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Introduction and Background

In September 2008 the Scott County Planning Department and the Center for Rural Design (CRD), University of Minnesota, began a collaborative effort, Defining the Rural Character for the Detailed Planning Area (DAP). This report represents the culmination of that effort. The core task identified for this effort was to begin the process of educating and engaging with local citizens to:

• explore the rural character
• determine its value to residents
• identify approaches to preserving appropriate characteristics

of the Detailed Planning Area (DAP) in the southeastern corner of the county.

The boundaries of the DAP are identified in the 2030 update to Scott County’s Comprehensive Plan. The DAP covers roughly one quarter of the county’s land base (app. 67 square miles) and is designated to remain permanently rural at full build-out of the county (figure 1). The designation as ‘permanently rural’ is an outcome of a joint study between Scott County and the Metropolitan Council that sought to identify the ultimate service area for projected new regional waste water treatment facilities. The DAP falls outside of the identified service area and includes portions of Cedar Lake, Credit River, New Market, and Spring Lake Townships. The County in partnership with the Townships is responsible for the detailed planning for the DAP, which will continue to face housing development pressure.

Early in 2008 Scott County received a grant from the McKnight Foundation for a series of projects designed to implement portions of the County’s 2030 Comprehensive Plan Update. A significant component of the grant (Task 2) was directed toward initiating the development of a detailed plan for the DAP. The work outlined in the grant included (under Subtask 2C) engaging with DAP area residents in a charrette design process that explored the rural character of the DAP, its potential significance, and possible approaches to preserving appropriate characteristics. A direct intention of the process was to reach out to individuals who may not have participated in the County’s 2030 planning process and provide new perspectives on how to achieve the County’s 2030 vision for the DAP.

In conversation between County planning staff and CRD staff a more detailed direction for the project began to emerge. It was concluded that to be successful the project ultimately has three basic goals to accomplish:

• Task 1: Identify the Rural Character(s) of the DAP – in order to gain broad public support to preserve and protect the environmental/cultural functions of an area it is important to gain an understanding of the perception residents of the area have of those environmental/cultural functions.
• Task 2: Translate the Rural Character(s) into an appropriate pattern of development and development types across the DAP – develop a set of design guidelines and a design
pattern book that guide development toward the most sensitive environmental outcomes while maintaining a character that is attractive to current and future residents.

- Task 3: Validate the Design Guidelines and Design Pattern Book with the citizens of the DAP through an open house to solicit input.

In light of time constraints to accommodate the McKnight grant timeline it was determined that it would be most useful to accomplish a modified form of Task 1 as defined in the opening paragraph above.

Figure 1: Detailed Planning Area in Scott County
Project Process

The Rural Character Study is one of the beginning steps in determining the extent to which rural character should be considered and could be guided for the near future in the DAP. This Study is part of a series of studies that are being done simultaneously in an effort to better understand the potential cumulative impact a change in rural housing density could have on natural resources, transportation, stormwater management, and rural character.

Integral to the Rural Character Study was the DAP Project Management Team comprised of significant individuals in the DAP such as township representatives, and key Scott County personnel. The role of the Project Management Team was to provide guidance and oversight to Scott County and CRD through the project process.

The intent of the Rural Character Study was to gain insight into the rural character of the DAP and to educate the public on the experiential impact of design and planning in the rural landscape. The Rural Character Study included three major phases as shown in figure 2 below and in the Appendix. Phase one focused efforts on visiting the DAP and the organization and inventory of the Geographic Information Systems (GIS) data. Phase two of the Study, Rural Character Identification, used the site and data analysis for the development of the in-house documentation.
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**Figure 2: Project Time Line**
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pre-workshop and the production of the public workshop. Phase three of the Study, Rural Character Documentation, developed the documentation of the Public Workshop and project in its entirety.

In phase one of the Study Scott County Staff led CRD through a site visit of the major areas of the DAP and the compilation and analysis of Geographical Information Systems (GIS) spatial data was developed. By having some physical understanding of “the lay of the land” CRD was better able to understand the GIS data and make well educated decisions when developing the analysis maps. In addition to understanding the land, academic and professional literature had begun to be gathered. The intent of an extensive literature compilation was to provide the professionals involved with additional resources and the public information if needed or interest warranted. Literature reviews provide needed background information, theoretical depth and potential opportunities for innovation. The topics of the literature ranged from different types of rural character project processes to innovations to the spatial implications of design choices.

In phase two of the Rural Character Study the in-house pre-workshop and the public workshop took place. The pre-workshop was held at the Scott County Government Center with the Project Management Team, staff from the Scott County Planning Department and CRD staff. The pre-workshop was a “dry run” of the public workshop and included a presentation from CRD on rural character units, two image preference surveys and access to key pieces of the literature review. The Rural Character Units Map (discussed in detail in following sections) is the product of the GIS data analysis, and delineated the DAP into areas with the potential to have different rural character. The intent of the Rural Character Units Map was to gain a common understanding of the spatial character of the DAP and begin a conversation of the potential commonalities and differences. The image preference surveys were developed to capture input on rural character perception. The first image preference survey, “I know rural when I see it” sought to
begin a group thought process on the many aspects of rural. The second image preference survey, “I know good rural development when I see it” sought to gain insights of rural character perception. The major excerpt of literature discussed at the pre-public workshop was Fred Heyer’s 1990, “Preserving Rural Character.” Heyer discusses rural character perception and provides guidance through one approach to determine and preserve rural character. The culmination of the pre-workshop was the Project Management Team’s questions and comments. Many comments described the difficulty to articulate definition of “rural.” Some comments focused on the clarity and goal of the second image preference survey. And some comments spoke of the need for a more defined introductory section of the presentation. Insights and input gained from the Steering Committee after the pre-workshop was greatly appreciated and significantly shaped the presentation to the DAP community at the public workshop.

The goal of the public workshop was to gauge the public interest of the significance of the rural character in the DAP and gain insight into if guidance is needed to shape that rural character. The intent of the public workshop was to educate the public about the significant design considerations in rural planning that have implications on the character of the DAP. The public workshop took place at Spring Lake Townhall in Spring Lake Township on December 4, 2008. The workshop drew around 40 people interested in the rural character of the DAP. The workshop combined an introductory image preference survey, Rural Character Units GIS mapping review and questionnaire, a presentation on rural design elements and two questionnaires: one seeking input on rural character in the DAP and the second seeking input on the overall perception of the public workshop itself.

The introductory image preference survey, located in the Appendix, is an expanded version of the pre-workshop survey. The survey served to start conversation and focused on the participants’ perceptions.
“What is rural?”. Rural Character Units GIS mapping review introduced a computerized analysis of the rural character of the DAP. The maps were discussed in a small group format with the intent of gaining a common understanding of the rural character in and around their places of interest. The table groups were asked to edit and confirm the map, discuss and document their finding on the map and in the adjacent questionnaire. The presentation of the rural design elements proceeded after the map exercise and included a detailed lecture on four ways design elements could impact the rural experience one has in the DAP. The four rural design elements are: broad arrangement of land uses in the rural landscape, view from the road, site landscape character and site architectural character. After the presentation on rural design elements the group was asked to fill out two questionnaires. The first questionnaire sought insight from the group about the rural design elements, if different rural design elements effects the rural character units of the DAP differently, appropriate land development types in DAP and how could planning and design guidelines help in the DAP. The second questionnaire was produced by Scott County and asked for input as to the success of the public workshop. After the questionnaires the group was then asked to voice there questions and comments as related to public workshop and to the consideration of furthering the process of rural character guidance.

Phase three of the study entailed the documentation of the public workshop results and producing this report. The results of the public workshops are located in the Appendix and detailed in a later section of this report. The documentation of the Rural Character Study will include: and introduction and background to the project, the project’s process, the public workshop results, next steps and a discussion on rural character, rural character units and the preservation of rural character.
Defining Rural Character

Classic definitions of ‘rural’, figure x, regularly allude to our agricultural heritage:

- living in or characteristic of farming or country life. (wordnet.princeton.edu/perl/webwn)
- rural areas are sparsely settled places away from the influence of large cities and towns. Such areas are distinct from more intensively settled urban and suburban areas, and also from unsettled lands such as outback or wilderness. People live in villages, on farms and in other isolated houses. (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rural)
- refers to an area with mostly farmland and little human population, or characteristic of farming and country life. (www.ecohealth101.org/glossary.html)

or are based on the concept of exclusion:

- a term to describe something which is not of an urban center. (www.mostreferred.com/resources/glossary-r.html)
- All areas not classified by the Census Bureau as urban are defined as rural and generally include places of less than 2,500 persons. (www.ntia.doc.gov/ntiahome/fttn99/glossary.html)
- Areas outside the boundaries of urban areas. (www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/sidewalks/appb.htm)

The public workshop drew around 40 people and included four opportunities for public feedback. For the purposes of this report three of the four exercise results will be summarized. The fourth exercise was a public workshop satisfaction survey distributed by the Scott County and it will not be summarized here.

The first exercise of the public workshop entailed a short image preference survey that sought to obtain insight into the public’s perception of the definition of rural. The workshop group was asked to rate each image from one to five with five being the most rural. Images of segregated farm houses and large expanses of agricultural land seem to rank the most rural. Images with a high percentage of residential density seemed to have been perceived as less rural. Images with a significant amount of open space, agricultural land, forest or prairie around and/or in between residential units seemed to be perceived as somewhere between rural and urban. In summary of exercise one, rural depends on residential density and open space access. This may imply that large continuous expanses of land are perceived as more rural. And natural areas in between residential units due to decreased density are perceived more rural.
However, a more recent concept revolves around natural features and access to recreation opportunities:

- Part of the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum. An area that is characterized by a natural environment, which has been substantially modified by development of structures, vegetative manipulation or pastoral agricultural development. Resource modification and utilization practices may be used to enhance specific recreation activities and maintain vegetative cover and soil. Sights and sounds of humans are readily evident, and the interaction between users is often moderate to high. ...

(terrasip.gis.umn.edu/projects/usdafs/help/descriptions.html)

It has become clear that, as the background of ‘non-urban’ residents has become more diverse over the last few decades the definition of ‘rural’ has also become more diverse. By extension, ‘rural character’ - the physical expression of rural - is often a perception unique to an individual. One person may interpret rural character as having a low density of development; another may only recognize it where there is a complete absence of man-made features, such as signs and buildings (http://www.vbco.org/planningeduc0059.asp).

However, despite diverse individual perceptions of what constitutes ‘rural character’, it remains true that a growing number of people are attracted to rural areas. The attendant new development imposes changes that alter the underlying character of the area - the character that attracted people in the first place. Identifying the key characteristics, both environmental and cultural, and developing a management plan to protect them becomes more of a challenge.

Ultimately, the challenge truly lies at the community scale. The diverse perceptions and values of the individual residents must be distilled into a community view as to what is important and what should be preserved. In order to gain broad public support to preserve and protect the environmental/cultural functions of an area it is important to gain an understanding of the perception residents of the area have of those environmental/cultural characteristics. Based on community consensus, an approach to planning, management, and design of the rural landscape can be formulated.

Since land planning, management, and design all deal primarily with physical features and functions in the landscape, it is essential to identify those elements. The range and nature of elements will vary with each unique landscape and, as pointed out above, each community will develop its own unique values toward those elements. However, it is possible to create a list of the potential landscape elements and functions. Furthermore, it can be useful to organize the list into categories that identify broad principles for landscape planning, management, and design. This type of list provides a framework within which to engage in public discourse about important landscape characteristics and their preservation. Such a categorized list was produced for the DAP as shown on the next page (figure 3).
## Principles of Rural Design

### Broader Arrangement of Land Uses in the Rural Landscape
- Clustered Development with surrounding open space (agriculture, natural resource management, habitat management and / or natural restoration)
- Hopscotch v. cohesive patterns of open space
- Hamlets (public gathering space) providing other types of land use vs. individual development (private gathering space)

### View from the Road
- Screening new development along roadways (vegetation, berthing)
- Single access points into development v. “keyboard plats"
- Deeper setbacks for homes/lots accessed from township roads
- Parallel trails/shared bike lanes
- Urban section (curb & gutter) v. rural cross section (ditches)
- Planning roads along natural area corridors
- Local street widths and design (linear v. curve)
- Ridge top and hilltop home and outbuilding development
- Placement of utilities and towers

### Site Landscape Character
- Smaller arrangement of development communities and open spaces
  - Small lots – privately owned, communal open space
  - Large lots – privately owned open space
- Storm water design (LID)
- Developing near shore land areas
- Excessive grading for desired floor plans
- Screening vs. not screening of utilities and neighbor’s houses
- Manicured v. more natural looking vegetation (use of natives, etc.)

### Site Architectural Character
- Architectural typology (Community Center, farm stead, hamlet, and other ‘theme’ oriented developments)
- Architectural style (farm house, ranch house, tudor, rustic, prairie, etc.)
- Matching outbuildings to principal buildings (color, scale, size, exterior materials)
- Preservation and reuse of existing farm buildings (barns, silos, coops, etc.)
- Residential fence types (barb wire, picket, wood)

---

*Figure 3: Principles of Rural Design*
Recognizing Diversity:
Landscape Character Units

As noted, the range and nature of physical elements expressed in a given landscape are unique to that place. These physical elements are the foundation for defining the rural character of that place. When dealing with relatively larger places it may be valuable to examine the place for unique landscapes within it. These unique landscapes are referred to as Character Units.

“Landscape character can be defined as the recognizable pattern of elements that occurs in a particular landscape. Variations in geology and soils, landform, land use and vegetation, field boundaries, settlement patterns and building styles, give rise to different landscapes each with its own distinctive character and unique sense of place. Description, classification and delineation of visual landscape elements are initial steps in developing visual resource management plans. Landscape elements identified as key factors in visual landscape analysis include land cover/land use and landform.”

Analysis of Landscape Character for Visual Resource Management
Anderson, Paul F.
US Forest Service, 1979

Applying the concept of visual resource management as it relates to rural character guides land planning, management, and design decisions in a manner that preserves the uniqueness of that place that drives social and cultural connections to it.

The second exercise of the public workshop asked the group to work in small table groups to discuss the Rural Character Units Map of the DAP. The Rural Character Units Map is the result of a series of analyses. The analyses that contributed most to the Rural Character Units Map was the existing land use and cover, parcel density and land form or topographic relief. The resulting map suggest four rural character areas including: mixed land cover rural residential, natural land cover rural residential, farm country (agricultural) and lake country rural residential. The first part of the exercise asked the attendees to examine, edit and confirm the map as a group at their tables. The results of the comments were wide ranging. Some of the comments agreed with the Rural Character Unit Map and some complete did not identify with the four different areas of character in the group. Most of the groups generally agreed and edited the map to include landmarks, missing roads and adjustments to the rural character areas. After the table groups reviewed the maps they then discussed three questions as related to that same map. The first question asked “Does the DAP have several different areas with a unique rural character in each (rural character units)?” Although only a few people physically recorded their answers on the handouts the few respondents felt that the DAP does have different areas of character with the exception of the comment that the character areas maybe over generalized. The second question asked ”Are the rural char-
total of 67 square miles. The elements of landscape character vary widely within the area ranging from natural - woodlands, lakes, and wetlands - to social/cultural - farmsteads and fields, single homes, subdivisions, and small hamlets. More importantly, these elements are not distributed uniformly throughout the DAP.

Land cover varies significantly throughout the DAP with relatively large tracts of woodlands and wetlands concentrated to the northeast, mixed land cover in the northwest, lakes and wetlands in the west central portion, and larger scale agriculture in the central and southern portions (figure 4).

Land use as represented by parcel data, figure x, parallels the land cover pattern. Parcel sizes are generally smaller in the northern and eastern portions of the DAP. The result is a sense of a finer grained pattern of existing development that could accommodate natural features - woods and wetlands - consolidated as larger tracts of land cover over

acter units accurately portrayed on the map (name, location, shape)? Again only a few people physically answered this question however the few that answered felt that the Rural Character Unit may not have been portrayed accurately. The responses may imply that the Rural Character areas were over generalized or people had a hard time understanding the map. The third question asked “What are the most important aspects of each Rural Character Unit? (for example: views, historic sites, recreation, natural areas, agriculture, development pattern, etc.).” A few people replied that agriculture is the most important aspect in the DAP and one person highlighted historic Crow River Cemetery of significance. In summary of the second exercise, the Rural Character Units Map of the DAP had mixed results but successfully served to build conversation. It seems as though most people agreed that the DAP had more than one type of rural character. After exercise two CRD proceeded to present the rural character elements slideshow. The slideshow discuss most of the design and planning “tools” that helped form rural character. Exercise three then asked the participants to discuss and answer a questionnaire as a group in regard to the Rural Character Units Map and the slideshow on rural character elements.
several parcels. On the other hand, the generally larger parcel sizes in the central and southern portions of the DAP better accommodate the needs of agriculture.

Although absolute elevation varies approximately 300 feet throughout the DAP landform as a visual component of landscape experience, figure 5, is relatively uniform across the region. As a whole, the DAP has a somewhat rolling topography that adds significantly to its visual appeal but with little variability to distinguish one portion from another. As a result, land form was deemed a less significant variable to defining character units in the DAP.

The primary variables to distinguish discreet character units within the DAP where identified as land cover and land use. Based on a process of overlaying the patterns of both variables an overall pattern of unique character emerged as indicated in figure 6.

The third exercise consisted of a questionnaire that asked the participants to discuss and provide feedback on the concepts of the DAP’s rural character units map and the rural character principles. The intent of this exercise was to gain an understanding of the applicability of the rural principles in the DAP, if different guidance is needed in different rural character units of the DAP, applicable land uses in the DAP and the usefulness of design guidelines in the DAP.
The Landscape Character Types are:

- **Mixed Land Cover Rural Residential** - these regions contain a diverse mix of land cover on relatively smaller parcels indicating a higher level of residential development.

- **Natural Land Cover Rural Residential** - the land cover types this region are predominantly natural in character (woodlands and wetlands) on relatively smaller parcels indicating a higher level of residential development.

- **Farm Country (Agricultural)** - the land cover in this region is predominantly agriculture on somewhat larger parcels.

- **Lake Country Rural Residential** - this region is distinguished by the presence of several significant lakes along with a somewhat high level of residential development.

Larger versions of the maps on these pages are included in the appendix of this report.

The first question of exercise 3, question a., asked the participants which rural character principles are already evident and which principles need more attention in the DAP area. Although a small number of participants recorded their thoughts all of the input gathered at the public workshop is important. In general most of the responses answered that the arrangement of land (land use) and the view from the road rural character principles are most evident in the DAP today. Some of the respondents responded that all of the principles are evident in the DAP today. In summary of exercise three question a most people seem to feel that the broad arrangement of land uses and the view from the road are the most apparent rural character principles in the DAP today.
The second question of exercise 3, question b., asked the participants which of the four broad rural principles retains rural or natural character the best and the least. Of the responses the “arrangement of the land uses” rural character principle has the most votes for the best principle that retain rural or natural character. Site landscape character ranked second as the best principle to retain rural or natural character. Of the responses for the rural character principle to least retain rural or natural character “site architectural character” ranked highest. “Site landscape character” and the “view from the road” was less significantly ranked as the least to retain rural or natural character. In summary of exercise three, question two land use and site landscape character retains rural or natural character significantly. And, site architectural character least retains rural or natural character.

The third question of exercise 3, question c., asked the participants if the four broad rural character principles apply differently to the rural character units of the DAP and if a different set of the guidelines should be developed for each? Of the fourteen responses, eight responses were positive, three were not supportive and three responses were related comments. In summary of exercise three question three some of the participants documented support for a different set of guidelines for each rural character unit in the DAP.

The fourth question of exercise 3, question d, asked the participants about the appropriate development types/patterns in the DAP in general and in each unit in particular? Of the responses submitted hobby farms and hamlets were the highest ranked development types/patterns in the DAP. Conservation and low impact development also had a significant ranking. Large lot/low density development ranked least significant. In summary of exercise three, question four, the participants who documented their responses perceive hobby farms and hamlets as the most appropriate development types/patterns in the DAP. Of secondary significance is conservation and low impact development.

The fifth question of exercise 3, question e., asked the participants how could planning and design guidelines be useful in directing future development in the DAP? The comments are very wider ranging from responding to the question to commenting generally. It seems a few responses think that design guidelines could enhance the look of the community, help the land owners control their land, and help to preserve the natural characteristics in the DAP. Other comments focused on the appropriate residential density of the DAP. While other comments focused on factoring in flexibility to the design guidelines if developed. In summary of exercise three question five, design guidelines could improve the rural experience by allowing for the enhancement of the look of the community, providing suggestions for land owner control, and allowing for preservation of natural characteristics. Allowance for flexible guidelines and study into appropriate residential density should be considered.
Next Steps

As identified in the introduction of this report the core task identified for this effort was to begin the process of educating and engaging with local citizens to explore the rural character, determine its value to residents, and identify approaches to preserving appropriate characteristics of the Detailed Planning Area (DAP). The outcome satisfied the needs of the effort. However, it must be emphasized that this effort represents only the beginning of the process leading to a cohesive and comprehensive approach to preserving the rural character of the DAP while encouraging necessary development to occur.

In order to reach a point where land planning, management, and design can be applied as useful tools to direct development in the DAP several additional steps, all involving citizen participation, are required.

- The process for public engagement outlined in this report must be refined. While the process was successful at achieving its core tasks, based on participant input it is clear that the process could be improved. The process of asking value-based questions is critical to guide decision making and the nature of the questions is critical to acquiring meaningful answers. The balance between educating citizens and asking for their input is also an important consideration in the participation process.

- In a similar vein, it must be recognized that the citizen engagement process has only just begun. Developing a reasonable consensus on the definition of rural character and the citizen values it embodies in the DAP would require a series of meetings designed to reach out to a wide cross section of residents, representatives from affected jurisdictions, and the development sector. During the process of public engagement a true definition will begin to emerge and evolve into a final reflection of community values related to rural character and a list of key features that need to be preserved.

- The finalized definition of rural character for the DAP, along with the list of its key features, needs to be formalized into a set of development guidelines that provide direction on decisions related to land planning, management, and design.

- The set of development guidelines would provide the basis in the 2040 planning process to develop a set of alternative development scenarios that meet the goals of the guidelines while exploring options and providing flexibility to meet changing future conditions.

- The alternative scenarios would be refined with citizen guidance into a master plan for development in the DAP in the 2040 planning process that would guide the pattern and character of development to protect citizen values through eventual build-out.
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Exercise 1. Short Image Preference Survey: “I know what rural is when I see it.” What does rural mean to you? Is the DAP rural?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image #</th>
<th>Ave. Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. | 4.425 | 5, 5, 5, 4, 5, 5, 5, 4, 3, 5, 5, 1, 5, 5, 4, 5, 3, 4.5  
• (5) Large farms but close possibility to other farms.  
• (5) Fully agricultural  
• (5) Looks like home  
• (5) wide open areas w/houses scattered around |
| 2. | 1.65 | 2, 1, 2, 1, 1, 2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 5, 1, 2, 2, 3  
• (2) Pretty developed  
• (2) Some open space remains  
• (1) Looks like people from urban areas expanding to rural  
• (2) Suburban |
| 3. | 2.675 | 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 2, 1, 4, 3, 1, 3, 3, 5, 2.5  
• (3) Looks like a lot of deforestation  
• (1) Very planned, quite close  
• (1) Looks like a foreclosure in process  
• (2) looks like 2.5 acres - ok |
| 4. | 3.95 | 4, 5, 2, 4, 5, 5, 5, 5, 3, 5, 2, 5, 4, 4, 4, 2, 5, 4  
• (2) Probably the most rural  
• (4) Lots of open space  
• (5) Would love to keep our land wide open to farming and not get taxed out until we’re old and ready to leave. |
| 5. | 2.125 | 1, 3, 2, 2, 2, 3, 1, 2, 2, 3, 1, 3, 2, 2, 1, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3.5  
• (2) The trees seem to give this a little more rural character  
• (1) very neighborhood – like  
• (1) City people are harming my quality of living |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>2.625</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 2, 2, 4, 2, 3, 3, 2, 4, 1, 5, 3, 3, 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• (3) Developed with open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• (3) Good open space between lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1, 3, 3, 2, 2, 4, 2, 4, 2, 2, 1, 3, 3, 4, 4, 4, 3, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• (3) Developed on top of photo, large lot below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1, 2, 2, 2, 1, 2, 1, 3, 1, 3, 2, 1, 2, 2, 2, 2, 5, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• (2) Lot development - frown on the cul-de-sacs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• (1) I have no idea what this is supposed to be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5, 4, 4, 3, 3, 4, 3, 4, 4, 4, 2, 5, 4, 3, 5, 4, 5, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• (4) Seems to be quite rural/farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• (2) Looks like the beginning of a suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1, 1, 2, 1, 1, 2, 1, 3, 1, 4, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 3, 2, 2, 1, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• (2) Developed area with woods and what seems to be wetlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• (3) Focus on natural areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• (1) Looks like someone or developer paid someone off to build that close to a wetland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>2.825</td>
<td>3, 4, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 3, 4, 3, 2, 2, 5, 3, 3, 2, 3, 1, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• (3) Populated abutting rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• (2) City lots parked in field very linear – too close.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• (2.5) My stomach turns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exercise 2. Introduction to Rural Character Units and Group Validation. Building off of Exercise 1, examine the unique character of units within the DAP. What is rural in each Rural Character Unit?

![Map of Rural Character Units](image)

a) Does the DAP have several different areas with a unique rural character in each (rural character units)?
   • Maybe
   • Yes - churches, golf courses, hunting preserve, parks, maple forests, naturalist
   • Yes
   • Yes
   • Yes
   • There are many more roads and housed areas.
   • They are labeled with different colors but it seems to be over generalized.

b) Are the rural character units accurately portrayed on the map (name, location, shape)?
   • No - too much of a “broad brush” approach. Many areas are farmed but not being portrayed as farms.
   • Somewhat
   • Dispute = northern mixed vs. lakes/wetlands
   • Yes, all mixed
   • We are most familiar with the natural land cover rural residential and it seems accurate
   • No
   • no

c) What are the most important aspects of each Rural Character Unit? (for example: views, historic sites, recreation, natural areas, agriculture, development pattern, etc.).
   • Agriculture preserve, development on 2.5 acres, keep parcels clean, cut grass, trees, view
   • Pretty accurate - Crow River Cemetery is 150 years old, very historic
   • Agriculture
   • Our area has mostly 2.5 acre lots and homes
   • The owners of the land. The Owner of a piece should be able to say what they can do with that land.
Exercise 3 – Questions and Group Discussion

a) Of the four broad principles (Arrangement of Land Uses; View from the Road; Site Landscape Character; Site Architectural Character), which principles are already evident in the DAP area? Which principles need more attention in the study area?

- Arrangement of Land and View from the Road needs more attention. Arrangement of land is evident in the Territory Development.
- View from the Road not important. Preserving agricultural lands in area.
- All
- Land use is somewhat in place as per Comp Plan.
- All. Arrangement of Land Uses.
- Arrangement of Land Uses and View From the Road are evident in DAP area. Every parcel of land has its own unique characteristics and have to be looked at differently.
- Seems like the idea is to look like a farm - but not really be a farm.
- Too many homes are dropped in the middle of lots. Clearly animal clinic did a great job on berming on 185th St.
- To some degree all are being used, and in some cases none at all. Give landowners more say in the action that will effect their land.
- Arrangement of land use.
- Land use is in place to the extent that the comp plan/zoning dictates. No other principles evident.
- All. Site Landscape.
- All principles.
- I do not live in the DAP and do not know which principles apply best.

b) Of the four broad principles (Arrangement of Land Uses; View from the Road; Site Landscape Character; Site Architectural Character), which do you feel retains rural or natural character the best? The least?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best</th>
<th>Least</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrangement of Land Uses</td>
<td>View From the Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangement of Land Uses</td>
<td>Site Landscape Character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangement of Land Uses</td>
<td>Site Architectural Character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Landscape Character</td>
<td>Site Architectural Character (pretty hard to tell someone what style of home to build)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have to do what it takes to sell.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangement of Land Uses</td>
<td>Site Architectural Character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the land correctly make most sense, but then your back to the Territory –big houses, small lots and lots of open space.</td>
<td>Site Architectural Character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None. Rural Character is fundamentally linked with the amount of people living in the area and furthermore the landowner should have choice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangement of land use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that land use and views play an unimportant part in the “look” of the parcel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best - view from road</td>
<td>Least – site architecture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods, wetland – Ag. land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All do but I feel the best is “Site Landscape Character” the least is the view from the road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c) Do the four broad principles apply differently to the Rural Character Units? If so, should a
different set of guidelines be developed for each Character Unit that addresses its unique
characteristics and features?
• Probably - yes, I think each area needs to be viewed (addressed) for their characteristic
  strengths.
• New guidelines be developed.
• Yes.
• Yes- more preservation of woodlands and wetlands, less concern with architectural character.
• Lot of the old farmsteads are obsolete and can not be kept up.
• Rural character fine in some instances, but not all development should be rural themed.
• I don’t know the land out of my own area, 40 years and I don’t even know the names of the
  roads around me.
• The model that is posited here seems incompatible with the current land make up. It is far too
general and give no say to the individual land owner.
• Yes.
• No.
• Yes, I believe each parcel should be treated and addressed appropriately for its “space”.
  Many are very unique and cannot fall under “guidelines” created for the whole.
• Site landscape character would have a higher priority in Lake /wetland and natural areas.
  View from the road may be more important in the flatter, more open ag. areas.
• Yes, yes.
• No.

d) What are appropriate development types/patterns in the DAP in general and in each unit in
particular?
For example:
  a. Large Lot/Low Density
     1,
  b. Hobby Farm
     1, 1
  c. Conservation Subdivision (preserved open space/small lot)
     1, 1,
  d. Low Impact Development (preserving hydrologic regime)
     1,
  e. Hamlet (unincorporated small village)
     1,

• I like a character subdivision but it is not always possible - it comes down to development
economics and feasibility to be able for the developer to financially do the infrastructure. The
County, Township and developer have to have more give and take than in the past.
• “e” - Hard to establish hamlets - they need their own uniqueness. “c” - sewer implications. Also
concern with open space becoming weeds and thistles.
• I don’t like hamlets - each development will have it’s own merits.
• Hobby farms w/be great, but people don’t realize how much maintenance it takes to keep
even 1 acre looking nice, let alone 10 or more – if animal are added, much more maintenance.
  Not an option, cost wise , on this land anymore.
• Low Impact Development (preserving hydrologic regime)
• Large Lot/Low Density, Hobby Farm, Hamlet
• Hobby Farm – Farm Country, preserving open space for future development should not apply
to the DAP. Low Impact Development is always a good thing. Hamlets in existing areas only.
• Conservation subdivisions, hamlets
• Large Lot / low density – Natural Land Country, Hobby Farm – Farm Country, Low Impact Development – Lake Country, Hamlet – Farm Country
• All of the above.

e) How could planning and design guidelines be useful in directing future development in the DAP?
• Would help preserve some natural characteristics of certain areas and allow for better traffic patterns and improve livability for the County.
• They could be, but we need to make the best of each development on its own merits.
• Try to incorporate development around rural features like in some of the slides (around trees, etc.). If 40 acres is developed on tillable farmland it’s pretty hard to achieve much character without significant grading.
• I think the 2.5 acre densities are too small for this DAP area. When you have that many houses they should be in cities.
• Work more with the developer and have fewer restrictions on developments.
• Developments with 2.5 acres can look beautiful (Grey Fox) – probably nicer than open space design (Territory) – If the market hadn’t crashed, Territory would have been a wonderful place, and I know open-space design was pushed, but those are really big houses on really small lots.
• It could help the land owner regain the control over their land (and how it is used) that was taken away in the 90’s.
• Overall look of community.
• Very carefully.
On a scale of 1 to 10, how would you rate the overall experience of this workshop? (please circle)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Total Responses: 10  Average Score: 6.2

On a scale of 1 to 10, how informative or educational was this workshop? (please circle)

Total Responses: 10  Average Score: 6.7

On a scale of 1 to 10, how would you rate the overall presentation of this workshop? (please circle)

Total Responses: 9  Average Score: 5.7

Please offer any comments, suggestions, or opinions you have on how this workshop could have been improved in the space provided below (use back page if necessary).

- Less lecture – more interaction with audience
- Presenter was imprecise – lots of incomplete thoughts and sentences. Felt like I was at a college lecture
- I’m glad things weren’t read to us. Presentation was a little flat. Nice to stay on time.
- Better flow – got a little long
- The explanation of what we were supposed to do with the large map was confusing. You try to cover too much material and speed through it without taking time for discussion. Seems to be too rushed
- It seems to be the same old thing
- Focus more on the issues which are facing land owners like us. Taxes, eminent domain, the ability to use our land in a fashion which we are used to without interference from others

Please offer any comments, suggestions, or opinions you have regarding Rural Design in the space provided below (use back page if necessary).

- Interesting slide presentation
- Slides that show pre-development and then post-development were the most informative and effective to help me understand the concept
- Every development will or should be different
- The longer the presentation went on the more I realized that there already is an agenda in place which will cause me to have to give up my way of living...farming. It seems there is nothing I can do to continue the culture and history of farming as my family has for 100 years. The wishes of governing agencies to turn land into houses has no way to be stopped, especially given eminent domain.
DAP Citizen Advisory Teams

Check your topic(s) of interest for which you are willing to participate on a team:

- Rural Design Guidelines Study
- Groundwater & Stormwater Impact Study
- Trail Planning Study
- Transportation (Road) Planning Study

Barbara Johnson – Transportation
(952) 447-2277

Al Aspengren – Groundwater; Trail
19025 Towering Oaks Dr  (952) 435-8644

Bill Feldman – Rural Design; Trail
20265 Vernon Ave  (952) 447-6387  bfeldman1@msn.com

Mick Borka – Groundwater
17586 Vergus Ave  (952) 440-6934  mborka@integraonline.com

Bob Grundman – Rural Design
20091 Erickson Path, Farmington  (651) 463-8667  bbkon@charter.net

Willard and Gwen Brandt – Rural Design; Groundwater
3410 E 200th St, Prior Lake  (952) 492-6920

Kevin Johns – Rural Design
2150 189th St E  (952) 825-9952  kevinjohns@hotmail.com

William Busacker – Rural Design; Groundwater; Trail; Transportation
PO Box 142, Jordan  (952) 292-5735  wjebusacker@hotmail.com
Scott County Defining the Rural Character for the Detailed Planning Area (DAP)

Focus on Community Issues
- **Integrating change** at the urban/rural edge while preserving rural character and community values
- **Empowering rural communities** to actively participate in the decision-making process affecting land-use and community well-being
- **Making room** for new agricultural production and processing technologies (like renewable energy) ensuring the environmental and economic health of the region
- **Filling an educational gap** by providing support and information on rural land issues defining regional character based on ecological systems and relationships between large and small towns

The Project:
Scott County Defining the Rural Character for the Detailed Planning Area (DAP)

to identify an approach to rural residential development that:
• preserves rural character,
• conserves open space,
• protects the environment
through a process that actively educates and engages with the citizens of the County.

Rural? What is it?
Definitions of rural on the Web:

1. **living in or characterized of farming or country life; “rural people”, “large rural households”, “unpaved rural roads”; “an economy that is basically rural”**
   [source](http://example.com/rural)

2. **Rural areas are sparsely settled places away from the influence of large cities and towns. Such areas are distinct from more intensively settled urban and suburban areas, and also from unsettled lands such as outback or wilderness. People live in villages, on farms and in other isolated houses.**
   [source](http://example.com/rural)

3. **A term to describe something which is not of an urban center.**
   [source](http://example.com/rural)

---

Figure 2. Public Workshop Power Point
**Short Image Preference Survey:**

“I know what rural is when I see it.”

“The Visual Preference Survey (VPS) is a research and visioning technique consisting of photographic images, evaluation forms, optional questionnaires, and visualization/analysis techniques to understand and present the results.”

The purpose of the VPS is to articulate the residents’ impression of the present community image and to build consensus for its future character.”

---

*Scott County: Defining the Rural Character for the Detailed Planning Area*
Local Rural Character Units — What is Rural in each Rural Character Unit?

Why is Landscape Character Important?
Description, classification and delineation of visual landscape character are initial steps in developing visual resources management plans. Landscape characteristics identified as key factors in visual landscape analysis include land cover, land use and landform.

Analysis of Landscape Character for Visual Resource Management
Anderson, Paul F.
US Forest Service, 1979

1. Does the DAP have several different areas with a unique rural character in each rural character unit?

2. Are the rural character units essentially portrayed on the map (name, location, shape)?

3. What are the most important aspects of each Rural Character Unit (for example: views, historic sites, recreation, natural areas, agriculture, development pattern, etc.)

Rural Character Units in the DAP
Questions
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Approaches to Rural Planning

- Broader Arrangement of Land Uses in the Rural Landscape
- View from the Road
- Site Landscape Character
- Site Architectural Character

Broader Arrangement of Land Uses in the Rural Landscape:

Clustered Development within surrounding open space

- Agriculture
- Habitat management
- Natural restoration
- Natural resource management
- Protecting water quality
- Permanent open space vs. ‘holding areas’

‘Conventional’ Development

‘Village’ Cluster Development Prototype

‘Farmstead’ Cluster Development Prototype
Open Space Preservation Priorities — will vary based on community regional landscape characteristics, and site specific details

- Large lot roadside development in open fields
- Large lot waterfront development
- Roadside commercial development
- Extensive and oversized infrastructure
- Water quantity impacts

- Roadside development tucked along woods
- Clustered development back from waterfront
- Screened commercial development
- Minimal quantity and size of infrastructure
- Water quantity protection

Broader Arrangement of Land Uses in the Rural Landscape: Hopscotch v. cohesive patterns of open space

- Larger scattered lots arranged on individual cul-de-sacs
- Strips of houses on sides of roads
- Fragmented development edge
- Dispersed lot arrangement

Preserving the connected pattern of open space through careful planning and design

Scott County: Defining the Rural Character for the Detailed Planning Area
Creative Development Approach

- Compact network of streets or local roads
- Compact lot arrangement
- Well-defined development edge
- Cohesive farm fields remain
- Accessible open spaces and public areas

Connective pattern of open space threatened by development

Open space linkages through and around development create cohesive patterns

Broader Arrangement of Land Uses in the Rural Landscape:

Hamlets (public gathering space) providing other types of land use vs. individual development (private gathering space)

Village Cluster Development Prototype
**Uplands in new development or**
- Screening existing unimproved hamlets.
  - 20 - 50 units laid out similar to a traditional rural town.
  - net density 4 - 6 bh/ac - gross density as permitted
  - open space minimum 50% including internal "commons"
  - predominantly single-family residential
  - could include minimal commercial
  - modest setbacks
  - varying lot shapes and site
  - garages in rear

**View from the Road**

- Screening new development along roadways
  - existing or new vegetation
  - existing landform or new berms
- Single access points into development vs. "keyboard" plats
- Deeper setbacks for homes/lots accessed from township roads
- Parallel trails/shared bike lanes
- Urban section (curb & gutter) vs. rural cross section (ditches)
- Roads along natural area corridors
- Local street widths and design (linear vs. curve)
- Ridge top and hilltop homes and outbuilding development

**View from the Road:**
Screening new development along roadways (vegetation, landform)

- Large isolated lot
- Homes and outbuildings visible from road side
- Fragmented farmland and wildlife habitat
**View from the Road:**
Screening new development along roadways (vegetation, landform)
- Covesve farm fields
- Home and outbuildings set back from road
- Development located at edge of farmland
- Driveway located along fence row
- Home screened with existing vegetation or new landscaping

**View from the Road:**
Single access points into development vs. “keyboard” plats
- Roadside lots with all homes visible from roadside
- Multiple driveways, each serving a separate house
- Long stretch of road interrupted by driveways

**View from the Road:**
Deeper setbacks for homes/ lots accessed from township roads
- Also reduces stormwater runoff to storm drains

**View from the Road:**
Typical Proposal
- Residences clustered in the form of a typical Roxbury farmstead
- Shared driveway or cul-de-sac road (tree-lined)
- Development set back from road
- Residential screened with new "farmstead" vegetation
- Whorlwise farm fields
- Reduced perimeter of developed area adjacent to farmland

**View from the Road:**
Existing Condition
**View from the Road:**
Multi-modal (bicycle) transportation and recreation
Parallel trails/shared bike lanes

- Common issues in suburban landscape — not so common in rural areas
- Important planning issue
  - Active living
  - Alternative transportation
  - Recreation
  - Perceived quality of life
- Important design issue
  - Aesthetic fit in rural setting
  - Perceived and real safety issues

**View from the Road:**
Parallel trails/shared bike lanes

- Dedicated bike lane on shoulder blends in visually with the rural landscape without adding significant infrastructure costs
- Provides local opportunities for alternative modes of transportation and active living, however, may not be perceived as recreational opportunity
- Perceived and real safety issues related to ADT

**View from the Road:**
Parallel bike trail within ROW may appear more ‘suburban’ than ‘rural’ in use/feel.
- Likely adds significant infrastructure costs
- Generally perceived as recreational opportunity while also providing local opportunities for alternative modes of transportation and active living
- Fewer perceived and real safety issues related to ADT

**View from the Road:**
Parallel trails/shared bike lanes

- Greater aesthetic fit and design freedom
- Not usually large enough to meet adult recreational needs
- Need for a cohesive fit into regional system to facilitate true transportation role

**View from the Road:**
Urban section (curb & gutter) v. rural cross section (ditches)

**View from the Road:**
Urban section (curb & gutter) v. rural cross section (ditches)
**View from the Road:**
Urban section (curb & gutter) v. rural cross section (ditches)

*Rural Highway*
More prevalent in areas with development pressure

*Urban Road with curb and gutter near rural town*
More prevalent in areas with development pressure

---

**View from the Road:**
Planning roads along natural area corridors

- Oriented and designed to preserve natural features
- Oriented and designed to preserve views of natural features

*Natural features preserved along ROW*

---

**View from the Road:**
Planning roads along natural area corridors

- Roadsides lost
- Multiple driveways, each serving a separate house
- Development visible from roadside
- Fragmented farmland and wildlife habitat

---

**View from the Road:**
Planning roads along natural area corridors

- Cohesive farm fields
- Homes set back from road
- Development located at edge of farmland and natural feature
- Minimize the amount of developed land adjacent to farmland
- Residences screened with existing vegetation or new landscaping

---

**View from the Road:**
Local street widths and design (linear v. curve)

- Roads follow natural features and topography
- May minimize site grading and prep
- Can be designed to break up sight lines and preserve rural character
- Avoids fragmenting farmland and wildlife habitat

---

*39*
Scott County: Defining the Rural Character for the Detailed Planning Area

**View from the Road:**
Local street widths and design (linear v. curve)

- Grided roads can yield a more compact development footprint
- Can avoid fragmenting farmland and wildlife habitat
- May minimize site grading and prep when properly sited
- Designed to produce the feel of a village or hamlet

**View from the Road:**
Local street widths and design (linear v. curve)

- In general consumes more land for development
- Converts open space, agriculture, and natural systems to development
- Increased infrastructure building and maintenance costs
- Scale of infrastructure exceeds the service needs
- Creates a ‘suburban’ feel of development

**View from the Road:**
Ridge top and hilltop home and outbuilding development

- In general a better approach to minimize development envelope for both individual lots and the development as a whole
- Preserves open space, agriculture, and natural systems
- Decreases infrastructure costs
- Enhances rural ‘neighborhood’, ‘hamlet’, or ‘village’ feel of development
- Actual measurements flexible based on overall density and site conditions

**View from the Road:**
Ridge top and hilltop home and outbuilding development

- Home built on hilltops
- Natural vegetation removed and replaced with minimal vegetation

**View from the Road:**
Ridge top and hilltop home and outbuilding development

- Homes built on hillside, not on hilltop
- Homes set back from road
- Development screened with existing vegetation or new landscaping
- Walls and roofs of structures to blend with hillside
- Driveway shared by residents; access from others
- Driveway minimizes views of development
**Site Landscape Character**

- Smaller arrangement of developed communities and open space
  - Small lots – privately owned, communal open space
  - Large lots – privately owned open space
- Storm water design (LID)
- Developing near shore land areas
- Excessive grading for desired floor plans
- Screening vs. not screening of utilities and neighbor’s houses
**Site Landscape Character: Low Impact Development (LID)**

An approach to land development that uses various land planning and design practices and technologies to simultaneously conserve and protect natural resource systems and reduce infrastructure costs.

LID primarily focuses on storm water management design and conservation.

**Site Landscape Character: Storm water design (LID)**

There are many techniques employed for successful LID. Some are:

- Roof Gardens
- Increasing Impervious Surfaces
- Slowing and cleaning surface water runoff by rainwater gardens, vegetative buffers, wetlands.

**Site Landscape Character: Storm water design (LID)**

This is a grass covered water permeable filter strip, somewhat like a dry well, or an unvegetated rainwater garden.

How can these techniques be utilized to enhance the rural character of the DAP?

**Site Landscape Character: Developing near shore land areas**
**Site Landscape Character:** Developing near shore land areas

Shoreline with erosion control

Shoreline with w/o erosion control

**Site Landscape Character:** Excessive grading for desired floor plans

Alternative grading for building-outs

**Site Landscape Character:** Developing near shore land areas

Shoreline with erosion control

Building that accommodates topography

Lots lines with potential for excessive grading
**Site Landscape Character:** Excessive grading for desired floor plans

Accommodating topography for developments

**Site Landscape Character:** Excessive grading for desired floor plans

Development with potential for excessive grading

**Site Landscape Character:** Screening vs. not screening of utilities and neighbor’s houses

**Site Landscape Character:** Screening vs. not screening of utilities and neighbor’s houses

**Site Landscape Character:** M采暖ed v. more natural looking vegetation (use of natives, etc.)

Natural aesthetic

M采暖ed aesthetic

**Site Landscape Character:** M采暖ed v. more natural looking vegetation (use of natives, etc.)

Natural aesthetic

M采暖ed aesthetic
**Site Architectural Character**

- Principle Buildings (Territory lodge, farmstead, hamlet, ‘theme’ oriented developments, farmhouse, ranch house, Tudor, rustic, prairie, etc.)
- Matching outbuildings to principal buildings (color, scale, size, exterior materials)
- Preservation and reuse of existing farm buildings (barns, silos, coops, etc.)
- Residential fence types (barb wire, picket, wood)

**Site Architectural Character:** Principle Buildings (Territory lodge, farmstead, hamlet, ‘theme’ oriented developments, farmhouse, ranch house, Tudor, rustic, prairie, etc.)

**Site Architectural Character:** Principle Buildings (Territory lodge, farmstead, hamlet, ‘theme’ oriented developments, farmhouse, ranch house, Tudor, rustic, prairie, etc.)

**Site Architectural Character:** Principle Buildings (Territory lodge, farmstead, hamlet, ‘theme’ oriented developments, farmhouse, ranch house, Tudor, rustic, prairie, etc.)

**Site Architectural Character:** Architectural typology (Territory lodge, farmstead, hamlet, and other ‘theme’ oriented developments)
**Site Architectural Character:** Matching outbuildings to principal buildings (color, scale, size, exterior materials)

**Site Architectural Character:** Preservation and reuse of existing farm buildings (barns, silos, corns, etc.)

**Site Architectural Character:** Residential fence types (barb wire, picket, wood)

---
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**Site Architectural Character:** Residential fence types (barb wire, picket, wood)

**Group Discussion and Consensus Questions:**

a. Of the four broad principles (Arrangement of Land Uses; View from the Road; Site Landscape Character; Site Architectural Character), which principles are already evident in the DAP area? Which principles need more attention in the study area?

b. Of the four broad principles (Arrangement of Land Uses; View from the Road; Site Landscape Character; Site Architectural Character), which do you feel retains rural or natural character the best? The least?

c. Do the four broad principles apply differently to the Rural Character Units? If so, should a different set of guidelines be developed for each Character Unit that addresses its unique characteristics and features?

d. What are appropriate development types/patterns in the DAP in general and in each unit in particular? For example:
   a. Large Lot/Low Density
   b. Hobby Farm
   c. Conservation Subdivision (preserved open space/small lot)
   d. Low Impact Development (preserving hydrologic regime)
   e. Hamlet (unincorporated small village)
Group Discussion and Consensus Questions:

e. How could planning and design guidelines be useful in directing future development in the DAP?

Conclusion: Community Engagement

Many studies have indicated that rural residents find the diverse rural landscape, including both natural and cultural features, the key feature that attracted them to live there and documented their strong desire to preserve its character.

Ultimately, it is the community’s own definition of rural character that is the single most important part of its preservation. It is up to each community to decide what its rural character is and subsequently, what should be preserved.

Conclusion: Value of Planning and Design

In order to translate the community’s vision into a reality that can be implemented, good planning and design are essential tools to preserve rural character in the DAP.

Good Planning provides the framework, through policies and objectives related to the spatial relationships of development, that protects citizen values while guiding new development.

Good Design translates citizen values and community vision for the future into a physical reality that preserves the rural character that residents cherish.
Scott County: Defining the Rural Character for the Detailed Planning Area (DAP)

**Phase 1**
Organize and Inventory

1. Tour of DAP
2. In-house Workshop: Identifying Rural Character (October 2nd)
3. Public Workshop Preparation
4. Public Workshop: Identifying Rural Character (T.B.A.)
5. Public Workshop Results Review
6. Draft Report Presentation, Review and Comment
7. Final Report Presentation

**Phase 2**
Rural Character Identification

1. Tour of DAP
2. In-house Workshop: Identifying Rural Character (October 2nd)
3. Public Workshop Preparation
4. Public Workshop: Identifying Rural Character (T.B.A.)
5. Public Workshop Results Review
6. Draft Report Presentation, Review and Comment
7. Final Report Presentation

**Phase 3**
Rural Character Documentation

1. Tour of DAP
2. In-house Workshop: Identifying Rural Character (October 2nd)
3. Public Workshop Preparation
4. Public Workshop: Identifying Rural Character (T.B.A.)
5. Public Workshop Results Review
6. Draft Report Presentation, Review and Comment
7. Final Report Presentation

**Steering Committee: Guidance and Oversight**

**Center of Rural Design: Inventory, Assessment and Documentation**

Project Timeline
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Land Cover as a Component of Local Rural Character

- Agricultural land
- Artificial surfaces with plant cover
- Buildings and/or pavement
- Exposed earth, mines, sand bars, etc.
- Flood plain forest
- Grass, shrub, tree mix
- Grassland
- Lake
- Non-native wet meadow
- Planted or maintained grasses
- Planted woody vegetation
- River
- Upland forest
- Wet forest
- Wet meadow
- Wetland

DEFINING LOCAL RURAL CHARACTER

Land Cover (MLCCS)

SCOTT COUNTY
DETAILED PLANNING AREA (DAP)

LEGEND

- Mixed Land Cover Rural Residential
- Natural Land Cover Rural Residential
- Farm Country (Agricultural)
- Lake Country Rural Residential

DAP Boundary

Highways and Roads
- Interstate
- Major Highway
- Highway
- County & Township Road

Municipal Boundaries

Lake
Land Form as a Component of Local Rural Character:
20' Contour Lines Over 3D Hillshade

LEGEND

DAP Boundary
Municipal Boundaries
Lake
Highways and Roads
Instarate
Major Highway
Highway
County & Township Road
Municipal Boundaries
Lake

SCOTT COUNTY
DETAILED PLANNING AREA (DAP)

DEFINING LOCAL RURAL CHARACTER

Lowland
Midland
Upland

Mixed Land Cover Rural Residential
Natural Land Cover Rural Residential
Farm Country (Agricultural)
Lake Country Rural Residential
Parcels Density as a Component of Local Rural Character: An Approach to Identifying Open Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Size</th>
<th>Parcel Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 10 acres</td>
<td>Low Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 40 acres</td>
<td>Medium Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 80 acres</td>
<td>High Density</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Mixed Land Cover Rural Residential
- Natural Land Cover Rural Residential
- Farm Country (Agricultural)
- Lake Country Rural Residential
- SCOTT COUNTY DETAILED PLANNING AREA (DAP)
- DEFINING LOCAL RURAL CHARACTER
- Elko New Market
- Prior Lake
- 35W
- Mile 0 0.5 1 2
- N
- Municipal Boundaries
- Lake Country Rural Residential
- Highways and Roads
  - Interstate
  - Major Highway
  - Highway
  - County & Township Road
- DAP Boundary
Landscape character is the recognizable pattern of features that occurs in a particular landscape. Variations in geology and soils, landform, land use and vegetation, field boundaries, settlement patterns and building styles, give rise to different landscapes each with its own distinctive character and unique sense of place.