



City of Lake Elmo

777-5510

3800 Laverne Avenue North / Lake Elmo, Minnesota 55042

Meeting Notice

The Lake Elmo Planning commission will meet Monday, August 10, 1998 at 7:00 PM in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 3800 Laverne Avenue N., Lake Elmo, Minnesota.

AGENDA

1. Agenda
2. Minutes July 27, 1998
3. **Planned Unit Development (PUD) Concept Plan**
File No. PUD/98-17
United Properties, applicant.
4. PF (Public Facilities) Ordinance FINAL DRAFT
5. OTHER
6. Adjourn

Aug
10
1998

Approved

**City of Lake Elmo
Planning Commission**

**Meeting Minutes
Monday, August 10, 1998**

Chairman Armstrong called the meeting to order at 7 PM in the Council Chambers of City Hall, 3800 Laverne Avenue North, Lake Elmo, Minnesota. Present: Commissioners Berg, Graczyk, Helwig, Herber, Sessing. Absent Commissioners Brass, Carlson, Mandel, Monette. Also present: City Planner Dillerud and Councilmember Johnston.

1. AGENDA

- Add: 5.a Volunteers for LE/Baytown Consolidation Steering Committee
5.b Village Commission Update
5.c Fence Ordinance

**M/S/P Berg/Sessing – to approve the agenda, as amended.
(Motion Passed 6-0).**

2. MINUTES

**M/S/P Sessing/Herber – to accept the minutes from the July 27, 1998 meeting, as presented.
(Motion Passed 5-0-1). Abstain: Graczyk, not in attendance.**

3. Planned Unit Development (PUD) CONCEPT PLAN

File No. PUD/98-17

United Properties, applicant.

City Planner Dillerud reviewed his August 4, 1998 memo to the Planning Commission that focused on the theory and mechanics of the PUD tool in general, and also how it relates to the Lake Elmo ordinance.

City Planner Dillerud reviewed the general location of the proposed PUD as approximately 120 acres of land in the Southeast quadrant of Section 33. He discussed the existing conditions of the site and noted the location of East Metro Health facility, which is currently under construction. He said the findings by the Planning Commission to form the basis of its recommendation to the City Council regarding the PUD Concept Plan are threefold-whether the Concept plan conforms to the Comprehensive Plan of the City; whether the Concept Plan satisfies the intent and purpose of the City's land use, zoning and subdivision regulations; and whether the Concept Plan is in any way inconsistent with the public health, safety and general welfare. He said a negative finding on ANY ONE of the criteria constitutes grounds for recommending denial. He discussed his recommendation for approval, but suggested the Planning Commissioners add an additional condition stating the covenants included in the Concept Plan are not specifically approved as a function of this action.

**George Burkhard-Project Manager
United Properties**

Mr. Burkhard introduced himself, Tony Kuechle (United Properties Development Division Representative) and Jon Pope, Pope Associates. He discussed the overall site and concept plan. He said the reason they filed the protective covenants with Washington County was that this action gives the developer the right to control future lot purchases by setting signage and lighting standards. He said he feels that adding an additional condition relating to the covenants should be excluded.

Mr. Pope reviewed the application/presentation booklet that included declaration of protective covenants, general site plan and topography, aerial photo of the site, conceptual site plans and site analysis.

City Planner Dillerud told the Commissioners that the standards within the PUD might be designed to be somewhat more or less restrictive than the current standards set forth in the Municipal Code for the Business Park District. He also said the Planning Commission should consider that a PUD addresses all site peripheries, and in advance, unlike the current situation, where individual parcels can be "split off" in 10 acre pieces, for example.

The Commissioners asked what kind of businesses would be located in this business park.

Mr. Burkhardts said the market would dictate which kinds of businesses that decide to locate on this site. He said although the plan indicates 15 lots, there could be 20 or less than 10.

There was discussion relative to the creek that runs through the property and Commissioner Berg suggested the applicant contact the South Washington Watershed District for further information.

M/S/P Berg/Helwig – to recommend adoption of a resolution approving a Planned Unit Development Concept Plan for the Northland Company to include the following conditions:

- 1. The Development Stage plans shall address all PUD site peripheries with respect to measures proposed to buffer uses and structures within the project from the incompatible uses off-site, and public roadways. Development Stage Plans shall include detailed plans for site peripheries, including on site landscape, spatial separation and topographic relief, that will be the responsibility of the overall project developer, not the individual site developers, together with a timetable for installation of these improvements and a plan for the perpetual maintenance of the improvements.**
- 2. The development Stage plans shall address, in detail, measures proposed to visually and functionally link the uses proposed for the area of the site north of Hudson Boulevard with the service uses proposed south of Hudson Boulevard. Key components would include pedestrian movement, architectural design, signage, landscape themes, and site lighting.**
- 3. Development Stage application documentation shall include a Project Design Guide that, in narrative, tabular and graphic form specifies required standards for development for all individual lots within the PUD. The standards shall directly relate to, but not necessarily be the same as, those prescribed by the BP (Business Park) section of the Lake Elmo Zoning Ordinance, and the other chapters of the Lake Elmo City Code that regulate land and site development (e.g. lighting, parking, noise and others that may apply.) The documentation of PUD standards shall include a description of the degree and manner of flexibility from existing City Code standards for development in the BP (Business Park) District proposed by the applicant, and the reasons such flexibility is proposed. It is the intent of this condition that the Design Guide become an appendix to, and a part of the PUD Developers Agreement. The Protective Covenants submitted by the applicant under Tab #2 of the PUD Concept Plan Booklet are expressly excluded from this Concept Plan approval action. Proposed project and site design standards shall be submitted with the Development Stage application only.**
- 4. The aforementioned Design Guide shall include specific narrative and graphic design standards for building architecture/construction materials, landscaping, parking lot and building service area design/location, and landscaped area**

irrigation, to ensure internal conformity of appearance and minimal external visual impact.

5. The Development Stage application shall propose measures to forecast, monitor and regulate wastewater discharge from individual sites to ensure compliance with wastewater volume restrictions prescribed for Lake Elmo by contract and the Metropolitan Council.
6. The Development Stage Plan shall provide for a greater degree of Open Space aggregation than represented by the Concept through the clustering of buildings and activities, as contemplated by the Planned Unit Development "Purpose" paragraph (Section 300.08, Para. 1) of the Lake Elmo City code.

(Motion Passed 5-1). Opposed: Armstrong; does not see much benefit to the City by approving at this time.

4. PF (Public Facilities) Ordinance

City Planner Dillerud reviewed the draft PF amendments. The Commissioners made these additional changes:

Subd. 6. Performance Standards

- vii. These standards may be waived in reference to Historical Structures.
- d. Buffering. Where areas abut residential districts, a buffer and setback area of a minimum depth of 200 feet is required.

M/S/P Sessing/Herber – to recommend the City Council direct staff to call a Public Hearing regarding the amendments to the Public Facilities Ordinance, September 14, 1998.

(Motion Passed 6-0).

5.a Volunteers for Lake Elmo/Baytown Consolidation Steering Committee

Commissioner's Tom Armstrong and Jeff Berg volunteered to participate on this committee as Lake Elmo Planning representatives.

5.b Village Commission Update

City Planner Dillerud said the Village Commission has worked very hard over that past several months to complete their work plan. He said the Commission members have been doing the legwork, rather than hire a consultant to gather the information. They have extended the moratorium through March 31, 1998 in order to be sure they have enough time to complete their work. He said City Attorney Filla suggested it might be inconsistent with Minnesota Statutes to extend the moratorium a third time, so this extension should allow the Commission enough time to finish their task.

5.c Fence Ordinance

Commissioner Sessing asked if the amendment to the fence ordinance, specifically the snow fencing changes be brought to the Commission at its September 14, 1998 meeting. City Planner Dillerud said he would do so.

Chairman Armstrong adjourned the meeting at 9:00 PM

Respectfully submitted, Cynthia Young-Recording Secretary