

**Eureka Township Commercial Task Force  
December 17, 2002**

The task force met from 7:05 pm to 9:10 pm. Present: Ken DeMaster, Mike Greco, Bob Papke, and Bob Ruddle. Not Present: Mark Malecha, Chris Nielsen, and Clyde Thompson.

1. Minutes from December 12, 2002 meeting were approved.
2. Ken DeMaster noted that the footnote concerning development in Airlake Industrial Park that was added to the minutes of the October 9, 2002 meeting should be amended to read that development there was limited from the 1960s through the early 1980s "due to legal issues concerning land ownership" rather than "due to litigation concerning the zoning of the land." Mike will amend the minutes and post a corrected version on the township website.
3. Ken DeMaster passed out copies of Corcoran's "home occupation" ordinance. He noted that Corcoran is in a somewhat similar situation to Eureka Township in that they have recently had to address the issue of existing nonconforming commercial establishments and they are now focused on future commercial development. Officials from Corcoran might be willing to speak to the task force about their experiences.

Mike suggested that other townships in the metro area might also have firsthand experience with some of the issues facing Eureka—particularly annexation pressures, existing nonconforming commercial uses, and zoning issues—and that officials from these townships might therefore be the best people to bring in as speakers at this point given our self-imposed deadline.

Ken also passed out an article photocopied from the December 14 issue of the *Lakeville Life and Times* concerning the Dakota County East-West Corridors study, which is still ongoing. A copy of both the ordinance and the article will be placed in the Commercial Task Force library (contact Bob Papke for a copy).

4. Members brainstormed research questions for each of the issues listed under the sections titled "planning implications" and "economic implications" on the "Issues to Research" list created at the last meeting. The questions for these sections have been added to the attached handout. The group will take up the remaining sections of this document at the next meeting.

This document is meant to guide the group's research and serve as a starting point for interview questions when interviewing speakers. In the event that the present taskforce does not complete its research by its self-imposed deadline, it can also serve as a framework for continued research by the town board or a future task force.

5. Members present volunteered to begin researching the following issues:

—Bob Papke

- History of and current control/management of commercial development in Lakeville (including prohibited commercial-industrial)
- History of and current control/management of commercial development in Farmington (including prohibited commercial-industrial)

—Ken DeMaster

- General legal issues concerning zoning, annexation, incorporation, defense and enforcement of ordinances, etc.

—Bob Ruddle

- Parking lots/impervious surfaces impact on surface water quality, drainage, erosion
- Environmental impact of hazardous materials
- Private wells impact on aquifer recharge
- Private septic impact on groundwater quality

—Mike Greco

- Mixed-use/New Urbanist vs. traditional suburban development styles
- Big-box development

Members agreed research should consist of a mix of interviews with qualified experts, library and Internet research, and data and ordinances from other cities and townships. Members also agreed that it was desirable to gather information from a variety of sources on each issue to ensure a balanced approach.

6. Mike gave a brief 10-minute presentation about the Envisioning Task Force Open House for members who were unable to attend the event. He also passed out a complete packet of handouts from the open house (contact Mike Greco for additional copies).
7. Next meeting: January 2 at Ken DeMaster's house (the town hall is unavailable that night due to a Planning Commission meeting).

Members agreed that the task force should continue meeting weekly as planned so long as a quorum of four (4) members is present at each meeting.

Respectfully submitted,  
Mike Greco, recorder

# **Issues to Research Concerning Commercial Development in Eureka**

## **I. Planning Implications**

- a. Pre-planning/zoning provides greater control
  1. What are some examples of townships or cities that undertook commercial development and either lost control of it or successfully controlled it? What can we learn from these experiences?
  2. From both a legal and a planning perspective, is it better to zone selective parts of the township (i.e., just identify a small commercial zone) or is it better to essentially zone the entire township at once?
  3. What does "control" of commercial development mean? Controlling the *direction* or *type* of growth only, or controlling the *rate* of growth as well? Can this be achieved? If so, how?
  4. How much control is desirable?
  5. Can the township legally justify restricting commercial development to a small commercial zone? Can landowners in other areas of the township successfully challenge such limitations?
  6. Does the existence of nonconforming commercial businesses have any effect on the type of restrictions the township can legally place on future commercial development?
  
- b. Commercial zoning and its impact on annexation attempts
  1. What are the rules concerning annexation in Minnesota (including limits on how much can be annexed)?
  2. What typically drives annexation attempts?
  3. What can a township do to fight or discourage annexation attempts?
  4. Is zoning really a solution to annexation?
  5. What other options are available besides annexation (joint powers agreements, etc.)?
  6. What are the annexation threats to Eureka, real or perceived?
  7. What are the rules concerning incorporation?
  
- c. Compatibility issues (between ag, residential, and commercial)
  1. What's the appropriate balance or mix between commercial and residential?
  2. To what extent are agricultural, commercial, residential, and industrial uses compatible or incompatible? How can incompatibility problems be overcome?
  3. What are the advantages and disadvantages of various commercial development patterns (traditional segregated use, mixed-use, commercial or industrial parks, strip malls, town centers/downtowns, scattered commercial, etc.)

d. Potential for undesirable businesses

1. To what extent can undesirable businesses be controlled through permitting and zoning?
2. What are examples of potentially "undesirable" businesses the township might consider restricting or prohibiting?

## **II. Economic Implications**

a. Impact of commercial development on tax base

1. What is the township tax structure? To what extent does the township control the tax structure?
2. What impact does commercial development have on the tax base?
3. What percentage of commercial taxes does township get? How does this compare with residential? Agricultural? Industrial?
4. What affects the mil rate at which a commercial enterprise is taxed (or are all taxed at the same mil rate)?
5. What characteristics make a commercial enterprise more desirable for tax purposes?
6. To what extent can commercial development allow reduction of residential or agricultural tax rates?

b. Impact of commercial development on property values

1. What types of commercial development tend to increase surrounding property values?
2. What types of commercial development tend to decrease surrounding property values?

c. Financing commercial development

1. What options are available for financing commercial development? What are advantages and disadvantages of each? (possible items include tax-increment financing, bonding issues, public purchase/development of land, etc.).
2. What grants opportunities are available for commercial development? (possibilities include Livable Communities Grants, foundation grants like Bremmer or McKnight, federal or state development grants, etc.)

d. Impact of commercial development on infrastructure/service costs

1. What infrastructure costs can developers be expected to shoulder?
2. What options are available for long-term infrastructure maintenance?
3. What options are available for long-term service costs (schools, fire, police, etc.)?
4. What are the comparative costs for services for commercial, industrial, residential, and agricultural uses? How do these costs compare with the tax revenue generated by each type of use?

### **III. Social Implications**

- Provides for employment opportunities at home
- Decrease commuting time for in-town jobs
- Increased traffic/congestion from
- Convenience
- Increased prestige for community
- Increased sense of community
- Affects the quality of life for residents
- Effect on aesthetic qualities in the township
- Can contribute to blight
- Increased noise pollution
- Increased light pollution

### **IV. Environmental Implications**

- Contributes to environmental degradation
- More paved parking lots can reduce the amount of surface waters returning to the aquifers.
- Impact of increased private wells/septic

### **V. Infrastructure Implications**

- If private developers pay for infrastructure improvements, those become public property (bridges, sewers, roadways, etc.)
- Increases in size (through addition of paid staff) and cost of government
- Enforcement issues of town rules – Eureka has no police force
- Sewage capacity (Vermillion already at its limit—no clear alternatives)
- Infrastructure/utilities must precede development
- Commercial provision for parking

### **VI. Other Issues to Research**

- Big-box development
- Pros/cons of placement of commercial
- Types of commercial development, and positives and negatives of each
- Definitions of terms
- Timeline for development

**VII. Unresearchable or Undecidable Issues** (these are issues the task force deems important considerations for any future commercial development in Eureka, but for which there is currently no concrete information or timeline available)

- Long-term Dakota County road plans (East-West Corridors, Cedar Ave. expansion, Pilot Knob expansion, etc.)
- Long-term metro transit expansion (Dan Patch commuter rail line, express bus service, I-35 expansion/interchanges, etc.)
- Airlake Airport expansion
- Elko/New Market sewer interceptor
- Farmington development along C.R. 50 and Denmark Ave.
- Lakeville development along C.R. 70
- Future sewer capacity of Chub Lake, Vermillion, etc.