

The Planning Commission is an advisory body to the City Council. One of the Commission's functions is to hold public hearings and make recommendations to the City Council. The City Council makes all final decisions on these matters.

Lake Elmo Ordinances require that certain documents and information be included in applications. The Planning Commission may postpone consideration of an application that is incomplete and may for other reasons postpone final action on an application.

For each item, the Commission will receive reports prepared by the City Staff, open the hearing to the public, and discuss and act on the application. If you are aware of information that hasn't been discussed, please fill out a "Request to Appear Before the Planning Commission" slip; or, if you came late, raise your hand to be recognized. Comments that are pertinent are appreciated.

AGENDA

LAKE ELMO PLANNING COMMISSION

APRIL 9, 1990

- 7:30 p.m. MEETING CONVENES
1. AGENDA
 2. MINUTES: March 26, 1990
- 7:40 p.m. 3. Trans-City Investment CUP Amendment
(Continued)
- 7:45 p.m. 4. Presentation by ReComp (Continued)
- 8:00 p.m. 5. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
- A. Future Land Use Map
 - B. RE Ordinance
 - C. Freeway Business Ordinance
- 9:15 p.m. 6. Planning Commission Reports
- 9:30 p.m. 7. Adjourn

LAKE ELMO PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

MARCH 26, 1990

Chairman DeLapp called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in the City Council chambers. Present: DeLapp, John, Johnston, Enes, Stevens, Johnson, Conlin, Arkell, Wilfong, Thomas, and Acting-Admin. Kueffner. Absent: Bucheck.

1. AGENDA

M/S/P Enes/Stevens - to approve the March 26, 1990 Planning Commission agenda as presented. (Motion carried 9-0).

2. MINUTES: March 12, 1990

M/S/P Johnston/Arkell - to approve the March 12, 1990 Planning Commission minutes as amended. (Motion carried 7-0-2 Abstain: Enes, Conlin.)

3. PUBLIC HEARING:

Trans-City Investment's Request for an Amendment to C.U.P. for Outside Storage at 11490 Hudson Blvd.

Jim McNamara, Building Official, reported in the PZ cover sheet that Howard Gelb of Trans-City Investment has requested an amendment to their Conditional Use Permit to allow outside storage in an existing fenced-in area on the north side of the building which is approximately 29,000 sq.ft. area and is naturally concealed by the surrounding topography. The area would be used for the storage of materials being used on the property by the various businesses plus lawn tractors and other equipment used to maintain the property.

If the PZ looked favorably on this request, Mr. McNamara suggested the CUP include outside storage within the fenced-in area not to exceed a maximum height of 7 feet (one foot below the top of the fence) so overflow does not occur. The storage should be in an orderly neat manner so as not to become a health or work hazard to anyone on the property or the surrounding area.

Chairman DeLapp opened up the public hearing at 7:40 p.m. in the City Council chambers. Public Hearing notice was published on March 14, 1990 in the St. Croix Valley Press and all adjoining property owners were notified.

Kurt Lange, Administrator for Trans-City Investments, stated he lives on the premises and can oversee the complex. He explained all the tenants in this complex have been reviewed by Jim McNamara. Items, such as raw materials for bank vaults, would be stored on a concrete slab. There would be no grain or food products stored outside because of the potential for rats or rodents. There will be a rent charge to the tenants who have outside storage. Lange will talk to the tenants on the south side of the building about their outside storage.

Ray Salus, 404 Lake Elmo Avenue, stated he had no objection to the proposed outside storage because the storage would be concealed by a fence and 10-15 feet of bank around it. Trans-City has done a good job in cleaning up the site.

Several PZ members voiced their concern on what solvents Glass Etc. and Etching Concepts were storing and how they were disposing of them.

M/S/P Johnson/Enes - to recommend to the City Council that Trans-City Investment Conditional Use Permit at 11490 Hudson Blvd., be amended to permit outside storage with the following conditions:

1. The area of storage not exceed 29,000 sq.ft. currently existing within a fenced area.
2. The height of storage within the fenced area not exceed a height of 7 feet.
3. Items be stored in an orderly, neat manner so as to insure the safety of workers in the area.
4. No hazardous chemicals, including, but not limited to organic solvents, acids and alkali material be permitted within the outside storage area.
5. No perishable goods be stored in this area.
6. No additional exterior lighting will be provided.

and based their recommendation on the following Findings of Fact:

1. After visiting the site, the PZ found outside storage would not be detrimental to the surrounding areas,
2. That the items being stored would not be detrimental to the environment,
3. Outside storage is consistent with the intent of the Alternate Ag Use Ordinance,
4. During the public hearing, Ray Salus had only favorable comments, and there were no objections from the neighboring property owners.

(Motion carried 9-0).

The staff will report back with Jim McNamara's CUP review done in January, 1990. Mr. Lang will contact Jim McNamara with the results of the water test and a list of solvents which were reviewed by Washington County Public Health. These chemicals will be reported to our Fire Department.

4. Bob Healy, ReComnp Inc.
Compost Site at I-94 and County Road 15

Mr. Bob Healy, ReComp, Inc. submitted a proposal for an organic soil manufacturing and yard waste composting operation in conjunction with Bob Mogren of Mogren Brothers Landscaping located on County Road 15 and I-94. Mr. Healy was not present at the meeting; therefore, the Commission addressed the documents before them.

Rita Conlin: I am strongly opposed. A compost site is very odorous and not consistent with our stand on the landfill--"Why are we going to receive compost, when we are unwilling to take a landfill". What happens to the pesticides and runoff? This is not a form of waste abatement because the law is already there. We have our own composting site. The other counties should be responsible for their own composting. It is not Lake Elmo's responsibility. Will this bring in revenue, taxes into the City?

Rob Enes: I am opposed, because I don't want other people's junk here. Lake Elmo has their own compost site. The residents have done their best to recycle and limit the amount of items that go into a landfill. I am a strong believer for Hennepin County to take care of their own little world and not push it off onto somebody else.

Ed Stevens: I am opposed to this proposal. If this is such a clean and harmless operation, as they make it out to be, there is no reason why they cannot find an area by St. Paul or Minneapolis to set this up.

Wyn John: Based on the information we have, I would be opposed.

Jim Arkell: I am opposed. I work for a recycling industry and see too many problems that have been glossed over and come up in the future. There wouldn't be a need for this if we left the clippings on the lawn.

Lonny Thomas: Based on the documents submitted by Mr. Healy and the limited PZ discussion, I would be opposed.

Karen Johnston: I am opposed and would agree with Rita's and Rob's reasons.

Debra Wilfong: I am opposed.

Steve DeLapp: I am in favor of the operation that Washington County and the City of Lake Elmo have now. Unless I hear otherwise from the City and County, I would like to leave it as it is.

Dick Johnson: We say, on one hand, we are in favor of recycling, we don't want more landfills, but on the other hand, we say you are not going to do any composting in my City because I don't want to be dumped on. I live near the City's compost site and don't notice any odor. If properly taken care of, and with the necessary controls, an excellent product is produced. This could be something the City could benefit from.

The Commission asked the staff to indicate to Mr. Healy that, based on the information presented, the proposal was not favorably viewed as a whole. If Mr. Healy has additional information to bring before them, they would be willing to consider it.

5. Discussion on Model Ordinance

The Commission received copies of Washington County and Afton's Zoning ordinances. After their review, the PZ made the following recommendation:

M/S/P Johnson/Enes - to request authorization by the City Council to direct the City Staff, with the City Planner and Attorney, put together a revised set of ordinances based on the Washington County and Afton Model Ordinance; including the new Freeway Business Zoning and Residential Estates Zoning and all components of the existing Lake Elmo Ordinance; excluding items that don't apply to Lake Elmo (such as PUD's). (Motion carried 9-0).

The Planning Commission will place this item, working on the model ordinance, as a priority item on their work plan.

6. Update on Comprehensive Plan/Future Land Use Map

Mary Kueffner updated the Commission of Council approval (3/20/90) on the Future Land Use Map with the average lot density of 3 per 10 acres for Rural Residential Density (RRD) as designated on this map. The Council will discuss the Comp Plan/Future Land Use Map at their April 3rd meeting.

After reviewing the map, some members asked if the Council had looked into RRD as a viable economic unit and what impact would RRD and commercial development along I-94 have on the City.

Copies of the Residential Estates Ordinances will be sent to the Commission for discussion at their next meeting.

M/S/P Enes/John - to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 9:18 p.m. (Motion carried 9-0).