



3800 Laverne Avenue North
Lake Elmo, MN 55042

(651) 747-3900
www.lakeelmo.org

NOTICE OF MEETING

The City of Lake Elmo
Planning Commission will conduct a meeting on
Monday, December 8, 2014 at 7:00 p.m.

AGENDA

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Approve Agenda
3. Approve Minutes
 - a. November 10, 2014
 - b. November 24, 2014
4. Business Items
 - a. 2014 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT ANNUAL REPORT. The Planning Commission will receive the annual report, documenting all activities of the community development department in 2014.
 - b. PROPOSED 2015 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING SCHEDULE. The Planning Commission will review and approve the 2015 meeting schedule.
5. Updates
 - a. City Council Updates – December 2, 2014 Meeting
 - i. Gonyea Final Plat Deadline Extension – Village Park Preserve
 - ii. Gonyea Final Plat Deadline Extension – Village Preserve
 - iii. Inwood PUD Preliminary Plat & Development Plans approved
 - iv. Inwood EAW – Declaration of No Need for EIS
 - v. Emmerson IUP Renewal for a Bus/Trucking Terminal at 11530 Hudson
 - vi. Halcyon Cemetary Sketch Plan Review
 - b. Staff Updates
 - i. Upcoming Meetings:
 - January 12, 2015 – Election of Officers
 - January 26, 2015
 - Future Joint Meeting with EDA
 - c. Commission Concerns
6. Adjourn



**City of Lake Elmo
Planning Commission Meeting
Minutes of November 10, 2014**

Chairman Williams called to order the meeting of the Lake Elmo Planning Commission at 7:00 p.m.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Williams, Dodson, Kreimer, Larson, Lundgren, Dorschner and Haggard.

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: City Administrator Zuleger and City Planner Johnson

Approve Agenda:

The agenda was accepted as presented.

Approve Minutes:

October 13, 2014:

The planning commission discussed multiple changes.

M/S/P: Haggard/Lundgren move to approve the minutes of September 13th as amended; ***Vote: 7-0, motion carried unanimously.***

October 27, 2014:

M/S/P: Williams/Dodson move to approve the minutes of September 27th as amended; ***Vote: 7-0, motion carried unanimously.***

Business Items: Downtown Redevelopment Plan

Johnson began his presentation. Zuleger clarified the purpose behind the economic development district and noted that the EDA has not made any final decisions with regards to tax increment financing.

Johnson provided information describing how the redevelopment plan is consistent with the goals of the City's Comprehensive Plan.

Zuleger presented the roster of the Economic Development Authority, describing all the members and all of their backgrounds. He noted that the EDA has focused on downtown redevelopment, as they have concluded that the I-94 Corridor will develop based on market conditions without any public incentives or involvement. The EDA falls under state statute 469. With regards to downtown, many of the properties meet the state standard for substandard or "blight". There are many vacant lots, as well as vacant space within buildings. The current status of downtown leads to a redevelopment TIF, if any were to be used.

Zuleger moved on to describe the checks and balances that are in place for the Economic Development Authority. The Planning Commission reviews all land use recommendations for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. The City Council has authority over all spending decisions.

Zuleger then described how Tax Increment Financing works. At this time, TIF would only be used for infrastructure projects such as streets, sewer, water, stormwater, etc. He presented an example of the downtown area and necessary stormwater improvements, noting how TIF could be leveraged to help pay for the improvements.

Dodson asked about the potential negatives if the additional value is not realized. Zuleger noted that he does not recommend using TIF without a large project in hand.

Lundgren asked about the impact to the school district. Zuleger stated that the school district gets paid on the base amount, but not the incremental amount. Lundgren asked if Zuleger was part of EDA. He said he was not part of the EDA, only there as staff. The EDA has met 6 times. Beckie Gumatz attends regularly, with Finance Director Bendel in attendance on a few occasions.

Williams asked why the City would not just issue general obligation bonds to pay for the improvements. Zuleger noted that cities get 10 additional years to pay the debt service with a redevelopment TIF.

Dorschner stated that if there is more walkability, it would be more desirable for businesses. The City may need to set the stage to attract more businesses to invest in downtown.

Lundgren requested that the minutes of the Economic Development Authority be sent to the Planning Commission. Staff will get the minutes and meeting agendas of the EDA up on the website.

Williams noted that he does not feel that the plan only applies to the mixed use area and feels it is ambiguous in regards to the residential.

Zuleger clarified that the TIF district would be a subset of the Redevelopment Plan.

Lundgren noted that she feels she needs more information. She recommends tabling the item.

Dodson was confused about the “project #1 is”. Zuleger stated that project number one is to study how we want to do things. If we want to use TIF or bonds, etc. Project #1 is a gather requirements project.

Dorschner asked for clarification. Zuleger stated that the Planning Commission is being asked to look at the land use of the plan.

A number of Planning Commission members disagreed with this assessment.

Haggard noted that she is concerned that the project plan does not reference the roles of the City Council or Planning Commission. She feels that they should have been given more information as the EDA was being formed and should have been provided the applicable state statutes.

Williams suggested that the written opinion of the Planning Commission come back before the body before it is presented to the City Council and EDA.

Dorschner noted that he would like everyone to place greater trust in the financial and business background of the people on the EDA to recruit quality businesses.

Williams suggested going through the document to identify areas of question or concern about the plan.

Haggard noted that TIF is frequently cited. Williams agreed that it should be removed until TIF is determined.

Dodson asked for greater clarity on the objectives. Zuleger highlighted the stated objectives. He suggested that the scope needs to be further clarified. “The City is going to study X, Y and Z”

Haggard asked about the difference between a redevelopment plan and an economic development district. Zuleger explained that the language is from state statute.

Williams requested that all references to TIF be removed until it is being proposed for a project.

There was a discussion about business recruitment and the expertise of the EDA.

Haggard asked about how marginal properties are designated or identified. Zuleger explained that the state has standards related to vacancy or disrepair.

Haggard noted concern about the paragraph that makes it sound like the EDA has full authority. Zuleger stated that anything the EDA does, the City Council has to approve.

Williams feels that the words industry and manufacturing is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. It is not allowed in I94, so certainly should not be allowed in Village. Williams would like this wording replaced with Commerce. Williams pointed out that there is not chronic unemployment in the Village area either. He also doesn't like the word "housing" as it is too general. Commission agreed to make it multi-family housing.

Williams dislikes the term highest and best use. He feels it is very subjective. Johnson noted it is a legal term. Williams noted concern that the study is a blank check. Dodson agreed that the 1st project should be studying what tools are best for the city for redevelopment before adoption of the redevelopment.

Larson spoke in support of the EDA functions and TIF. He noted that it is a tool to provide and focus the resources in solving impediments to redevelopment downtown.

The "but for" clause was discussed. It is the philosophy of TIF. "But for" TIF, the property would not develop.

Williams noted that he feels that the city does not know the development potential of the downtown yet. Perhaps we are putting the cart before the horse. Dodson noted that it may be good to have the tool at disposal when a project presents itself.

Zuleger stated that based on the studies done by U of M and other outside agencies, without TIF we might not be able to attract the businesses without some sort of incentive.

Takeaways for Zuleger are that the language of the plan needs to be cleaned up to better reflect the Village Land Use Plan, 2) the Planning Commission needs to become more familiar with the EDA and their purpose. Zuleger recommends a joint meeting with the EDA.

Williams asked if it would be too restrictive to limit the use of TIF to only bigger projects. Zuleger noted that the planning commission can recommend to the EDA and City Council that the City not use TIF speculatively.

Dodson asked Zuleger when he would like to have the project plan complete. Zuleger noted that he would like to have economic development tools in place before construction for the streets and storm sewer in 2015/16.

Williams asked why the EDA is better in this regard than the City Council? Zuleger listed three reasons. 1) It is a calling card for commerce, 2) It allows for multiple financing mechanisms and 3) It has the ability to buy/sell/condemn property in problem areas. Johnson added the ability to recruit people with economic development expertise is an advantage.

M/S/P: Williams/Dodson, move to postpone consideration of the document until the Planning Commission receives an updated version of the redevelopment plan, Vote: 7-0.

Updates and Concerns

Council Updates

1. Reviewed rural area analysis.

Staff Updates

With Holidays, please let staff know if you won't be attending the next meetings. There will only be one meeting in December.

Commission Concerns –

Discussion about the temporary signage at the smoke shop. Now they have the truck and should not be allowed. Johnson stated that it is an ongoing problem and the Staff is working on it.

Meeting adjourned at 9:25 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Ziertman
Planning Program Assistant



**City of Lake Elmo
Planning Commission Meeting
Minutes of November 24, 2014**

Chairman Williams called to order the meeting of the Lake Elmo Planning Commission at 7:00 p.m.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Williams, Dodson, Kreimer, Larson, Lundgren, Dorschner and Haggard.

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Community Development Director Klatt and City Planner Johnson

Approve Agenda:

The agenda was accepted as presented.

Approve Minutes: November 10, 2014

Consideration of the November 10th minutes was postponed, as the Planning Commission received the minutes from October 27th.

Public Hearing: Inwood Preliminary Plat and Preliminary PUD Plan

Klatt began his presentation by noting that the PUD Concept Plan was approved in September. He noted that the application for tonight is a Preliminary Plat and Preliminary PUD Plan application submitted by Hans Hagen Homes and Inwood 10, LLC. Klatt outlined the PUD process as a refresher. Moving on, Klatt presented existing conditions of the site. He noted the location of the 5th Street pinch point in between Stonegate Park and the Bremer Bank facility. Klatt also presented the City's Comprehensive Plan, noting the various land uses included on the subject property.

Klatt then presented the approved General Concept Plan, noting the highlights of the plan. Based on the conditions of approval for the General Concept Plan, Klatt provided an overview of the changes to the plan based on the previous approval. First, the 150-unit multi-family building in the northwest corner has been removed. Second, the design speed of the curve of the 5th Street pinch-point has been reduced from 40mph to 35mph. This change reduced the impact to both Stonegate Park and Bremer Bank. Third, the applicant has provided a greater gathering space in the northwest corner on Outlot P. Fourth, the applicant provided for revised access for street D. The 100-foot buffer was maintained and, in some areas, increased. Klatt discussed the other updates to the plan since the Concept Plan stage.

Moving forward, Klatt presented the phasing plan for the development. He noted that the single family residential area is broken up into 4 phases.

Relating back to the Concept Plan approval, Klatt noted that the applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission reconsider three recommendations: 1) They are requesting that the loop road not include sidewalks due to the center planted islands that are used for stormwater management; 2) They are requesting that lifestyle lots be considered along the eastern edge of the plat; and 3) They are requesting that the trail recommendations comply with the County's Comprehensive Trail Plan. Klatt noted that the City Council specifically requested that the Planning Commission reconsider items #1 and #2.

Moving forward, Klatt described the low impact development techniques utilized in the single family residential areas. The planted center island serves as stormwater management and provide green space within each street. Klatt also described the proposed parkland dedication, noting that the applicant is proposing 12.6 acres of park, which exceeds the amount required by the subdivision ordinance. Klatt zoomed in on the southeastern park area and discussed access for the park. He also presented the proposed gathering area in the northwest portion of the site.

Klatt noted that there is additional information in the Staff Report. However, he did want to spend time discussing critical path issues, which include the water tower site and the 5th Street collector road. With regards to the water tower, the City and property owner have reached a preliminary agreement for a site north of 10th Street. Regarding the design of 5th Street, the City has received a study back from SRF consulting that the proposed design at the pinch-point with reduced design speed will function properly. However, there are some additional recommendations with regards to access spacing.

Klatt then provided an overview of general questions that he has received thus far from the Planning Commission or members of the public. He provided clarification on a couple of typos on the staff report. Finally, Klatt presented the findings of fact and conditions of approval as recommended by Staff. He also presented 4 modifications to the conditions of approval (conditions 2, 4 and 9). Klatt welcomed any questions.

Dodson asked if the applicants and Bremer Bank discussed a possible land swap to acquire the additional right-of-way for 5th Street. Klatt noted that the applicants have presented land swaps to Bremer Bank, but they were concerned about their ability to expand their facility. In addition, Bremer was interested in slowing down traffic. Williams asked how locked in the Boulder Ponds alignment is. Johnson noted that Boulder Ponds is completing the land transaction with Bremer Bank to provide for the proposed alignment.

Lundgren asked about street D. Klatt noted that access spacing as specified by the City Engineer informed the design of this road. Lundgren also asked about the City water tower. Klatt noted that the water tower is needed to provide adequate water pressure and storage for the entire area.

Kreimer asked about the maintenance of the central loop road. Klatt noted that while owned by the City, the central island would be maintained by the HOA.

Haggard asked if Outlot P is part of the open space calculation or part of the park calculation. Klatt noted that Outlot P is part of the open space calculation.

Williams asked about the oversizing of the sewer, noting that it would provide additional capacity. Klatt noted that this is best management practice for engineering to provide additional capacity in case any adjacent properties are in a situation where service is needed. Williams also asked about the density of the multi-family area, wondering if the applicant can come back with a higher density still within the range of the HDR land use category. Klatt explained that it could be done, but would require a Concept Plan Amendment.

Lundgren asked about the access issues identified by the City of Oakdale. Klatt noted that the County is charged with managing access on Inwood Ave. (CSAH 13). The County has a future plan that notes that access in some areas will need to be modified. 9th Street remains a concern identified by the City of Oakdale. Lundgren also asked about the request for a trail on the west side of Inwood. Klatt noted that it is a good recommendation, but is not currently supported by the County's Transportation Plan.

John Rask, Hans Hagen Homes, presented an overview of the project and discussed the general site amenities that will be incorporated into the development. He noted that there is a substantial amount of berming and buffering that will be incorporated into the project. Rask noted that 5th Street is being privately financed. In addition, he talked about the probable phasing of the project. Hans Hagen views the buildout of the residential area as a 7 or 8 year buildout. Rask spoke about the design standards used for the single family homes.

Moving forward, Rask spoke about the designs for the park areas. He noted that they are conceptual, that the Park Commission will get the opportunity to program these park areas.

Rask talked about the loop roads and the design intent. He noted that sidewalks are not included in order to provide more usable space in the front yards of the homes, as well as providing the internal green space. They are hoping to achieve a unique design with one-way streets, center planted medians and potential for gathering space.

Lundgren noted that the developer did an excellent job preparing their application. Lundgren noted that she was at first hesitant to forego sidewalks on the residential streets, but really liked the one way loop street designs. She also asked why there were so many cottonwood and box elder trees proposed. Rask noted that the box elder and cottonwood trees are the existing trees on the site that have been inventoried.

Dodson asked why the 9th Street access was necessary. Rask noted that access would be beneficial for the future office or commercial uses. Dodson asked about when the HOA would be established as a business entity. Rask provided background information about the structure of HOAs in Hans Hagen neighborhoods. In addition, due to the maintenance that is provided, the HOA starts on sound financial footing. Kreimer asked about the maintenance of the sprinkler systems. Rask noted that the system will be based on a stormwater reuse system from the retention ponds. He also noted that the HOA adopts rules on the irrigation of lawns.

Haggard asked about the size of the commercial in the northwest corner. Rask noted that the conceptual building is a 10,000 square foot footprint. The northwest site is restricted due to the shoreland zoning due to proximity to Armstrong Lake. Haggard also asked how parking is restricted within the loop roads. Rask noted that some signage will be used, and the HOA has strict rules with regards to parking. Haggard asked about the 5th Street cross section. Rask noted that the applicants are using the City's typical cross section. Haggard also asked about the landscaping of back yards within the viewshed of the commercial areas. Rask stated that they had talked to Inwood 10, LLC about having a maintenance agreement in place for landscaping so that they can do additional plantings. Williams suggested adding a condition. Haggard asked about the likely timing of the commercial and multi-family sites. Phase one would start in 2015 and will take 7 years for the residential. The Commercial will serve the residential, so the Commercial will not happen until probably after the residential.

Dorschner asked what information is provided to the buyer of these sites. He noted that often people are surprised when a different use shows up. Rask noted that the entire mixed-use development is presented to the prospective buyers. He added that the owners view the commercial and senior housing as a benefit to the community. Hans Hagen discloses all of this information, and actually uses as a selling point.

Williams asked about the berm along 10th Street, noting that it is located within the County right-of-way. Rask noted that the lots along that area are extra deep, so the right-of-way can be accommodated. Williams asked about reducing the access at the southeastern park. Rask noted that they can likely figure it out, but the design of the park will inform the access. Williams noted that the buffer trail was not moved further west. Rask suggested that the trail be field staked with City staff to minimize tree loss. The best alignment can be accommodated with this approach while maximizing privacy for both Stonegate and the Inwood neighborhood. Williams asked about the

incorporation of theming. There was a general discussion about incorporating theming elements.

Haggard asked about set places for cross-walks for 5th Street, particularly for the multi-family portion of the site to access the park area.

Public Hearing opened at 9:25

Curt Montieth, 331 Julep Ave. N., asked about the installation and maintenance of the street lights. Klatt noted that the developer must install the lights and the City will lease them from Xcel. Montieth asked about snow removal of the loop roads. Montieth asked about the possibility of locating the water tower in the 2-acre park. He noted that he supports the lower design speed of 5th street, as it will slow people down. Montieth noted that design standards in place for the multi-family development, as it may relieve future opposition to that development. Regarding Stonegate Park, Montieth suggested that the park area have adequate parking. He also requested that a berm be put in place in Stonegate Park to buffer some of the nearby residential properties. He requested that Hans Hagen and the Park Commission meet with nearby Stonegate residents to work on the park design.

Clayton Lance, Oakdale resident, noted that they are concerned about 9th Street. It is difficult to make left-hand turns onto Inwood Ave. at this point from 9th Street. Clayton Lance noted that the future commercial users are a concern. He would prefer commercial uses that are not 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

Kyle Klatt read a letter from the City of Oakdale into the public record. Emily Shively, City Planner, notes that Oakdale does not support restricted access at Oak Marsh Drive and 9th Street. In addition, they recommend a trail be installed on the east side of Inwood Ave. N.

Public Hearing closed at 9:45pm

Klatt addressed a few questions that came up during the discussion. He noted that the proposed homes would not meet the single family garage design standards for width. Klatt also raised an issue related to the design of 1-way streets. Klatt wrapped up by talking about the benefits of planned developments and how they relate to this specific project. Finally, he noted the flexibilities requested by the applicant.

Regarding the conditions of approval, Klatt recommended that the additional condition that the Engineer's comments related to the transportation study be incorporated as a condition of approval.

Williams suggested that the road be narrowed to accommodate a sidewalk on one side of loop roads. There was a discussion about street width and the functionality of these

areas. Williams noted he is concerned about the safety aspect. 30th Street was utilized as an example. Dorschner noted that the comparison is not valid as 30th Street is a collector road and the proposed loop roads would mostly be used for the limited number of homes on that particular street.

Williams noted that he no longer supports requiring designer lots at the end of loop roads adjacent to the Stonegate neighborhood as it added little benefit.

Haggard noted that she is interested in design standards for the commercial and multi-family housing. She would like to see the design standards for the outlot areas be consistent with the single family areas. Larson suggested that the design standards be addressed once the multi-family and commercial areas come forward for development.

Lundgren asked if it would be appropriate to include berms around the residential properties. Dorschner noted concern about access, visibility and safety. Montieth noted that the berms could be used as sledding hills. There was general discussion about having the park commission look at the berming.

Haggard suggested an additional condition that landscaping be added around the borders of pond #200. She also suggested theming be considered for the communal areas within the loop roads.

Kreimer noted that the 5th Street intersection at Inwood is a gateway. Some theming elements should be incorporated at that location. There was agreement that Street B and 10th Street would be another appropriate location. There was a discussion about theming. Klatt suggested that theming be utilized in the "common elements".

Haggard noted that she would like to see a trail on the west side of the development. There was a discussion about trails.

M/S/P: Haggard/Lundgren, move to provide landscape material along the west side of pond #200 to satisfy the Cities landscape consultant. **Vote: 6-1, motion carried**, with Dorschner voting no.

Williams made a motion to include themin within loop roads and gateways.

Dodson noted his concern about including theming within the loop roads. Dorschner agreed, and suggested that the developer has done an excellent job designing this subdivision.

M/S/P: Haggard/Larson, move to amend original motion to remove the theming components within the common elements within the loop roads, **Vote: 6-1, motion carried**, with Williams voting no.

Williams noted his opposition to the amendment.

M/S/P: Williams/Haggard, move to utilize theming at the gateway of 5th Street and Inwood, and the intersection of Street B and 10th Street, **Vote: 7-0, motion carried unanimously.**

M/S/P: Kreimer/Williams, move to include a trail along 10th Street from Street B to Inwood Ave. N. within the County right-of-way, **Vote: 6-1, motion carried**, with Dodson voting no.

Williams suggested amending finding #1 – after Lake Elmo Comprehensive plan, insert “except for narrowing and extending the commercial areas to the south to the intersection of 5th Street and Inwood avenue”.

Williams suggested amending finding #2 – Add at the end “with exceptions for lot width, lot area, setbacks and 60% rule for garage width”.

M/S/P: Williams/Kreimer, move to amend finding #1 regarding the Comp Plan, **Vote: 7-0, motion carried unanimously.**

M/S/P: Williams/Dorschner, move to amend finding #2 to list exceptions from LDR zoning districts, **Vote: 6-1, motion carried**, with Haggard voting no.

Haggard does not think the garage width rule should be exempt.

Dodson moves to include some considerations related to HOA covenants.

M/S/P: Dodson/Lundgren, move to include HOA have finances in place before homes are built, **Vote: 3-4, motion fails**, with Williams, Larson, Dorschner and Kreimer voting no.

Kreimer noted that the previous concept plan approval included financial participation of the signal at 5th and Inwood. Klatt noted this is still a condition of the Concept Plan.

Kreimer noted that the trail alignment in the Eastern buffer area be as far west as possible.

M/S/P: Williams/Kreimer, move to have the trail alignment in the buffer area will be determined in consultation with the landscaping consultant and planning staff, **Vote: 7-0, motion carried unanimously.**

M/S/P: Lundgren/, move to have the Park Commission look at Stonegate Park and screening and landscaping around the park and along 5th Street. There was a general discussion about park improvements. Lundgren withdrew the motion.

Larson asked about the need to include the discussion about the sidewalks within the loop roads. Williams noted a lack of support for this recommendation.

M/S/P: Dodson/Larson, move to recommend approval of the Preliminary PUD Plan with the conditions outlined in the staff report and added by the Planning Commission based on the findings of fact as amended, **Vote: 5-2, motion carried.**

M/S/P: Haggard/Lundgren, motion that the Park Commission prioritize Stonegate Park, including the Inwood development portion, in light of the overall development plans for the area around this park. **Vote: 7-0, Motion carried unanimously.**

M/S/P: Dodson/Larson motion to recommend that when HOA's are established, before homeowners move into development, that the City makes sure that a bank account and accounting system is set up to ensure that HOA is viable. **Vote: 7-0, Motion carried unanimously.**

Williams asked for a friendly amendment to clarify that developer's agreement include this provision.

Business Item: Sketch Plan - Halcyon Cemetery

Johnson presented an overview of a sketch plan review related to a proposed cemetery that would be located at Lake Elmo Avenue and 50th Street. He noted that a sketch plan has been submitted to the City because a cemetery must be processed as a plat. Staff reviewed the site for land use and zoning. Public utilities, private utilities, access, landscaping and tree preservation, screening and fencing, park dedication, and the subdivision review process.

Johnson noted that the City has received a letter with questions from the property owner adjacent to the proposed cemetery. This letter was distributed to the Planning Commission.

Williams asked why the application is coming forward as a plat since the boundaries are not changing. The applicant stated that they would address this question.

Dodson questioned how the existing house would be used. Johnson stated that the applicant intends to convert the house into a caretakers residence.

Lee Rossow, 11050 50th Street North, addressed the Commission and offered a response to the questions from the adjacent property owner. He noted that: there will be a gate restricting access to the site, there will be lights but they will adjust to lower levels at night, fencing will be used around the perimeter of the property, with wrought iron along Lake Elmo Avenue and 50th Street North and chain link around the other

boundaries, once approved as a cemetery the site can never be used for any other use. There are no dangers for soil contamination since concrete vaults are now used for all burials.

Mr. Rossow explained the rationale for the creation of a new cemetery and noted that the cemetery would be catering to the needs for modern burials.

Bill Sanders, Loukes Associates, Landscape Architect, explained that he has 25 years of experience with cemetery design. He reviewed the proposed plans for the property, and discussed access to the site, parking, use of the building, and other site design considerations. He stated that all bodies would be placed in concrete vaults and would not pose any risk for soil contamination.

Dodson asked for clarification for the ownership of each burial lot. Sanders indicated that the owner will be required to file a plat with the County, but any persons that wish to be buried on the site would purchase a right to be buried in the cemetery. State law requires that a portion of any burial fees be placed into a long-care perpetual maintenance fund for the cemetery. He noted that the tax exempt status takes effect upon filing of a final plat for the property. It was noted that the cemetery will be private and non-denominational, and that Halcyon would not be providing any funeral home services. The overall plan includes space for approximately 1,200 burials.

Williams expressed concern with the access spacing proposed and with the overall storm water management plans for the site.

The Commission asked general questions concerning the function and operation of the facility.

Updates and Concerns

Council Updates

None

Staff Updates

1. Upcoming Meetings
 - a. December 8, 2014
2. Possible 6:30 meeting start time for next year.
3. Possible Planning Commission Retreat.

Commission Concerns

Dodson asked if cemeteries should be conditional uses.

Larson thanked staff for including the City Council minutes for the Inwood Project.

Haggard thanked staff for the information and staff reports.

Lundgren asked if the agenda could have been amended to accommodate the shorter item first.

Meeting adjourned at 12:11 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Ziertman
Planning Program Assistant



PLANNING COMMISSION
DATE: 12/8/2014
AGENDA ITEM: 4A – BUSINESS ITEM
CASE #: N/A

ITEM: 2014 Community Development Department Annual Report

SUBMITTED BY: Kyle Klatt, Community Development Director

REVIEWED BY: Nick Johnson, City Planner

SUMMARY AND ACTION REQUESTED:

The Planning Commission is being asked to review an annual report that has been prepared by Staff to summarize the activities of the Planning Commission and Planning Department in 2013. This report focuses on the larger activities and projects undertaken during the year, and will include some statistical information pertaining to the City's planning activities. The Planning Commission is asked to review the plan, provide any comments or suggestions, and to submit the document to the City Council.

RECCOMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission review the annual report and adopt a motion to recommend submission of the report to the City Council.

“Move to submit the 2014 Community Development Department Annual Report to the City Council.”

ATTACHMENTS:

1. 2014 Community Development Department Annual Report

ORDER OF BUSINESS:

- IntroductionCommunity Development Director
- Report by Staff City Planner
- Questions from the Commission Chair & Commission Members
- Discussion by the Commission Chair & Commission Members



2014 Community Development Department Annual Report

I. Annual Summary

The Lake Elmo Community Development Department is submitting its annual report for consideration by the City Council and Planning Commission. The theme of 2014 was development review, as a significant number of residential plats and commercial projects were proposed over the course of the year. The significant level of proposed development follows the approval of the Comprehensive Plan Amendments for the Village and I-94 Corridor Planning Areas. In addition, sewer and water utilities were extended in various locations to make future development possible. These factors resulted in the busiest year in recent memory in terms of development activity.

In terms of residential development, the City worked on 9 residential subdivisions in various stages of approval this year. Overall, 4 residential final plats have been approved in 2014 (Savona 1st Addition, Savona 2nd Addition, Hunters Crossing 1st Addition and Hammes Estates 1st Addition) as of the date of this report. The approved final plat to date include 190 residential lots. In addition, 7 residential preliminary plats were approved in 2014. Given the amount of plat approved, it is anticipated that final platting and residential development and construction activity will be substantial in 2015.

With regards to commercial development, the City reviewed and approved two projects in 2014: Eagle Point Medical Clinic and Kwik Trip Gasoline Station, both in the I-94 Corridor Planning Area. Both of these projects are currently under construction at the time of this report. In addition to these projects, the City also reviewed and approved a new building for Family Means in the Cimarron Manufactured Home Park.

Regarding public projects, Staff has been heavily involved in both the Lake Elmo Avenue (CSAH 17) and Manning Avenue (CSAH 15) Projects in collaboration with Washington County. In particular, the CSAH 17 Project has required a significant amount of staff resources due to the complexity of the project. In addition to the reconstruction of multiple streets in the downtown area, the City is planning on the installation of sewer and storm sewer infrastructure. It is the goal of the project to make necessary transportation improvements, improve surface water drainage conditions in the downtown, and connect downtown properties to the municipal wastewater system. Staff anticipates that these projects will continue to be of highest priority in 2015, necessitating substantial resources and attention from the City, as well as close collaboration with the County.

In terms of broader planning and policy efforts focused on the future of the community, work has been completed in a number of areas. First, research and analysis of the City's Rural Planning Area was completed in order to inform future policy recommendations with regards to rural land uses. Areas of investigation include the cost of public services for the various types of rural land uses, as well as the possibility of further subdividing Agricultural and Rural Residential areas into residential lots (i.e. 2.5 acre lots). In addition to the analysis of the rural areas, Staff continued to work with Washington County on the possible Gateway Corridor bus rapid transit

facility. The addition of bus rapid transit along the southern boundary of the community will likely result in land use changes around future station areas. The City continues to be an active participant in the regional planning of the transit line and is initiating preliminary station area planning work on the local level.

One of the greatest achievements in 2014 was the elimination of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Metropolitan Council, relieving the community of mandated growth quotas and potential wastewater inefficiency fees. The Met Council was agreeable to negotiate the elimination of the MOU after the adoption of the two major Comprehensive Plan Amendments in the I-94 Corridor and Village Planning Areas and the extension of municipal utilities. In addition, the review and approval of various development applications provided the Met Council with the confidence to move forward with the elimination of the MOU.

On a staffing level, the Community Development Department added a Planning Intern in 2014, who has provided additional horsepower in the areas of parks and trails planning, rural area analysis, form-based codes and other day-to-day operations. The Building Official continues to make substantial progress at improving the City's Building Inspection operations. In addition, code enforcement activities continued to be a high priority in 2014, as a number of cases and violations were resolved by the Building Official.

II. Annual Review: Major Projects

Major projects/accomplishments for the Community Development Department in 2014 include the following:

Comprehensive Plan Updates. The City completed work on five minor updates to the Comprehensive Plan in 2014, including:

- *9434 Stillwater Boulevard North.* It was proposed by the City Council to change the land use guidance of this parcel from Rural Area Development – Alternate Density (RAD-Alt) to Rural Area Development (RAD). The amendment was not approved, as it did not receive the necessary super-majority vote at the City Council.
- *Density Ranges Amendment.* The density ranges for various land use categories within the Land Use Plan were slightly amended to fill artificial gaps between categories.
- *Holliday Parcel Amendment.* GWSA Land Development, LLC requested that the City amend the future land use guidance of a 14-acre parcel at the northwest corner of 30th Street and Manning Ave. from Rural Area Development (RAD) to Village Urban Low Density Residential (V-LDR). The amendment request was associated with the approved Village Park Preserve preliminary plat.
- *RAD-Alt Land Use Category Elimination.* The City Council approved the elimination of the RAD-Alt land use category from the Land Use Plan. The three parcels that had the RAD-Alt designation were amended to Rural Area Development (RAD) in the Future Land Use Map.
- *Wildflower at Lake Elmo Amendments.* Related to the proposed Wildflower at Lake Elmo residential subdivision, Robert Engstrom Companies requested that two areas guided for Rural Area Development be amended to Village Urban Medium Density (V-MDR) and Village Urban Low Density (V-LDR) respectively. The City approved the amendment request and is awaiting final approval from the Metropolitan Council.

Land Use Applications. Through the support of the Planning Commission, the Community Development Department worked on 53 land use applications/projects in 2014, including but not limited to amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, preliminary and final plats, conditional use permits, zoning text amendments, and variances. The most significant of the applications reviewed this year remain the residential plats that were processed in 2014, including the following:

- Savona 1st Addition Final Plat
- Hammes Estates Preliminary Plat
- Easton Village Preliminary Plat
- Village Preserve Preliminary Plat
- Hunter's Crossing Preliminary Plat
- Boulder Ponds Preliminary Plat
- Savona 2nd Addition Final Plat
- Village Park Preserve Preliminary Plat
- Hammes Estates 1st Addition Final Plat
- Hunter's Crossing 1st Addition Final Plat
- InWood Preliminary Plat

Additional land use applications that were reviewed in 2014 include but are not limited to the following:

- Lakewood Crossing (Kwik Trip) Preliminary Plat, Final Plat and Conditional Use Permit
- Family Means Conditional Use Permit
- Eagle Point Medical Preliminary and Final PUD Plan
- Halcyon Cemetery Sketch Plan
- Verizon Wireless Cell Tower Conditional Use Permit
- Launch Properties PUD Concept Plan
- Savona Townhome Conditional Use Permit
- Wildflower at Lake Elmo PUD Concept Plan

Board of Adjustment Actions. Planning Staff reviewed 2 variances in 2014:

- Jane Road Lot Size Variance
- Hammes Property Shoreland Variance – request withdrawn by applicant

City Code Amendments. In 2014 the Community Development Department approved/reviewed 12 City Code/Zoning Code Amendments, including the following:

- Zoning Code Cleanup Amendment
- Animal Ordinance
- Driveway Standards Ordinance
- Accessory Structure Standards
- Commercial Wedding Venues Ordinance
- Animal Therapy Ordinance
- Site Plan Review Ordinance – Subdivision Ordinance Cleanup
- Shoreland Ordinance
- Net and Gross Density Definitions
- Urban Low Density Residential Garage Standards
- Exterior Storage
- Screening

Metropolitan Council – MOU. The City successfully negotiated the termination of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the City of Lake Elmo and Met Council. The MOU was the legal document that stipulated the 2030 required growth targets for Lake Elmo. The City received preliminary 2040 forecast number of 20,500. Staff will continue to work towards a reduced population forecast as the Metropolitan Council prepares the release of community system statements in 2015.

CSAH 17 Project. The City has been working in close coordination with Washington County on the planning and design of the downtown street and utility project, which includes Lake Elmo Avenue, 30th Street, Upper 33rd Street, 36th Street and Laverne Avenue. The project will include the installation of sanitary sewer and storm sewer, replacement of old watermain, and the reconstruction of streets with additional pedestrian facilities. At this point, construction is scheduled to occur in two phases in 2015 and 2016. Staff recognizes that successful completion of this impactful project is of the highest priority in the next years. The preliminary design for the improvements will be brought forward for municipal consent in early 2015.

CSAH 15 Project. Staff participated in the future planning for CSAH 15/Manning Avenue as part of the project management team for this project. The overall plans for this county roadway will address issues concerning safety, access, property impacts, and future development plans along the Manning Avenue corridor. A final design for the road will be brought forward for municipal consent in 2015.

Rural Area Discussion. The Planning Commission began discussing the future of the City's rural development areas. The adoption of the 2040 regional development forecast by the Met Council is seen as a crucial next step in determining the appropriate level of development within these areas. The rural area discussion will likely be a component of the Commission's 2015 plan of work.

Gateway Corridor Technical Committee. Staff continues to participate as part of the Gateway Corridor Technical Advisory Committee in an advisory role. In addition, the Mayor and members of the Council serve on the Policy Advisory Committee and Gateway Corridor Commission. A Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the proposed transit project was approved by all affected communities in 2014. The LPA includes the preferred alignment and mode choice (Bus Rapid Transit). Officials and Staff will continue to work with Washington County and the other agencies involved in the Gateway Corridor planning process.

Village AUAR 5-Year Update. Staff drafted a five-year update to the Village Urban Alternative Areawide Review (AUAR). The City Council adopted the five-year update. The update is pending submission to the Environmental Quality Board.

Airport Zoning. Staff has continued to meet with representatives from the Metropolitan Airport Commission (MAC), who operate Lake Elmo Airport. It should be noted that MAC is in the process of updating the long range Comprehensive Plan for the Lake Elmo Airport. One of the critical decisions being considered is moving the northwest by southeast runway further to the north. While the Planning Department had established a goal to have an airport zoning ordinance adopted in 2014, uncertainty over the runway alignment has contributed to delays in the process. However, Staff have been in contact with potential consultants who could assist the City in developing a future airport zoning ordinance.

Railroad Crossing Study. Staff continued communication with representatives of Union Pacific Railroad to begin the process of created a new railroad crossing for the Village Parkway

roadway. As more detailed plans for the developments adjacent to the railroad have been developed, Staff has distributed these plans for the purposes of planning the future crossing.

Form Based Codes. The Planning Intern conducted further research about the possible implementation of a form-based code for the Village Mixed-Use Area in downtown Lake Elmo. Included in the research are performance standards that may be appropriate for these areas. Staff will present the findings of this research in 2015.

InWood Planned Development EAW. The InWood Planned Development was large enough that it required a mandatory Environmental Assessment Worksheet. Although the document was prepared by the developer's consultants, City Staff was involved in the processing and review of the document.

Trail Planning. The Planning intern completed a Trail Audit for the Lake Elmo trail system. The audit evaluates the location and condition of public and private trails within the community. In addition, the audit presents recommendations for future trail connections. Finally, Staff has been working with Washington County parks and trails staff on possible trail improvements along Lake Elmo Ave., Manning Ave., and other County roads as part of future construction projects.

Building Permits. The City of Lake Elmo processed 267 building permits, not including plumbing and mechanical permits, in 2014. The number of permits issued in the past year is generally consistent with amount of building activity over the past 5 years. However, it should be noted that 2014 marks the first full year of the permit works tracing system, so the data may be slightly different. In terms of new single family homes, the City has issued permits for 34 new homes in 2014 to date, which represents the highest number in over 10 years. Given the number of platted lots in the urban planning areas, as well as the lots likely to be platted in the new future, the Staff is anticipating an extremely significant increase in new home construction in 2015. Staff is projecting that over 100 single family homes will be constructed in the urban planning areas next year.

Permit Works Utilization. 2014 was the first year of full utilization of the permit works system. The system continues to provide improvements in accuracy and efficiency with regards to the issuance and tracking of building permits.

Development Escrow Fee System. The City Council adopted a new fee schedule in 2013 that requires the submission of an escrow deposit for larger land use applications. Staff has been diligent in tracking time spent on reviewing development projects in 2014, and this time has been reimbursed by developers/landowners.

Annual State Planning Conference. The Community Development Director and City Planner attended the State Planning Conference in Duluth, MN in September of this year. The theme for the conference was Port of Call: Charting the Course to Resiliency.

Staffing. Over the course of the year, the City of Lake Elmo added an intern to the Community Development Department. The Planning Intern is Catherine Riley, who joined the department in May of 2014. Catherine has been extremely helpful in supporting the planning department during a year of record workload. In addition, she has led multiple projects related to parks and trail planning, serving as staff support for the Park Commission. In addition to the Planning Intern, the Community Development Department also utilized contract inspection services for the increased building activity.

III. Statistical Information

A. Planning Commission Meetings

1. Regular Meetings: 23
2. Workshop Meetings: 2
3. Public Hearings: 30

B. Planning and Zoning Permits

2014 Planning and Zoning Applications					
Planning Applications	Approved	Denied	Pending	Reviewed	Total
Comprehensive Plan Amendments	4	1			5
Zoning Map Amendments	3				3
Zoning Text Amendments	5			3	8
City Code Amendments	4				4
Conditional Use Permits	4				4
Interim Use Permits				1	1
Sketch Plans	5 ^a				5
PUD Concept Plans	3				3
Preliminary Plats	8				8
Final Plats	5		1		6
Minor Subdivisions					0
Lot Line Adjustments	3				3
Variances	1			1	2
Vacations					0
Sign Permits	11				11
Appeals	1				1
Other	0				0

- a. Sketch Plan reviews do not require formal action by the City.

C. Building Permits: 5-Year Summary

Building Permits Issued (by type): 5-Year Summary								
Year	SF Dwellings - Remodel/Repair	Demo	Manufactured Homes	Multi-Family	Commercial/Ind Remodel/Repair	New Commercial	Single Family	Total
2010	265	10	6	0	20	0	26	327
2011	320	2	0	0	24	0	24	370
2012	250	3	8	0	19	0	31	311
2013 ^a	254	4	0	0	16	0	32	306
2014 ^{bc}	191	5	16	0	17	5	34	268
Total Units	1280	24	30	0	96	5	147	1582
Average	256.0	4.8	6.0	0	19.2	1.0	29.4	316.4

- a. Total valuation of construction in Lake Elmo during 2013 was \$20,944,000.
- b. Total valuation of construction in Lake Elmo through December 4th, 2014 is \$27,691,000.
- c. 2014 was the first full year of the City's utilization of the permit works tracking system

D. Housing Starts: 5-Year Summary

Housing Starts in Lake Elmo: 5-Year Summary					
Year	Single Family	Multi-Family	Manufactured Homes	Dwellings Demolished	Net Increase in Dwelling Units
2010	26	0	1	8	19
2011	24	0	0	0	24
2012	29	0	8	3	34
2013	32	0	0	4	28
2014	34	0	4	5	33
Total Units	145	0	13	20	138
Average	29.0	0	2.6	4.0	27.6

Respectfully Submitted,



Kyle Klatt
Community Development Director



PLANNING COMMISSION
DATE: 12/8/2014
AGENDA ITEM: 4B – BUSINESS ITEM
CASE #: N/A

ITEM: Proposed 2015 Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

SUBMITTED BY: Nick Johnson, City Planner

REVIEWED BY: Kyle Klatt, Community Development Director

SUMMARY AND ACTION REQUESTED:

The Planning Commission is being asked to consider the attached proposed schedule of meetings for 2015. The schedule follows the established pattern of meeting on the 2nd and 4th Monday of each month with one exception due to the observance of a holiday.

RECCOMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission review and accept the proposed 2015 Meeting Schedule with the following action:

“Move to accept the 2015 Planning Commission Meeting Schedule”

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Proposed 2015 Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

ORDER OF BUSINESS:

- IntroductionCommunity Development Director
- Report by Staff City Planner
- Questions from the Commission Chair & Commission Members
- Discussion by the Commission Chair & Commission Members



City of Lake Elmo Planning Commission

2015 Proposed Meeting Schedule

Date	Day
1/12/2015	Monday
1/26/2015	Monday
2/9/2015	Monday
2/23/2015	Monday
3/9/2015	Monday
3/23/2015	Monday
4/13/2015	Monday
4/27/2015	Monday
5/11/2015	Monday
5/27/2015*	Wednesday
6/8/2015	Monday
6/22/2015	Monday
7/13/2015	Monday
7/27/2015	Monday
8/10/2015	Monday
8/24/2015	Monday
9/14/2015	Monday
9/28/2015	Monday
10/12/2015	Monday
10/26/2015	Monday
11/9/2015	Monday
11/23/2015	Monday
12/14/2015	Monday

*Meeting moved from 5/25 to 5/27 due to the City's observance of Memorial Day