

**PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**CASCADE TOWNSHIP – OLMSTED COUNTY – MINNESOTA**  
**February 17, 2009**

Commission Members Present: Dan Frissora, Arlen Heathman, Jay Hesley, Kevin Lenz, Tom Schwalen

Call to order at 6:40 PM

Hesley presented the agenda for the meeting.

Heathman moved and Lenz seconded to forego the reading of and to formally approve the Commission meeting minutes from regularly scheduled meeting on 01/20/2009. (Minutes had previously been electronically approved). Motion passed. All members voting for.

Open discussion of the proposed Access Management Ordinance:

- Heathman explained that Rochester Township had created the proposed Access Management Ordinance and has done a Rochester Township wide survey using a standardized evaluation approach. That Township has not yet enacted the Ordinance.
- Schwalen asked how this fits in with current Cascade Township ordinances. As drafted the proposed Ordinance has information (mostly definitions) that is different from existing Ordinances.
  - The differences would have to be resolved as part of adopting the Proposed Ordinance.
  - The Proposed Ordinance could be either a stand alone Ordinance or incorporated into existing Ordinances.
- Frissora stated that the Commission had previously tabled action on this Ordinance until Rochester Township completed implementation of their Ordinance. Also question of the need for the Ordinance and potential liability exposure justifies the cost of implementing the Ordinance – specifically the cost of doing the survey.
  - Heathman explained that Township Board is concerned about the lack of an Ordinance and the potential liability exposure.
- Lenz stated that the Rochester Township approach is a well thought out plan.
- Schwalen asked if Olmsted County has an Access Management Ordinance.
  - Heathman said Olmsted County does not have such an Ordinance.
  - Frissora again questioned the need for a Township Ordinance since the County does not have one.
- Frissora questioned how much undeveloped property remains in the Township and how many new driveways would be covered by the new “headwall requirements”. The suggestion was made that control of new driveways be handled through the existing Driveway Permit process.
  - Heathman stated the current Driveway Process does not include headwalls and enforcement would be difficult with the power of an ordinance.
  - Discussion followed about how unpopular the requirement to remove, potentially expensive, existing headwalls will be with the Township residents.
- Discussion of how to move forward relative to this Ordinance:
  - Schedule a meeting with Rochester Township Board or representative to determine / discuss the current status of their activity and experiences to date.
  - Find out when they are going public and if they already have what the reaction of the Township population has been to their Ordinance.
- Based on the discussion Frissora made a motion table activity on the draft Cascade Ordinance until implementation of the Rochester Township Ordinance is complete. Upon complete implementation of the Rochester Township Ordinance the Planning Commission will solicit information from Rochester Township before drafting a Cascade Access Management Ordinance. Hesley seconded. Motion passed. All members voting for.

**PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**CASCADE TOWNSHIP – OLMSTED COUNTY – MINNESOTA**  
**February 17, 2009**

Open discussion of the current definition of Private Drive and Private Road:

- Schwalen stated the current description of a Private Road (Section 2.0/B/7, Section 5.1 and Section 5.4) does not specify any maximum to control the extent of Private Roads within a development. It only states that a Private Road serve a minimum of 4 private residences. Possible new descriptions:
  - Private Drive – non-public trafficway utilized by four or less private residences.
  - Private Road – non-public trafficway utilized by X or less private residences and / or being less than X feet in length and / or representing less than X% of the total trafficways in the development, having a road name and being able to accommodate emergency vehicles.
  - With limits on the scope of a Private Road (perhaps on a Private Drive as well) it set limits on the usage within a development. Variances can be granted in situations as required. Currently without any maximums it makes opposing the use of Private Roads more difficult.
- Another alternative would be to completely eliminate the use of Private Roads while retaining Private Drives.
- Another alternative is to retain Private Roads but change the standard for the Road to be the same as for Local Street.
- After some discussion no action was taken. Topic to be discussed at the next meeting.

Open discussion of Google Doc as the method for handling Commission meeting minutes and other Commission related documentation:

- Frissora gave a demonstration of Google Doc and its capabilities.
- After some discussion the Commission agreed to start using Google Doc for Commission meeting minutes and other Commission related documentation.
- Frissora and Schwalen will work on getting the support set up.

Heathman will obtain current maps of Cascade Township for use by the Planning Commission members.

Schwalen moved and Frissora seconded that the meeting be adjourned. Motion passed. All members voting for.

Meeting adjourned at 8:40 PM.