



**City of Jordan  
City Planning Commission  
February 10, 2009**

**Members Present:** Chair Terry Jeffery; Council Representative Jeanne Marnoff; Dawn Benko; Rolf Hafslund; Rob Mishica; John Watkins

**Staff Present:** Senior Planner Joe Janish; Planning Consultant, Joanne Foust, MDG Inc;

**Others Present:** Mayor, Pete Ewals; Park and Recreation Commission Member, Donna Breeggemann; Economic Development Authority Member, Ray Sandey; Dean Morlock; Kirby Morlock; Herb Baldwin; Chuck Wood; Kathy Lopic

**1.0 Call to Order.**

*Chair Jeffery called the Planning Commission to order at 6:32 pm.*

**2.0 Adopt Agenda.**

Senior Planner Janish noted he would like to correct the date on the minutes write up. The minutes that are presented for approval are January 13, 2009. Mr. Janish noted the correct minutes were provided; however, the agenda shows the incorrect date. Mr. Janish also noted the Community Growth Options item was shown to start at 7:00 p.m. and that Park and Recreation Commissioner Donna Breeggemann may be late for the 7:00 p.m. start time. *Motion Marnoff seconded by Mishica to approve agenda as submitted with the correction of the date for the minutes. Motion unanimously approved.*

**3.0 Approval of Minutes.**

*Motion Mishica, seconded by Hafslund to approve the January 13, 2009 minutes. Motion unanimously approved.*

**4.0 Public Hearings.**

**A. Code Amendment Laundromat in Highway Commercial (C3) Zoning District.**

Senior Planner Janish indicated a request was received from Dean Morlock proposing the City of Jordan consider amending the code to allow for a Laundromat to be a permitted use in the Highway Commercial (C3) zoning classification. Mr. Janish indicated Mr. Morlock is pursuing a Laundromat facility to be located within a building he owns in the Highway Commercial area.

Mr. Janish proposed the following definition for a Laundromat:

“Laundromat” – A facility where patrons wash, or dry clothing or other fabrics in machines operated by the patron and/or a business that provides washing, drying and ironing for hire by an employee of the facility. Does not include dry cleaning of clothing or other fabrics on-site.

Mr. Janish noted a draft ordinance was included in the packet with the definition and is intended to be brought forward to the City Council once the Planning Commission makes a recommendation this evening.

Mr. Janish noted the definition and proposed ordinance amendment would not allow for a dry cleaning facility to be located on-site, however a Laundromat business could collect and send out dry cleaning. Mr. Janish noted that a dry cleaning facility that actually conducts the dry cleaning would probably be a better fit in an industrial setting.

*Chair Jeffery opened the public hearing at 6:36 p.m.*

No comments were received.

*Chair Jeffery closed the public hearing at 6:37 p.m.*

Commissioners questioned parking and Mr. Janish noted the parking requirements would be reviewed at the time of a building permit. Mr. Janish indicated the code amendment would be effective for any property within the Highway Commercial (C3) zoning district and the specifics of the site or sites would be reviewed according to existing code. Mr. Janish noted the definition would allow for either a paid employee to wash clothes or for a self service type of situation. Chair Jeffery commented a Laundromat would be acceptable in Highway Commercial districts. Commissioners also discussed if it would be of importance to establish operating times for the Laundromat, however the discussion lead to not regulation the time and allow for the operator of the business to select the business hours.

*Motion Benko, seconded Watkins to recommend a positive review of the draft ordinance to the Jordan City Council in regards to amending the city code to allow for a “Laundromat” as a permitted use with the definition staff provided and not to set operating times. Motion unanimously approved.*

## **5.0 New Business.**

### **A. Community Growth Options**

Planning Consultant Joanne Foust, MDG, Inc. congratulated the City of Jordan on being awarded the Community Growth Options program. Foust indicated Jordan was one of ten communities who received the award which included: Afton, Becker Township, Center City, Corcoran, Livonia Township, Norwood Young-America, Pine Island, Princeton, and Victoria.

Foust noted the Community Growth Options (CGO) is a multi-year project funded by the McKnight Foundation. The program was designed to deliver to small, fast-growing communities

financial and other assistance for community planning, ordinance development and implementation. CGO is implemented by 1000 Friends of Minnesota and their University of Minnesota Partners, the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs and the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs.

Foust noted, CGO is intended to be a six-year program with the following goals: assisting local elected officials, staff and citizens in guiding the development patterns in their communities; supporting Minnesota communities in accommodating growth; creating models of successful planning and implementation; incenting planning firms to provide to growing communities a comprehensive array of services; and creating and sustaining in communities a demand for long-term planning and a balanced-growth approach to community development.

Foust also noted the City of Jordan and Municipal Development Group, Inc have entered into a two year agreement with a good will of a six year contract for the planning assistance. The CGO program provides funding for the additional planning with the costs slowly shifting to the City over a six year period in order to ease the costs of ongoing planning expenses.

It was noted the CGO benefits include technical assistance and facilitation to update ordinance to implement the Comprehensive Plan. With access to CGO partners and their programs the City will be assigned a liaison and also received assistance in communications through quarterly newsletters. CGO will also assist with education by coordinating speakers of relevant planning topics. Foust also noted the CGO program allows for the ability to work with CURA, which could include Faculty research Projects, Capstone Workshop Projects, Class Projects, Internships and Student Research Assistants who would typically work at CURA. Foust also mentioned Faculty Experts are available for training sessions or seminars from the University of Minnesota's Hubert Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs.

Foust noted that the City of Jordan would be obligated to develop a cyclical 5-year Planning Framework, including community visioning, planning, ordinance development and updates, plan implementation, policy and procedure audit, along with internal education and training. Individuals would also need to participate in at least one 1000 Friends of Minnesota sponsored workshop. The City would also seek diverse and broad citizen representation in the planning process and develop communication strategies to keep citizens advised. Sharing of planning models and techniques or a "model" for other communities would also be asked of the City. Periodic and final reports would need to be submitted and accounting for the project would have to be maintained until 2016.

Foust provided an overview of the projects the City is intending on completing in 2009 which included Development of Architectural Guidelines and or Ordinances of the Downtown Commercial area, review the Downtown Uses, review the Industrial Uses and possible create a second district for Commercial-Industrial zoning classification. The intent is also to review and make recommendations based off of legislative amendments, pursue training on relevant planning topics and market the CGO Project to the community to keep them informed and involved.

Joanne Foust reviewed the survey results that were obtained during the development of the Comprehensive Plan. The Planning Commission asked if a speaker could be obtained in order to provide information on the difference between guidelines and requirements for possible future architectural requirements in the Downtown Zoning district. Foust indicated she would speak with CGO to find a speaker.

Foust also reviewed the stated purpose of the downtown district information that was obtained from the Comprehensive Plan Business meeting in which 37 people participated. At this meeting, five goals were derived from comments which include: to provide a variety of goods and services convenient for local residents in our downtown areas while preserving the unique, historical district; to offer a unique commercial area focusing on the river/creek, serving as a hub to the scenic byway and offering items such as bicycle trails and a train ride to New Prague; Using resources to cultivate the historic downtown for the convenience for residents and create a place to draw people from out of town; to offer a unique blend of retail, restaurants and service businesses; and create a hub byway, unique railway destination. Foust then provided a list of current permitted uses in the downtown business district for the individuals in attendance to complete. Mr. Janish noted the list would be sent to others in order to receive a larger sample of what individuals would like to see in Downtown Jordan.

Foust noted if members would brainstorm possible speakers and training ideas she would work with CGO and its contacts to try to bring them in.

Foust also noted the City is working on a public meeting to be held on March 31<sup>st</sup> with the location to be determined yet but notices would be developed and sent out through civic groups and posted in the local newspaper in order to get a broad spectrum of attendees.

Park and Recreation Commissioner Breeggemann commented she would like to see the Park and Recreation Commission involved in the process in the beginning.

Herb Baldwin commented the City of Jordan has a unique situation in which it needs to sustainability in order to thrive. The architectural guidelines should promote the historical significance and also evaluate the hard and soft architecture.

Chair Jeffery encouraged the audience to continue to attend the CGO meetings. Chair Jeffery also suggested Consultant Foust look for a speaker who could speak on getting the residents in Jordan engaged in the planning that is occurring.

Mr. Janish noted he intends to create an email list similar to the Comprehensive Plan, this would allow interested individuals to sign up and received the same information about the CGO that the CGO members would receive. Mr. Janish noted interested individuals should leave their email address on the sign up sheet in back if they would like to receive the information.

## **B. Commissioner Interview.**

This item was conducted at the end of the meeting.

*Motion Marnoff, seconded Mishica to have Halfslund be the temporary Chair of the Planning Commission since the existing chair would be interviewed. Motion unanimously approved.*

Senior Planner Janish indicated that this is a public meeting and can not require the public to leave the room. Mr. Janish did ask individuals to consider leaving in order to allow for the questions of candidates to remain unknown (no one left the room).

The Planning Commission asked Mr. Jeffery a series of questions that were dispersed by Mr. Janish. After the interview was completed Mr. Jeffery left the room.

*Motion Mishica, seconded Benko to recommend re-appointing Terry Jeffery to the Planning Commission to Mayor Ewals. Motion unanimously approved.*

Mr. Jeffery returned to the room and Temporary Chair Hafslund relinquished his temporary position to Jeffery.

## **6.0 Old Business.**

### **A. Comprehensive Plan Discussion – Formal Submittal**

Foust noted in December the Planning Commission reviewed comments from Scott County and the Metropolitan Council relating to the draft Comprehensive Plan. As a result of their input, a number of amendments were recommended to be made to the document. Foust noted staff and consultants met with the School Board on January 8, 2009 and no written comments were received. The School Board; however, verbally noted they were going to further study their future expansion but felt the school would want to expand on their current campus.

Foust noted no comments or meetings occurred with St. Lawrence Township. Both Planner Janish and Foust attempted to arrange meetings over the past few months.

Foust further noted staff and consultants met with the Sand Creek Township Board on January 8, 2009 and at the time of the packet compilation no comments had been received. However, on February 10, 2009 comments were received. Foust noted the official deadline for comments had passed but provided a handout to respond to the comments.

The Planning Commission reviewed the questions and concurred with the following responses:

1. Does the Comp Plan reflect a sincere effort to respectfully and cooperatively consult and coordinate with Sand Creek Township? The Planning Commission concurred it does.. The City appointed representatives from each adjacent township, the County and school district to participate in the comprehensive planning process. It has been the intent from the beginning of the process to work cooperatively with the local government units, including Sand Creek Township. A meeting was held during the process with representatives from Sand Creek Township, the City of Prior Lake and City of Jordan to discuss ultimate land use boundaries between the cities and how it affected Sand Creek Township. Information from this meeting was considered with the ultimate future east land boundary (outside the 2030 boundary). The Plan recognizes a need for an orderly annexation agreement and these discussions, as illustrated in Chapter 11-Implementation, Page 8:

2. Does the Comp Plan propose a means to discuss and deliberate future planning issues, such as the establishment of a functional orderly annexation agreement? The Planning Commission noted the plan does, citing the examples noted previously and text within Chapter 11 on Page 16.

3. Does the Comp Plan include current demographics to realistically project growth potential? The Planning Commission noted the City used two forms of population projections; the Metropolitan Council's System Statement (a requirement) and a more aggressive population forecast. Within Chapter 3, Demographics, statistics are included from the 2000 Census, building permits and population and household growth, based on actual building permits through 2007 and

State Demographer estimates. The Plan also acknowledges that there are outside factors which can affect population projections.

Within Chapter 3, Demographics on Page 5, it was noted that actual population, household and employment projections are affected by a number of factors including things outside of the City's control such as state and nation economy, gas prices, interest rates, etc, but are also affected by local factors such as development fees, availability of utilities and zoning regulations. Chapter 3, Demographics, Page 7 also addresses the data used to develop projections.

4. Does the Comp Plan adequately present a coordinated and strategically staged plan for the realistic expansion of the City into the Township areas? The Planning Commission noted the development of a staged land use plan was discussed, but not included. It is the City's hope that through the orderly annexation agreement process the City and Township can develop a staging plan. At this time, since there is not an orderly annexation agreement, comprehensive plan amendments will be required for each annexation. The Planning Commission noted it would welcome the opportunity to develop a staged plan as a part of the implementation of this plan. At this time, Comprehensive Plan amendments will be required with each expansion into the Township area.

Foust noted that the Plan does note within the Future Land Use Policies in Chapter 6, that compact, contiguous development that efficiently uses the existing and proposed infrastructure and capital investment is recommended. It is also noted that the future land use boundaries are coordinated with sanitary sewer service areas, projected capital expenditures, topography and the transportation system.

5. Does the Comp Plan include an agricultural land use classification that preserves, protects and conserves prime Ag lands with soils of statewide significance from indiscriminant development? The Planning Commission noted that during the initial planning input phase, the topic of ag preservation was posed to the community and 52.24% of the 134 survey respondents recommended the City plan for the accommodation of future residential, while 44.03% recommended the City preserve prime agricultural land. 3.73% did not respond.

The City also conducted an open house in May 2008, in which a request was made to acknowledge the prime ag lands. The Planning Commission discussed this at their June, 2008 meeting. The Planning Commission requested the following be added to the draft Chapter 6 recommendations: *"The City should work with Scott County and township residents/land owners to identify valuable agricultural land and research methods to encourage the preservation of this land, taking into account the potential development of adjacent properties."*

6. Does the Comp Plan propose a comprehensive transportation plan that is based on a real need and proposes environmentally and socially sensitive alignments? The Planning Commission agreed the plan does address this and is based on real needs.. The transportation plan is based on 2030 projections and traffic projections from the Metropolitan Council and the City.

As noted within Chapter 7, on page 1, The Transportation Plan, *"provides the **framework** for decisions regarding the nature of roadway infrastructure improvements necessary to achieve*

*safety, adequate access, mobility, and performance of the existing and future roadway system. The primary goal of this Plan is to establish local policies, standards, and guidelines to implement the future roadway network vision that is coordinated with respect to county, regional, and state plans in such a way that the transportation system enhances quality economic and residential development within the City of Jordan.”*

Relating to the future alignments, the Planning Commission noted the actual design of roadways will occur at the time of the proposed development as noted within Chapter 7, on page 16,

7. Does the Comp Plan present a utilities and infrastructure system plan that is fiscally and physically feasible and considers staged growth (or no growth at all) or reflect land uses that are more agriculture in nature and in practice? The Planning Commission agreed Chapter 10, Utilities, Page 4, includes extensive references to the topography of Jordan and the limitations it presents to serving areas with utilities. The utility plans are tied to the City’s capital improvement plan. Cost estimates for the projected infrastructure improvements have been included. The Plan and CIP also address connection fees and area charges to pass the cost of the improvements on to the developer. As noted on Page 9, of Chapter 10, *“The City has a “Premature Subdivision” section in its Subdivision Ordinance, which allows for the denial of plats if the City is unable to service the area with municipal sewer, among other services. The City should carefully monitor capacity, and if needed, implement and exercise a premature subdivision clause if capacity becomes limited before an expansion can be completed.”*

The utility plan is based on the forecasted future land uses, which do not include agricultural uses. The construction of infrastructure is proposed to be development driven. If there is no, growth, additional wells, water towers and WWTP expansions are not proposed.

8. Does the Comp Plan actually reflect a planning and design process that is sufficiently studied including planning options and clear evidence of a ‘vision for the City of Jordan’. The Planning Commission agreed the plan does. The City conducted a community visioning session in November 2006, and a Community wide survey in February 2007. Based on these comments and further Planning Committee and Council meetings, various “optional” future land use maps were created. The future land use map which is included was the result of much discussion and consideration by the comments and mapping completed at visioning session. The vision, as noted through survey comments and meetings was incorporated in the Land Use Chapter, and other chapters.

9. Does the Comp Plan demonstrate any real-time three dimensional imagery that suggests, even minimally how the Comp Plan can be reasonably implemented and how it would function and appear. The Comprehensive Plan includes the required elements of the Metropolitan Council, including various maps. The budget for the comprehensive plan did not include three dimensional imagery. A few were included within the economic development chapter to illustrate parking lot designs and downtown designs.

10. Foust noted she was uncertain what the authors were referring to in their tenth question and therefore could not respond.

11. Does the Comp Plan adequately consider adjacent land use district issues within and outside the City Limits and suggest means by which these issues can be resolved? The Planning Commission agreed the plan does. Within Chapter 6, there are a number of objectives or policies which specifically address adjacent land uses and methods to minimize the impact. A few examples were cited on pages 11, 12, 17 and 18.

12. Does the Comprehensive Plan contain maps and diagrams that are erroneous, using lines and colors to define land use areas that are beyond a realistic and justified possibility? Foust noted the Comprehensive Plan includes nearly 30 maps, based on Scott County GIS parcel data, information from other reliable sources (environmental mapping). The plan acknowledges there is additional land within the future land use boundary and states the reason therefore. This is also noted within Chapter 6, on page 15.

13. Does the Comp Plan promote a 'sustainable' concept or attitude it will support a well balanced community, minimizing or hopefully eliminating irresponsible energy consumption.

The Planning Commission noted the Plan does promote a sustainable concept and there are several policy statements within the Land Use Chapter which relate to the reduction of vehicular trips through the future development of neighborhood commercial areas, use of second floors of commercial buildings to support the downtown and, promotion of a walkable community and consideration for impact on the city's environment and infrastructure system. A few of the examples referenced includes policy statements within Chapter 6 on pages 4, 12, 13, and 18 and Chapter 8, page 12.

14. Does the Comp Plan propose a preserved, refined or improved character image of Jordan, creating a memorable 'sense of place' or identity? The Planning Commission discussed the comments received from various community meetings, business meeting and the community survey which were incorporated into several places in the comprehensive plan. The plan recognizes and promotes the future development of Jordan as a "small town" which is family oriented, places focus on the downtown as a gathering place, recognizes the historical importance through the Plan's mission statement and guiding principals as well as policy statements in Chapter 6.

15. Does the Comp Plan truly reflect the needs of the citizens of Jordan and surrounding area? The Planning Commission noted the Plan was developed over two year with numerous community input opportunities offered. Comments received from these sessions has been incorporated into the document and is often specifically noted with the number or % of community members noting their specific desires. Public input sessions included:

- One-on-one interviews with a cross-section of 15 community leaders (Oct-Dec. 2006)
- Visioning Session – 30 participants (Nov. 2006)
- Community On-line Survey – 134 respondents (Jan. 2007)
- Economic Development Authority Bus Tour and Meetings (Jan. 23rd and Feb. 27th 2007)
- Business Meeting – 32 local business participants (Feb. 15 2007)
- Park Board (May 29, 2007)
- Joint School Board/Planning Committee Meeting (July 30, 2007)
- Council Workshops – Mission Statement, System Statement Amendments, Etc.

- Planning Committee: Jordan Planning Commission and representatives from Sand Creek Township, St. Lawrence Township, Scott County, Jordan School District- Monthly meetings (Oct 2006....2008)

The Township's concern with the amount of land included in the future land use map was also discussed. It was noted that as a part of the survey process, in which 134 residential homes participated, 61.94% of the respondents encouraged planning beyond the year 2030 to take into consideration future interchanges, transportation routes, and other communities' growth boundaries, while only 34.3% suggested including only land anticipated to be needed to support growth to the year 2030.

The township's concerns with leap frog and not planning within current boundary was also discussed. The Commission noted the Comp Plan does recognize a need to infill and redevelop. A map is included in Chapter 5 identifying redevelopment sites. In addition, Chapter 6, Pages 5-6 includes the information relating to the infill of existing vacant acres for development and emphasizes the use of current sites within the service area prior to the development of alternative sites. It recommends prevention of leap-frog development and proper phasing of urban expansion.

The Planning Commission concurred that the City should work with Sand Creek Township on an Orderly Annexation Agreement, as noted within the Comp Plan and requested the City Council initiate the process as soon as possible. They agreed that through an orderly annexation agreement, a staging plan can be developed. Since an agreement is not in place at this time, comp plan amendments with required public hearings will be required for any annexation from the Township.

*Motion Mishica, seconded Hafslund to forward the Comprehensive Plan to the City Council for their approval for formal submittal to the Metropolitan Council. Motion unanimously approved.*

**7.0 Planners Report.**

None.

**8.0 Commissioner Report.**

None.

**9.0 Adjournment.**

*Motion Hafslund, seconded Watkins to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 8:50 p.m. Motion unanimously approved.*

Respectfully submitted,

Joe Janish  
Senior Planner