

# Minutes

Community Development Committee



**Meeting Date:** February 20, 2024

**Time:** 4:00 PM

**Location:** 390 Robert Steet

## Members Present:

- Chair, Robert Lilligren, D7
- Vice Chair, Susan Vento, D11
- Judy Johnson, District 1
- Reva Chamblis, District 2

- Peter Lindstrom, District 10
- Chai Lee, District 13
- Toni Carter, District 14

- Tenzin Dolkar, District 15
- Wendy Wulff, District 16

## Call to Order

A quorum being present, Chair Lilligren called the regular meeting of the Community Development Committee to order at 4:00 p.m.

## Approval of Minutes

It was moved by Carter, seconded by Wulff, to approve the minutes of the February 5, 2024, regular meeting of the Community Development Committee. **Motion carried.**

## Non-Consent Business

1. 2024-33 System-wide, Regional Parks and Trails System Administrative Process for Minor Long-Range Plan Amendments (Emmett Mullin 651-602-1360; Tracey Kinney 651-602-1029)

It was moved by Wulff, seconded by Carter that the Metropolitan Council approve the Administrative Process for Minor Long-Range Plan Amendments with one amendment to modify the boundary change dollar limit to \$750,000 total.

## Motion carried.

Chamblis asked how staff determine if amendment proposals are political in nature. Mullin responded that the political context of proposals is vetted by Council Staff during the in-take evaluation process. During this time, Council and agency staff discuss the nature of the request and the political context surrounding it. The Summit Avenue Regional Trail or Nokomis-Hiawatha Regional Park Long-Range Plans are two examples of politically charged proposals. Kinney provided an example of a small technical correction with Scott County's Blakley Bluffs Park Reserve that resulted in a 7-acre correction because the land surveyor missed a portion of a parcel boundary due to weather conditions and difficult terrain.

Lindstrom asked if the Implementing Agencies support the amendment process. Mullin responded that the agencies are supportive of making the Council's amendment process more efficient.

Wulff supports taking less time to review proposals that are minor. She is concerned about the potential total cost of a minor boundary change proposal since the current proposal of 5-acres at \$250,000 per acre could add up to over \$1 million dollars. She is also concerned about the cumulative impact of multiple boundary changes to the same regional park or trail as an approach to increase the boundary. Mullin responded that major boundary changes would be considered by

a full amendment process that would be reviewed through the usual Council Committee process. The administrative process is intended for minor technical changes. Chamblis supports criteria that have no cumulative impacts. Community Development Director Lisa Barajas noted that the criteria includes the caveat that the proposal will have no cumulative impact. Mullin asked if there is an acreage or dollar amount for boundary change amendments that is more reasonable. Wulff responded that boundary changes for up to 5 acres for a total maximum of \$750,000 is more reasonable. Carter expressed her support for this proposed modification.

Carter asked about the initial step in the administrative amendment process. Mullin clarified that the first step in this process is for Implementing Agencies is to contact Council staff with an administrative amendment proposal. Council Staff will then evaluate the request to determine whether the proposal is an eligible candidate for the administrative process.

Chair Lilligren asked about the reference to Thrive 2040 in the administrative process policy as compared to Imagine 2050 (Attachment 1). Kinney responded that since the administrative process policy is being considered by the Metropolitan Council in February 2024, Thrive 2040 is the Regional Development Guide. When the Imagine 2050 plan is considered by the Metropolitan Council in early 2025, this administrative approval policy will be integrated into the Regional Parks Policy Area of Imagine 2050.

## Information

### 1. Draft Land Use Objectives and Policies (Angela R. Torres, 651-602-1566)

The Metropolitan Council is charged in statute with preparing a comprehensive development guide for the metropolitan area. The land use objectives, policies, and actions in *Imagine 2050*, the next regional development guide, will provide directions on how the Council plans to manage growth and development within the region. Council staff use the regional vision and goals as a foundation for developing land use objectives, along with associated policies and actions. Regional goals broadly describe the desired end states for the region, while objectives provide more specific direction by identifying achievable results that advance each regional goal. Policies identify the Council's intent or approach to regional issues or topics to help achieve objectives, and actions are specific strategies or activities to implement these policies.

Council staff developed draft land use objectives and solicited feedback from stakeholders including the Land Use Advisory Committee (LUAC), the Transportation Policy Plan Advisory Working Group (TPP AWG), the Regional Development Guide Work Group (RDG Work Group), and Council staff from other policy and system areas. The original draft land use objectives were:

#### **Original Land Use Objectives**

1. Minimize the amount of land needed to accommodate regional growth.
2. Maximize the development of places accessible for people by transit, bicycling, rolling, and walking.
3. Design places where all people feel safe and connected.
4. Maximize the preservation and restoration of natural systems at all scales of development.
5. Maximize housing choice within communities.
6. Remedy past and present discriminatory land use practices.
7. Prioritize land use and development patterns that strengthen local climate resilience.

Council staff reviewed stakeholder feedback and findings from external community engagement and incorporated it into the draft land use objectives. Some feedback included advice for more people-centered language, use of the term housing "opportunities" rather than housing "choice," and the addition of an objective focused on economic development and economic competitiveness. Given these and other changes, the current draft land use objectives are:

#### **Revised Land Use Objectives (Current as of February 20, 2024)**

1. Respect the relationship with land and water as a foundation for regional growth.
2. Maximize opportunities for growth in places well-served by transit, bicycle, and pedestrian



infrastructure.

3. Establish vibrant, inclusive, connected, and safe communities for people to live in .
4. Ensure that development activities contribute to the fullest protection and restoration of natural systems on every level.
5. Ensure that in all types of communities, people find housing opportunities that align with their needs.
6. Remedy past and present discriminatory land use practices.
7. Strengthen the climate resilience of neighborhoods and communities through sustainable land use and development patterns.
8. Support the economic wellbeing of our region and its communities.

Council Members and staff discussed the objectives, some requiring more explanation. Some concerns discussed were displacement, senior housing, enforceability and increasing the priority of climate mitigation – at minimum secondary.

## 2. Density and Land Use Approaches (Angela R. Torres 651-602-1566; Raya Esmæili 651-602-1616)

As part of the regional development guide and land use policies, Council staff worked with the Land Use Advisory Committee (LUAC) in 2022 and 2023 to establish proposed 2050 community designations (see Figure 1), which the Council endorsed at its meeting on March 15, 2023. While proposed community designations were developed based on similarities and differences between the communities in the region, using the planned residential densities identified in the 2040 local comprehensive plans as one of the variables, density requirements are determined as part of land use policy discussions.

Council staff are in the process of exploring various approaches to density policy and planning requirements aligned with regional goals. The possible approaches are based on extensive analysis of planned and developed densities in the communities within Metropolitan Urban Service Area (MUSA). This analysis reveals that the development trends in the region do not align with current regional land use and density policies, and overall do not achieve minimum requirements, despite communities appropriately planning for those requirements. 4

To conduct an analysis of current development density trends in communities within MUSA, staff compiled several pieces of data:

### **1. Net Developed Overall Density**

The overall net developed density illustrates community-wide density of existing residential development in each jurisdiction in the region. This measure uses the number of all the housing units in a community based on the 2020 census and the areas identified as residential in the Council's 2020 Generalized Land Use information. The acreage excludes areas that are not developable and only includes the developed portions of the land.

### **2. Net Developed 2010-2020 Density**

This measure is the net density of developments that occurred between 2010 and 2020 in each community using two factors: 1) the number of housing units added between the 2010 and 2020 census; and 2) the change in residential acreage between the Council's 2010 and 2020 Generalized Land Use information, where change refers to movement from a non-residential use or vacant land to any residential use.

### **3. Minimum 2030 Planned Density (2030 CPU Planned)**

The minimum 2030 planned density includes the overall minimum density of new development and



redevelopment within each community. This measure is extracted directly from each 2030 local comprehensive plan.

#### **4. Minimum 2040 Planned Density (2040 CPU Planned)**

The minimum 2040 planned density includes the overall minimum density of new development and redevelopment within each community. This measure is extracted directly from each 2040 local comprehensive plan.

#### **5. Plat Monitoring 2000-2022**

Communities that participate in the Council's [Plat Monitoring Program](#) (Program) annually report their sewer residential platting activity. The Program started in early 2001 and includes data from these communities going back to 2000 and provides credit to communities that assist with meeting minimum density requirements. There are 45 communities included in the Program. Platting activity demonstrates a stage between planning and permitting development. As such, not all plats are realized into actual developments, or may be realized with a several-year delay. This measure shows the density of the plats submitted by each participating community during the Program.

Council Members and staff discussed upcoming changes in development, demand, market, potential, and the need for a review every 10 years.

Chair Lilligren encouraged absent Council Members to watch the info 2 portion of meeting video.

### **Adjournment**

Business completed; the meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

### **Certification**

I hereby certify that the foregoing narrative and exhibits constitute a true and accurate record of the Community Development Committee meeting of February 20, 2024.

---

#### **Council Contact:**

Michele Wenner, Recording Secretary  
[Michele.Wenner@metc.state.mn.us](mailto:Michele.Wenner@metc.state.mn.us)

