

Manning Avenue Corridor Development Options Questionnaire

Public Engagement Meeting, September 8, 2014

	Positive	Negative
<p>1. <u>No Change</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the land along Manning Avenue is zoned Agricultural. • The Agricultural zone allows development at a density of <u>3 lots</u> per quarter/quarter section (40 acres). • The Ag zone does not allow subdivisions that require the construction of a new public street, so all new lots must have access from existing public roads. • Each lot must have a minimum of 300 feet of frontage on a public road. • The Ag zone requires a minimum of 300 feet between driveways on a public road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No roads to be maintained or constructed • Good choice, if sustainable • No new public streets or access to MN95 • Keeps rural character • Limits growth • Does not require city investments • Positive impact on crime 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May not be sustainable • Mismatch with land use patterns in Woodbury • Met Council would not allow it and may bring Met Council into it • A no-change option without teeth, as a strategy, will not work • Makes it easier for developers to assemble land in the future
<p>2. <u>Preservation and Land Conservation Development (PLCD)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PLCD is an overlay for the Ag zone that allows a density of <u>four units</u> per quarter/quarter section (40 acres). • Allows subdivisions that require the construction of a new public street. • Requires a tract of land that is a minimum of 80 contiguous acres. • At least 50% of the total tract is required to be preserved as an undeveloped parcel (and placed into a conservation easement – a perpetual easement, involving an organization such as the Minnesota Land Trust - that preserves the land as open space in its current character. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If it could be permanent (i.e. no other subdivision allowed in future), it would be positive • If the 40 acres could be strategically preserved as open space, it would be positive • If the open space dedication was contiguous, it would be positive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Even if 40 acres are preserved, the four 10-acre lots could be redeveloped at a higher density in the future • Would require new road construction • Requires a minimum of 80 acres – which excludes otherwise developable parcels • Challenges of stewarding the land (who maintains the open space) • More density could threaten aquifer • No opportunity for commercial development

	Positive	Negative
<p>3. <u>Rezone from Agriculture to Rural Residential</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Rural Residential zone allows development at a density of <u>one lot per five acres</u>, with a minimum lot size of 5 acres. • The Rural Residential zone allows new public roads to serve new subdivisions. • Each lot must have a minimum of 300 feet of frontage on a public road. • The Rural Residential zone does not require a minimum distance between driveways. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If done properly, it is acceptable development (at 5-acre minimum parcels) • Better than “urban” pattern development • Value to land owners • Brings revenue while maintaining rural • Results in better land use • Increased tax base • Simple (city knows how to facilitate) • Positive tax impact for 10-acre lots 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potentially raises taxes on Ag land • Increase in school age population; could be strain on schools • Increase in density • Could detract from rural character (5-acre parcels are too small for hobby farms) • 300 feet of frontage requirement • Increase in number of driveways • If developments can't do 5 lots per 40, (parcels lose density due to road & r-o-w needs) could be a financial problem • If not strategic, could exacerbate traffic problems (with increase in driveways and new roads) • Potential for more intersections controlled (stop lights/signs) • Increase in density → Increase in services and service cost to City
<p>4. <u>2.5 acre lots with 50% of the land placed in a conservation easement (similar to Cedar Bluff)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows development at a density similar to the Cedar Bluff development, with a minimum lot size of 2.5 acres. • Requires a planned unit development using Limited Impact Design principles. • Requires placing 50% of the land being subdivided into a conservation easement. • Requires a tract of land that is a minimum of 80 acres. • Lots are clustered in a portion of the land to preserve natural features and reduce visual and environmental impacts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most likely to sustain; makes it difficult to purchase more permanent easements • Better than city size lot • Guarantees open space • Family orientated • Land Trust permanence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density too high • 2.5 acre lots – Afton loses rural character • Stewardship of land by Minnesota Land Trust -- could be costly to maintain • If 80 acres is needed, it limits available parcels for using this development option • Uncertainty of sustainability of soils for individual on-site septic systems

	Positive	Negative
<p>5. <u>Public Recreational Trail Corridor</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involves the establishment of a continuous public trail corridor, 30 to 100 feet wide, along the full length of Manning Avenue for a recreational trail separated from Manning Avenue. • The public trail corridor would be a barrier to the extension of utilities from the west. • Existing zoning regulations would remain unchanged. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity to design with Afton’s rural look and feel • Opportunity to connect with other trails and transit • If done well, facilitates land use options 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would impinge on existing structures and properties that are near Manning • Parking for people who use the trail • Just moves Manning issues to the east • Expensive to maintain trail • Brings more traffic to the area and more opportunity for crime • Could divide Afton – i.e. higher density between Manning and Trail corridor • Privacy concerns for adjacent residents
<p>6. <u>Other Options</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please describe. 	<p><u>Other Ideas & Options</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include in plan (wildlife/water etc.) • Consideration for commercial (considerable value) • Commercial recreation (take advantage of rural character) • Proactive use of limited commercial development • Economically viable use • Option for pooling land together • Permanent conservation proactively • Incorporate “spot zoning” flexibility • Use the ¼ section line as a western buffer (by preservation easement) and have the housing development on the east side 	<p><u>Issues & Questions to Pursue</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option with the least amount of new roads is preferable • Minimum amount of acreage can be a problem, as road easements/rights-of-way are subtracted from the lot size (20 acres would not get 4 lots) • Do a cost/benefit analysis for road decisions • How many agricultural parcels front Manning Avenue? • How many acres of Ag-zoned land along Manning? • Address ordinance requirements for required minimum land amounts • “One size fits all” options may confine progress; have multiple options • Have a follow-up meeting with specifically affected parcel owners

	Positive	Negative