

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE
INDEPENDENCE PLANNING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, JULY 18 – 6:30 P.M.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Pursuant to due call and notice thereof, a regular meeting of the Independence Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Phillips at 6:30 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Chair Phillips, Commissioners Dumas, Gardner, and Thompson
STAFF: City Administrative Assistant Horner, City Administrator Kaltsas
ABSENT: Palmquist
VISITORS: Jan Gardner, Richard & Kari Stromer, Pat Rodrigger, Sally Simpson, Lance Gyllenblad, Marcia Kreklow, Bridget Ennevov, Rollie Radtke, Les Peterson, Tom Raden, Craig Olson, Ed Pluth, Brian Glover, Lynda Franklin, Kathi Pluth, Paula Savage, Nathan Betts, Jennifer Kazin

3. Approval of minutes from the June 20, 2017 Planning Commission Meeting.

Motion by Gardner, to approve the minutes of the June 20, 2017 Planning Commission Meeting, second by Thompson. Ayes: Phillips, Gardner, Thompson, and Dumas. Nays: None. Absent: Palmquist. Abstain: None. Motion approved.

4. **PUBLIC HEARING:** Richard and Kari Stromer (Applicant/Owner) requests that the City consider the following actions for the property located at 2828 County Line Road (PID No. 18-118-24-24-0003) in Independence, MN:
- a. A variance to allow a lot split of their 19.47 acres in the Agriculture zoning district. The variance would allow for the division of a 4-5 acre portion of this property with access onto Nelson Road.
 - b. A minor subdivision allowing the split of the subject property into two parcels.

Property/Site Information:

The subject property is located south of Hwy. 12, west of Nelson Road and East of County Line Road. There is an existing home and accessory buildings located on the property. The home is accessed via Maria Rd. There is a creek that bisects a portion of the property. The property has upland pasture as well as a stand of mature trees. The property has the following site characteristics:

Property Information: 2828 County Line Road

Zoning: Agriculture
Comprehensive Plan: Agriculture

Acreage: (BEFORE) 19.47 acres
Acreage: (AFTER) 15.15 acres-West Parcel
4.32 acres-East Parcel (Proposed Tract A)

Discussion:

The applicants approached the City about the possibility of subdividing their property into two lots. The property is zoned Agriculture. The City does not allow the subdivision of property zoned Agriculture with the exception of lot line rearrangements and rural view lot splits. The City would have to consider granting a variance from the zoning ordinance to allow the subdivision of this property. The overall property does not meet the minimum 40-acre requirement to realize a rural view lot subdivision.

The property has an existing home and accessory structures that are accessed via Maria Rd. to the west. The applicant has noted in their application that the existing creek and tree line divides the property and makes access of the eastern portion difficult. Additionally, the property has frontage on Nelson Road to the east. The applicant would like the City to consider granting a variance to allow the subdivision of property in the Agriculture zoning district that does not meet the minimum 40-acre lot size. The applicant has provided a survey, wetland delineation and septic design for the proposed Tract A. The proposed new parcel would be a total of 4.32 acres with 2.76 acres of useable upland. The newly subdivided property would be accessed via Nelson Road. Based on the information provided and a site visit, the proposed lot would appear to accommodate the development of a single-family home meeting all requisite requirements. The proposed property would have the following detail:

Min. Lot Size Required to Subdivide:	40 Acres
Existing Lot Size:	19.47 Acres
Min. Lot Frontage Required:	250 Lineal Feet
Lot Frontage Proposed:	440 Lineal Feet
Min. Upland Acreage Required:	2.5 Acres
Upland Acreage Proposed:	2.76 Acres

The remainder property with the existing home and accessory structures would not be negatively impacted as a result of the proposed subdivision. The proposed property line for the new parcel would not create any non-conformities or reduced setbacks relating to the remainder property, the existing home or accessory buildings.

recommendation relating to the application. The standards established by the City require the applicant to demonstrate that the requested variance does not create a situation that is not in keeping with the character of the surrounding area. In addition, the applicant must demonstrate that the requested variance is unique to the subject property. The standards for granting a variance are as follows:

520.21. Standards for granting variances. Subdivision 1. The City Council may grant a variance from the terms of this zoning code, including restrictions placed on nonconformities, in cases where: 1) the variance is in harmony with the general purposes and intent of this zoning code; 2) the variance is consistent with the comprehensive plan; and 3) the applicant establishes that there are practical difficulties in complying with the zoning code (Amended, Ord. 2011-08)

Subd. 2. An applicant for a variance must demonstrate that there are practical difficulties in complying with the zoning code. For such purposes, "practical difficulties" means:

- (a) The property owner proposes to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the zoning code;*
- (b) the plight of the property owner is due to circumstances unique to the property not created by the landowner;*
- (c) the variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality.*

Economic considerations alone do not constitute practical difficulties. Practical difficulties include, but are not limited to, inadequate access to direct sunlight for solar energy systems. (Amended, Ord. 2011-08)

Subd. 3. The City Council shall not grant a variance to permit a use that is not allowed under the zoning code based on the zoning classification of the affected property. (Amended, Ord. 2011-08)

520.23. Conditions and restrictions. The board of adjustments may recommend and the City Council may impose conditions on a variance. Conditions must be directly related to and must bear a rough proportionality to the impact created by the variance. (Amended, Ord. 2011-08)

Consideration of the standards for granting a variance:

- a. The applicants are proposing to use the property as residential which is consistent with the AG-Agriculture Zoning District.
- b. The properties created by the subdivision are similar in nature and character to the surrounding properties. There are existing properties located along Nelson Road that range between 2.5 and 40 acres plus.
- c. The character of the surrounding area is mixed residential/agricultural and guided for long term agriculture. The majority of existing properties that are less than 40 acres

along Nelson Road, were subdivided based on a previous ordinance and comprehensive plan for the City. The City's current comprehensive plan guides this area for long term agriculture. The City will need to determine if the proposed subdivision is in keeping with the intent of the City's comprehensive plan.

- d. The requested variance to allow the subdivision of the property must be found to be unique to this property. The City reviewed aerial photographs and survey information to determine if the condition of having a creek subdivide the property with two points of access (Maria Road on the west and Nelson Road on the east) is unique to this property. Due to the large area of the City and the number of properties, it is difficult to determine if this situation is wholly unique to this property. The City has many unique properties as well as many situations that could be presented as unique to a given property. The City has recently considered and granted a variance to allow the subdivision of an Agricultural property, less than 40 acres, that was bisected by an existing road. In that instance, the City was able to more definitively identify the same condition and found that there were a handful (less than 5) of properties that had the same circumstances and conditions of a road bisecting the property. The City has a large number of properties that are less than 40 acres, zoned Agriculture and have unique conditions. The City will need to determine if the unique characteristics of this property are distinctive and discernable from other conditions on similar properties.

The Planning Commission will need to determine if the requested variance to allow the subdivision of the property meets the requirements for granting a variance. The proposed subdivision, if approved, would create two properties that meet all other applicable criteria of the City's zoning ordinance.

The existing house on the remainder property has an existing on-site septic system that will remain in use with the existing home. Upon the sale of the parcel, the City will require an inspection of the system. Proposed Tract A will need to accommodate the requisite primary and secondary on-site septic system locations. The proposed subdivision does not currently provide for the requisite drainage and utility easements along all property lines. These easements would need to be provided to the City should the application be approved.

The proposed Tract A would be required to pay the City's Park Dedication fee. For this property, the park dedication fee amount is \$3,500.00. This fee will need to be paid prior to recording the subdivision.

Park dedication fee \$3,500 per lot up to 4.99 acres, plus \$750 per acre for each acre over 5.

4.32 acres = \$3,500

Planning Commission Recommendation:

Staff is seeking a recommendation from the Planning Commission for the requested variance and minor subdivision with the following findings and conditions:

1. The proposed variance and minor subdivision request meet all applicable conditions and restrictions stated in Chapter V, Section 520.19, Procedures on variances, and Chapter V, Section 500, Subdivisions, in the City of Independence Zoning Ordinance.
2. The Applicant shall provide to the City verification that proposed Tract A can accommodate a primary and secondary septic site.
3. The Applicant shall provide, execute and record the requisite drainage and utility easement with the county within six (6) months of approval.
4. The Applicant shall pay the park dedication fees in the amount of \$3,500 prior to the applicant receiving final approval to record the subdivision by the City.
5. The Applicant shall pay for all costs associated with the City's review of the requested variance and subdivision.
6. The Applicant shall record the subdivision and City Council Resolution with the county within six (6) months of approval.

Dumas noted the 19 acres is an odd shaped parcel, and wondered when that was created, Kaltsas said it was back in the late 90's. The south parcel was allowed to subdivide in 1993.

Public Hearing Open

Richard Stromer (applicant) of 2828 County Line Rd SE came to the podium. They bought their home 5 years ago. They wanted space, but here they don't have access through their property-there's a run-off. They'd like to subdivide so they can sell a parcel so someone can build. They talked to their neighbors and he mentioned they had the 1:40 when they tried to separate. When they did that they forgot to account for the easement.

Motion by Gardner, second by Thompson to close the Public Hearing

Public Hearing Closed

Thompson would like to know why there were 2 different frontages, bisected by a creek. He's concerned we'll get a cascade vs someone who said there were unique characteristics. Kaltsas said we'd say it's because of these factors that make it unique. We'd list the characteristics that findings or conditions that make it unique. Based on the facts, it is straight forward. Phillips disagreed noting that in the past they've been exceptional. There are other remedies to access that part of their property. He didn't see any hardship and the precedent would be such that we don't want to start. We have the 1:40 for a reason that we modified with the most recent Comp Plan when we allowed the rural view lots to come in below 40. Dumas wondered if the rural view lot allows for 2:20, Kaltsas clarified it's 2:40, down to a 30 and a 10. Gardner recalled a bit of the history, it sprang from efforts to preserve the physical realities. The creek is an unusual feature with frontage road access and fits the neighborhood so he doesn't feel we're setting a precedent. Thompson felt they've done a good job trying to make the ordinances more considerate rather than huge chunks. Hardship is a tough subject.

Motion by Gardner to approve the request for a variance and minor subdivision as is, second by Thompson. Ayes: Gardner & Thompson. Nays: Phillips & Dumas. Absent: Palmquist. Abstain: None. Motion was neither approved nor denied. It will go to Council July 31st.

5. Public Hearing: Ram General Contracting (Applicant) and Bell Farms, LLC (Owner) request that the City consider the following action for the property located at 499 Nelson Road (PID No. 31-118-24-24-0001) in Independence, MN:

- a. A conditional use permit to allow an accessory structure that exceeds 5,000 SF with bunkhouse for the property caretaker.

Property/Site Information:

The property is located on the west side of Nelson Road and north of CSAH 6. The property has an existing home and several smaller barns and accessory structures. There are several large pasture areas with some existing tree coverage. The property has the following characteristics:

Property Information: 499 Nelson Road
Zoning: *Agriculture*
Comprehensive Plan: *Agriculture*
Acreage: *17.44 acres (including ROW)*

Discussion:

The property was recently acquired by a new owner and they are seeking a conditional use permit to allow an accessory building larger than 5,000 SF on the subject property. The applicants are proposing to develop the property into a private horse farm. The proposed development of the property would include a private stall barn, walker building and indoor riding arena. There is an existing home and several detached accessory buildings located on the property. The applicant is proposing to demolish one of the existing accessory buildings.

All accessory structures greater than 5,000 square feet require a conditional use permit. The proposed stall barn, walker building and indoor riding arena are approximately 30,000 square feet in size and would house eight (8) stables. In addition to the barn and indoor riding arena, the applicant is seeking a conditional use permit to allow a bunkhouse on top of a new storage garage to house a property caretaker. The applicant has provided the City with a site survey, site plan, interior floor plan and isometric elevation of the proposed buildings. The proposed development of this property into a horse farm is a permitted use in the Agriculture zoning district.

The proposed site and buildings have the following

characteristics: Site Area: 17.44 Acres

Required Setbacks:

Front Yard: 85 feet from centerline
Side Yard: 30 feet principle structure

15 feet accessory structure
Rear Yard: 40 feet
Structures: 150 from nearest residential structure
Housing
Livestock

Proposed Setbacks:

Front Yard: 113 feet (riding arena from centerline of Nelson Road)
Side Yard: 150 feet (riding arena to south property line)
Structures: ~286 from nearest residential structure (property across Nelson Road to East)
Housing
Livestock

The existing home and detached accessory structures meet all applicable building setbacks.

The City generally allows 1 animal unit on the first two acres and then 1 additional animal unit for each additional acre of property. The subject property is approximately 17 acres. All 17 acres is useable upland acreage. Applying the City's standard, the site would accommodate 16 animals. The applicant would be permitted to have up to 16 horses on the subject property. The proposed stall barn has eight (8) stalls and the applicant has noted that they intend to not have more than eight (8) horses on the property.

The criteria for granting a conditional use permit are clearly delineated in the City's Zoning Ordinance (Section 520.11 subd. 1, a-i) as follows:

1. The conditional use will not adversely affect the health, safety, morals and general welfare of occupants of surrounding lands.
2. The proposed use will not have a detrimental effect on the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted or on the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding vacant property for uses predominant in the area.
3. Existing roads and proposed access roads will be adequate to accommodate anticipated traffic.
4. Sufficient off-street parking and loading space will be provided to serve the proposed use.
5. The proposed conditional use can be adequately serviced by public utilities or on-site sewage treatment, and sufficient area of suitable soils for on-site sewage treatment is available to protect the city from pollution hazards.
6. The proposal includes adequate provision for protection of natural drainage systems, natural topography, tree growth, water courses, wetlands, historic sites and similar ecological and environmental features.
7. The proposal includes adequate measures to prevent or control offensive odor, fumes, dust, noise, or vibration so that none of these will constitute a nuisance.
8. The proposed condition use is consistent with the comprehensive plan of the City of Independence.
9. The proposed use will not stimulate growth incompatible with prevailing density standards.

The City has visited the site and discussed the operation of the proposed commercial riding stable with the applicant. This owner of this property recently sold a similar facility located on County Road 92. The owner has noted that this farm will be for their private use only and no commercial boarding or training of horses would occur on this property. The conditional use permit would allow an accessory structure larger than 5,000 SF as well as the bunkhouse for the property caretaker. The proposed bunkhouse would be located on top of the proposed new garage near the existing principal residence on the property. The remaining use of the property as a private horse farm is permitted in the Agriculture zoning district. The City is being asked to determine whether or not the proposed accessory structure larger than 5,000 SF would meet the criteria for granting a conditional use permit.

The applicant is proposing to screen the proposed structure from Nelson Road using landscaping. The attached landscape plan generally indicates the location and type of the proposed planting; however, a detailed landscape site plan will be required. The applicant has noted that the plan is in the process of being prepared. The landscape screening should provide relief to the views of the proposed accessory structure from the surrounding properties. The isometric plan illustrates how the mature landscaping would screen the proposed structure.

This “stretch” of Nelson Road is comprised of generally smaller residential properties to the north and east of the subject site. The property to the west and south is comprised of larger more typical agricultural parcels. The City will need to determine if the proposed accessory structure larger than 5,000SF meets the criteria for granting a conditional use permit. The criteria generally require that the use of the property is consistent with the City’s comprehensive plan, is not detrimental to the reasonable use and enjoyment of the surrounding properties and will not cause any adverse nuisances.

Additional Notes/Considerations:

The applicant is proposing to construct an enclosed compost building to handle manure generated on the property. The applicant has not submitted any information pertaining to building or site lighting. All building lighting will need to comply with the City’s lighting standards. The City reviews building and site lighting during the building permit review process.

The applicant has prepared a grading, drainage and storm water plan for the proposed site improvements. The plan includes measures for storm water treatment (storm water pond). The City is in the process of reviewing the grading, drainage and storm water plan. Any comments resulting from the plan review will need to be addressed prior to final consideration by the City Council. The City’s approval of this project will also be subject to the Pioneer Sarah Creek Watershed Management Commissions approval of the proposed site improvements.

The following conditions should be considered:

1. The conditional use permit will be reviewed annually by the City to ensure conformance with the conditions set forth in the resolution.
2. The applicant shall submit a detailed landscape plan to the City for further review.

3. The applicant shall obtain all requisite approvals from the Pioneer Sarah Watershed Management Commission for the proposed site work and disturbance.
4. The applicant shall provide all requisite information and or revisions to the proposed grading and drainage plans in accordance with the review by the City's water resource consultant.
5. The applicant shall provide the City with information and details pertaining to any and all building and site lighting. All lighting will be required to comply with the City's applicable lighting standards.
6. The bunkhouse is for the caretaker of the owners of the property only. The bunkhouse shall not be rented to anyone not employed on the property.
7. No commercial use of the horse farm shall be permitted.
8. No future expansion of the barn and riding arena shall be permitted on the property without the further review and approval by the City through the conditional use permit amendment process.

Neighbor Comments:

The City has not received any written or oral comments regarding the proposed conditional use permit.

Recommendation:

Staff is seeking a recommendation from the Planning Commission pertaining to the request for a conditional use permit with the following findings and conditions:

1. The proposed conditional use permit request meets all applicable conditions and restrictions stated in Chapter V, Section 510, Zoning, in the City of Independence Zoning Ordinance.
2. The conditional use permit will be reviewed annually by the City to ensure conformance with the conditions set forth in the resolution.
3. The applicant shall submit a detailed landscape plan to the City for further review.
4. The applicant shall obtain all requisite approvals from the Pioneer Sarah Watershed Management Commission for the proposed site work and disturbance.
5. The applicant shall provide all requisite information and or revisions to the proposed grading and drainage plans in accordance with the review by the City's water resource consultant.

6. The applicant shall provide the City with information and details pertaining to any and all building and site lighting. All lighting will be required to comply with the City's applicable lighting standards.
7. The bunkhouse is for the caretaker of the owners of the property only. The bunkhouse shall not be rented to anyone not employed on the property.
8. No commercial use of the horse farm shall be permitted.
9. No future expansion of the barn and riding arena shall be permitted on the property without the further review and approval by the City through the conditional use permit amendment process.
10. The applicant shall pay for all costs associated with reviewing the application and recording the resolution.

Kaltsas reminded the Commissioners that stated they have discussed how they will manage the manure. It is a unique property-it's private. He reiterated this request is for a Conditional Use Permit for an accessory dwelling unit greater than 5,000 SF. This is for the owners to have a caretaker live in this bunkhouse, and it's not to be rented out. Phillips added he spoke with two of his neighbors and there were no negative feelings. Staff confirmed we received no written or oral comments from residents. Kaltsas clarified that the owner occupancy continues forward, and a principle residence be maintained on the property. They could rent the home if wanted, but needs to be maintained as a principle residence.

Thompson asked the owner, Bridget Ennevor if she planned to live there, and she replied not now, but the caretaker will. It's not for a commercial purpose but private. Kaltsas stated our ordinance doesn't require owner occupancy, but principle residency. The intent is not to commercialize storage and we do have other farms that only have caretakers living on the property but not the owner.

Public Hearing Open

Motion by Gardner to close the Public Hearing, second by Thompson.

Public Hearing Closed

Phillips asked the age of the mound system, Kaltsas said it's compliant. We received a request to add on to the mound, and the plan was found to be acceptable by the Building Inspector. They may build a sub mound to support the bedrooms in the bunk house, and the bathroom in the barn. Gardner brought up lighting, and it was sufficiently noted in the write-up.

Motion by Thompson to approve the request for a conditional use permit to allow an accessory structure that exceeds 5,000 SF with a bunkhouse for the property caretaker with all conditions as listed numbers 1-8, second by Gardner. Ayes: Thompson & Gardner. Absent: Palmquist. Abstain: Dumas & Phillips. Motion carried.

6. Comprehensive Plan-2040 Plan Preparation.

- a. Present Community Survey Results
- b. Community Survey Results Discussion

Kaltsas thanked all for attending. He was pleased with the 421 responses on our Community Survey. It was confirmed there were 20 digital survey returns, and the rest were mailed back in. The results were on the screen and hand-outs were available as well. Some themes prevailed. A re-cap of these are:

- **Why do you choose to live in Independence? (Could list more than 1)**
 - Open Space-72.7%
 - Rural Character-70.5%
 - Location-44.7%
- **Which of the following items are most important to ensure quality of life in Independence? (Could list more than 1)**
 - Open Space-81.3%
 - Quality Schools-50.7%
 - Parks and Trails-43.8%
- **Which of the following should the City focus on developing and/or securing? (Could list more than 1)**
 - Parks-65.6%
 - Dining-45.7%
 - Shopping-28.3%
- **What type of growth should the City focus on developing in the future? (Could list more than 1)**
 - No Growth-50.7%
 - Residential-33.6%
 - Retail-30.1%
- **Independence should continue to rely on its neighbors to provide commercial/retail services.**
 - Strongly Agree-34.7%
 - Agree-18.7%
 - Somewhat Agree-17.2%
- **It is important for the City of Independence to pursue the expansion of sewer to provide new housing and commercial options.**
 - Strongly Disagree-39.1%
 - Somewhat Disagree-22.4%

Agree-14.1%

- **Independence should consider expansion of commercial zoning along the Highway 12 corridor.**
 - Strongly Disagree-27.1%
 - Agree-23.6%
 - Strongly Agree-17.4%

- **I would support suburban development (more density than currently permitted) around the City limits of Maple Plain.**
 - Strongly Disagree-43.3%
 - Agree-17%
 - Somewhat Disagree-15.1%

- **I would support urban expansion to increase services provided by the City without increasing taxes (i.e. roads, parks, retail options).**
 - Strongly Disagree-29.6%
 - Agree-24.1%
 - Strongly Agree-15.9%

- **How do you think the City of Independence should use their resources to promote safe transportation? (Answers were ranked 1-5).**
 - #1-Local Roads-48.1%
 - #1-State Roads-23.5%
 - #1-County Roads-15%
 - #1-Trails-10.4%
 - #1-Public Transit-10.6%

- **What recreation facilities do you think the City of Independence should use tax revenue to develop or enhance? (Answers were ranked 1-5).**
 - #1-Sports Fields-15.6%
 - #1-Playgrounds-21.6%
 - #1-Trails-57.9%
 - #1-Baseball/Softball Fields-8.5%
 - #1-Courts-7.1%

- **What types of housing should the City of Independence promote and develop? (Answers were ranked 1-5).**
 - #1-Single Family-81.5%
 - #1-Townhomes-3.9%
 - #1-Senior Rental-9.1%
 - #1-Senior Owner-16.4%
 - #1-Apartments-2.3%

- **What types of business should the City of Independence use their resources to promote and develop? (Answers were ranked 1-5).**
 - #1-Retail-42.2%

#1-Industrial-18.9%
#1-Commercial-22.1%
#1-Office-14%
#1-Convenience-21.3%

- **What type of land use should the City develop/preserve? (Answers were ranked 1-5).**

#1-Agriculture-52.6%
#1-Large Lot Residential-43.5%
#1-Urban Residential-14.5%
#1-Industrial-3.6%
#1-Commercial-7.2%

- **In what general area of Independence do you live?**

Area 1-8.2%
Area 2-23.1%
Area 3-33.4%
Area 4-17.2%
Area 5-17.2%
Do Not Live in the City-0.8%

- **How long have you lived in Independence?**

Less than 1 year-1%
1-2 years-3.1%
3-5 years-9.6%
6-10 years-10%
11 or more years-76.3%

- **Age**

18 to 24-1.2%
25 to 34-2.2%
35 to 49-18.3%
50 to 64-43.7%
65 and over-29.3%
Prefer not to answer-5.4%

- **Gender**

Female-35.6%
Male-54.2%
Prefer not to say-10.1%

- **How long is your commute to work?**

Less than 5 minutes-19.2%
5-15 minutes-14%
16-30 minutes-30.8%
More than 30 minutes-36%

- **How do you acquire or would like to acquire information from the City?**

Local Newspaper-41.4%
City Newsletter-75.5%

City Website-35.3%
Cable Television-2.5%
Social Media-11%

All Comments are attached with the survey results.

Kaltsas referred to the comments attached and on the results link. An overarching theme in these comments is the City should maintain rural and agricultural feel and characteristics, as well as open space and peace and quiet. Jen Kazin wondered if there were metrics showing the average age in relation to responses. She feels that when driving around she sees many young families. This seems heavily biased toward upper age group, and given these results, i.e. heavy on paper responses, low social media, etc.... Olson wondered if we could get the three upper age brackets with their corresponding answers. Thompson felt the demographics were not hugely important. McCoy felt it would be interesting to seeing results based on zone. Kaltsas said this median age is higher than most. We can pull the results in several different ways. Thompson wondered how we'd represent incorporation as input vs articulating that people voted. Just because we heard that 'people don't want growth' does not mean there will be no growth. Simpson said she feels it gets back to managing expectations. We got some explosive information and we want people to know they were heard, but just because they said, one thing does not mean that is how it is going to be. We need to be concise moving forward. Savage was not surprised by the results. She participated in the last Comprehensive Plan and the results are very similar. Betts wondered how the results correlate to the tax base-how can we continue with services with a low tax base. Spencer felt the results could preclude the vision of what could come next. We could take this with a grain of salt and attempt to meet the needs of society, not just those who responded to the survey.

Thompson felt it gets back to managing expectations-we need to not create this sense that the answers automatically flow into the comprehensive plan. Dumas felt it would be important to know that if those who didn't live near Maple Plain but wanted growth in that area vs those who live right there-what if they didn't want the growth. Kaltsas reminded us it is about the vision. What do we want to look like in the future?

There will be more public involvement in the coming months to help starting to design this plan. We are not under huge pressure to grow. If we do grow, it will be by choice. Met Council has some long-term plans for us to expand. Within the next few meetings, we will get into these expectations and look at our 'big picture'. Kaltsas felt it would be better to get into the details, by beginning to focus on land use from a graphic standpoint. We are not trying to fit into a certain box outlined by Met Council, unlike some communities that get that by Met Council. Betts brought up the population predictions by Met Council. Kaltsas said they predicted 4920 and we are currently at 3800 in population. There are 1400 households currently with a projection of 1720 by 2020.

Olson said we should have our own vision. Franklin asked what the goals were in the previous survey. Did the items happen or why didn't they happen. She said for the amount of people that responded to the survey she wondered where they were at tonight.

Kaltsas said next steps are to get into the details. The land-use piece will be the next task for this group. He anticipates in the next three meetings there will be another public input session. Further, down the road, there will be an open house/ public engagement component as well. Betts said it would be good to include the Highway 12 changes, any roads that will be impacted and water and

sewer plans too. Olson said it would also be important to include the lakes in the vision. Kaltsas said the next meeting would be August 15, 2017.

7. **Open/ Misc.**

8. **Adjourn.**

Motion by Gardner, second by Palmquist to adjourn at 8:20 p.m. Ayes: Phillips, Gardner, Thompson, and Dumas. Nays: None. Absent: Palmquist. Abstain: None. Motion approved.

Respectfully Submitted,

Beth Horner
Recording Secretary