

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

July 25, 2013

Committee Members Present: Jon Commers, Bill Droste, Chip Halbach, Andy Hestness, Amy Ihlan, Kim Kang, Elizabeth Kautz, Phillip Klein, Bill Neuendorf, Kristina Smitten

Committee Members Absent: Ginny Black, Gregory Boe, Tami Diehm, Kathi Hemken, Elizabeth Wefel, Jon Ulrich

CALL TO ORDER

Committee Chair Commers called the special meeting of the Council's Land Use Advisory Committee to order at 4:10 p.m. on Thursday, July 25, 2013.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES

Chair Commers asked for approval of the July 25, 2013, agenda. It was moved by Kautz, seconded by Droste, to approve the agenda of the July 25, 2013, special meeting of the Land Use Advisory Committee. Motion carried.

Chair Commers asked for approval of the May 16, 2013, meeting minutes. It was moved by Klein, seconded by Kautz, to approve the minutes of the May 16, 2013, regular meeting of the Land Use Advisory Committee. Motion carried.

INFORMATION

Geographic Planning Areas presentation – Lisa Barajas & Deb Detrick

Chair Commers stated that the purpose of the meeting is to make a recommendation on geographic planning areas, including the rationale underlying it.

Barajas stated that grouping communities together based on commonalities will help the Metropolitan Council (Council) and the region move forward in implementing regional policies at the local level. The goal is to advise the Committee of the Whole (COW) on geographic planning areas so the Council may more effectively implement policies and strategies in *Thrive MSP 2040*. Geographic planning areas have been used to apply the Council's broad policies within the context of the local community for development, wastewater provision, transportation choices, housing choices, and natural resources management.

Five suggested options for changing planning areas are combinations of:

1. Approaches that focus on characteristics at the community level, and
2. Features that transcend community borders (layers or overlays).

General Description of Options

Options are based on input from LUAC and the Committee of the Whole, the Metropolitan Council's statutory authority and staff review.

Each option emphasizes different policy themes to address issues or challenges.

Options describe concepts rather than detailed definitions.

Four Ways to Make Changes

Two approaches update the current planning areas by adding characteristics at the community level.

Approach A adds information on intersection density and the age of housing.

Approach B adds information on the percentage of urbanized land and residential density.

Two layers highlight features that transcend community borders (overlays).

Layer 1 emphasizes job and activity centers, transportation corridors, and potential for redevelopment, reuse and infill.

Layer 2 emphasizes sustainable water supply and natural resources.

Five Options for Planning Areas

1. *Approach A*: Updates current planning areas by adding information on intersection density and age of housing.
2. *Approach A and Layer 1*: Adds information on intersection density and age of housing; emphasizes job and activity centers, transportation corridors, and potential for redevelopment, reuse and infill.
3. *Approach A and Layer 2*: Adds information on intersection density and age of housing; emphasizes sustainable water supply and natural resources.
4. *Approach B and Layer 1*: Adds information on the percentage of urbanized land and residential density; emphasizes job and activity centers, transportation corridors, and potential for redevelopment, reuse and infill.
5. *Approach B and Layer 2*: Adds information on the percentage of urbanized land and residential density; emphasizes sustainable water supply and natural resources.

BUSINESS

Recommendations on Geographic Planning Areas

The committee discussed the options.

Kautz stated *Approach A* shows only the age of housing, but it is important to look at affordable housing as part of housing stock. She asked about *Layer 2*, and stated it would be helpful to streamline the process related to water supply. *Layer 2* needs more work, and water supply involves many other entities.

Elhassan, Environmental Services, explained how the Council worked with partners while developing its water supply plan. An advisory committee had representatives from all agencies.

Neuendorf commented he sees in public meetings a huge interest in policy structure, the 30-year forecast, and people asking why we need to do this.

Halbach commented that the approach that makes sense is what is important for the region as a whole. Protecting the water supply is important. Efficient transportation is important. Transportation corridors and enhancing economic competition (connected to transit and centers) is important. Efficient use of sewer infrastructure is important, so it should be reflected on the map. Racially concentrated areas of poverty (RCAPs) are important to designate, but are not shown in options.

Kautz stated that social justice measures are messy from a land-use standpoint, and law suits can result if social justice is added to zoning.

Commerz referenced conversations on social conditions and their relationship to physical infrastructure. Geographic planning areas are to remain relatively static. RCAPs and education are more dynamic.

Halbach asked about the utility of their recommendation and how planning areas are used.

Commers explained that policy implementation is tailored for different communities.

Halbach questioned implementation in the developed area. He stated that water supply is important, but developed and developing area names are not so useful.

Commers explained that planning area names will evolve, and committee members may give input on names.

Droste stated that he is hesitant on water supply recharge areas and proximity to surface water. He said look at funding mechanisms. A well costs about \$1 million versus \$30 million for a pipe.

Commers stated that water supply has been a consistent theme, with comments on aquifers depletion, multiple players, and the need for more resilience. Water supply is stressed here, regardless of uncertainties over who does it and who pays for it.

Smitten stated that the region is vulnerable on capacity issues.

Kautz said we should encourage where we can accommodate growth. She asked about redevelopment potential, said some areas in the map are outside the Metropolitan Urban Service Area (MUSA), and suggested focusing efforts and reviewing areas with communities.

Neuendorf stated that development and redevelopment areas are critical, although too much information is provided. He thinks Option 4 is best. Socio-economic aspects are important, but not number one.

Kautz commented that she likes Approaches A & B. She likes Option 4. Approach B is more generalized, and Layer 1 gives us the transit piece to attract new business. Layer 2 is important, but needs legislative work to determine a leading regulatory body and collaboration. Funding is needed to build plants for surface water.

Smitten stated that areas should inform where we see growth shifting and capacity. She gave Plymouth as an example and asked, what if an area wants to change to higher density?

Commers stated that is an important point. This is a snapshot, but application has to be prospective.

Hestness stated that transportation corridors in Layer 1 relate to changes and asked how they relate to current plans.

Hiniker, Metropolitan Transportation Services, defined corridors and explained how corridors affect decisions.

Kari, Metropolitan Transportation Services, said maps give general guidance, and details are provided in policy plans and forecasts.

Commers addressed sequencing.

Barajas stated that areas will be refined as Council policies are decided.

Starling, Research, talked about forecasts and how 2030 plans for density ranges are integrated into forecasts.

Ihlan stated that she supports Halbach on recommending areas best for planning. She likes Approach A and Layer 2. Connectivity and age of housing go to the character of a community and infrastructure. It is important to focus on environmental sustainability and make the region a leader. She is willing to give up Layer 1.

Halbach stated that in Option 4 we lose the concept of connectivity.

Smitten stated that she likes Option 3 and job and activity centers.

Kautz commented that she likes Approach A and B and likes Layer 2. Transit is always a priority for site selection.

Droste stated that there is huge interest in water supply, but he wants to see a policy structure around it.

Klein likes Option 4. He has questions about water supply and agrees with Droste. Transit and connectivity are needed to support economic conditions.

Neuendorf stated that he likes reflecting connectivity, but intersection density does not show differences within Edina, including high and low connectivity for future investment.

Barajas stated the maps are generalized to a city level with higher-level goals for the city. In addition to the historic planning area maps, the report provided to the committee previously includes maps and information regarding the Council's Long-Term Wastewater Service Area, transitways, transit market areas, and LCA Transit Oriented Development eligible areas.

Halbach remarked this policy should reflect diversity and greater granularity.

Commers stated the committee's interest in Options 4 and 3 and concerns over water supply policy.

Elhassan, Environmental Services, offered to present the Water Supply Plan to the committee.

Commers accepted the offer of a presentation at a future LUAC meeting.

Smitten likes the housing and connectivity part and groundwater recharge. She understands the Mayor Kautz's perspective.

Kautz stated that Option 4 is more flexible with density. She suggested adding connectivity to Approach B. However, Approach B gives more flexibility and we can look at market conditions and redevelopment opportunities. Layer 1 has the necessary transit piece and job centers, without boundaries.

Halbach asked about the product of their decision and whether there is any flexibility.

Barajas stated the information is used as a filter to group together communities.

Chair Commers asked for recommendations.

Klein moved for Option 4, seconded by Kautz. Option 4 is *Approach B and Layer 1*. It adds information on the percentage of urbanized land and residential density and emphasizes job and activity centers, transportation corridors, and potential for redevelopment, reuse and infill. **Motion not carried.**

Halbach stated he would not support the motion unless more detail is provided. He explained more granularity within communities is needed, and there should not be a single designation by community.

Ihan stated she would not support the motion. Ihan does not want to omit Layer 2 because it is very important and provides impetus for future planning.

Droste questioned water supply in Option 3 or 5 and the need to get a structure around water policy.

Barajas asked Elhassan to speak of his work on this 10-year collaboration.

Elhassan stated the water supply and wastewater policy is to be discussed at the next COW meeting

Commers requested receiving the information prior to the 8/14 COW meeting.

Kautz remarked on the importance of tonight's vote and coming back to the Committee of the Whole to address the importance of water resources.

Commers stated the cost of inaction is very high.

Detrick pointed out page 16 of the report, describing implications of the layer on water supply.

Smitten asked if there are other options, crossing over, or putting one option with another layer. She does not support Option 4 and prefers Option 2 due to connectivity and housing pattern; she likes Option 4 with the recharge areas overlay.

Halbach commented that connectivity has value to Council planning. He questioned option 4 and if urbanization has equal value in Council planning.

Barajas commented on the urbanization piece and that communities are developing with higher densities around transit corridors.

Halbach stated that connectivity is important for planning and stated it's a tradeoff between connectivity versus density. Halbach asked, which is more useful?

Barajas remarked that the staff suggests connectivity has more value.

Neuendorf stated that connectivity is important and so is density, while age of housing is not as important. Layer 1 is critical, and Layer 2 is important, but not top tier. Neuendorf asked if they could include everything.

Barajas said there is a lot of overlap, and results would not probably change significantly with more variables.

Smitten offered a motion to recommend Option 2 with the addition of groundwater recharge potential, Ihlan seconded. The motion covers *Approach A and Layer 1, plus recharge potential*. This adds information on intersection density and age of housing; emphasizes job and activity centers, transportation corridors, and potential for redevelopment, reuse and infill; and adds the high/low recharge areas. **Motion carried**, with one no vote from Halbach.

Halbach is opposed to anything without granularity; it is not meaningful if have the same policy for groupings. He gave the example of Plymouth, Maple Grove and Corcoran.

Barajas commented that Plymouth and Maple Grove have policies for density levels, land use, growth planning. For rural areas, like Corcoran outside the MUSA, the same policy is not applicable.

Halbach commented that city-wide density policy is not helpful.

Hestness asked what we would lose without including proximity to surface water in Layer 2.

Detrick commented the proximity to water supply is important and one policy implication is working towards balancing ground water and surface water.

Smitten remarked recharge is affected by higher density; we cannot see the impact on recharge impacted by regional growth.

Ihlan suggested adding all of Layer 2.

Smitten said the motion was to add just recharge areas from Layer 2.

Commers thanked the committee and staff. He reminded the committee of the August 14 Committee of the Whole meeting. He stated that Elhassan's water supply presentation will be distributed, and he invited all to attend the next COW meeting.

NEXT MEETING

September 19, 2013, at 4:00 pm at the Metropolitan Council in Room LLA.

ADJOURNMENT

Business completed, the meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Michele Wenner (on behalf of Sandi Dingle)
Recording Secretary