

**CITY OF HANOVER  
PARK BOARD MEETING  
NOVEMBER 22, 2016**

**CHAIR**  
**MAT BOIE**

**BOARD MEMBERS**  
**ABBY PETERSON**  
**ABBY STREHLOW**  
**COLLEEN WILLIAMS**

**VICE CHAIR**  
**TOM GLEASON**

**COUNCIL LIAISON**  
**JIM ZAJICEK**

- 1. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance: 7:00 p.m**
- 2. Approval of Agenda**
- 3. Approval of Minutes from September 27, 2016 Meeting**
- 4. Citizen's Forum**
- 5. Unfinished Business**
  - a. Park Comp Plan Recap**
- 6. New Business**

*None*
- 7. Reports and announcements**
- 8. Adjournment**

**CITY OF HANOVER  
PARK BOARD MEETING  
SEPTEMBER 27, 2016 – DRAFT MINUTES**

**Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance**

Chair Mat Boie called the Park Board meeting of September 27, 2016 to order at 7:00 p.m. Present were Chair Mat Boie, Tom Gleason, Abby Peterson, Colleen Williams, Council Liaison Jim Zajicek, and City Accountant/Deputy Clerk Elizabeth Lindrud. Guests present were Stephanie Gleason.

**New Member Introductions and Oath of Office**

The Oath of Office was stated by Williams.  
Williams was welcomed by the Park Board.

**Selection of Officers**

Peterson nominated Tom Gleason for the position of Vice Chair, accepted by Gleason. Gleason is appointed 2016 Vice Chair.

**Approval of Agenda:**

Williams requested to add the Park Maintenance items to New Business.

**MOTION** by Peterson to approve the Agenda as amended, seconded by Gleason. **Motion carried unanimously.**

**Approval of Minutes from July 26th, 2016 Meeting**

Williams inquired about the letter explaining the ballfield redesign referenced by Liaison Zajicek. Lindrud stated it was printed in the third quarter newsletter.

**MOTION** by Gleason to approve the minutes from July 26, 2016, seconded by Peterson. **Motion carried unanimously.**

**Open Forum:**

**Stephanie Gleason**

Stephanie Gleason expressed concern over the decision to expand the Settlers Park Ballfield and remove the 150-year-old oak trees. She stated it takes away the open space in the park. She further explained she stopped by the park two weeks ago and saw several teenagers hanging out underneath the oak grove. She inquired if the City had collected data to make the decision and stated that the Park Board Survey showed that Settlers Park met the community's needs. She also stated there was feedback from hundreds of residents that do not want the trees to be removed. She explained there are multiple other options for ballfields, the Hanover Athletic Association can extend their current field or Hanover Youth Ball can utilize surrounding cities fields. She inquired why the Planning Commission had not reviewed the decision and stated that the land is still in use by the community.

**Unfinished Business:**

**Set Dates/Events for 2017**

Board Members discussed the dates for the events. The Bike Rodeo is tentatively set for Spring. The Easter Egg Hunt will be held on 4/15/17, Concert in the Park 6/15/17, Zoomobile 7/19/17. Movie in the Park will not return, discussion took place around how late the movie would have to start and bugs being a deterrent.

**New Business:**

**Park Maintenance Discussion**

Williams thanked Public Works for adding new mulch in the parks. She stated that the gazebo in Mallard Park is in bad shape and has broken wood and needs to be stained. She further explained the drinking fountain at Prairie Run Park is not working and inquired if drinking fountains could be added to all the parks. The Board explained that the addition of drinking fountains is an item on the comp plan that was reviewed during the park walk through in the spring. She also requested that hand sanitizer be added to the porta-potties.

Williams inquired on the status of the tree removal in Settlers Park and who would be removing them. She stated that to help the survival of the remaining trees its best to start construction in the winter, when the trees are dormant.

**MOTION** to adjourn by Williams to request to postpone removing the oak trees until winter, seconded by Gleason. **Motion carried unanimously.**

**Reports:**

**Peterson**

- Inquired on the status of the Little Libraries. Lindrud stated that at this time they can be put in the parks, but the City will help promote them on private property via the City website and Facebook page. Lindrud further stated that the City does not have the staff to maintain the libraries.

**Boie**

- Stated he has been looking into the possibility of creating a park on the land near the Historic Bridge where the future switch back for the bike trail will be constructed.

**Lindrud**

- Updated the Board on the vandalism at Bridgeview Park and Settlers Park.

**Adjournment:**

**MOTION** to adjourn by Gleason to adjourn at 8:05 p.m., seconded by Williams. **Motion carried unanimously.**

ATTEST:

---

Elizabeth Lindrud, Accountant/Deputy Clerk



## League of Minnesota Cities

145 University Avenue West, St. Paul, MN 55103-2044

(651) 281-1200 • (800) 925-1122

Fax: (651) 281-1299 • TDD: (651) 281-1290

www.lmnc.org

## Establishing Park Dedication Requirements

### Introduction

Minn. Stat. Sec. 462.358 subd. 2b and 2c authorizes and governs the park dedication requirement of cities.

Parkland dedication requirements rest on the theory that new development occurring within a community places additional burdens on existing city infrastructure, and in particular, park and recreation facilities. Minn. Stat. 462.358 subd. 2b and 2c, are premised on the assumption that new development (and not existing taxpayers) ought to pay for the additional park and recreation facilities needed to accommodate the demands created by the new development.

### Statutory Authority

The relevant statutory authority for municipal park dedication regulations is as follows:

#### *Subd. 2b. Dedication*

- (a) *The regulations may require that a reasonable portion of any proposed subdivision be dedicated to the public or preserved for public use as streets, roads, sewers, electric, gas and water facilities, stormwater drainage and holding areas or ponds, and similar utilities and improvements.*
- (b) *In addition, the regulations may require that a reasonable portion of any proposed subdivision be dedicated to the public or preserved for conservation purposes or for public use as parks and recreational facility, as defined and outlined in Section 471.191, playgrounds, trails, wetlands, or open space; provided that (1) the municipality may choose to accept an equivalent amount in cash from the applicant for part or all of the portion required to be dedicated to such public uses or purposes based on the fair market value of the land no later than at the time of final approval, (2) any cash payments received shall be placed in a special fund by the municipality used only for the purposes for which the money was obtained, and may not be used for ongoing operation or maintenance, (3) in establishing the reasonable portion to be dedicated, the regulations may consider the open space, park, recreational, or common areas and facilities which the applicant proposes to reserve for the subdivision, and (4) the municipality reasonably determines that it will need to acquire that portion of land for the purposes stated in this paragraph as a result of approval of the subdivision. The basis for calculating the amount to be dedicated or preserved must be established by ordinance or pursuant to the procedures established in section 462.353, subdivision 4a.*

*Subd. 2c. Nexus*

- (a) ***There must be an essential nexus between the fees or dedication imposed under subdivision 2b and the municipal purpose sought to be achieved by the fee or dedication. The fee or dedication must bear a rough proportionality to the need created by the proposed subdivision or development.***
- (b) *If a municipality is given written notice of a dispute over a proposed fee in lieu of dedication before the municipality's final decision on an application, a municipality must not condition the approval of any proposed subdivision or development on an agreement to waive the right to challenge the validity of a fee in lieu of dedication.*
- (c) *An application may proceed as if the fee had been paid, pending a decision on the appeal of a dispute over a proposed fee in lieu of dedication, if (1) the person aggrieved by the fee puts the municipality on written notice of a dispute over a proposed fee in lieu of dedication, (2) prior to the municipality's final decision on the application, the fee in lieu of dedication is deposited in escrow, and (3) the person aggrieved by the fee appeals under Section 462.361, within 60 days of the approval of the application. If such an appeal is not filed by the deadline, or if the person aggrieved by the fee does not prevail on the appeal, then the funds paid into escrow must be transferred to the municipality.*

The statutory requirements can be summarized as follows:

- 1) The parkland dedication requirement and the methodology used to arrive at the requirement must be established by ordinance.
- 2) The city may accept either land or an equivalent amount in cash, based on the fair market value of the land.
- 3) Any cash payments received must be separately accounted for and used only for the purposes for which they were obtained.
- 4) Any cash payments may not be used for ongoing "operation or maintenance."
- 5) The city must "reasonably determine" that the land or cash payment is needed to meet the increased demands of the new subdivision.
- 6) There must be an "essential nexus" between the fees or dedication and purpose sought to be achieved by the fee or dedication, and the fee or dedication must bear a "rough proportionality" to the need created by the proposed subdivision or development.

### **Recommendations**

In light of the statutory obligations we offer the following recommendations regarding the establishment of parkland dedication requirements:

- 1) Review parkland dedication requirements to make sure there is a logical connection between the amount of the dedication requirement and the purpose for which it is used. For example, there should be able to demonstrate that each new lot that is approved, necessitates X amount of new parkland. (See, Methodology below)
- 2) The city should separately account for parkland dedication fees and make sure they are not used for ongoing park “operation or maintenance.”

### **Sample Park Dedication Methodology**

#### **Step 1.**

The city should first undertake a parks study to arrive with a general idea of what it would like to see in their community in the way of parks, recreation, trails, and open space. That study should look at the question of whether current facilities are sufficient to meet the needs of current residents. If there is a deficiency, the city should calculate what additional expenditures would be necessary to meet that city’s desired parks plan.

#### **Step 2.**

The city should calculate the total amount of city parks, recreation, trails and open space, plus any additional amount to meet current, but unmet park goals.

#### **Step 3.**

The city should undertake some evaluation of the use of city parks, recreation, trails and open space. The intent would be to arrive with an estimate of what percentage of these facilities exist to serve residential landowners and what percentage exist to serve the needs of commercial development. In arriving at these percentages, it is probably helpful to consider such matters as the use of park facilities by businesses and their workers and the use by sports teams that may be sponsored by businesses. From this analysis, the city will arrive at a determination of what percentage of its park needs should be met by residential development and what percentage should be met by commercial/industrial development.

#### **Step 4.**

The city then will use the results of step 2 and step 3 to arrive at a calculation for parkland acreage, per resident or per employee. The following examples may be helpful:

Per Capita Residential Share/Per Capita Commercial Share

Existing Park Lane and Trail Acreage  
500 acres

Residential Share  
 $90\% \times 300 = 270$  Acres

Per Capita Residential Share  
 $270 \text{ acres} / 15,000 \text{ residents (population)} = .018 \text{ acres per Resident}$

Commercial Share  
 $10\% \times 300 = 30$  acres

Per Capita Commercial Share  
 $30 \text{ acres} / 1000 \text{ employees in city} = .03 \text{ acres per Employee}$

**Step 5.**

Establish park dedications by ordinance. The amount of land to be dedicated as part of residential subdivision or plat will be equal to the per acre residential share (determined in Step 4) times the number of residents expected in the development or subdivision. To arrive at an amount in lieu of land dedication, take the per acre value of undeveloped land times the amount of land the city could have required to be dedicated.

**Step 6.**

To calculate the amount to be dedicated as part of a commercial development, multiply the per acre commercial share (determined in Step 4) times the number of employees expected in the development. To arrive at a cash payment in lieu of land dedication, take the per acre value of undeveloped commercial land times the amount of land the city could have required to be dedicated.

**Step 7.**

Make provisions in your ordinance to provide that these are the maximum amounts that the city can charge and give the council discretion to vary from these requirements as a result of unique attributes of the development or to account for parks or open space that may already be included the development. (Note, the city is not required to take any of these considerations into account when arriving at the park dedication amount.)

## RELEVANT LINKS:

Minn. Stat. § 462.358, subd. 3b.  
*Calm Waters, LLC v Kanabec County Bd. of Com'rs*, 756 N.W.2d 716 (Minn. 2008) (applies 60-Day Rule tolling only to county review of subdivisions).

Minn. Stat. § 462.358, subd. 3b.  
LMC information memo,  
*Land Use Public Hearings*.

Minn. Stat. § 462.358, subd. 3b.  
*Semler Const., Inc. v. City of Hanover*, 667 N.W.2d 457 (Minn. Ct. App., 2003).  
*Jordan Real Estate Services, Inc. v. City of Gaylord*, No. A08-0294, (Minn. Ct. App. April 14, 2009) (unpublished decision).

Minn. Stat. § 462.358, subd. 3b.

Minn. Stat. § 462.358, subd. 2(b). *Collis v. City of Bloomington*, 310 Minn. 5, 246 N.W.2d 19 (Minn. 1976). *Middlemist v. City of Plymouth*, 387 N.W.2d 190 (Minn. Ct. App., 1986). *Kottschade v. City of Rochester*, 537 N.W.2d 301 (Minn. Ct. App., 1995).

A subdivision application must receive preliminary approval or disapproval within 120 days of its delivery, unless the applicant agrees to an extension. If no action is taken, the application will be deemed approved after this time period. (Note that this 120-day period differs from the usual 60-Day Rule. The 60 Day Rule at Minn. Stat § 15.99 by its terms does not apply to city subdivision regulations). The city should document all extensions in writing. If the city does not act on an application within 120 days, the applicant may demand a certificate of approval from the city. Following receipt of the certificate, the applicant may request final approval by the city as discussed below.

The city must hold a public hearing on all subdivision applications prior to preliminary approval, following publication of notice at least 10 days before the hearing.

### c. 60 Days: Timelines for final plat approval

After preliminary plat approval, state statute allows the applicant to seek final approval. The final plat application must demonstrate conformance with the conditions and requirements of preliminary approval and conformance with city regulations and state and federal law (where applicable). Unlike preliminary plat approval, there is no required public hearing on the final plat.

Once an applicant has requested final approval, the city must approve or disapprove of the application in 60 days. If the municipality fails to act within 60 days, the final plat application may automatically be deemed approved.

## 4. Dedication requirements and park dedication fees

A subdivision ordinance may require a subdivision applicant to dedicate a reasonable portion of land within the development to the public to address infrastructure needs created by the development. Cities may require dedication of land to the public for numerous uses, including:

- Streets, roads, and alleys.
- Water, sewer, and similar facilities.
- Gas, electric, and similar facilities.
- Storm water drainage and hold areas or ponds.
- Parks, recreational facilities, and playgrounds.

## RELEVANT LINKS:

Minn. Stat. § 462.358, subd. 2b (c).  
Minn. Stat. § 462.358, subd. 2c.  
*Collis v. City of Bloomington*, 310 Minn. 5, 246 N.W.2d 19 (Minn. 1976), *Middlemist v. City of Plymouth*, 387 N.W.2d 190 (Minn. Ct. App. 1986).  
*Kottschade v. City of Rochester*, 537 N.W.2d 301 (Minn. Ct. App. 1995).

Minn. Stat. § 462.358, subd. 2c.  
*Collis v. City of Bloomington*, 310 Minn. 5, 246 N.W.2d 19 (Minn. 1976), *Middlemist v. City of Plymouth*, 387 N.W.2d 190 (Minn. Ct. App. 1986).  
*Kottschade v. City of Rochester*, 537 N.W.2d 301 (Minn. Ct. App. 1995).

Minn. Stat. § 462.358, subd. 2b(d).

Minn. Stat. § 462.358, subd. 2b(c).

See LMC information memo, *Subdivision Guide for Cities*.

Minn. Stat. § 462.358, subd. 2b(c).

See LMC information memo, *Subdivision Guide for Cities*.

- Trails and sidewalks.
- Wetlands and wetland preservation.
- Open space.

When the city requires land to be dedicated within a specific subdivision, it must determine that:

- The city reasonably needs to acquire the specific portion of land for reasons permitted by state statute (e.g., streets, parks, utilities) as a result of approval of the subdivision (this is sometimes referred to as a nexus requirement).
- The need created by the subdivision is roughly proportional to the city's dedication requirement. For example, in a five-house subdivision, it may be reasonable to require dedication of park land for a small, local swing set park. It may not be reasonable to require the same small subdivision to dedicate multiple acres for a community park serving hundreds of city residents.
- The need for the dedicated land has not already been offset or obviated by other actions of the developer in setting aside for public use other open space, recreational, or common areas, or other facilities within the development.

In lieu of land dedication for parks, recreational facilities, playgrounds, trails, wetlands, or open space, cities may require a developer to pay “cash fees” commonly referred to as “park dedication fees” and/or “trail fees” (cumulatively referred to as park dedication fees in the rest of this memo) Park dedication fees excuse a developer from a local land dedication for park and recreational purposes, but still allow the city to purchase and acquire new, off-site facilities to serve needs created by the subdivision. When a city establishes and imposes a park dedication fee, in lieu of land dedications, it must still comply with all of the requirements discussed above for land dedications related to procedure, nexus, and proportionality.

State statute requires cities to follow a specific formula for setting park dedication fees. Cities may wish to retain the services of a land appraiser, or some other professional, to help them determine the appropriate rate for their park dedication fees.

## **Park Dedication Fees**

Minnesota Statutes Section 462.358 permits municipalities to require parkland dedication or a cash equivalent for park acquisition and development. The City must be able to prove that the proposed project will create a need for additional park facilities and that the amount of dedication required is roughly proportionate to the need that will be generated from the development.

Park maintenance and future improvements should not be financed using park dedication funds. The operational and future improvement costs must be budgeted within the City's general funds with costs shared by all community residents.

### **Recommendations from the 2011 Park Dedication Study (Approved December 6, 2011)**

- The park dedication fee structure for new residential developments should be based upon the analysis providing a park dedication fee of approximately \$2,786 per residential unit.
- A portion of the future improvements for both existing and future development is anticipated to be funded by grants. In the event that this does not occur, the City will need to secure other funding.
- A periodic review of land values and facility costs should be done to ensure that the park dedication fee remains current based upon market conditions.
- The City should review this study, as well as the population and household projections in the Comprehensive Plan to ensure that adequate park facilities are provided for an expanding population.
- The City should consider incorporating park redevelopment infrastructure planning as part of the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan. As Minnesota Statutes specify that park dedication fees may not be used for maintenance purposes, it is important that the City continue to provide a separate budget fund for maintenance.
- The City's ordinances should be amended to reflect the adoption of the new park dedication fee amount as well as to incorporate the other recommended ordinance changes.
- In the event the City determines to reduce the number, or size, of the parks proposed by its current park plan, park dedication fees should be adjusted accordingly.
- It is recommended that the City maintain an annual detailed budget appropriation for the ongoing maintenance and replacement of existing facilities.
- Park dedication fees must be placed in a separate segregated fund and appropriate accounting of the fund should be created on an annual basis.

### **Future Parks (Proposed):**

- **East Hanover – Near Riverside Park:** A three acre land acquisition to include a shelter area, paved parking lot, restrooms, playground equipment, recreation field, and horseshoe pits. Total estimated cost is \$263,205.
- **Southwest Hanover:** A three acre land acquisition to include a boat/canoe launch, parking lot, and internal trails. Total estimated cost is \$197,313.
- **Central Hanover – Historic Bridge:** Landscaping with interpretive signage of the historic bridge. Total estimated cost is \$10,000.
- **Southeast Hanover with School Property:** A 20 acre land acquisition to include a building (with restrooms, concessions, and storage), playground equipment, lighted baseball/softball fields, lighted soccer fields, basketball court, and tennis court. Total estimated cost is \$1,257,438.
- **West Hanover:** A three acre land acquisition to include a shelter, playground, parking lot, and woodchip trails. Total estimated cost is \$275,438.
- **Trails:** Proposed trails include along Beebe Lake Road, within the School Park, and in the annexation area of Hanover.

## **Economic Development Activities & Planning**

Hanover has established an Economic Development Authority (EDA) that is active in projects in the community. In addition, the City continues to use the services of the Economic Development Partnership of Wright County Economic, a not-for-profit organization with 501(c)(3) status.

The meaning of economic development to this area is neither unreachable nor complicated. Good jobs, increased wages, and the willingness to grow internally and externally in terms of potential developments are high goals that the people of the Hanover area have expressed. Hanover area residents have expressed concern about creating a sustainable economic development plan that includes residents inside the boundary of the City as well as residents living outside of the City. Being aware of the current economic conditions within the region and understanding the community's role within that region will aid the community in pursuing economic development initiatives to achieve their goals.

## **Parks & Recreation**

The City of Hanover is situated straddling the Crow River with the eastern portion of the City covered by a portion of the Crow-Hassan Park Reserve. Hanover contains numerous recreation opportunities, including small neighborhood playgrounds as well as larger regional parks. The number of acres devoted to park and recreation facilities should grow as the City's population grows to ensure that all residents have their recreational needs met. As the demand on park spaces increases, so shall the pressure to offer additional recreational facilities and a wider range of facilities in the area.

If the community wishes to meet public recreational demands, accomplish its desired recreational goals, and reverse unwanted negative park trends, a park and recreation plan is an essential tool. In 2003, the City completed a Park Study that reviewed existing regulations and park dedication requirements to determine whether the City adequately provided for existing and future expected park demands.

Having developed a parks study, Hanover can be prepared for the allocation of resources to meet the desired recreation goals most appropriately for the population. In addition, Hanover can have a leading park system that provides excellent facilities in a rural, small town atmosphere.

### **Existing Park Facilities**

The City of Hanover has a variety of park and recreation facilities within its corporate limits, as well as a large regional park on the eastern edge of the community along the Crow River. The Hanover area park system provides numerous passive and active recreational opportunities for residents and visitors, including ball fields and playgrounds near City Hall, fishing and canoeing in the Crow River, and hiking in the Crow-Hassan Park Reserve.

The City completes an annual park inspection report to ensure that the existing facilities are up-to-date, safe, and meet the needs of the community. Significant improvement and park development is planned in the Parks and Recreation Plan. As new residential subdivisions are proposed, the City always ensures, and needs to continue to ensure, that the community's needs are being met.

### **Neighborhood Parks**

The City currently contains a park system consisting of six neighborhood parks, a county park, and a portion of a regional park reserve within its corporate limits. Neighborhood parks are intended to provide opportunities for recreational activities such as courts, field games, and skating rinks. This type of park generally serve a population of 4,000 to 5,000 people and have a service area that ranges from ¼ mile to ½ miles from the park. All of Hanover's city parks are of this park classification.

One of Hanover's parks is Eagle View Park, which is located in the southern portion of the Hanover Hills development that overlooks the Crow River. The park measures roughly 3.7 acres in size and mostly serves the residents living nearby primarily in Hanover Hills and Whitetail Preserve.

To the east of downtown Hanover, the Pheasant Run neighborhood contains a 2.0-acre park called Pheasant Run Park. This park primarily serves residents that live in this part of town.

The third neighborhood park is Settler's Park, located north of the City Hall near the Hanover Athletic Association Complex. The park is just under five acres in size and serves residents of the downtown area and the surrounding neighborhoods.

Another park, Cardinal Circle, is approximately five (5.0) acres in size and is scheduled for completion as a part of the Crow River Heights subdivision located in the northwest portion of the City on Kadler Avenue.

The Schendels Field Addition, located at the intersection of 11th Street and Mallard Street, contains Mallards Landing Park, a 1.8-acre park.

The Bridges at Hanover Park is a one tenth acre park located within The Bridges at Hanover subdivision. The park is the result of a public-private partnership between the City of Hanover and the Bridges at Hanover Homeowners Association.

### **Regional Parks**

Regional parks are usually between 200 and 500 acres in size and serve three to five communities. This type of park usually contains natural areas or scenic vistas and is oriented toward outdoor recreation opportunities, such as swimming, hiking, fishing, boating, and camping.

Hanover contains the Riverside County Park, located in the northeast of Hanover's corporate limits. This park is maintained by the Wright County Parks Department and measures roughly 17 acres, having approximately ¼ mile of frontage on the Crow River. The park contains picnic facilities, as well as facilities for camping and picnicking.

### **Regional Park Reserves**

Regional park reserves, similar to regional parks, serve multiple communities, but are much larger in size, containing at least 1,000 or more acres. This type of park usually consists of areas with high natural quality for nature-based and outdoor recreation opportunities, including wildlife habitat, conservation, viewing and studying nature, swimming, hiking, boating, camping, and other similar uses.

Hanover contains a portion of the Crow-Hassan Park Reserve, which totals 2,600 acres in size and extends well outside the boundaries of Hanover. This park is maintained by the Three Rivers Park District and borders the Crow River. The park contains facilities for group camping, horseback riding, dog walking, hiking, and snowmobiling, as well as general hiking and nature viewing.

### **Trails**

As discussed above, the City is home to a number of parks. To have a fully functional park system in which parks are easily accessible and connected to one another and their surrounding neighborhoods, residents have expressed the need to ensure that trails connecting the existing parks are put into place. In review of new development proposals, the City has actively sought out trail connection corridors to meet these needs.

In addition, the Three Rivers Park District, which manages the Crow-Hassan Park Reserve, has been working to connect this park to other regional recreational resources. While the City falls outside of

the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Council, the Council has identified trail and land search corridors on the Hennepin County side of the Crow River. According to the 2030 Regional Parks Policy Plan, these future trail and search corridors would ultimately connect the Crow-Hassan Park Reserve to the Lake Rebecca Park Reserve, south of the City of Rockford, to the Elm Creek Park Reserve in the City of Dayton, and to the Baker Park Reserve to the South near Maple Plain. The 2030 Plan further identifies trail corridors running to the north along the Crow River and into Anoka County. The City has the opportunity to work with the Three Rivers Park District and Metropolitan Council in developing these regional connections and furthering the recreational opportunities for the community's residents.

## **Recommended Park Acreage**

The Park Study completed in 2003 analyzed Hanover's existing parks and demographics to determine any unmet park demand and project future demand. Using an anticipated population of 5,336 residents, the Study evaluated the total acreage based on guidelines developed by the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA). The NRPA recommends using a formula to calculate the adequacy of parkland based on the total park acreage per 1,000 residents.

At the time of the Park Study completion, Hanover had an estimated population of 1,355 and had 11 acres of existing parks within the City. NRPA guidelines indicate that the City should have 17 acres of parkland to serve a population of this size. The Park Study also projected future park demand using the same guideline and an expected population of 5,336 people. Based on that information, the City of Hanover should provide an additional 54 acres of parkland to serve the expected population growth, averaging roughly 12.1 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents.

The Park Study further analyzes methods of obtaining funding for parks, including park dedication for residential and non-residential developments. The Study includes a detailed analysis of the cost of future park acquisition and recommendations for achieving the park goals.

## **Environment**

The Hanover area is fortunate to have an abundance of natural beauty and environmentally valuable areas. Many times, these features will determine what kind of adjacent land use may occur and at what intensity a particular use should occur. The Hanover area is located in the Eastern Broadleaf Forest Province, acting as a transition area between the prairies that cover western and southwestern Minnesota and the coniferous forests that cover northeastern Minnesota. The section of the province in which Hanover is located was characterized by deciduous forest and woodlands present at the time of European settlement located on rolling terrain deposited by the last glacier.

While there is a substantial portion of the Hanover area that is inherently suitable for urban-style development, other areas are more valued for their natural features. These areas function best when left in a natural state, or when they are protected from urban development. Through responsible preservation, a high standard of living can be maintained for Hanover area residents.

Preservation of the area's natural resources has been identified as a major topic of concern by local officials and residents. Residents value the natural resources for their contribution to the small town atmosphere in the area, as well as for their ecological value in providing habitat and aiding in stormwater management.

## Playground Equipment

Bridges		
	Purchase Year	Replacement Year
	2007	2032
<b>Midwest Playscapes</b>		
Playworld Systems Play Area		\$23,669.00
2 Bay Swings		\$1,629.00
Rules Sign		\$419.00
Recycled Border Timber		\$2,432.00
Wood Carpet Surfacing		\$2,849.00
Discount		(\$6,114.13)
Freight		\$1,992.08
Tax		\$1,746.94
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$28,622.89</b>
<b>Potential Improvements (2016 Walkthru)</b>		
	<b>Estimated Cost</b>	
- Add a gazebo	-no room in park	
- Replace woodchips with pea gravel	\$ 5,000.00	
- add concrete curbing	\$ 5,950.00	

Settlers Park		
	Purchase Year	Replacement Year
	2005	2030
	2004	2029
Play Power (2005)	\$	32,397.00
Little Tikes (2004)	\$	49,048.81
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>81,445.81</b>
<b>Potential Improvements (2016 Walkthru)</b>		
	<b>Estimated Cost</b>	
- Remove sand volleyball and replace w/moveable net		
- Replace woodchips with pea gravel	\$ 5,980.00	
- add concrete curbing	\$ 11,500.00	

Cardinal		
	Purchase Year	Replacement Year
	2008	2033
Play Power		\$52,770.00
Little Tikes		\$13,200.28
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$65,970.28</b>
<b>Potential Improvements (2016 Walkthru)</b>		
	<b>Estimated Cost</b>	
- Add tennis/basketball court	\$ 50,000.00	
- Add shelter w/kitchen & restrooms	\$ 250,000.00	
- turn field into ice rink in winter		
- Replace woodchips with pea gravel	\$ 5,520.00	
- add concrete curbing	\$ 8,000.00	

Eagle View		
	Purchase Year	Replacement Year
	1997	2022
Playground Equipment	\$	21,250.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>21,250.00</b>
<b>Potential Improvements (2016 Walkthru)</b>		
	<b>Estimated Cost</b>	
- Replace playground equipment		
- Replace woodchips with pea gravel	\$ 3,060.00	
- add concrete curbing	\$ 4,350.00	

Mallard		
	Purchase Year	Replacement Year
	2008	2033
Play Power		\$32,571.72
Little Tikes		\$7,536.70
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$40,108.42</b>
<b>Potential Improvements (2016 Walkthru)</b>		
	<b>Estimated Cost</b>	
- Add tennis court	\$ 50,000.00	
- Continue adding dirt to soccer field		
- Add permanent restroom if neighborhood expands	\$ 100,000.00	
- Replace woodchips with pea gravel	\$ 3,175.00	
- add concrete curbing	\$ 6,500.00	

Pheasant Run		
	Purchase Year	Replacement Year
	2004	2029
Playground Equipment	\$	27,977.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>27,977.00</b>
<b>Potential Improvements (2016 Walkthru)</b>		
	<b>Estimated Cost</b>	
- Replace woodchips with pea gravel	\$ 3,474.00	
- add concrete curbing	\$ 6,800.00	