

**Minutes of the
REGULAR MEETING OF THE LAND USE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

January 17, 2013

Committee Members Present: Jon Commers, Chip Halbach, Tami Diehm, Phillip Klein, Bill Droste, Kim Kang, Elizabeth Wefel, Amy Ihlán, Jon Ulrich, Bill Neuendorf

Committee Members Absent: Andy Hestness, Kathi Hemken, Kristina Smitten, Elizabeth Kautz, David Elvig, Gregory Boe

CALL TO ORDER

A quorum being present, Committee Chair Commers called the regular meeting of the Council's Land Use Advisory Committee to order at 4:03 p.m. on Thursday, January 17, 2013.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES

Chair Commers asked for approval of the proposed January 17, 2013, agenda. It was moved by Wefel, seconded by Klein, to approve the agenda of the January 17, 2013, regular meeting of the Land Use Advisory Committee. Motion carried.

Chair Commers asked for approval of the November 15, 2012, meeting minutes. It was moved by Kline, seconded by Droste, to approve the minutes of the November 15, 2012, regular meeting of the Land Use Advisory Committee. Motion carried.

BUSINESS

Reappointment of Vice Chair

In accordance with the Land Use Advisory Committee Bylaws, Article II, B. 2., Committee Chair Commers appointed Tami Diehm as Vice Chair subject to the approval by the Committee.

It was moved by Wefel, seconded by Klein, to recommend that the Land Use Advisory Committee approve the appointment of Tami Diehm as the Committee's Vice Chair for 2013. Motion carried.

INFORMATION

LUAC Report to Community Development Committee on 12/3/12 – Jon Commers

Commers discussed the report to the Community Development Committee given on December 3, 2012, and noted that it was done in a different format. He stated they had a conversation about the discussions, dialogues and themes that have been communicated by this Committee in previous meetings.

Introduction to Information on Geographic Planning Areas – Jon Commers

Commers offered framing comments regarding information on geographic planning areas (GPAs) and referred to the document supplies by staff. He discussed the initial suggestions for defining GPAs contained in the document provided (on page 24).

Discussion of Geographic Planning Areas by Committee

Commers stated that, speaking as a Council Member, what would be most useful would be a sense of what are the fundamental criteria to be used to create a set of GPAs for Thrive MSP 2040.

Halbach stated it would be helpful to be very clear to acknowledge the consequence of defining GPAs and how these areas will be used. Commers noted that there are many staff members in the audience today to help address some of these questions.

Detrick responded that the Council has used GPAs to implement their strategies and noted that there is a great deal of diversity across the metro area. The GPAs are made after the Council has a set of goals.

Halbach discussed interest in more housing along transit lines, so if we are able to define a GPA that centers around transit lines this would lend itself to this type of strategy as opposed to how GPAs were defined in the past. If we knew the strategies we were going to get at, it would help us define GPAs.

Commers would like to explore the idea of overlays around transit structures as a tool to be used towards implementation.

Ulrich discussed current terms and talked about how we are 'busting boundaries' that are defined by whether they're getting sewer service. Therefore, we should get rid of current terms.

Commers stated that Ulrich's comment raises the question of how the transit system is built out and asked if this is a frame that he feels would be useful in terms of organizing the planning areas? Ulrich stated that planning sectors may be related to systems.

Detrick stated that today we do have both – i.e., parks are where natural resources are. With the expansion of transitways we have a lot of capacity in our sewer system. What does this mean for GPAs going forward and how might service areas be different (for good reason) or how might there be other ways to really be complementary.

Neuendorf discussed commercial sectors to connect homes, jobs, commercial, etc. and noted that commercial nodes are vital.

Commers asked how do we use a range of markets – should they be considered separately. Halbach stated that it is worth looking at. What commercial nodes are significant (both regionally and sub-regionally)?

Neuendorf stated this would align with most comp plans as well without getting into micro analysis.

Ulrich commented on page 3, #6 – he doesn't see the ability to preserve farmland over 40 years and feels it will weaken over time.

Ihlan stated she wants to push urban/rural element as well.

Wefel stated she felt the need to explore protection of water resources and natural resources.

Commers noted that thinking regionally there are different recharge rates for aquifers and may be something to consider and asked the Committee what their thoughts were.

Klein stated he feels it is more of a regional concern – how do we maintain greater reserves for water as need grows with future development.

Halbach discussed looking at what's important to protect and what's important to enhance. He noted this doesn't align with municipal borders. He discussed fair housing and equity assessment and feels this is very important. This would be an important element of GPAs (social/economic criteria).

Commers asked for ways of structuring GPAs that would be difficult to bring to a City Council and asked for comments on what the issues from a city perspective are.

Droste stated that at a city level, you get parochial to your own turf you don't think about the region as a whole. There are some areas that won't be developed for another 50 years. However, systems developed need to look at the entire region. We need to continually talk about the seven county region, as we are all connected. He felt discussing educating local governments would be helpful.

Diehm stated she has always appreciated more complex terms rather than just 'developed' or 'developing.'

Ihlan stated using overlays for transit or protection of water may help cities see how they fit into the bigger picture. So one city wouldn't be defined by one definition but one area may be a transit way, one about water protection, one area commercial, etc.

Commers raised the question of how that dialogue plays out, for example about water, where the city's prior expectations of goals around development and specific land use don't fit with a water strategy that is shared with surrounding cities. He asked how does this play out at the city level. Ihlan stated that when there's a

proposal for a housing development, for example, there are discussions of what impervious services are going to do and what are the concerns of water runoff.

Halbach discussed looking at individual systems as a way to categorizing areas rather than having cities labeled to a certain categorization. He explained that if a city has a certain designation that then defines what density should be. Detrick stated some communities do have more than one geographic classification.

Ihlan asked about business concentrations. Detrick stated that she feels this comes down to local zoning.

John Kari, Council Consultant, stated that business concentrations had been brought up before and regional attempts to deal with these issues. Councils have hesitated from the beginning to designate business center concentrations. He is working on looking at identifying these centers.

Commers asked about the evolution of the overlay concept and asked if this is a new concept. There are conditions that we should think about how we could reflect the GPAs that don't correspond with municipal boundaries. He asked if there have been these types of overlays previously. Kari stated that a natural resources inventory and assessment was taken and given to communities and they were asked to consider natural resources in their planning.

Lisa Barajas, Manager of Local Planning Assistance, explained how overlays are especially helpful to smaller communities doing planning.

Detrick noted that the request to consider the natural resource inventory in planning was only a suggestion to communities. It was not a mandate and not every community followed the recommendation.

Commers asked if surface water as well as water supply should be considered as a criterion in this process.

Ihlan stated that this definitely needs to be considered, especially if lake water quality is a consideration as well as supply. She asked if you had water protection or natural resource protection you could restrict business/industry development in those areas.

Ulrich stated that he does not work a lot with land use but does work a lot with transportation and economic development in Scott County. He stated that one of their goals, by 2030, is to have 50% of jobs in their County. He's asked what would happen if rush hour was equally going in two different directions. He stated that the goal seems to be to make it denser and bring in light rail, but to a lot of people this is not very appealing. Our transit or road system will not continue to support that. He says he feels you cannot build yourself out of congestion with light rail. He stated we need to think in terms up moving the jobs out of our core cities and make use of the rural areas, therefore creating traffic in both directions during rush hours.

Commers summarized the underlying premise being: are you matching where people live with where they're working as effectively as you can.

Ulrich stated that what they're working on is bringing good paying jobs into Scott County so folks don't have to travel inward or on I-494.

Halbach asked Kari to talk more about the relationship with the work we are now doing with the comprehensive plans – what are the major components. Kari stated that in the current Framework there are policies related to all communities; then there are policies related specifically to each planning area. What we try to do in system statements is tailor to individual communities. The key driver is the forecasts, as this becomes the basis of how we do regional planning.

Halbach asked if there is a stock guidance for each type of community – is it on the website. Barajas responded that each GPA is identified on the website and then policies are outlined for each. Halbach felt that looking at this would really help him. Detrick pointed out information in the handouts.

Commers noted that this conversation will continue and then summarized the themes that he's heard:

- Notion of urban/rural distinction losing some of its relevance.
- Considering market concentrations including specific markets – land, labor, and housing (including job locations – are they near where people live?).
- Age of infrastructure and the life cycle of the community.

- Water – both ground water and surface water.
- Demography or income frame – recognizing socio-economic characteristics with the GPAs.

Kang discussed technology is something to think about.

Ulrich discussed competition they're having with Chihuahua, Mexico, for jobs because they have fiber optics.

Droste discussed making networks work. It's a struggle to look out 30 years but technology is sure to change. He also talked about industry – there are some that (50 years from now) should not be located within a metro area.

Commers noted this is an interesting point. He is working on redevelopment along the river that has caused a lot of interconnected questions. This does speak to regional-scale trends that are something to think about.

Halbach stated that in thinking of a single classification for a city he noted it could be very different from another city with that same classification.

Commers stated this shows why this is so important to look at. The Thrive Working Group will be having this discussion on January 22. He asked members to call or email him with further thoughts or discussion. He noted this discussion will be brought back in May.

Halbach asked about this committee being a good sounding board for Fair Housing and Equity. Commers stated he will consider bringing it to this group.

NEXT MEETING

March 21, 2013, at 4:00 pm at the Metropolitan Council in Room LLA.

ADJOURNMENT

Business completed, the meeting adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

Sandi Dingle
Recording Secretary