

CITY OF HANOVER
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
NOVEMBER 14, 2011 APPROVED MINUTES

Chairperson Schendel called the November 14, 2011 Planning Commission Meeting to order at approximately 7:00 p.m.

Call to Order

Members present: Karsten, Schendel, Smola, and Zanetti.
Members absent: Sprangel
Staff present included City Council Liaison Malewicki, City Planner Cindy Nash, and City Administrator Buchholtz
Others present included Leander Wetter

Chairperson Schendel introduced the agenda for the Planning Commission Meeting.

Approval of Agenda

MOTION by Karsten, second by Zanetti, to approve the agenda.

Voting aye: Karsten, Schendel, Smola, and Zanetti
Voting nay: none
Motion carried: 4:0

MOTION by Smola, second by Karsten, to approve the minutes from the October 10, 2011 Planning Commission Meeting.

Approval of Minutes

Voting aye: Karsten, Schendel, Smola, and Zanetti
Voting nay: none
Motion carried: 4:0

CITIZEN'S FORUM

Citizens Forum

No citizens wished to be heard.

PUBLIC HEARING

Public Hearing

Amendment to Comprehensive Plan Text; Park and Trail Map

Amendment to
Comprehensive Plan
Text; Park and Trail Map

Schendel recessed the meeting at 7:03pm and opened a public hearing to consider amendments to both the text and the park and trail map within the 2008 Comprehensive Plan.

Nash provided an overview of the proposed text changes to the 2008 Comprehensive Plan. She said the majority of changes focused on three areas: correcting population projections that were in error; updating the City's demographic characteristics to match up with the 2010 Census data and updating language in the Parks and Recreation section.

She stated that the 2008 Comprehensive Plan had a 2030 population estimate of 3,445. She said that with the City's 2010 population at 2,938 and with the existing inventory of vacant lots, the population estimate was not realistic. She said the 2002 Comprehensive Plan had a population project closer to 5,000. She proposed a 2030 population estimate of 5,585, which was based on estimates proposed by the Metropolitan Council and the State Demographer's Office.

Nash noted that the average age of the City has dropped since the 2000 census. She said the City showed the highest growth in the 25 to 34 age bracket, as well as children under 9 years of age, which demonstrates that Hanover is an attractive place for young families. She said there was slower growth in households over 75 represents that there is not adequate housing or services in Hanover to support that age cohort.

CITY OF HANOVER
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
NOVEMBER 14, 2011 APPROVED MINUTES

Nash proposed removing an entire paragraph comparing the rate of growth in households in Hanover to neighboring communities. She said the percentage change is deceptive as the neighboring communities started with a higher number of households. She stated that she amended language stating that the City expects persons per household to remain steady until 2020, when household size is expected to drop as more households move into the empty nest stage where children start to leave their family home.

Nash proposed removing language within the Comprehensive Plan on the loss of renter-occupied units. She said that the paragraph was speculative in nature.

Nash proposed removing the circular references within the Comprehensive Plan that references the 2003 park dedication study. She said that 2003 study will be replaced by the new 2010 park dedication study. She said the new language in more generic and flexible. She also recommended striking the "Recommended Park Acreage" section, stating that it was confusing and that recommended standards change over time and should not be memorialized in the Comprehensive Plan.

Nash pointed out a number of changes to the Park and Trail map (Map 4), including the correction of errors, moving proposed parks to areas where new populations will be, removing the proposed park on the Anderson property, and amending trails locations. She stated that the 12th Street/Irvine Drive trail is proposed to be removed from the map. She said that the trails through Crow River Heights were relocated from following Kayla Lane to running along Kadler Avenue between the proposed Beebe Lake Regional Trail and Cardinal Circle Park. Nash inquired about the necessity of the Jandel Avenue trail. She suggested having those trails designated as a "share the road" trail, rather than a separated 8 foot bituminous trail. Smola asked how wide the street would need to be in order to accommodate a bike lane. Buchholtz said that a 32 foot wide street will accommodate two lanes of traffic and parking on both sides. He said parking could be restricted to one side of the street to accommodate a bicycle lane on the street. Smola asked if Jandel would connect to Beebe Lake Road. Buchholtz stated it is proposed to be extended through Crow River Heights to tie into Kadler Avenue.

Smola asked what would be included in the 2030 park plan. Nash stated that the current City limits as well as land currently in Rockford Township between the Crow River and the City limits were included in the plan. She said it was realistic that the City would annex those properties over the next 20 years.

Karsten inquired about how the 2030 growth projection tied into the park dedication study. Nash stated that the City needs to show a connection between the improvements it is making to the number of new households those improvements will serve. Karsten asked if it was reasonable to expect the City's population to double over the next 18 years. Nash stated that the State Demographer expects the City's population to double by 2030.

Hearing no further comment, Schendel closed the public hearing at 7:30pm.

MOTION by Zanetti, second by Smola, to recommend approval of the amendments to the City's Comprehensive Plan.

Voting aye: Karsten, Schendel, Smola, and Zanetti
Voting nay: none

MOTION to recommend approval of the amendments to the City's Comprehensive Plan

CITY OF HANOVER
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
NOVEMBER 14, 2011 APPROVED MINUTES

Motion carried: 4:0

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Unfinished Business

Park Dedication Study

Park Dedication Study

Schendel introduced the item. Nash provided an overview of the Park Dedication Study, stating that it was in a similar format as the original 2003 Park Dedication Study. She highlighted the Community Growth Section, noting that the numbers used in this section are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan amendment the Planning Commission recommended approval for earlier in the meeting. She stated that the plan provides an inventory of the City's existing parks as well as a list of future parks and trails the City plans to develop by 2030.

Nash provided an overview of Exhibit B, the Park Facilities Cost Matrix, identifying anticipated total acreage, facilities and values of each park. She said these numbers are used in the calculation of the park dedication fee.

Leander Wetter, 180 Ibarra Avenue S.E., asked when the City anticipated developing Future Park 5. Nash stated that development of the park could happen concurrently with development. She said the speed at which the park would be developed would correspond with the rate of growth of the subdivision. Wetter stated that the proposed location of the park was inconsistent with the concept plan that was approved by the City. Nash stated that the location of the park could shift depending on the final development plan. Wetter asked that a subdivision on his property in southwest Hanover would have similar park and trail amenities as other parks in similarly sized subdivisions. He said that he was under the impression that a park could not be located within the ecological corridor. Nash stated that there will need to be a balance between open space requirements and park land as the ordinance does not allow double-counting.

Nash stated that the estimated value of the completed park system is approximately \$11.4 million. She said that the percent of completed value is approximately \$3.2 million, or 29%. She said the estimated park dedication fee is \$2,992, which is higher than the current park dedication fee of \$2,740. She said that the amount of funding that will be generated by park dedication fees will be insufficient to pay for the full build-out of the park system. She said the City will need to secure a funding source to cover the cost of future improvements that will serve existing households.

Nash noted that the City hasn't charged commercial or industrial development park dedication fees. She stated that it is difficult to calculate the impact of commercial/industrial on the park system. She stated that she is recommending the City continue its policy of not charging park dedication fees to commercial/industrial development.

Nash stated that she is recommending that the City's ordinances be updated to reflect the following:

- Update the park dedication fee to \$2,992 per residential unit;
- Provide for a mechanism to allow for park dedication credit for the construction or land dedication of trails shown in Exhibit A;
- Provide for a mechanism to allow for credit for trails constructed by developers in open space in the ecological corridors when such trails are open to the public and an easement is provided to the City.
- Provide a requirement that approved plans must include trails that link

CITY OF HANOVER
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
NOVEMBER 14, 2011 APPROVED MINUTES

within, through and connect the development with points of interest off-property as determined by the City Council

- General updates to the park dedication section of the subdivision regulation to bring ordinances into conformance with the park dedication study.

Nash also suggested reviewing the costs of land and improvements from time to time to ensure that the park dedication fee is adequate to fund the proposed park infrastructure. She also encouraged the City to plan for the replacement of its existing park infrastructure in its capital improvement plan, as park dedication fees are not allowed to be used to fund long term capital maintenance. She noted that the City cannot use park dedication fees for improvements that are not listed within the park dedication fee study. She said that if any changes are made to lessen the scope of the new parks and trails, the park dedication fee study would need to be updated to reflect the change and the park dedication fee would need to be lowered accordingly.

Wetter asked how a land dedication would be addressed. Buchholtz stated that the City would need to develop a value for the land and subtract the value of the land dedication from the park dedication fee. Wetter asked what value the City would use. Nash stated that market value at the time of subdivision would typically be used – typically an appraised value.

Malewicki inquired how long equipment was scheduled to last. Buchholtz stated that the City has a depreciation schedule to help guide those budget decisions but stated that the ultimate decision is based on inspection of the equipment to determine if it meets the City's safety standards.

Malewicki stated that he has a difficult time increasing the park dedication fee. He would like to see the City find a way to reduce the number and scope of proposed park improvements to either maintain or lower the fee. Wetter agreed. Nash stated that the most effective way to reduce the fee would be to reduce the number of proposed trails. Malewicki suggesting sending the matter back to Park Board to reduce the amount of expenditures. He also suggested bumping up the City's growth projections as a way to lower the park dedication fee per unit. Schendel stated that the fee is expensive, but noted that trails are expensive.

Karsten inquired about the trail along Jonquil Lane. Malewicki stated that when a future school is constructed on property adjoining Jonquil Lane, it will become a bicycling and pedestrian destination. Buchholtz noted that the Jonquil Lane trail segment would only be constructed when the school would be constructed.

Smola asked what a normal park dedication fee is. Nash stated that the park dedication fees vary across communities. She noted that many communities don't include trails within their park dedication fee. She said that many communities will require developers to construct trails as part of their development improvements, outside the park dedication fees. Buchholtz noted that some will add trail improvements as part of a road reconstruction project.

Malewicki asked what the driving force was for the proposed increase to the City's park dedication fee. Nash stated that the City's proposed low densities create a situation where there are not as many units to divide the cost of the improvements against.

Karsten asked which trails would be proposed to be cut. Buchholtz stated that the City could remove the County Road 20 trail from the park dedication fee

CITY OF HANOVER
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
NOVEMBER 14, 2011 APPROVED MINUTES

study. He recommended keeping the trail in the Comprehensive Plan to allow the City to enter into a collaborative agreement with the City of Rockford and Wright County to apply for a Transportation Enhancement Grant to fund the construction of a regional trail segment between Hanover and Rockford. Nash stated that she would look at the park and trail improvements and make recommendations on proposed cuts to be reviewed by the Park Board.

MOTION by Zanetti, second by Smola, to recommend approval of the Park Dedication Fee Study so long as cuts to park and trail improvements are made to keep the park dedication fee at \$2,800 or less.

Voting aye: Karsten, Schendel, Smola, and Zanetti

Voting nay: none

Motion carried: 4:0

MOTION to recommend approval of Park Dedication Fee Study so long as park dedication fee would not exceed \$2,800

NEW BUSINESS

No new business was on the agenda.

MISCELLANEOUS/OPEN FORUM

No one wished to be heard.

REPORTS

Schendel

- No report.

Karsten

- No report.

Spraungel

- Not present.

Zanetti

- No report.

Smola

- No report.

Buchholtz

- Reported that all the platted, vacant lots in the Crow River Heights subdivision have gone into foreclosure. He said the lots are currently in the redemption period and will be under full control of Village Bank in March. He said this could be a positive development for the City if Village Bank aggressively prices the lots. Smola stated that the current number of homes presently for sale in Hanover is extremely low. She said she believes there is demand for more housing.
- Reported that the EDA has received a grant from Hennepin County for a Hennepin County Road 19 Corridor Market Study. He said the study may result in recommendations for land use changes along the corridor.

MOTION by Karsten, second by Smola, to adjourn the November 14, 2011 Planning Commission meeting at 8:39 p.m.

New Business

Miscellaneous/Open Forum

Reports

Adjournment

CITY OF HANOVER
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
NOVEMBER 14, 2011 APPROVED MINUTES

Voting aye: Karsten, Schendel, Smola, and Zanetti
Voting nay: none
Motion carried: 4:0

Daniel Buchholtz, City Administrator