

**NOTES FROM A WORKING SESSION OF THE ROCKVILLE CITY PLANNING  
COMMISSION HELD TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 2006 – 7:00 P.M. – ROCKVILLE CITY HALL**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Jerry Bechtold. Roll Call was taken and the following members were found to be present: Chair Bechtold, Toni Honer, Dale Borgmann, Roger Schmidt, Jerry Tippelt, Dan Hansen, and Council Liaison Vern Ahles. Susan Palmer arrived at 7:04 p.m.

Staff members present were: Rena Weber, Judy Neu, & Attorney Jim Mogen.

Others present were: Denny Kron, Brian Herberg, Ed Karls, Lloyd Lommel, Jeff Hagen, Vince Schaefer, & Don Simon.

**AGENDA APPROVAL – *Motion by Chair Bechtold, second by Member Borgmann, to approve the agenda as presented including the one addition of the Stearns County Park. Motion carried unanimously.***

**ADMINISTRATIVE PLAT- COUNTY PARK** – Stearns County Surveyor, Denny Kron, was present to review the proposed Stearns County Park and further discuss the need for two Administrative Plat approvals in order to make the deal happen. Denny Kron further explained the underlying fee ownership which needs to be cleaned up. Possible uses for the park will be horse trails, ski trails, etc.

***Motion by Member Hansen, second by Member Honer, to approve both Certificates of Compliance as presented. Motion carried unanimously.***

**WORKING SESSION**

**AG-40C – TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS** – Attorney Jim Mogen presented information on the AG-40 ordinance and brought up discussion on the transfer of property rights.

- What happens if we want to subdivide a lot of record?
- Concern of using wetlands for the declaration of restriction

PURPOSE OF DISTRICT –

GOALS –

- Preserve open spaces
- Limit clustered developments to a low number of houses
- Prevent houses being built close to each other
- Maintain non-intensive uses in the district
- Prevent intensive uses that would be contrary to future uses
- Discourage development of residential dwellings outside of planned areas and corridors
- Prevent subdivision of land that would limit future uses
- Limit demands on infrastructure caused by denser development
- SP-1 is the overlay district – keeps the 1 house per forty acres – prohibits certain ways of subdividing property – SP-1 prohibits PUD

ISSUES –

- Allow clustered residential building in Ag-40- currently allowed
- Allow transfer of development rights-currently allowed
- Transfer of lot of record – how much has to be preserved
- How do we handle wetlands and other non-buildable property?

CONSIDERATIONS -

- Which preserves the agricultural & rural nature of the district best?
- Is it more rural/agricultural to have large areas of open space (more than 40 acres) or to have one house per ¼ mile
- Which is more efficient for the City, multiple houses within a quarter-quarter, or the same number of houses throughout the City?
- Which preserves the future land uses best?
- What do citizens want?
- What is common ownership?

## PROPOSALS –

- Restrict all transfers of development rights
- Restrict transfers within a parcel
- Restrict transfers within ownership
- Restrict transfers of rights from non-buildable property
- Restrict rights of non-buildable property

Discussion of what the consolidation called for came up.

Don Simon – transfer

Jerry Tippelt – no transfer

Dan Hansen – transfer

Lloyd Lommel – transfer only between one property owner that is contiguous

Ed Karls – no transfer

Jerry Bechtold – transfers within the city – but clustered

Dale Borgmann – transfers within the city – but clustered and look at the property first

Susan Palmer – transfers within contiguous common ownership

Jeff Hagen – transfer of rights within contiguous parcels allow variances to remove contiguous

Brian Herberg – transfers within the city & within the same character of what is in the area

Toni Honer – transfers within the city & within the same character of what is in the area – wetlands no problems

Roger Schmidt – transfers only between one property owner that is contiguous

Vern Ahles – transfers only between one property owner that is contiguous

## WETLANDS

Brian Herberg – wetlands should count

Jeff Hagen – wetlands should count

## TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS

One house per 40 – no transfers - 3 voted for

Transfers between different owners - 7 voted for

Transfer between ownerships – contiguous in some manner – 8 voted for

## WETLANDS –

Wetlands – buildable & has development right – majority

40 acres of wetlands – no upland – development right – majority (9)

Can you transfer 40 acres of wetland that is contiguous – 12

## LOTS OF RECORD –

Transfer of right – contiguous, different owner – 11

Bring it up to the 80 acre standard – 2

40 acre would be okay

Lot of record to contiguous owner – majority

Remove house and gain building right that can be transferred contiguous – majority

**CLASSIFIED ROADS (AG-40) IN GENERAL REQUIREMENTS** – It was determined that this section should be moved to general requirements as road classifications and setback requirements affects all districts.

**PRELIMINARY PLAT, FINAL PLAT, MINOR SUBDIVISIONS, CERTIFICATE OF SURVEY**

It was determined that the number of required copies would change to:

- 15 11" x 17" copies
- 5 24" x 36" copies

**FLOOR-AREA RATIO** – It was determined that we should delete this section and create a lot area coverage requirement of 25% impervious surface. Staff needs to look into the definition of impervious surface and decks.

**RULES AND DEFINITIONS –**

- 11. AWNING – delete
- 12. AWNING – keep
- 70. FLOOR AREA RATIO – delete
- 75. GRADE – delete
- 76. GRADE – keep but change to all structures
- 89. LOT – delete
- 90. LOT – keep, but clean it up
- 113. OWNER – hold for attorney to review
- 117. OWNER – hold for attorney to review
- 118. OWNER – hold for attorney to review
- 124. PLAT – keep Subdivision definition
- 153. SIGN – delete
- 154. SIGN – keep
- 162. STREET YARD – delete the words street frontage

**PRAIRIE INDUSTRIAL PARK – ALLOWING COMMERCIAL**

Discussion was held and it was determined that most feel that commercial uses should not be allowed.

**LARGE ANIMAL UNITS** – It was determined that the verbiage from the township ordinance should be added restricting it to 10 acres or more.

**COMPOSTING** – It was determined that there is only one area of complaint and that an ordinance is not needed. Staff will try to regulate under the nuisance ordinance.

**TRANSITIONAL ZONING** – It was suggested that the Planning Commission should determine areas where R-5 or Ag-5 could be zoned. No action was taken.

**SIGN ORDINANCE** – No idea what this was about.

**ADJOURNMENT** – *Motion by Member Hansen, second by Member Borgmann, to adjourn the meeting at 10:42 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.*

---

**VERENA M. WEBER-CMC**  
**ZONING ADMINISTRATOR**

---

**JERRY BECHTOLD**  
**CHAIR**