project was not likely going to include specific requirements for developers, and would instead be presented as guidance for amenities of Theming elements to be incorporated into new developments.

Larson questioned if the City was in any way promoting alternative energy and if there was a way to reward developers for the use of renewable energy sources. Johnson replied that such improvements could be incentivized through density bonus, but have not been specifically called out in the proposed ordinance. Reeves noted that the renewable energy may be covered under the LEED certification bonus.

The Commission recommended that Development Review Committee be defined in the City Code.

Klatt recommended that the language with specific times limited for review and approval be removed from the ordinance. He noted that other portions of Zoning Ordinance address time requirements for review.

Kreimer asked how performance would be guaranteed for those elements of the plan that might be part of a phased plan in particular. Johnson indicated that an existing section of the ordinance already requires a performance guarantee. Klatt noted that this section could also be amended to require an agreement between the City and the developer.

There was a general discussion concerning the potential for additional bonuses if several of the objectives listed in the code are met by a developer. The Commission did not elect to incorporate any additional bonuses.

M/S/P: Larson/Haggard, move to recommend approval of the PUD ordinance as amended by the Planning Commission; **Vote: 6-0.**

Business Item: *2012 Community Development Department Annual Report*

Klatt presented an overview of the Community Development Department's Annual Report. He highlighted a list of major projects undertaken over the course of the year. Overall, there were less land use applications for individual properties this year.

However, there were more significant projects related to Comprehensive planning and other city-wide projects than other years. Klatt then presented some statistical information pertaining to planning and building activity in 2012.

Reeves asked if the annual report is typically tied to the department's work plan. Klatt noted that in other years, Staff has done a review of the previous year's work plan. He noted that Staff can share the work plan to act as a benchmark for the year's activities.

M/S/P: Kreimer/Reeves, move to accept the annual report as presented and forward the report to the City Council; **Vote: 6-0.**

Business Item: *Planning Commission Work Plan for 2013*

Klatt noted that the work plan is broken into 3 sections: zoning initiatives, planning initiatives and administrative initiatives. He also noted that the City has adopted a City-wide Work Plan. The department's work plan is not intended to supersede the City's overall work plan, but further narrow down the plan of work related to planning. Klatt also noted that each item in the work plan is given a date or completion goal, as well as a priority level.

Klatt gave a general overview of the zoning initiatives related to the Zoning Code planned for 2013. They include but are not limited to the following:

- Zoning map changes necessary to implement the Comp Plan Amendments.
- Rural Zoning Districts
- Village Mixed Use District
- Tree Preservation Ordinance
- Performance Standards

Other zoning initiatives of high priority include the design standards manual, engineering standards, subdivision ordinance, and form-based code.

Klatt moved forward to provide an overview of planning initiatives for 2013. These include the adoption of the I-94 Corridor and Village Comp Plan Amendments as the highest priority items. Other planning initiatives include the theming project, parks and trails planning, and other projects.

Haggard asked if we would need to amend the Comp Plans if we received quantitative easing from the required REC units in the MOU with the Met Council. Klatt noted that an amendment would be necessary.

Kreimer asked if there are ordinances currently in place that provide some standards for the development that is staged to occur sooner rather than later. Klatt explained the City does have existing standards for most of the proposed ordinances in the Work Plan. Upcoming updates should be viewed as improvement to the existing ordinances.

Reeves thanked Klatt for the Work Plan and suggested that the Planning Commission receive periodic updates. The Planning Commission suggested biannual updates of work completed as compared with the Work Plan. Klatt noted that the Staff will provide verbal updates as appropriate.

Williams asked about the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. Klatt explained that this ordinance is intended to support the City Staging Plan for utility and infrastructure extension.

Williams asked about the initiative pertaining to developing a policy for consideration of requests to expand activities in proposed sewer service areas before sanitary sewer is available. Klatt explained the purpose of the policy.

Williams asked about the Washington County septic permitting. Klatt explained that Washington County is the permitting authority for this activity.

Updates and Concerns

City Council approved the Christ Lutheran Church Variance and VBWD CUP for the removal of the culvert located at Raleigh Creek at the Council meeting on 2/5/13.

Staff updates include upcoming public hearings for a zoning text amendment to the LDR zoning district and the Village Comp Plan Amendment.

Staff also highlighted two training opportunities for the Planning Commission provided by the American Planning Association (APA).

Meeting adjourned at 9:20pm

Respectfully submitted,

Nick Johnson
Planner