



GOVERNING & MANAGING INFORMATION

Zoning Guide for Cities

600A1A
January 2012

145 UNIVERSITY AVE. WEST
ST. PAUL, MN 55103-2044

PHONE: (651) 281-1200
TOLL FREE: (800) 925-1122
FAX: (651) 281-1299
WEB: WWW.LMC.ORG

The League of Minnesota Cities provides this publication as a general informational memo. It is not intended to provide legal advice and should not be used as a substitute for competent legal guidance. Readers should consult with an attorney for advice concerning specific situations.

© 2012 League of Minnesota Cities
All rights reserved

Table of Contents

I. Introduction.....	4
A. The purpose of zoning.....	4
B. Legal authority to zone	5
C. Role of comprehensive planning in zoning ordinance adoption.....	5
II. Drafting a zoning ordinance.....	7
A. Typical zoning ordinance provisions and concepts	7
B. Drafting a readable zoning ordinance	11
C. Drafting a legally defensible zoning ordinance	12
D. Obtaining technical assistance in ordinance drafting.....	18
III. Common issues in ordinance drafting.....	18
A. Establishing permitted and conditional uses	19
B. Aesthetic zoning requirements.....	19
C. Performance standards	20
D. Zoning to protect natural resources or preserve open spaces and green space	20
E. Parking requirements	20
F. Historic Preservation.....	21
G. Zoning regulation of adult uses.....	21
H. Restricting Feedlots	22
I. Extra-territorial zoning and joint planning.....	22
J. Zoning ordinances that limit competition or protect local business from being displaced by new business.....	23
IV. Zoning ordinance adoption and/or amendment.....	24
A. Public hearings and adoption	24
V. Zoning ordinance administration.....	25
A. The 60-Day Rule.....	25
B. Organizational structure for review of zoning applications	28
C. Standards for reviewing zoning applications: limits on city discretion	31
D. Environmental review	43
E. Fees and escrow	43
F. Updating and maintaining the city’s zoning ordinance.....	44
VI. Zoning ordinance enforcement.....	47
A. Legal nonconformities predating the adoption of the zoning ordinance.....	48
B. Violations of the zoning ordinance: criminal penalties.....	51
C. Violations of the zoning ordinance: civil remedies.....	51
D. Violations of the zoning ordinance: conditional use permit revocation.....	52
VII. Conclusion: other land use controls available to cities	52

A. Subdivision ordinances 52
B. The official map 54
C. Safety and maintenance codes 54
D. City land acquisition 56

I. Introduction

This memo discusses the framework of municipal zoning. It provides guidance on zoning ordinance drafting, adoption, administration and enforcement. Finally, this memo introduces, in brief, other land use controls available to cities that may complement or be used separately from zoning controls.

A. The purpose of zoning

Zoning allows a city to control the development of land within the community – both the type of structures that are built and the uses to which the land is put. Most building in a community is done by private individuals and businesses seeking to develop property for their own private use – whether this is residential, commercial or industrial. Zoning is one important tool for guiding this private development, so that land is used in a way that promotes both the best use of the land and the prosperity, health and welfare of the city’s residents. Local zoning control over other governmental entities acting or owning property within a city, such as the State of Minnesota and local school districts may be more limited depending on the circumstances.

Zoning is normally accomplished by dividing the land in the city into different districts or zones and regulating the uses of land within each district. Generally, specific districts are set aside for residential, types of commercial and various industrial uses. The city can also use zoning to further agricultural and open space objectives.

By creating zoning districts that separate uses, the city assures that adequate space is provided for each use and that a transition area or buffer exists between distinct and incompatible uses. Adequate separation of uses prevents congestion, minimizes fire and other health and safety hazards, and keeps residential areas free of potential commercial and industrial nuisances such as smoke, noise and light.

Zoning regulations may also constrain the types and location of structures. The regulations must be the same within each district, but may vary from district to district. These regulations often control:

- Building location, height, width, bulk
- Type of building foundation
- Number of stories, size of buildings and other structures
- The percentage of lot space which may be occupied
- The size of yards and other open spaces
- The density and distribution of population
- Soil, water supply conservation

[Minn. Stat. § 462.351](#)

[Town of Oronoco v. City of Rochester](#), 293 Minn. 468, 197 N.W.2d 426 (Minn. 1972).

[Minn. Stat. § 462.357, subd. 1](#)

[Sample Zoning District Section](#)

[Minn. Stat. § 462.357, subd. 1](#)

- Conservation of shore lands
- Access to direct sunlight for solar energy systems
- Flood control

B. Legal authority to zone

Village of Euclid, Ohio v. Ambler Realty Co., 272 U.S. 365, 47 S. Ct. 114 U.S., 1926

Nordmarken v. City of Richfield, 641 N.W.2d 343 (Minn. Ct. App.2002).

Minn. Stat. § 462.352, subd. 2

Minn. Stat. § 462.351

Statutory and Home Rule Charter Cities are granted the authority to adopt a zoning ordinance by the Minnesota and US Supreme Court cases and by the Municipal Planning Act found in Minnesota Statutes. The Municipal Planning Act establishes a uniform and comprehensive procedure for adopting or amending and implementing a zoning ordinance.

Minn. Stat. § 473.851

Cities in the metropolitan area are governed by the Metropolitan Land Planning Act. The metro area is defined as the cities in the counties of Anoka, Dakota (excluding the city of Northfield), Hennepin (excluding the cities of Hanover and Rockford), Ramsey, Scott (excluding New Prague) and Washington. The Metropolitan Planning Act also imposes certain mandatory zoning and regulatory requirements on metropolitan cities.

Minn. Stat. § 103F; Minn. Stat. §§ 103F-103F.155; Minn. Stat. § 103F.335 Minn. Stat. § 40A.01; Minn. Stat. § 138.71

Cities are also granted additional authority by state statute to impose land use controls on development through the Minnesota Water Laws, the Floodplain Management Laws, the Minnesota Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, the Agricultural Land Preservation laws and the Minnesota Historic District Act to name only a few.

C. Role of comprehensive planning in zoning ordinance adoption

Minn. Stat. § 462.351

All cities have the authority to adopt zoning regulations, though cities may follow different paths to adoption of an ordinance. Some cities may engage in extensive formal planning, including the drafting of a comprehensive plan, prior to ordinance adoption, while others may need to follow a more immediate process.

1. Comprehensive planning

The adoption of a comprehensive plan is a common first step in the development of a zoning ordinance. Minnesota statutes grant all cities authority to adopt a formal comprehensive plan for their community. A comprehensive plan is a lengthy document that formally establishes a blueprint for the city's long-range (usually between five and 15 years) social, economic, and physical development.

In metropolitan area cities, including cities in the counties of Anoka, Dakota (excluding the city of Northfield), Hennepin (excluding the cities of Hanover and Rockford), Ramsey, Scott (excluding the city of New Prague) and Washington, the adoption of a comprehensive plan is mandatory under the Metropolitan Land Planning Act. All other cities have the option of adopting a comprehensive plan, but are not required to do so.

Non-metropolitan cities located in counties or watersheds that contain 80 percent of their presettlement wetlands are subject to the President Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Bill to Preserve Agricultural, Forest, Wildlife, and Open Space Land (hereinafter the "T. Roosevelt Memorial Preservation Act"). These cities are not required to engage in comprehensive planning, but must meet the requirements of the T. Roosevelt Memorial Preservation Act by adopting certain findings of fact when adopting a comprehensive plan.

a. Reasons to adopt a comprehensive plan

While not all cities are required to adopt a comprehensive plan, a plan is still a good practice for a couple of reasons.

First, the comprehensive planning process helps a city develop a plan for creating and maintaining a desirable environment and safe and healthy community. Once a plan is adopted, it guides local officials in making their day to day decisions and becomes a factor in their decision making process.

See LMC
information memo,
*Planning
Commission Guide*

Minn. Stat. § 462.353;
*Roselawn Cemetery v.
City of Roseville*, 689
N.W. 2d 254 (Minn.
Ct. App. 2004).

Minn. Stat. § 462.352,
subd. 5

Minn. Stat. § 462.355,
subd. 1a; Minn. Stat. §
473.121, subd. 2,
Minn. Stat. § 473.864,
subd. 2; *Amcon Corp.
v. City of Eagan*, 348
N.W.2d 66 (Minn.
1984).

Minn. Stat. § 462.357,
subd. 1h;

Minn. Stat. §
462.355, subd. 1,
Minn. Stat. §
103G.005, subd. 10b

See LMC
information memo,
*Planning
Commission Guide*

For more information
on Comprehensive
Planning see *Under
Construction* by MN
Department of
Administration

Concept Properties, LLP v. City of Minnetrista, 694 N.W.2d 804 (Minn. Ct. App. 2005); *Larson v. Washington County*, 387 N.W.2d 902 (Minn. Ct. App. 1986).

Second, preparing a comprehensive plan prior to the adoption of a zoning ordinance also affords the city additional legal protections, if a particular ordinance provision is challenged in court. Zoning ordinances must be reasonable and have a rational basis. Comprehensive plans assist a city in articulating the basis for its zoning decisions. Usually the courts will not question the policies and programs contained in a comprehensive plan adopted by a local community, or the ordinances based upon the plan, unless the particular zoning provision appears to be without any rational basis or clearly exceeds the city regulatory authority.

If a city is not able to develop a comprehensive plan prior to adopting a zoning ordinance, the zoning ordinance should be adopted in conjunction with written finding of facts, stating the policy reasons that necessitate the ordinance's adoption.

b. Relation of the comprehensive plan to zoning

See LMC information memo, *Planning Commission Guide*

Zoning and planning are not the same thing. Municipal planning is a lengthy process of collecting and analyzing economic, social and physical data about a city and organizing this information into a formal set of goals and standards for community development. The comprehensive plan is a document that embodies the city's vision for the future, including its aspirations and plans for future development that may not appear for many years to come.

Mendota Golf, LLP v. City of Mendota Heights, 708 N.W.2d 162 (Minn.2006).

Once a comprehensive plan is adopted, the city needs a means of attaining its development goals as stated in the comprehensive plan. Zoning is one tool for implementing a comprehensive plan. In cities subject to the Metropolitan Planning Act, zoning directives must harmonize with and not contradict the city's comprehensive plan.

See Part VII, *Other land use controls available for cities.*

It is important to emphasize that zoning is merely *one* of the tools available to a city to assist implementing a comprehensive plan. A city may also use its subdivision ordinance, building and housing codes, nuisance ordinance, capital improvement programs and official map in conjunction with its zoning ordinance to achieve its goal of orderly development.

II. Drafting a zoning ordinance

Minn. Stat. § 462.357, subd. 1.

Zoning regulations can *only* be imposed by a local ordinance adopted in accordance with the Municipal Planning Act. A zoning ordinance consists of both text and maps.

A. Typical zoning ordinance provisions and concepts

The zoning ordinance is usually a lengthy document that consists of three major sections, an administrative section, a performance standards section and a zoning district section.

1. The administrative section

Sample Definitions
Section

The administrative section sets forth administrative procedures for implementing the zoning ordinance, including the grant or denial of requests for zoning permits and variances. The administrative section usually contains a fee schedule, an expansive definition section to help interpret and apply the ordinance, a procedure section and a penalty section.

2. The performance standards section

Sample Performance
Standards Section

The performance standard section sets forth regulations that are uniformly applicable to all districts, such as noise, property maintenance, parking, fencing and signage standards.

3. The zoning district section

Sample Zoning
District Section

The zoning district section establishes the different types of districts, for example residential, commercial or industrial/manufacturing, and sets the regulations for each district. Districts may also be designated reflecting desired density in addition to use, such as residential-1 (usually low density single family homes), residential-2 (usually single family homes and twin homes), residential-3 (usually apartment buildings), etc. Modern zoning may also feature “mixed-use” or “hybrid” districts where traditional use categories are mixed, for example a downtown residential/commercial district. The district section is often the lengthiest section of the zoning ordinance, depending on the number of districts established in the city. This section usually also contains the following concepts for each district:

a. Use designations

Sample Permitted and
Conditional Uses

Use Designations are text (usually in a list form) that specify the permitted, conditionally permitted and prohibited uses for a district or zone. There are several types of uses generally found in a zoning ordinance:

- **Permitted Uses:** Uses that are allowed in a district as a matter of right without further need for review or approval of the city
- **Prohibited Uses:** Uses that are not permitted in a district under any circumstances. An explicit listing of prohibited uses is rare. Many ordinances will simply provide that any uses not specifically listed are deemed prohibited.
- **Conditional Uses:** Uses that are permitted, after approval of the city, if conditions listed in the ordinance are met. Some zoning ordinances use the term “special use” instead of conditional use. The Municipal Land Use Planning Act does not recognize special use permits, and the courts would likely apply the same requirements for their issuance as those for conditional uses specified above.

Minn. Stat. §
462.3595

- **Interim Uses:** Uses that are permitted for a limited amount of time (contain a sunset provision), after approval of the city, if conditions listed in the ordinance are met.
- **Accessory Uses:** Uses that are permitted or conditionally permitted to serve a permitted or conditionally permitted use. Generally the accessory use will not be permitted absent the primary use. For example, a tool shed is a standard accessory use in a residential zone.

b. Setbacks, height and density requirements

Sample Setback
Requirement Diagram

- **Setbacks requirements:** Establish the minimum horizontal distance between a structure and the lot line, road, highway or high-water mark (if the property abuts shore land).
- **Height requirements:** Establish maximum and/or minimum height requirements for structures and/or their attachments (such as antennas, cupolas, etc).
- **Density requirements:** Establish the number of structures or units allowed per lot or area.

Sample Height
Requirement Diagram

4. Additional provisions

Some ordinances may contain, depending upon the individual needs of the city, additional provisions, though the quality of a zoning ordinance does not depend upon the quantity or complexity of the provisions it contains (nor the number of districts established).

Cities should strive for a zoning ordinance that meets their goals as simply and efficiently as possible. Above all, a zoning ordinance should be a practical document that is as enforceable as possible.

Depending on the individual needs of the city, a zoning ordinance may also contain provisions for the following:

- **Mixed use or hybrid districts.** Districts that do not neatly meet the traditional district categories of residential, commercial or industrial use, but may contain a blend of uses. For example, a “downtown mixed use district” that features a blend of commercial uses and multifamily residences.
- **Planned Use Development (PUD) or cluster development:** A development of contiguous land area that contains developed clusters intermixed with green space or commercial or public development. Often the cluster development allows greater density than normally permitted in the development, in exchange for some other benefit, such as green space or open space.

- **Overlay districts:** A district that is developed to be imposed over or “overlay” one or more existing zoning districts, which impose additional zoning requirements. Overlay districts may be developed with a specific land area in mind or they may be developed to “float” until they are anchored to a suitable development proposal. In some cities, overlay districts may be structured as conditional uses.

5. Natural resource protection and flood plain provisions

In cities that contain certain natural resources such as lakes and rivers, or are located in a floodplain, the zoning ordinance may also contain the following:

- **Floodplain requirements:** Floodplain management ordinances are required by state law. Flood plain ordinances regulate the use of land in the floodplain in order to preserve the capacity of the floodplain to carry and discharge regional floods and minimize flood hazards.
- **Wild and scenic rivers development requirements:** Wild and Scenic Rivers development ordinances are required by state law for cities that have shore land located within the Minnesota Wild and Scenic Rivers System. These ordinances must comply with state standards set by the Commissioner of Natural Resources.
- **Shoreland development requirements:** For cities that contain shore land, these zoning regulations control the use and development of its shorelands. City shore land regulations must be at least as restrictive as State standards and are subject to the review of the Commissioner of Natural Resources.
- **President Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Bill to Preserve Agricultural, Forest, Wildlife, and Open Space Land.** Non-metropolitan cities subject to the T. Roosevelt Memorial Preservation Act when adopting or amending a zoning ordinance, must *consider* restricting new residential, commercial, and industrial development in a manner consistent with the Act’s goal of preserving land from development sprawl. Cities are not required to adopt zoning practices consistent with the T. Roosevelt Memorial Preservation Act, but must demonstrate (possibly through findings of fact), that their decision process *considered* the Act’s stated goals.

Minn. Stat. § 103F.121; Minn. R. 6120.5000I

See [MN DNR sample floodplain management ordinances](#)

See also [MN DNR](#) for more information and resources on floodplain management

Minn. Stat. § 103F.335

See also [MN DNR](#) website for more information on MN Wild and Scenic Rivers.

Minn. Stat. § 103F.221; Minn. R. 6120.2500 – 3900

See [MN DNR sample shoreland management ordinance](#)

See also [MN DNR](#) website for more information and resources on shoreland management.

Minn. Stat. § 462.355, subd. 1; Minn. Stat. § 103G.005, subd. 10b

B. Drafting a readable zoning ordinance

Zoning ordinances can be lengthy documents, but from the first to last page, emphasis should be placed upon drafting a well organized ordinance that communicates clearly. A good zoning ordinance:

- Makes information easy to find.
- Is easy to administer and amend.
- Uses plain, well-defined language that reduces the potential for erroneous or controversial interpretations.

1. Suggestions for drafting a readable zoning ordinance:

- Use graphics, tables, maps and illustrations wherever possible.
- Use a consistent numbering system or other system of organization.
- Define terms, words, and phrases, preferably in a separate “definitions” section, so that there is minimal need for interpretation of the text.
- Pick terms and use terms consistently. For example do not interchange the word “residence,” with “house,” “dwelling” and “single-family home.” Instead, pick your preferred term, define the term in your definitions section and use the same term throughout the ordinance.
- Avoid legalese such as “aforesaid,” “hereby,” and “herewith.”
- Avoid archaic and/or potentially offensive terms. For example using, “trailer court” instead of “manufactured home park” or “old folks home” instead of “residential living facility.”
- Avoid establishing too many districts and other impractical complexity.
- Be careful about copying neighboring cities’ zoning provisions, especially in a piece-meal manner. A zoning ordinance fitting one community may be a bad fit for another. When only portions of an ordinance are copied and utilized, terms and definitions may not remain consistent.

2. The importance of clear, unambiguous ordinance language

The unfortunate consequence of unclear or ambiguous language in a zoning ordinance is public controversy and loss of efficiency. In some instances, a city may find itself in court simply on the issue of whether the city interpreted its own ambiguous ordinance correctly. In the past the courts have been asked to resolve controversies over such undefined terms in an ordinance as:

Frank's Nursery Sales, Inc. v. City of Roseville, 295 N.W.2d 604 (Minn. 1980).

Lowry v. City of Mankato, 231 Minn. 108, 42 N.W.2d 553 (Minn. 1950).

Village of St. Louis Park v. Casey, 218 Minn. 394, 16 N.W.2d 459 (Minn. 1944).

Frank's Nursery Sales, Inc. v. City of Roseville, 295 N.W.2d 604 (Minn. 1980).

Amcon Corp. v. City of Eagan, 348 N.W.2d 66 (Minn. 1984).

[Sample Definitions Section.](#)

- “lawn and garden center,”
- The words "accessory", "subordinate," "incidental," and "main,"
- “structure”

When a court is called upon to resolve a controversy over an undefined or ambiguous word or phrase in a city ordinance, the court may not always interpret the ordinance in the manner the city would prefer. The court may, but is not required, to give deference to the city’s interpretation of the ordinance.

In interpreting zoning ordinances, the court will attempt to find the plain and ordinary meaning of the terms. The court will interpret any doubtful language against the city and in favor of the landowner.

Only in limited circumstances, where the language is so ambiguous on its face that a plain meaning cannot be understood, will the court consider evidence of the city’s intent in drafting the ordinance.

The best way to avoid the time and expense of a lawsuit over basic terms in a zoning ordinance is clear drafting from the outset. A definition section is essential to any zoning ordinance. Terms and concepts that may be reasonably subject to more than one interpretation should be explicitly defined in this section.

C. Drafting a legally defensible zoning ordinance

In drafting a zoning ordinance, cities must also draft an ordinance that conforms to the requirements of state and federal law. In addition, cities must draft ordinances that are consistent with state and federal court rulings.

1. The Municipal Planning Act

Cities have a wide range of discretion in developing a zoning ordinance. City zoning requirements can range from very complex to minimal. However, all city zoning authority is granted to cities by and subject to the Municipal Planning Act. Ordinances may vary from city to city, but all must comply with both the substantive and procedural requirements contained in the Municipal Planning Act.

Hubbard Broadcasting, Inc. v. City of Afton, 323 N.W.2d 757, (Minn. 1982); *DI MA Corp. v. City of St. Cloud*, 562 N.W.2d 312 (Minn. Ct. App. 1997).

Minn. Stat. §§ 462.351 - 462.365.

Minn. Stat. §§ 473.851 - 473.871.

Nordmarken v. City of Richfield, 641 N.W.2d 343 (Minn. Ct. App. 2002).

It is important to note that the Municipal Planning Act has specific provisions related to local zoning control of:

Minn. Stat. § 462.357, subs. 1a, 1b

- Manufactured home parks

Minn. Stat. § 462.357, subd. 1

- Manufactured homes

Minn. Stat. § 462.357, subd. 1e

- Existing *legal* nonconformities at the time of zoning ordinance adoption

Minn. Stat. § 462.357, subd. 1g

- Feedlots

Minn. Stat. § 462.357, subd. 1

- Earth sheltered construction as defined by MN Stat. 216C.06

Minn. Stat. § 462.357, subd. 1

- Relocated residential buildings

Minn. Stat. § 462.357, subd. 7

- State licensed residential facilities or housing services registered under MN Stat. 144D serving six or fewer persons in single family residential districts

Minn. Stat. § 462.357, subd. 7

- Licensed day care facilities serving 12 or fewer persons in single family residential districts

Minn. Stat. § 462.357, subd. 7

- Group family day care facilities licensed under Minnesota Rules 9502.0315 to 9502.0445 to serve 14 or fewer children in single family residential districts

Minn. Stat. § 462.357, subd. 8

- State licensed residential facilities serving 7-16 persons in multifamily residential districts

Minn. Stat. § 462.357, subd. 7

- Licensed day care facilities serving 13-16 persons in multifamily residential districts

Minn. Stat. § 462.357, subd. 6

- Solar energy systems

Northshor Experience, Inc. v. City of Duluth, MN, 442F.Supp.2d 713 (D. Minn. 2006); *Costley v. Caromin House, Inc.*, 313 N.W.2d 21 (Minn. 1981); A.G. Op. 59-A-32 (Jan. 25, 2002).

Cities cannot adopt local ordinances which contradict the explicit provisions of the Municipal Planning Act.

2. Additional state law requirements

Cities must also draft their zoning ordinances to meet the requirements of state law outside of the Municipal Planning Act. The following is not a comprehensive list of state laws that effect city zoning, but discusses some of the most common limitations of city zoning authority.

a. Flood plains, shoreland and wild and scenic rivers

Some land is subject to special protection under state law because it contains important natural resources, such as lakes and rivers. Cities are generally required to adopt standards for development of these types of land areas that meet established state standards. Generally such ordinances are subject to the review of the State through the Commissioner of Natural Resources.

b. Manufactured homes

No city zoning regulation may prohibit manufactured homes built in conformance with the manufactured home building code and which comply with all other zoning ordinances promulgated pursuant to state law.

Cities *can* apply architectural and aesthetic requirements to manufactured homes, but only if the same architectural and aesthetic requirements also apply to all other single-family homes in the zoning district, not just to manufactured homes.

c. Manufactured home parks

A manufactured home park must be allowed as a conditional use in any zoning district that allows the construction or placement of a building used or intended to be used by two or more families. Standards for granting the conditional use should be explicitly stated in the city ordinance.

See also Section III-D, *Zoning to protect natural resources or preserve open spaces and green space.*

Minn. Stat. §§ 327.31 - 327.35; Minn. Stat. § 462.357, subd.1

For more information on manufactured homes and parks see the LMC information memo, *Manufactured Homes and Zoning: Comprehensive Advice*

Minn. Stat. § 327.32, subd. 5

Minn. Stat. § 462.357, subs. 1a, 1b.

See Section III-A, *Establishing permitted and conditional uses.*

Cities cannot enact, amend, or enforce a zoning ordinance that has the effect of altering the existing density, lot-size requirements, or manufactured home set back requirements in any manufactured home park constructed before January 1, 1995, if the manufactured home park, when constructed, complied with the then existing density, lot-size and setback requirements, if any.

3. Federal law considerations: The Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act

42 U.S.C. § 2000cc.

The Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act (RLUIPA) of 2000 provides that no government entity shall impose or implement a land use regulation in a manner that puts a substantial burden on the religious exercise of a person, religious assembly or religious institution, unless the government can show the burden is in furtherance of a compelling government interest and is the least restrictive means of furthering that interest. This means that if a religious use may be, in some circumstances, exempted from city zoning requirements if the regulation substantially burdens the religious organization or person's exercise of religion.

RLUIPA also provides that no government may impose or implement a land use regulation in a manner that:

- Treats a religious assembly or institution on less than equal terms with a nonreligious assembly or institution. For example, a zoning ordinance that allows community centers and fraternal organization centers in a particular district, but not a religious center (such as a church, mosque or synagogue), whose use would be strikingly similar to the other allowed uses.
- Discriminates against any assembly or institution on the basis of religion or religious denomination.
- Totally excludes religious assemblies from their jurisdiction or unreasonably limits religious assemblies, institutions, or structures within a jurisdiction.

City of Woodinville v. Northshore United Church of Christ, 162 P 3d 639 (Wash. Ct. App. 2007); *McGann v Inc. Vill. Of Old Westbury*, 719 N.Y.S.2d 803 (N.Y. Sup. 2000).

Activities beyond worship services for religious institutions *may* potentially be protected by the RLUIPA, including schools and childcare. However, this is an unsettled area of the current law.

Williams Island Synagogue, Inc. v. City of Aventura, 358 F.Supp.2d 1207 (S.D. Fla. 2005); *Guru Nanak Sikh Society of Yuba City v. County of Sutter*, 326 F.Supp.2d 1140 (E.D. Cal. 2003); *Cottonwood Christian Center v. Cypress Redevelopment Agency*, 218 F.Supp.2d 1203 (C.D. Cal. 2002); *Civil Liberties for Urban Believers v. City of Chicago*, 342 F.3d 752 (C.A.7 (Ill.) 2003).

Village of Euclid, Ohio v. Ambler Realty Co., 272 U.S. 365, 47 S. Ct. 114 (1926); *Kiges v. City of St. Paul*, 240 Minn. 522, 62 N.W.2d 363 (Minn. 1953); *State ex rel. Berndt v. Iten*, 259 Minn. 77, 106 N.W.2d 366 (Minn. 1960).

State, by Rochester Ass'n of Neighborhoods v. City of Rochester 268 N.W.2d 885 (Minn. 1978); *Amcon Corp. v. City of Eagan*, 348 N.W.2d 66 (Minn. 1984).

Since RLUIPA was adopted in 2000, numerous cases have been brought in federal court concerning the law's application to various city zoning requirements. However, federal courts in the 8th Circuit (which includes Minnesota) have not ruled on many RLUIPA cases. If a city has concerns about RLUIPA, the city should consult its attorney for specific guidance.

4. Federal and state constitutional concerns

Zoning regulations limit the ability of landowners to use their property in any manner they wish. While both the state and federal constitutions provide protections to landowners from government seizures of land (takings), the courts have long upheld zoning regulations as a reasonable use of a government's police power to protect the health, safety and welfare of the public. However, there are still some federal and state constitutional restraints on city zoning authority.

The adoption or amendment of a zoning ordinance is considered a legislative decision of the city council. Courts normally give legislative decisions great deference and weight, but the court *will on occasion* set aside or intervene in city zoning decisions if two important constitutional restraints in the federal and state constitution are violated. First, the courts may overrule a city zoning decision, when it determines that a zoning ordinance is unsupported by any rational basis related to promoting public health, safety, morals, or general welfare. Usually, in these cases the court finds that the city's actions were arbitrary and/or capricious. Second, when a zoning ordinance denies the landowner practically all reasonable use of the land, resulting is a "taking" of the land without just compensation; the court may order the city to pay compensation to the affected landowner.

a. Legislative authority must be reasonable

Under the federal and state constitution, zoning authority must be used in a manner that is reasonable and free from arbitrariness or discrimination. A city zoning decision is reasonable (not arbitrary), when it bears a reasonable relationship to the purpose of the zoning ordinance.

Mendota Golf, LLP v. City of Mendota Heights, 708 N.W.2d 162 (Minn. 2006); *State v. Northwestern Preparatory School*, 37 N.W.2d 370 (Minn. 1949); *County of Morrison v. Wheeler*, 722 N.W.2d 329 (Minn. Ct. App. 2006)

See Section VC, *Standards for reviewing zoning applications: limits on city discretion*.

State v. Northwestern Preparatory School, 37 N.W.2d 370 (Minn. 1949)

Zoning ordinances may be found to be unreasonable when they appear arbitrary. When a zoning classification treats similarly situated individuals differently, there must be rational reason for the unequal treatment that bears a relation to the purposes of the ordinance (protection of the health, safety and welfare of the public). If no such reasonable or rational justification can be found, the court may decide that the city has been arbitrary.

State v. Northwestern Preparatory School, 37 N.W.2d 370 (Minn. 1949)

For example, the Minnesota Supreme Court invalidated provisions of one zoning ordinance that allowed public schools, but not private schools, to be located in a residential zone. The court ruled, in that instance, that the ordinance was arbitrary, because “the distinction between the different kinds of schools, upon which the classification made in the ordinance rests, is not based upon alleged evils which it is claimed exist in the case of private schools and do not exist in the case of public or parochial schools.” In the courts view two very similar entities (public and private schools) were being treated differently under the law. This difference was not reasonably related to protecting the health, safety and welfare of the public. As a result, the distinction was ruled to be arbitrary.

b. A zoning designation may not be so restrictive as to deny all reasonable use of the land

Both the U.S. Constitution and the Minnesota Constitution forbid taking private property for public use without just compensation. Zoning regulations may be considered “takings” if a regulation goes too far. This is generally termed a “regulatory taking.”

U. S. Const. Amend. V.

Minn. Const. art. I § 3.

Pennsylvania Coal Co. v. Mahon, 260 U.S. 393, 43 S. Ct. 158 U.S. 1922.

See House Research Memo, *Eminent Domain: Regulatory Takings*.

Wensmann Realty, Inc. v. City of Eagan, 734 N.W.2d 623 (Minn.,2007) *Czech v. City of Blaine*, 253 N.W.2d 272 (Minn. 1977); *Pearce v. Village of Edina*, 118 N.W.2d 659 (Minn. 1962)

Generally, a zoning scheme will constitute a regulatory taking only if it denies landowner all economically viable or beneficial use of property or, stated differently, all reasonable use of property. However, not all diminution of property values will be considered a taking. Zoning often has the side effect of increasing the value of some property while decreasing the value of other property. To be ruled a regulatory taking, the regulation must be so severe as to render the property practically useless for the purpose for which it is zoned. For example, a regulation that would prohibit a residence in a strictly residential zone. In these cases, the court will order the city to pay the affected landowner compensation for the land lost to the regulatory taking.

D. Obtaining technical assistance in ordinance drafting

The Municipal Planning Act grants cities the authority to hire staff, including professional planners and attorneys, to assist in the drafting of a zoning ordinance. Local city officials and staff often have in-depth knowledge regarding the community and its needs, but lack expertise in the many technical and legal aspects of zoning. Professional planners and the city attorney can contribute this needed information to the zoning ordinance adoption process and, while not required, are highly recommended. Because zoning is regulated by numerous diverse state and federal laws and court cases, at a minimum, the assistance of the city attorney is necessary to help the city evaluate whether its ordinance complies with all applicable laws. Assistance may also be obtained by contacting the LMCIT Land Use Services for zoning information and materials.

[LMCIT Land Use Loss Control Brochure](#)

III. Common issues in ordinance drafting

Zoning ordinances can accomplish a great deal of good for a community. Drafting a zoning ordinance seemingly opens up many possibilities for dealing with concerns or even outright problems and challenges faced by a particular community. However, cities must be careful not to exceed their authority in drafting a city zoning ordinance. Below are some common concerns raised by cities in relation to an initial drafting of a zoning ordinance.

A. Establishing permitted and conditional uses

[Sample Permitted and Conditional Uses.](#)

See LMCIT risk management memo [Conditional Use Permits: Frequently Asked Questions.](#)

In drafting a zoning ordinance, cities often struggle to decide what their permitted and conditional uses should be for each zoning district. For each district created by the zoning ordinance, the ordinance typically provides a list of the permitted and conditional uses. Appropriate uses will change from district to district. Uses designated as “permitted” will be automatically allowed with no need for further application or review (related to zoning) by the city. Therefore, the list of permitted uses should only contain uses about which the city has no reservations.

Conditional uses are also a form of authorized permitted use, provided that the applicant can meet the conditions specified in the ordinance. Uses specified as conditional are uses which are generally favorable and desired, but may also pose potential hazards that need to be mitigated (for example a gas station on a corner in a residential neighborhood). As a result of these potential hazards, council review is necessary.

It is important to stress that conditional uses, like permitted uses, *must* be allowed if the applicant can prove that the application meets all of the conditions and requirements of the city’s ordinance and will not be detrimental to the health, safety and welfare of the public. As a result, the list of conditional uses should only contain uses that the city is certain should be allowed once appropriate conditions are met.

B. Aesthetic zoning requirements

Aesthetic zoning seeks to create a pleasant appearance in a district or community. Advocates for aesthetic zoning assert that it confers a beneficial effect on property values and on the well-being of its residents. For example, many cities address a host of aesthetic concerns through “design standards” section(s) in their zoning ordinance. Design standards often specify the type of building materials (such as brick or stone) that should be used in that district.

[Naegele Outdoor Advertising Co. of Minn. v. Village of Minnetonka](#), 162 N.W.2d 206 (Minn. 1968); [Pine County v. State, Dept. of Natural Resources](#), 280 N.W.2d 625 (Minn. 1979).

Traditionally aesthetic zoning has been criticized as not adequately related to the protecting the health and safety of the public. However, the Minnesota Supreme Court has ruled that “mere fact that adoption of zoning ordinance reflects desire to achieve aesthetic ends should not invalidate an otherwise valid ordinance.” Furthermore, the courts recognize that local city officials are in the best position to determine whether aesthetic regulations promote the community’s well-being. Generally, zoning ordinances that contain aesthetic regulations will be upheld if the council has made findings that they are reasonably tied to promoting a community’s health safety and welfare in addition to mere aesthetic concerns.

C. Performance standards

[Sample Performance Standards Section](#)

Performance standards are a common feature of zoning ordinances. Typically, the performance standard section of the ordinance sets forth regulations governing the uses within districts, such as noise, vibration, smoke, property maintenance (i.e. outdoor storage), parking, fencing and signage standards. Proposed uses that cannot meet the performance standards are not allowed in the district. Performance standards typically are adopted to apply to all districts. However, particular districts, such as industrial districts, may call for specific standards.

D. Zoning to protect natural resources or preserve open spaces and green space

[Wensmann Realty, Inc. v. City of Eagan, 734 N.W.2d 623 \(Minn. 2007\)](#); [Mendota Golf, LLP v. City of Mendota Heights, 708 N.W.2d 162 \(Minn. 2006\)](#); [Pine County v. State, Dept. of Natural Resources, 280 N.W.2d 625 \(Minn. 1979\)](#).

[Minn. Stat. § 103F.335](#)

[Minn. Stat. § 103F.221](#)

See Section VE1c *Applicability* for more information on regulatory takings.

The Minnesota Supreme Court has ruled that a municipality has legitimate interests in protecting open, green and recreational space for the public through comprehensive planning and zoning. City ordinances use a variety of methods to promote open space and green space. A common zoning tool is cluster zoning. Cluster zoning groups new homes onto part of the development parcel, so that the remainder can be preserved as unbuilt open space. However, it is important to note that zoning regulations (including regulations mandating green or open spaces) that deny an owner all practical use of their property may be considered a regulatory taking.

E. Parking requirements

[Sample Parking Requirements.](#)

Cars are ubiquitous to American life and off-street parking requirements are a common feature of city zoning ordinances. Off-street parking requirements may reduce congestion on city streets, thereby improving safety and aesthetics.

Typically a city zoning ordinance will require a certain number of off-street parking space for each type of use. For example, an ordinance may require a landowner in a commercial district to provide four parking spaces per 1,000 sq ft of useable floor space. Many zoning ordinances find it helpful to use a table to illustrate the city's parking requirements.

F. Historic Preservation

Minn. Stat. § 138.74

Historic preservation ordinances seek to protect and maintain buildings and sites of significance to history and pre-history, architecture and culture. Certain cities, which contain historic districts established by state statute, are specifically empowered by state law to create zoning regulations for their historic districts that:

- regulate the construction, alteration, demolition and use of structures within the district.
- prevent the construction of buildings of a character not in conformity with that of the historic district.
- allow the city to remove blighting influences, including signs, unsightly structures and debris, incompatible with the maintenance of the physical well-being of the district.
- allow the city “to adopt other measures as necessary to protect, preserve and perpetuate the district.”

Minn. Stat. § 138.73

Currently there are 25 official historic districts designated by state law.

State, by Powderly v. Erickson, 285 N.W.2d 84 (Minn. 1979).

Cities that do not contain official historic districts, as designated by state law, may also preserve their historic properties and districts through local zoning ordinances. Often this is accomplished by establishing a standalone district or an overlay district with specific design standards. The Minnesota Supreme Court has upheld historic preservation ordinances as a reasonable use of the city’s police powers to protect the health, safety and welfare of the public.

G. Zoning regulation of adult uses

See LMCIT risk management memo, *Strip Clubs: The Bare Essentials*

See LMC information memo, *Adult Use Packet* for more information and ordinance samples

Adult uses typically refer to bookstores, theaters, bars, and other establishments where sexually explicit books, magazines and videos are sold or sexually explicit films or live performances are viewed. Cities can control the location of adult uses through zoning ordinances to reduce the negative secondary effects of adult uses.

Minn. Stat. § 617.242
*Northshor
Experience, Inc. v.
City of Duluth, MN*
442 F.Supp.2d 713
(D. Minn. 2006)

A state law, enacted in 2006, requires that anyone intending to open an adult use business provide notice, 60 days in advance, to the city where the business will locate. The law includes numerous other provisions focused on regulation of adult uses businesses. The new law is the subject of an injunction issued by a federal district court; the court finds that questions about the law's constitutionality are valid and rules that the city may not enforce the new law. Until the constitutional questions regarding the new law are resolved, cities probably should not rely on it as the sole mechanism for regulating adult entertainment establishments.

Instead, cities may consider taking proactive measure to adopt local adult use regulations. However, adopting any regulations of adult uses is legally complex and the city attorney should be involved in the drafting of any adult use ordinances.

H. Restricting Feedlots

Minn. Stat. § 462.357,
subd. 1g.

Zoning ordinances that regulate feedlots must comply with certain procedures outlined in the Municipal Planning Act. When a city considers adopting a new or amended feedlot ordinance, it must notify the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency and commissioner of Agriculture at the beginning of the process.

A local zoning ordinance that requires a setback for new feedlots from existing residential areas must also require that new residential areas have the same setbacks from existing feedlots in agricultural districts. This requirement does not pertain to a new residence built to replace an existing residence. A city may grant a variance from this requirement.

At the request of the city council, the city must prepare a report on the economic effects from specific provisions in the feedlot ordinance. Assistance with the report, in the form of a template, is available from the commissioner of Agriculture, in cooperation with the Department of Employment and Economic Development. Upon completion, the report must be submitted to the commissioners of Employment and Economic Development and Agriculture along with the proposed ordinance.

I. Extra-territorial zoning and joint planning

1. Extra-territorial zoning

Minn. Stat. § 462.357
A.G. Op. 59-A-32
(Aug. 18, 1995).

A city's zoning authority may be extended by ordinance to unincorporated territories within two miles of its boundaries, unless that area falls within another city, county or township that has adopted its own zoning regulations. Where zoning is extended, ordinances may be enforced in the same manner and to the same extent as within the city's corporate limits.

2. Joint planning

Minn. Stat. §
462.3585

Joint planning may also assist cities in coordinating their land use efforts with neighboring townships. State statute authorizes the creation of a joint planning board, when requested by a resolution of a city, or county or town board.

The joint planning board exercises planning and land use control authority in the unincorporated area within two miles of the corporate limits of a city. Members of the board are appointed by each of the participating governmental units to equally represent the governmental units that comprise the board.

J. Zoning ordinances that limit competition or protect local business from being displaced by new business

Dobbins v. City of Los Angeles, 195 U.S. 223, 25 S. Ct. 18, 49 L. Ed. 169; *Pacific Palisades Assn. v. City of Huntington Beach*, 196 Cal. 211, 237 P. 538; *Charnofree Corp. v. City of Miami Beach (Fla.)*, 76 So.2d 665; State ex rel. *Killeen Realty Co. v. City of East Cleveland*, 108 Ohio App. 99, 153 N.E.2d 177; *Linden Methodist Episcopal Church v. City of Linden*, 113 N.J.L. 188, 173 A. 593

A city's zoning authority is based upon its police power to protect the public's health, safety and welfare. Zoning to protect private economic interests is problematic, because it is not generally perceived to be related to the public's health and welfare. In general, the federal courts have ruled that cities should not adopt zoning regulations with the sole intent to protect enterprises from competition in a particular district or to create monopolies or to make certain areas subservient to others.

Cities may encounter this issue in the zoning drafting process, when specifying permitted and conditional uses for a district. More commonly, the issue will arise in the context of reviewing a particular zoning application. For example, a city may wish to not grant a CUP for a new bank in the city, because officials perceive that there are too many banks in an area or that the a new bank may put long-established businesses out of business. This type of economic favoritism is not permitted in zoning ordinance drafting or application.

IV. Zoning ordinance adoption and/or amendment

A.G. Op. 59-A-32
(Jan. 25, 2002);
*Pilgrim v. City of
Winona*, 256 N.W.2d
266 (Minn. 1977)

The Municipal Planning Act mandates a procedure for the adoption or amendment of zoning ordinances for both statutory and charter cities.

A. Public hearings and adoption

Minn. Stat. § 462.357,
subd. 3; For
information on
conducting hearings,
see LMCIT risk
management memo
Public Hearings.

A public hearing must be held by the council or the planning commission (if one exists) before the city adopts or amends a zoning ordinance.

1. Notice and hearing

Minn. Stat. § 462.357,
subd. 3

See LMC information
memo *Newspaper
Publication*

A notice of the time, place and purpose of the hearing must be published in the official newspaper of the municipality at least ten days prior to the day of the hearing.

If an amendment to a zoning ordinance involves changes in district boundaries affecting an area of five acres or less, a similar notice must be mailed at least ten days before the day of the hearing to each owner of affected property and property situated completely or partly within 350 feet of the property to which the amendment applies. However, failure to give mailed notice to individual property owners, or defects in the notice shall not invalidate the proceedings, provided that a genuine attempt to comply with this subdivision has been made.

Following the public hearing, the planning commission (if one exists) must review the proposed zoning ordinances and any comments from the public hearing, and make any appropriate and reasonable revisions. The planning commission must then present the zoning ordinance and any amendments in final draft form and a report to the council.

Minn. Stat. § 462.357, subds. 2, 5 .

A.G. Op. 59-A-32 (Jan. 25, 2002).

If there is no planning commission, the city council itself should review and address comments from the public hearing and make any appropriate and reasonable revisions. Zoning ordinances must be adopted by a majority vote of all of the members of the council. For example, this would mean three votes on a five member council. One Minnesota attorney general opinion has found that charter cities may not provide for different voting requirements in their city charter, because the Municipal Planning Act supersedes inconsistent charter provisions.

2. Publication

Minn. Stat. § 412.191, subd. 4;

Minn. Stat. § 331A.02;

Minn. Stat. § 331A.04.

After adopting or amending a zoning ordinance, the council must publish or summarize it in the official newspaper.

See Handbook, Chapter 7 for more information on publishing ordinances in summary form

V. Zoning ordinance administration

A. The 60-Day Rule

See LMCIT risk management memo, *The 60-Day Rule: Minnesota's Automatic Approval Statute*

Minn. Stat. § 15.99
Manco of Fairmont v. Town Bd. of Rock Dell Township, 583 N.W.2d 293 (Minn. Ct. App. 1998) .

Hans Hagen Homes, Inc. v. City of Minnetrista, 728 N.W.2d 536 (Minn. 2007) .

Most importantly in administering a zoning ordinance, cities must remember that they generally have only 60 days to approve or deny a written request relating to zoning, including rezoning requests, conditional use permits, and variances. This requirement is known as the “60-Day Rule.”

The 60-Day Rule is a state law that requires cities to approve or deny a written request relating to zoning within 60 days or it is deemed approved. The underlying purpose of the rule is to keep governmental agencies from taking too long in deciding land use issues. Minnesota courts have generally demanded strict compliance with the rule.

1. Scope of the rule

Minn. Stat. § 15.99, subd. 1(c) .

The rule applies to a “request a related to zoning.” The courts have been rather expansive in their interpretation of the phrase “related to zoning,” and many requests affecting the use of land have been treated as subject to the law. The statute creates an exception for *subdivision and plat approvals*, since those processes are subject to their own timeframes. The Minnesota Court of Appeals has ruled that Minn. Stat. § 15.99 does not apply to building permits.

Minn. Stat. § 15.99, subd. 2(a).

Minn. Stat. § 462.358, subd. 3b.

Advantage Capital Mgmt, v. City of Northfield, 664 N.W.2d 421 (Minn. Ct. App. 2003) .

2. Applications

Minn. Stat. § 15.99, subd. 1(c) .

A request must be submitted in writing on the city’s application form, if one exists. A request not on the city’s form must clearly identify on the first page the approval sought. The city may reject as incomplete a request not on the city’s form, if the request does not include information required by the city. The request is also considered incomplete if it does not include the application fee.

Minn. Stat. § 15.99, subd. 3(a) .

The 60-day time period does not begin to run if the city notifies the landowner *in writing* within 15 business days of receiving the application that the application is incomplete. The city must also state what information is missing.

Minn. Stat. § 15.99, subd. 3(c) .

If a city grants an approval within 60 days of receiving a written request – and the city can document this - it meets the time limit even if that approval includes certain conditions the applicant must meet. Subsequently, if the applicant fails to meet the conditions, the approval may be revoked or rescinded. An applicant cannot use the revocation or rescission to claim the city did not meet the 60-day time limit.

Tollefson Dev., Inc. v. City of Elk River, 665 N.W.2d 554 (Minn. Ct. App. 2003).

When a zoning applicant materially amends their application, the 60-day period runs from the date of the written request for the amendment, not from the date of the original application. However, minor changes to a zoning request should not affect the running of the 60-day period.

3. Denials

Minn. Stat. § 15.99, subd. 2(a); *Johnson v Cook County*, No. A08-1501 (Minn. 2010) (unpublished decision).

Minn. Stat. § 15.99, subd. 2(c) .

Hans Hagen Homes, Inc. v. City of Minnetrista, 728 N.W.2d 536 (Minn. 2007)

Minn. Stat. § 15.99, subd. 2(b) .

If an agency or a city denies a request, it must give written reasons for its denial at the time it denies the request. When a multimember governing body such as a city council denies a request, it must state the reasons for denial on the record and provide the applicant with a written statement of the reasons for denial. The written statement of the reasons for denial must be consistent with reasons stated in the record at the time of denial. The written statement of reasons for denial must be provided to the applicant upon adoption.

State statute provides that the failure of a motion to approve an application constitutes a denial, provided that those voting against the motion state on the record the reasons why they oppose the request. This situation usually occurs when a motion to approve fails because of a tie vote, or because the motion fails to get the required number of votes to pass.

4. Extensions

Minn. Stat. § 15.99, subd. 3(f) .

The law allows a city the opportunity to give itself an additional 60 days (up to a total of 120 days) to consider an application, if the city follows specific statutory requirements. In order to avail itself of an additional 60 days, the city must give the applicant:

- Written notification of the extension before the end of the initial 60-day period;
- The reasons for extension; and
- The anticipated length of the extension.

American Tower, L.P. v. City of Grant, 636 N.W.2d 309(Minn. 2001) ; *Northern States Power Co. v. City of Mendota Heights*, 646 N.W.2d 919 (Minn. Ct. App. 2002) .

The courts have been particularly demanding on local governments with regard to this requirement and have required local governments to meet *each element* of the statute. An oral notice or an oral agreement to extend is insufficient. The reasons stated in the written notification should be *specific* in order to inform the individual applicant exactly why the process is being delayed. Needing more time to fully consider the application may be an adequate reason. As demonstrated in one Minnesota Supreme Court case, the written notification should not take the form of a blanket statement on the zoning application that the city will need the extension.

Minn. Stat. § 15.99, subd. 3(g).

An applicant may also request an extension of the time limit by written notice. If a city receives an applicant request for an extension, this should be thoroughly documented.

Minn. Stat. § 15.99, subd. 3(g).

Once the city has granted itself one 60 day extension, additional extensions must be negotiated with the applicant. A city can only go beyond 120 days if it gets the approval of the applicant. The city must initiate the request for additional time in writing and have the applicant agree to an extension in writing. The applicant may also ask for an additional extension by written request.

Minn. Stat. § 15.99, subd. 3(d), (e).

The 60-day time period is also extended if a state statute requires a process to occur before the city acts on the application if the process will make it impossible for the city to act within 60 days. The environmental review process is an example. If the city or state law requires the preparation of an environmental assessment worksheet (EAW) or an environmental impact statement (EIS) under the state Environmental Policy Act, the deadline is extended until 60 days after the environmental review process is completed. Likewise, if a proposed development requires state or federal approval in addition to city action, the 60-day period for city action is extended until 60 days after the required prior approval is granted from the state or federal entity.

Minn. Stat. ch. 116D.
Minn. R. ch. 4410.

Minn. Stat. § 15.99, subd. 2(a), (e).

On occasion, a local city zoning ordinance or charter may contain similar or conflicting time provisions. The 60-Day Rule generally supersedes those time limits and requirements.

See LMCIT risk management memo, *The 60-Day Rule: Minnesota's Automatic Approval Statute*.

Cities should adopt a procedure or set of procedures to ensure planning staff, the planning commission, and the city council follow the 60-Day Rule. City staff should develop a timetable, guidelines and forms (checklists for each application may be helpful) to ensure that no application is deemed approved because the city could not act fast enough to complete the review process.

B. Organizational structure for review of zoning applications

The pressures posed by the 60-Day Rule mandate that any city with a zoning ordinance have in place an efficient system of zoning administration. Generally, this system is composed of both staff and city officials, who ensure that zoning applications are reviewed and answered in a timely manner and that zoning ordinance provisions are enforced.

1. The zoning administrator

Typically, a city will have a staff person who acts as the “Zoning Administrator” who is the first point of contact with the public on zoning matters and provides and receives zoning application forms. Generally, this person will also perform a preliminary review of the application, refer the application to the Planning Commission (if one exists) or City Council for review and offer one or both bodies a staff report reviewing the adequacy of the application. Depending on the size of the city and the number of zoning applications the city typically receives, the position of zoning administrator may be a full-time position or a part-time position. In some cities, the city clerk simply bears the additional title of zoning administrator.

2. The planning commission

See LMC information memo [Planning Commission Guide](#)

Cities may choose to establish planning commissions to assist in *zoning* administration, but are not required to do so. (However, if a city has adopted a comprehensive plan, a planning commission is mandatory). Usually, it is a good idea to create a planning commission, because city council officials have multiple budgeting, legislative and administrative duties that they must perform in addition to their land use responsibilities. Planning commissions, on the other hand, are usually composed of people who focus solely on zoning and development and, thus, can devote their full attention.

Minn. Stat. § 462.354, subd. 1

Planning commissions are created by ordinance or charter and may vary in size. City council members may be appointed to serve as commission members. Once formed, planning commissions, with city council consent, may adopt bylaws or their own rules of procedure. The city may provide the planning commission with staff, including legal counsel, as necessary.

Minn. Stat. § 462.357, subd. 3

In many cities all zoning applications for conditional use permits, rezoning and variances are submitted to the planning commission for review. If a planning commission exists, state law requires that the planning commission *must* review zoning ordinance amendments and amendments to the official map. With limited exceptions, the planning commission’s role in reviewing all types of zoning applications is generally advisory. The City Council usually gives the planning commission recommendations great weight in their considerations, but is not bound by them.

Minn. Stat. § 462.357, subd. 3

The planning commission may hold required public hearings on behalf of the city council, such as a hearing for a zoning ordinance amendment.

3. Planning departments

Minn. Stat. § 462.354,
subd. 2

Cities may also form a planning department. In cities that chose this option, the planning commission becomes advisory to the planning department while the planning department takes on the role of advising city council.

4. The city council

Minn. Stat. §
462.3595

In many cities the city council makes the final determination on all applications for rezoning, conditional use permits and interim use permits after consulting the zoning administrator, planning commission and City Attorney as needed. However, the Municipal Planning Act allows cities to delegate final decision making authority concerning conditional use permits to a “designated authority” (presumably the Planning Commission). The City Council cannot delegate its authority to grant rezoning applications and interim use permits.

5. Board of zoning adjustment and appeals

Minn. Stat. § 462.354,
subd. 2 and 462.357,
subd. 6.

State law requires all cities that have adopted a zoning ordinance to create a Board of Appeals and Adjustments. The Board of Appeals and Adjustment must be created by ordinance. The council may designate itself as the Board of Appeals and Adjustments, or appoint a separate board or the planning commission to serve the city in this capacity. If the board is a separate body, the council can provide in its ordinance that board decisions are:

- final and subject only to judicial review;
- final subject to appeal to the council and judicial review; or
- only advisory to the council, who will makes the final determination.

The board hears requests for variances from the zoning code and makes the determination to grant or deny the variance. In addition, the Board of Appeals and Adjustment hears requests for reconsideration of zoning applications (usually denials), where it is alleged there has been an error in the administration of the zoning ordinance.

Minn. Stat. § 462.354, subd. 2.
Minn. Stat. § 15.99.

The ordinance establishing the board must provide notice and time requirements for hearings before the board. All orders by the board are due within a reasonable time. Requests before the board are subject to the 60-day rule.

C. Standards for reviewing zoning applications: limits on city discretion

State, by Rochester Ass'n of Neighborhoods v. City of Rochester, 268 N.W.2d 885 (Minn. 1978)

When drafting and adopting a zoning ordinance, cities have enormous discretion in choosing their language and specifying uses as permitted, prohibited or conditional in particular districts. When drafting and adopting a zoning ordinance, the city is said to be utilizing its legislative (or law-making) authority. When using its legislative authority, the only limits on the city's zoning authority are that action must be constitutional, rational and in some way related to protecting the health, safety and welfare of the public. This is known as the "rational basis standard" and it generally a very friendly standard for cities to meet.

For more information on applications for rezoning see Section VC *Standards for reviewing zoning applications: limits on city discretion*

The varying discretion available to cities in making zoning decisions has been described as following a pyramid diagram

In contrast, when administering an existing zoning ordinance (for example when reviewing specific zoning applications for conditional use permits), the city's discretion is much more limited. Generally, when reviewing a zoning application (with the exception of rezoning applications), the city is no longer acting in its legislative capacity. When reviewing zoning applications, the city is said to be exercising a quasi-judicial function. Rather than legislating for the broad population as whole, the city is making a quasi-judicial (judge-like) determination about an individual zoning application regarding whether the application meets the standards of the city ordinance.

In quasi-judicial circumstances, the city must follow the standards and requirements of the ordinance it has adopted. If an application meets the requirements of the ordinance, generally it must be granted. If an application is denied, the stated reasons for the denial must all relate to the applicant's failure to meet standards established in the ordinance. In sum, the city has a great deal of liberty to establish the rules, but once established, the city is as equally bound by the rules as the public.

A city is acting in a quasi-judicial manner when it reviews applications for:

- Conditional use permits.
- Interim use permits.

- Variances.

Northwestern College v. City of Arden Hills, 281 N.W.2d 865 (Minn. 1979)

In quasi-judicial situations, a reviewing court will closely scrutinize the city’s decision, to determine whether they city has provided a legally and factually sufficient basis for denial of an application.

In quasi-judicial situations, due process and equal protection are the main reasons for the more stringent scrutiny. Due process and equal protection under the law demand that similar applicants must be treated uniformly by the city. The best process for insuring similar treatment among applicants is to establish standards in the ordinance and to provide that if standards are met, the zoning permit must be granted. An application may generally only be denied for failure to meet the standards in city ordinances.

A reviewing court will overrule a quasi-judicial city zoning decision if it determines that the decision was arbitrary (failed to treat equally situated applicants equally or failed to follow ordinance requirements).

1. Standard of review for re-zoning applications

State, by Rochester Ass'n of Neighborhoods v. City of Rochester, 268 N.W.2d 885 (Minn. 1978)

See Section VC *Standards for reviewing zoning applications: limits on city discretion.*

An application for a rezoning is a request for an amendment to the zoning ordinance. When reviewing applications for re-zoning, the court has ruled that the city continues to act in a legislative capacity, even though the re-zoning application may only relate to one specific parcel owned by one individual. The existing zoning ordinance is presumed to be constitutional, and an applicant is only entitled to a change if they can demonstrate that the existing zoning is unsupported by any rational basis related to the public health, safety and welfare.

2. Making a record of the basis for zoning decisions

Minn. Stat. § 15.99, subd. 2(a) .

See Section VA *The 60-Day Rule.*

The 60-Day Rule requires the city to provide reasons for its denial of a zoning request. These reasons for denial must be stated on the record. In addition, the city must provide the applicant with a written statement of the reasons for denial. The reasons for denial or approval, whether written or stated on the record are considered the city’s “findings of fact” on the application if later court review of the city’s decision is necessary.

SuperAmerica Group, Inc. v City of Little Canada, 539 NW 2d 264 (Minn. Ct. App. 1995); *Swanson v City of Bloomington*, 421 NW 2d 307 (Minn. 1988); *Larson v Washington County*, 387 N.W.2d 902 (Minn. Ct. App 1986)

See also LMCIT risk management memo, *The Necessity of Adequate Findings/Reasons to Support Municipal Land Use Decisions* and LMC information memo, *Findings of Fact: Elected Officials as Policymakers*.

Zylka v. City of Crystal, 167 N.W.2d 45, (Minn. 1969)

See Sections V3c *Conditional use permits* and V3d *Requests for variances from the zoning ordinance*, for more information on the standards of review for conditional use permits and variances.

Minnetonka Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses, Inc. v. Svee, 226 N.W.2d 306 (Minn. 1975)

For more information on public opposition see LMCIT risk management memos, *Land Use: The Neighbor Factor; Frolicking Between the Landmines*.

Findings of fact are also essential to the zoning process, because they enable a reviewing court to sustain a city's zoning decisions. When a land use decision is challenged in court, the standard of review used by the court is very limited. The city's decision will be upheld if the *findings of fact* demonstrate a *rational and legally sufficient basis* for the decision that is not arbitrary or capricious.

Findings of fact should state all of the relevant facts the city considered in making its decision on the zoning application. A fact is relevant if it proves or disproves that the application meets the legal standards of the city ordinance and state law for granting the zoning request. For example, applications for conditional use permits and variances are all subject to particular standards that are or should have been spelled out in city ordinances, or have been defined by state law or court decision. In evaluating any particular zoning request, the reviewing body should apply the relevant facts to the particular standards that govern the specific type of decisions being made. The basis for reviewing specific types of zoning applications is discussed more extensively later in this memo.

a. Neighborhood opposition

Certain zoning applications may generate vocal public opposition. Frequently, cities struggle with handling vocal neighborhood opposition in their findings of fact. However, general statements of public opposition should not be a finding of fact listed as a basis for denying a zoning application. Nor should the official record intimate that public opposition is the underlying basis for the city's findings of fact. If a zoning application meets the requirements of the ordinance, it must be granted, despite the disapproval of the neighbors.

*Minnetonka
Congregation of
Jehovah's Witnesses,
Inc. v. Svee*, 226
N.W.2d 306 (Minn.
1975)

However, this does not mean that all statements of the public must be disregarded. A significant part of the zoning process is generally the public hearing mandated by the Municipal Planning Act. The Municipal Planning Act requires that all parties interested in an application, including the applicant and neighbors, be granted an opportunity to speak and present their views on the application. While general statements of opposition may not be used as a finding of fact, statements made by the public that are concrete and factual relating to the public welfare are acceptable findings.

For example, a finding of fact should not be “public opposition to the project is strong.” But a finding of fact can be, “numerous statements were made at the public hearing by neighbors in the vicinity of the project that streets in the area are already highly congested. The addition of a shopping mall would significantly increase congestion on streets that are at capacity.” Where possible, findings of fact that refer to statements by the public should be corroborated by studies and/or expert testimony or opinions.

b. Conducting a public hearing

Public hearings are required prior to the city taking action on numerous types of zoning issues. A public hearing must be held for:

Minn. Stat. § 462.357,
subd. 3.

- Zoning ordinance adoption or amendment.

Minn. Stat. §
462.3595, subd. 2.

- Conditional use permits.

Minn. Stat. § 462.357,
subd. 3.

- Rezoning.

City ordinances may also require additional hearings for certain matters. Since variances are considered in the nature of a zoning amendment, some cities hold hearings for variance requests as well. As this is an unsettled area of law, please consult your city attorney on the practice of holding hearings for variances.

See [Sample Public
Hearing Notice](#)

Notice of the hearing must be published in the official newspaper at least 10 days prior to the hearing, and notice must be mailed to property owners within a 350-foot radius of the land in question (including landowners within the 350 foot radius who may live outside the city).

Public hearings should include a complete disclosure of what is being proposed, and a fair and open assessment of the issues raised. A public hearing must include an opportunity for the general public and interested parties to hear and see all information and to ask questions, provide additional information, express support or opposition, or suggest modifications to the proposal.

For more information on conducting public hearings see LMCIT risk management memo, [Public Hearings](#).

Public hearings should be conducted with a goal of developing findings of fact to support the city's decision to grant or deny a zoning application. As a result, it may be helpful for the city to provide the public with guidelines for the procedure of the hearing and to encourage the public to present only factual evidence for public consideration.

3. Review of specific types of zoning applications

Cities who have adopted a zoning ordinance need procedures to help them review the different types of zoning applications they receive. Cities typically receive applications for conditional use permits, interim uses, variances and requests for rezonings. As discussed above, all of these applications are subject to the 60-Day Rule. However, this is where the similarities among the review procedures for each type of application ends. Each type of application requires a different standard of review, because state law (and likely local ordinance as well) establishes specific requirements for granting each type of application.

a. Permitted uses

Cities may vary in their administrative procedures for handling permitted uses. For example, some cities will have their building inspector confirm that a use is permitted and meets all applicable zoning rules at the time a building permit is issued with no other formal action from the city. Other cities, that may not enforce the State Building Code, may require all landowners seeking to develop or build to apply for a formal zoning permit. The permit is issued to confirm that that the use is permitted and/or meets all other applicable zoning standards.

Regardless of the administrative procedures used, it is important to remember that a city may not impose additional conditions on a permitted use that fits the standards of city ordinance. Such actions are likely to be seen as arbitrary or denying the landowner equal protection and due process. Generally, a landowner is entitled to engage in the permitted use provided they have met all applicable requirements.

Chase v. City of Minneapolis, 401 N.W.2d 408 (Minn. 1981).

Rose Cliff Landscape Nursery v. City of Rosemount, 467 N.W.2d 641 (Minn. Ct. App. 1991).

See Section III-A
*Establishing permitted
and conditional uses.*

Cities should regularly review their permitted uses to be certain that the listed permitted uses fit current city needs and circumstances. Permitted uses that may have previously been standard (such as carriage houses in residential districts), may be inappropriate on a modern city, residential block. As time passes, permitted uses may need to be reclassified as prohibited uses or transformed into conditional uses, where conditions may be imposed to prevent any negative secondary effects.

b. Prohibited uses

See Section VC
*Standards of
reviewing zoning
applications: limits on
city discretion.*

[Minn. Stat. § 462.357,
subd. 6; *Sunrise Lake
Ass'n v. Chisago
County Bd. of
Comm'rs*, 633
N.W.2d 59 \(Minn. Ct.
App. 2001\)](#)

See Section VC3d
*Requests for
variances from the
zoning ordinance.*

Cities may receive applications requesting permission to engage in uses explicitly prohibited under the city's zoning ordinance. For example, a request to engage in industrial activities in a commercial zone. When a use is prohibited, the city cannot allow the use unless an amendment to the city's zoning ordinance is adopted in accordance with the procedures of the Municipal Planning Act. Cities are prohibited from granting variances or conditional use permits to engage in prohibited uses.

c. Conditional use permits

[Amoco Oil Co. v. City
of Minneapolis](#), 395
N.W.2d 115 (Minn.
Ct. App., 1986); [Zylka
v. City of Crystal](#), 167
N.W.2d 45 (Minn.
1969).

See Sample [resolution
granting a CUP](#)

See Sample [resolution
denying a CUP](#)

[Minn. Stat. §
462.3595](#)

[Zylka v. City of
Crystal](#), 167 N.W.2d
45, (Minn. 1969)

The concept of a conditional use permit (CUP) was created to give cities more flexibility in zoning ordinance administration. Generally, conditional uses are uses that are often too problematic to be permitted uses as of right in a district. However, since the use is still generally favorable or necessary, outright prohibition of the use is generally not practical or desired. A classic example of such a mixed positive/negative use is a gas station in a residential area. Conditional uses seek to strike a middle ground between outright, unchecked permissive establishment and complete prohibition. Conditional uses are uses that will be allowed if certain conditions (that minimize the problematic features of the use) are met.

Cities must specify conditional uses in a city ordinance. Generally, a list of conditional uses will be found alongside the permitted uses in a city ordinance. The ordinance must also establish what conditions or standards must be met to allow the conditional use. Ordinances that fail to establish standards for granting the listed conditional uses are problematic and potentially invalid.

Minn. Stat. § 462.3595.

Minn. Stat. § 462.3595, subd. 2.

Schwardt v. County of Watonwan, 656 N.W.2d 383 (Minn. 2003); *Yang v. County of Carver*, 660 N.W.2d 828 (Minn. Ct. App. 2003); *Citizens for a Balanced City v. Plymouth Congregational Church*, 672 N.W.2d 13 (Minn. Ct. App. 2003); *Trisko v. City of Waite Park*, 566 N.W.2d 349 (Minn. Ct. App. 1997).

The city *must* grant the CUP if the applicant satisfies all the conditions established in the ordinance.

A city may deny a CUP if the proposed use:

Hubbard Broadcasting, Inc. v. City of Afton, 323 N.W.2d 757 (Minn. 1982).

See Section IC *Role of comprehensive planning in zoning ordinance adoption*.

SuperAmerica Group, Inc. v. City of Little Canada, 539 N.W.2d 264 (Minn. Ct. App. 1995).

In re Livingood, 594 N.W.2d 889 (Minn. 1999).

Minn. Stat. § 462.3595, subd. 4

- Does not meet the specific standards or conditions established in the zoning ordinance;
- Is not consistent with the city's officially adopted comprehensive plan;
- Endangers or is not compatible with the health, safety and welfare of the public.

When a local government denies a landowner a CUP without sufficient evidence to support its decision, a court can order the issuance of the permit subject to reasonable conditions.

Once a CUP is granted, a certified copy of the CUP (including a detailed list of all applicable conditions) must be recorded with the county recorder or the registrar of titles, and must include a legal description of the land.

Northpoint Plaza v. City of Rochester, 465 N.W.2d 686 (Minn. 1991); *Snaza v. City of St Paul*, 548 F.3d 1178 (8th Cir. 2008).

Minn. Stat. § 462.3597.

A.G. Op. 59-A-32 (February 27, 1990).

CUPs are considered property interests that run with the land—that is, they pass from seller to buyer when the land is sold or transferred. For this reason, time restrictions on a CUP are potentially invalid. In one instance, however, the courts have supported the city’s decision to issue a time-limited CUP. If the city wishes to issue a time-limited CUP, the city attorney should be consulted.

Upper Minnetonka Yacht Club v. City of Shorewood, 770 N.W.2d 184 (Minn. Ct. App. 2009).

Once issued, a CUP’s conditions cannot be unilaterally altered by the city, absent a violation of the CUP itself.

d. Requests for variances from the zoning ordinance

See LMCIT risk management memo, [FAQs on Variances](#)

Variances are an exception to rules laid out in a zoning ordinance. They are permitted departures from strict enforcement of the ordinance as applied to a particular piece of property if strict enforcement would cause the owner “practical difficulties.” Variances are generally related to physical standards (such as setbacks or height limits) and may not be used to allow a *use* that is prohibited in the particular zoning district. Essentially, variances allow the landowner to deviate from the rules that would otherwise apply.

[Minn. Stat. § 462.354, subd. 6.](#)

See Section VB5 *Boards of Adjustment and Appeals*

The law provides that requests for variances are heard by the board of adjustment and appeals. In many communities, the planning commission serves this function. Generally, the board’s decision is subject to appeal to the city council. Under the statutory practical difficulties standard, a landowner is entitled to a variance if the facts satisfy the three-factor test of (1) reasonableness, (2) uniqueness, and (3) essential character.

Minn. Stat. § 462.357, subd. 6.

See also [LMC: 2011 Variance Legislation](#) for sample ordinance language.

Krummenacher v. City of Minnetonka, 783 N.W.2d 721 (Minn. 2010).

Note! “Undue hardship” was the name of the three-factor test prior to a May 2011 change of law. Effective May 6, 2011 Minnesota Laws, Chapter 19, amended Minn. Stat. § 462.357, subd. 6 to restore municipal variance authority in response to *Krummenacher v. City of Minnetonka*, case. In *Krummenacher*, the Minnesota Supreme Court interpreted the statutory definition of “undue hardship” and held that the “reasonable use” prong of the “undue hardship” test was not whether the proposed use is reasonable, but rather whether there is a reasonable use in the absence of the variance.

See LMCIT risk management memo, 2011 Variance Legislation.

The 2011 law changed the first factor back to the “reasonable manner” understanding that had been used by some lower courts prior to the Krummenacher ruling. The 2011 law renamed the municipal variance standard from “undue hardship” to “practical difficulties,” but otherwise retained the familiar three-factor test of (1) reasonableness, (2) uniqueness, and (3) essential character. The 2011 law also provides that: “Variances shall only be permitted when they are in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the ordinance and when the terms of the variance are consistent with the comprehensive plan.”

The practical difficulties factors are:

Krummenacher, v. City of Minnetonka; Rowell v. Board of Adjustment of the City of Moorhead, 446 N.W.2d 917 (Minn.App.,1989)

- The property owner proposes to use the property in a reasonable manner. This factor means that the landowner would like to use the property in a particular reasonable way but cannot do so under the rules of the ordinance. It does not mean that the land cannot be put to any reasonable use whatsoever without the variance.
- The landowner’s situation is due to circumstances unique to the property not caused by the landowner. The uniqueness generally relates to the physical characteristics of the particular piece of property and economic considerations alone cannot create practical difficulties.
- The variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality. This factor generally contemplates whether the resulting structure will be out of scale, out of place, or otherwise inconsistent with the surrounding area.

Myron v. City of Plymouth, 562 N.W.2d 21 (Minn. Ct. App. Apr. 15, 1997), aff’d, 581 N.W.2d 815 (Minn. 1998) overruled on other grounds by *Wensmann Realty, Inc. v. City of Eagan*, 734 N.W.2d 623 (Minn. 2007).

Variances are to be granted only if strict enforcement of a zoning ordinance causes p. A landowner who purchased land knowing a variance would be necessary in order to make the property buildable is not barred from requesting a variance on the grounds the hardship was self-imposed.

City of Maplewood v. Valiukas, (Minn. Ct. App. Feb 11, 1997).

In granting a variance, the city may attach conditions, but the conditions must be directly related and bear a rough proportionality to the impact created by the variance. For example, if the variance reduces side yard setbacks, it may be reasonable to impose a condition of additional screening or landscaping to camouflage the structure built within the normal setback.

Mohler v. City of St. Louis Park, 643 N.W.2d 623 (Minn. Ct. App. 2002).

Nolan v. City of Eden Prairie, 610 N.W.2d 697 (Minn. Ct. App. 2000).

Graham v. Itasca County Planning Comm'n, 601 N.W.2d 461 (Minn. Ct. App. 1999).

Stotts v. Wright County, 478 N.W.2d 802 (Minn. Ct. App. 1992).

Mohler v. City of St. Louis Park, 643 N.W.2d 623 (Minn. Ct. App. 2002).

Minn. Stat. § 462.357, subd. 6.

Kismet Investors v. County of Benton, 617 N.W.2d 85 (Minn. 2000).

Kismet Investors v. County of Benton, 617 N.W.2d 85 (Minn. 2000).

Minn. Stat. § 462.357, subd. 6(2)

Broad discretion is permitted when denying a request for a variance, but there must be legally sufficient reasons for the denial. The board must make findings concerning the reasons for the denial or approval and the facts upon which the decision was based. The findings must adequately address the statutory requirements. Best practice suggests seeking specific legal advice from the city attorney before making decisions on requests for variances.

An applicant for a variance is not entitled to a variance merely because similar variances were granted in the past, although in granting variances, the city ought to be cautious about establishing precedent.

Error by city staff in approving plans does not entitle a person to a variance. While the result might be harsh, a municipality cannot be estopped from correctly enforcing a zoning ordinance even if the property owner relies to his or her detriment on prior city action.

As discussed above, the most common requests for variances relate to physical conditions on the property. For example, setbacks and height restrictions. On occasion a city may receive requests for variances related to *uses*. For example, a request to use the property for a landscaping business out of a home in a residential district. This is commonly known as a *use variance*.

A use variance may not be granted if the use is prohibited in a zoning district. This may occur when the local zoning ordinance specifically lists prohibited uses (such as industrial uses in a residential zone) or when a zoning ordinance lists permitted uses and states that all uses not specifically listed are considered prohibited.

A city *may* grant a use variance when a use is not prohibited in the zoning district. For example, the zoning ordinance is silent on the issue or when the use is explicitly allowed, but limited by another portion of the city ordinance. For example, when a permitted use cannot meet performance standards elsewhere in the ordinance (such as parking or screening). The requirements of unusual hardship and other statutory requirements still apply to use variances.

Finally, state statute create two use variances that a city may always choose (but is not required to) permit through a variance. State statute specifically empowers cities to grant use variances for solar energy systems where a variance is needed to overcome inadequate access to direct sunlight and for the temporary use of a single family residence as a two-family residence.

e. Requests for rezoning or zoning ordinance amendments

Minn. Stat. § 462.357.
Minn. Stat. § 462.358,
subd. 2a.
Minn. Stat. § 15.99.

Cities have the authority to rezone (change a designation from residential to mixed commercial) or otherwise amend the zoning regulations governing a particular parcel of property (such as adding a permitted or conditional use). ***Note however, that rezoning is an amendment to the actual zoning ordinance and therefore all the procedures for amendments to the zoning ordinance apply.***

Minn. Stat. § 462.357,
subd. 4.
See Part III, *The 60-*
day rule

Rezoning may be initiated by the planning commission, council, or a petition by an individual landowner. If a request for rezoning does not come from the planning commission, the matter must be referred to the planning commission for study and report. Care should be taken so that the 60-Day Rule discussed previously is not violated, resulting in an automatic granting of the rezoning.

Sun Oil Co. v. Village of New Hope, Minn. N.W.2d 256 (Minn. 1974).

Rezoning is a legislative act and needs only to be reasonable and have some rational basis relating to public health, safety, morals, or general welfare. A rezoning decision must be supported by findings of fact that indicate the city's rational basis for the rezone. If the city has followed a comprehensive planning process, the findings of fact should also indicate that the decision is consistent with the city's comprehensive plan.

i. Rezoning residential property

Minn. Stat. § 462.357,
subd. 2.

When property is rezoned from residential to commercial or industrial, a two-thirds majority of *all members of the city council* is required. (This means there must be four affirmative votes on a five-member council, in most cases.) For other rezoning decisions, a simple majority vote of all members is all that is required.

A.G. Op. 59-A-32
(Jan. 25, 2002).

The Minnesota attorney general has issued an opinion that charter cities may not alter this voting requirement in their charter. The purpose of state law is to provide a uniform set of procedures for city planning and such procedures apply to all cities, charter or statutory.

ii. Spot zoning

Amcon Corp. v. City of Eagan, 348 N.W.2d 66 (Minn., 1984);
Olsen v. City of Hopkins, 178 N.W.2d 719 (Minn. 1970);
Three Putt, LLC v. City of Minnetonka, No. A08-1436 (Minn. Ct. App 2009) (unpublished decision).

The general rule is that property owners do not acquire any vested rights in the specific zoning of their parcel. Cities may exercise their legislative discretion to rezone property in furtherance of the public, health, safety and welfare. Cities should, however, avoid a type of rezoning known as “spot zoning.”

Spot zoning usually involves the rezoning of a small parcel of land in a manner that:

- Is unsupported by any rational basis relating to promoting public welfare.
- Establishes a use classification inconsistent with surrounding uses and creates an island of nonconforming use within a larger zoned district (for example one lot where industrial uses are permitted in an otherwise residential zone).
- Dramatically reduces the value for uses specified in the zoning ordinance of either the rezoned plot or abutting property.

State, by Rochester Ass'n of Neighborhoods v. City of Rochester. 268 N.W.2d 885 (Minn. 1978).

Alexander v. City of Minneapolis, 125 N.W.2d 583 (Minn. 1963).

Spot zoning that results in a total destruction or substantial diminution of value of property may be considered a form of regulatory taking of private property without compensation. In these rare instances, a property owner may be entitled to compensation for damages related to a legislative rezoning.

D. Environmental review

See [Handbook, Chapter 16](#) for more information on environmental review

[Minn. Stat. § 116D.](#)

[Minn. R. ch. 4410.](#)

[Minn. Stat. § 16D.02.](#)

Minnesota has adopted a comprehensive and detailed environmental review program to determine the significant environmental effects of private and governmental actions. The idea behind the program is that if governmental bodies require documents that identify the environmental consequences of a proposed development and those documents are available to the public, decision-makers can incorporate environmental protection into the proposed development. The law prohibits the issuance of permits or development prior to completion of necessary documents.

[Minn. Stat. § 15.99, subd. 3\(d\), \(e\); Minn. Stat. § 116D; Minn. R. ch. 4410.](#)

See Section VA *The 60-Day Rule*

The state-mandated environmental review process usually occurs in conjunction with the city's administration of its zoning ordinance. The environmental review process may require the city to delay consideration of an application. The 60-Day Rule allows an extension for these purposes.

E. Fees and escrow

[Minn. Stat. § 462.353, subd. 4\(a\).](#)

[Minn. Stat. § 462.353, subd. 4\(b\).](#)

Proper zoning administration may require significant financial commitment from a city. However, a city may establish land use fees under the Municipal Planning Act sufficient to defray the costs incurred by the city in reviewing, investigating, and administering an application for an amendment to an official control, or an application for a permit or other approval required under the zoning ordinance.

Fees are required by law to be fair, reasonable, proportionate, and be linked to the actual cost of the service for which the fee is imposed. All cities are required to adopt management and accounting procedures to ensure fees are maintained and used only for the purpose for which they are collected. Upon request, a city must explain the basis of its fees.

[Minn. Stat. § 462.353, subd. 4\(d\).](#)

[Minn. Stat. § 462.361.](#)

If a dispute arises over a specific fee imposed by a city related to a specific application, the person aggrieved by the fee may appeal to district court provided the appeal is brought within 60 days after approval of application and deposit of the fee into escrow. An approved application may proceed as if the fee had been paid, pending a decision on the appeal.

Minn. Stat. § 462.353, subd. 4(a).

Generally, cities must adopt fees by ordinance. However, there is a statutory exception to this general requirement. The exception authorizes cities that collect an annual cumulative total of \$5,000 or less of land use fees to simply refer to a fee schedule in the ordinance that governs the official control or permit. These cities are authorized to adopt a fee schedule by ordinance or by resolution, either annually or more frequently, after providing notice and holding a public hearing. Notice must be published at least 10 days before the public hearing. The exception also authorizes cities that collect an annual cumulative total in excess of \$5,000 of land use fees to adopt a fee schedule if they wish, but they may only do so by ordinance, after following the same notice and hearing procedures.

Minn. Stat. § 462.353, subd. 4(c).

January 1 is set by statute as the standard effective date for changes to fee ordinances, but a city may set a different effective date as long as the new fee ordinance does not apply to a project for which application for final approval was submitted before the ordinance was adopted.

Minn. Stat. § 16B.685; Minn. Stat. § 326B.145

Cities that collect over \$10,000 in fees annually must report annually to the Department of Administration all construction and development-related fees collected or face penalties. The report must include information on the number and valuation of the units for which fees were paid, the amount of building permit fees, plan review fees, administrative fees, engineering fees, infrastructure fees, other construction and development related fees, and the expenses associated with the municipal activities for which the fees were collected.

F. Updating and maintaining the city's zoning ordinance

The last, but perhaps most important topic to discuss in zoning administration is on-going maintenance of the zoning ordinance itself, both its actual text and maps. City zoning authority is created and regulated by statutes and court decisions. Both are changed or are amended frequently, making it imperative that cities remain abreast of current developments in the law and, with the assistance of legal counsel, amend their zoning ordinances accordingly.

Any city that has adopted a zoning ordinance should regularly review it to make sure it is consistent with current law. In addition, cities should also review their ordinances to make sure they are consistent with past staff and council interpretation and to make sure they are consistent with the city's comprehensive plan.

Finally, the zoning ordinance should be reviewed to ensure that it is consistent with the city council's current goals and visions for the community. Changes in the city's economic situation, population changes and surges in development interest may quickly make a zoning ordinance outdated with current city realities. Regulations that are inconsistent with what the staff and council see as the future of the community can only cause conflicts when particular applications have to be evaluated.

1. Interim Ordinances (Moratoria)

Minn. Stat. § 462.355, subd. 4); *Pawn America Minnesota, LLC v. City of St Louis Park*, No. A08-1697 (Minn. Ct. App. 2009) (unpublished decision) (rev. granted Oct. 28, 2009)

Adoption of a interim ordinance (more commonly known as a moratorium) may aid cities in the zoning ordinance amendment process, by allowing a city to study an issue without the pressure of time generated by pending applications. Cities may use a moratorium to protect the planning process, particularly when formal studies may be needed on a particular issue. Cities must follow the procedures established in state statute to initiate a moratorium.

a. Procedure for interim ordinance adoption

Minn. Stat. § 462.355, subd. 4(a)

Cities must initiate a moratorium by adopting an ordinance (interim ordinance). The interim ordinance may regulate, restrict, or prohibit any use, development, or subdivision within the city or a portion of the city for a period not to exceed one year from the effective date of the ordinance. An interim ordinance may only be adopted where the city:

- Is conducting studies on the issue.
- Has authorized a study to be conducted.
- Has held or scheduled a hearing for the purpose of considering adoption or amendment of a comprehensive plan or other official controls, including the zoning code, subdivision controls, site plan regulations, sanitary codes, building codes and official maps.
- Has annexed new territory into the city for which plans or controls have not been adopted.

The legal justification for the interim ordinance should be stated in the findings of fact when the ordinance is adopted.

Minn. Stat. § 462.355, subd. 4(b), *Duncanson v. Board of Supervisors of Damville Tp.*, 551 N.W.2d 248 (Minn. Ct. App. 1996).

No notice or hearing is generally necessary before an interim ordinance is enacted. However, a public hearing must be held if the proposed interim ordinance regulates, restricts or prohibits livestock production (feedlots). In such case, the notice of the hearing must be published at least ten days prior to the hearing in a newspaper of general circulation in the city.

b. Procedure for interim ordinance extension

Minn. Stat. § 462.355, subd. 4(c).

An interim ordinance may be extended only in *limited* circumstances if the procedures of state statute are followed. An interim ordinance may be extended if the city holds a public hearing and adopts findings of fact stating that additional time is needed to:

Minn. Stat. § 462.355, subd. 4(c)(3)

- Complete and adopt a comprehensive plan in cities that did not have comprehensive plan in place when the interim ordinance was adopted. This allows an extension for an additional year.

Minn. Stat. § 462.355, subd. 4(c)(1).

- Obtain final approval or review by a federal, state, or metropolitan agency of the proposed amendment to the city's official controls, when such approval is required by law and the review or approval has not been completed and received by the municipality at least 30 days before the expiration of the interim ordinance. This allows an extension for an additional 120 days.

Minn. Stat. § 462.355, subd. 4(c)(2).

- Complete "any other process" required by a state statute, federal law, or court order and when the process has not been completed at least 30 days before the expiration of the interim ordinance. This allows an extension for an additional 120 days.

Minn. Stat. § 462.355, subd. 4(c).

- Review an area that is affected by a city's master plan for a municipal airport. This allows for an additional period of 18 months.

The required public hearing must be held at least 15 days but not more than 30 days before the expiration of the interim ordinance, and notice of the hearing must be published at least ten days before the hearing.

c. **Applicability**

Minn. Stat. § 462.355, subd. 4(c) *Semler Const., Inc. v. City of Hanover*, 667 N.W.2d 457 (Minn. App. 2003).

An interim ordinance or moratorium may not delay or prohibit a subdivision that has been given preliminary approval, nor extend the time for action under the 60-day rule with respect to any application filed prior to the effective date of the interim ordinance.

Woodbury Place Partners v. Woodbury, 492 N.W.2d 258 (Minn. Ct. App. 1993).

According to the Minnesota Court of Appeals, the use of an interim ordinance prohibiting or limiting use of land is generally not compensable if there is a valid purpose for the interim regulation. In evaluating whether an interim ordinance is a temporary taking in the nature of a regulatory taking, courts will look to the parcel as whole. There is no bright-line rule for regulatory takings; rather, they must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Tahoe-Sierra Pres. Council, Inc. v. Tahoe Reg'l Planning Agency, 535 U.S. 302, 122 S. Ct. 1465 (2002)

VI. Zoning ordinance enforcement

A.G. Op. 477b-34 (July 29, 1991).

The Municipal Planning Act authorizes cities to enforce their zoning ordinance through criminal penalties. In addition, civil remedies, such as an injunction, are available to cities to cure on-going violations. The Minnesota Attorney General has ruled that it is a general duty of a city to enforce its zoning ordinance and that a city cannot refuse to enforce zoning requirements by ignoring illegal land uses. In enforcing city ordinances, however, a city must be aware that certain landowners may have specific rights as existing non-conformities; if their non-conforming use pre-dated the city's zoning regulation.

A. Legal nonconformities predating the adoption of the zoning ordinance

1. Legal nonconformities

Minn. Stat. § 462.357, subd. 1c.

Jake's, Ltd., Inc. v. City of Coates, 284 F.3d 884 (8th Cir. 2002)

Minn. Stat. § 462.357, subd. 1d.

Legal nonconformities are legal *uses, structures, or lots* that predate current zoning regulations and thus do not comply with the current zoning ordinance. In most cases, nonconformities cannot be amortized or phased out. A municipality must not enact, amend or enforce an ordinance that eliminates a use which use was lawful at the time of its inception. Similar protections do not exist for nonconformities that were not lawful, or prohibited by state law or city ordinance, at the time of their inception. This prohibition also does not apply to adults-only bookstores, adults-only theaters or similar adults-only businesses, as defined by ordinance. Nor does it prohibit a municipality from enforcing an ordinance providing for the prevention or abatement of nuisances, or eliminating a use determined to be a public nuisance.

SLS P'ship v. City of Apple Valley, 511 N.W.2d 738 (Minn. 1994); *Halla Nursery v. Chanhassen*, 763 NW 2d 42 (Minn. St. App. 2009)

Legal nonconformities are those uses, structures or lots that legally existed prior to the creation of the zoning district and, in recognition of the landowner's property rights, are allowed to continue even though they are now illegal. Besides being allowed to remain in effect, legal nonconformities also escape requirements subsequently enacted, such as setback requirements. The state statute on legal nonconformities supersedes any conflicting language in a zoning ordinance.

Minn. Stat. § 462.357, subd. 1e.

While legal nonconformities must be allowed to continue, a zoning ordinance may prohibit them from being expanded, extended or rebuilt in certain situations. However, nonconformities, including the lawful use or occupation of land or premises existing at the time of an amendment to the zoning ordinance, may be continued through repair, replacement, restoration, maintenance, improvement, but not including expansion, unless:

- The nonconformity or occupancy is not used for a period of more than one year.
- Any nonconforming use is destroyed by fire or other peril to the extent of greater than 50 percent of its estimated market value, as indicated in the records of the county assessor at the time of damage, and no building permit has been applied for within 180 days of when the property is damaged. In this case a municipality may impose reasonable conditions upon a building permit in order to mitigate any newly created impact on adjacent property or bodies of water.

Minn. Stat. § 462.357,
subd. 1e (c)

Cities can also regulate nonconforming uses and structures to maintain eligibility in the National Flood Insurance Program. State law specifically authorizes city regulation of nonconforming uses to mitigate potential flood damage or flood flow.

Minn. Stat. § 462.357,
subd. 1f.

Any subsequent use or occupancy of the land or premises shall be a conforming use or occupancy

2. Shoreland legal nonconformities

a. All shoreland lots

Minn. Stat. § 462.357
subd. 1e(2)

When a nonconforming structure in a shoreland district, as defined by local ordinance, with less than 50 percent of the required setback from the water, is destroyed by fire or other peril to greater than 50 percent of its estimated market value, as indicated in the records of the county assessor at the time of damage, the structure setback may be *increased* by the city if practicable and reasonable conditions may be placed upon a zoning or building permit to mitigate created impacts on the adjacent property or water body.

In addition, nonconforming shoreland lots *of record* in the office of the county recorder, on the date of adoption of local shoreland controls that do not meet the requirements for lot size or lot width have additional state law protections.

The city *may* (but is not required to) allow this type of lot to be used as a building site if:

- All structure and septic system setback distance requirements can be met.
- A Type 1 sewage treatment system, consistent with Minn. R. ch. 7080, can be installed or the lot is connected to a public sewer.
- The impervious surface coverage does not exceed 25 percent of the lot.

Minn. R. ch. 7080

In evaluating all variances, zoning and building permit applications, or conditional use requests related to nonconforming shoreland lots, the city must require the property owner to address, when appropriate:

- Stormwater runoff management.
- Reducing impervious surfaces.
- Increasing setbacks.
- Restoration of wetlands.
- Vegetative buffers.
- Sewage treatment and water supply capabilities.
- Other conservation-designed actions.

A portion of a conforming shoreland lot may be separated from an existing parcel as long as the remainder of the existing parcel meets the lot size and sewage treatment requirements of the zoning district for a new lot and the newly created parcel is combined with an adjacent parcel.

b. Contiguous lots without habitable residential dwellings

In a group of two or more contiguous shoreland lots of record under a common ownership, the city *must* allow an individual lot to be considered as a separate parcel of land for the purpose of sale or development, if it meets the following requirements:

- The lot must be at least 66 percent of the dimensional standard for lot width and lot size for the shoreland classification consistent with Minn. R. ch. 6120.
- The lot must be connected to a public sewer, if available, or must be suitable for the installation of a Type 1 sewage treatment system consistent with Minn. R. ch. 7080, and local government controls.

[Minn. R. ch. 6120](#)

[Minn. R. ch. 7080](#)

- The lot’s impervious surface coverage does not exceed 25 percent of each lot.
- The development of the lot is consistent with the city-adopted comprehensive plan (if any).

c. Contiguous lots with habitable residential dwellings

Two or more contiguous nonconforming shoreland lots of record in shoreland areas under a common ownership must be able to be sold or purchased individually if each lot contained a *habitable residential dwelling* at the time the lots came under common ownership and the lots are suitable for, or served by, a sewage treatment system consistent with the requirements of section 115.55 and Minn. R. ch. 7080, or are connected to a public sewer.

Minn. Stat. § 115.55,
Minn. R. ch. 7080

B. Violations of the zoning ordinance: criminal penalties

Cities may provide for criminal penalties for violation of the city zoning ordinance. In an ordinance, cities may designate ordinance violations as misdemeanors or petty misdemeanors. Cities may impose maximum penalties for misdemeanors of a \$1,000 fine or 90 days in jail, or both. In addition, the costs of prosecution may be added. The maximum penalty for a petty misdemeanor is a fine of \$300.

Minn. Stat. § 462.362
Minn. Stat. § 169.89,
subd. 2.
Minn. Stat. §§ 609.02,
subds. 3, 4a;
609.0332; 609.034.

See Handbook,
Chapter 7 for
information on
prosecution
responsibilities for
violations of local
ordinances

C. Violations of the zoning ordinance: civil remedies

In many instances, criminal sanctions will not cure a zoning violation. Where the city desires removal of building or use that violates the zoning ordinance, civil remedies may be more effective than even repeated criminal fines. A city may enforce its zoning ordinance through requesting an injunction (a court order requiring someone to stop a particular activity or type of conduct) or other appropriate remedy from the court. These remedies can be used to compel owners to cease and desist illegal uses of their property or even to tear down structures that have been built in violation of the city’s zoning ordinance

Minn. Stat. § 462.362

City of Minneapolis v. F and R, Inc. 300 N.W.2d 2 (Minn. 1980); *Rockville Tp. v. Lang*, 387 N.W.2d 200 (Minn. Ct. App. 1986); *Hall Nursery v. Chanhassen*, 763 NW 2d 42 (Minn. Ct. App. 2009)

D. Violations of the zoning ordinance: conditional use permit revocation

Minn. Stat.
§462.3595, subd. 3

Where a conditional use permit has been issued, a city may have an additional method of compelling compliance with city zoning ordinances. Conditional use permits may be revoked if the permit holder violates the conditions of the permit. For example, if the permit requires the installation traffic calming measures, but the permit holder fails to do so.

Northpoint Plaza v. City of Rochester, 465 N.W.2d 686 (Minn. 1991)

However, it is important to emphasize that conditional use permits, once granted, are a property right. A city seeking to revoke a conditional use permit should provide the permit holder with due process, an opportunity to be heard and respond to allegations, prior to permit revocation. Procedures for revocation should be established in the zoning ordinance.

VII. Conclusion: other land use controls available to cities

It is important to emphasize that zoning is merely *one* of the tools available to a city to assist in creating a well-planned, even thriving community. A city may also use its subdivision ordinance, building and housing codes, nuisance ordinance, capital improvement programs and official map in conjunction with its zoning ordinance to achieve its planning goals and assure the social, economic and cultural future of the community.

A. Subdivision ordinances

Minn. Stat. § 462.358

See LMC information memo, *Subdivision Guide for Cities*

See Handbook, Chapter 14 for more information on city subdivision ordinances

Municipalities have the authority to regulate subdivisions of land for many reasons including but not limited to encouraging orderly development and planning for necessities such as streets, parks and open spaces. Cities have the authority to adopt a subdivision ordinance setting out the standards, requirements and procedures to review, approve or disapprove an application to subdivide tracts of land in the city.

Minn. Stat. § 462.358, subd. 2b.

Minn. Stat. § 462.353, subd. 4.

Cities have the authority to require, as part of the subdivision regulations, that a reasonable portion of buildable land in any proposed subdivision be dedicated to the public or preserved for public use as some or all of the following:

- Streets, roads.

- Sewers.
- Electric, gas, and water facilities.
- Stormwater drainage and holding areas or ponds and similar utilities and improvements.
- Parks, recreational facilities, playgrounds, trails.
- Wetlands.
- Open space.

[Minn. Stat. § 462.353, subd. 4](#)

In the alternative, city ordinance may require money instead of land; state law refers to this as “cash fees.”

Subdivision regulations may be as extensive as city zoning regulations. Subdivision regulations, in addition to the dedication requirements discussed above, may address:

- The size, location, grading and improvement of lots, structures, public areas, streets, roads, trails, walkways, curbs, gutters, water supply, storm and drainage, lighting, sewers, electricity, gas and other utilities.
- The planning and design of sites.
- Access to solar energy.
- The protection and conservation of floodplains, shore lands, soils, water, vegetation, energy, air quality, and geologic and ecologic features.

- Consistency of the subdivision with the official map (if one exists) and other local controls such as zoning and the comprehensive plan (if one exists).

Finally, subdivision regulations may require the installation of sewers, streets, electric, gas, drainage, water facilities and similar utilities and improvements.

1. Platting requirements

All platting is governed by the state Platting Act at Minn. Stat. ch. 505. A plat is a scale drawing of one or more existing parcels of land that depicts the location and boundaries of lots, blocks, outlots, parks, and public ways and other data required by the Platting Act.

City subdivision regulations may require plats where any subdivision creates parcels, tracts, or lots. Cities *must* require plats if any subdivision creates five or more lots or parcels which are 2-1/2 acres or less in size. City subdivision regulations must not conflict with state platting laws but may address the same or additional subjects.

B. The official map

Cities have authority to adopt an official map. As a planning tool, official maps ensure that land the city needs for street widening, street extensions, future streets, local airports and other public purposes will be available at basic land prices by reserving these areas on a map. The official map is *not* the map adopted with the city's comprehensive plan or zoning code.

Official maps do not give a city any right to acquire the areas reserved on the map without payment. When the city is ready to proceed with the opening of a mapped street, the widening and extension of existing mapped streets, or acquisition for aviation purposes, it still must acquire the property by gift, purchase, or condemnation. It need not, however, pay for any building or other improvement erected on the land without a permit or in violation of the conditions of the permit.

C. Safety and maintenance codes

In conjunction with the zoning requirements, cities may promote the city's development by enforcement of the State Building Code and local nuisance and/or property maintenance ordinances. All three types of regulation ensure that the structures allowed within zoning districts are well-maintained and safe for the public, by preventing and combating blight.

See LMC information memo, *Subdivision Guide for Cities*

Minn. Stat. § 505.01, subd. 3(f)

Minn. Stat. § 462.358, subd. 3a; Minn. Stat. ch. 505.

Minn. Stat. § 462.359.

Minn. Stat. § 462.357, subd. 1.

For more information on the official map see *Handbook*, Chapter 14

Minn. Stat. § 462.359, subd. 3.

1. The State Building Code

State Building Code

For more information on the State Building Code see [Handbook, Chapter 13](#)

The State Building Code is a series of standards and specifications related to the type of building materials, spacing and other dimensions of building materials and structures designed to establish minimum safeguards in the construction of buildings, to protect the general public and people who live and work in them from fire and other hazards.

Minn. Stat. § 326B.121.

The State Building Code is the standard that applies statewide for the construction, reconstruction, alteration, and repair of buildings and other structures of the type governed by the code. The State Building Code supersedes the building code of any municipality.

Minn. Stat. § 326B.121

If, as of Jan. 1, 2008, a municipality has in effect an ordinance adopting the State Building Code, the municipality must continue to **administer and enforce** the State Building Code within its jurisdiction. The municipality is prohibited by state statute from repealing its ordinance adopting the State Building Code. However, this provision does not apply to cities that have a population of less than 2,500, according to the last federal census, and that are located outside of a metropolitan county. These cities may repeal an ordinance adopting the State Building Code and they are not required to administer and enforce the code (although the State Building Code will remain in effect). These cities may, however, opt to enforce and administer the State Building Code by adopting a local ordinance.

Minn. Stat. § 326B.121

Minn. Stat. § 326B.121.

A city must not, by ordinance or through a development agreement, require building code provisions regulating components or systems of any structure that are different from any provision of the State Building Code. However, a city may, with the approval of the state building official, adopt an ordinance that is more restrictive than the State Building Code where geological conditions warrant a more restrictive ordinance.

Minn. Stat. § 326B.16

Minn. Stat. § 326B.112

Minn. Stat. § 326B.175

Requirements regarding accessibility, elevator safety, and bleacher safety apply statewide, with no exception.

2. Nuisance ordinances

Minn. Stat. § 412.221, subd. 23.

Minn. Stat. § 561.01.

See LMC information memo, *Public Nuisance*

With or without zoning, cities may prevent and abate nuisances through the passage of a local ordinance that defines nuisances and provides for their regulation, prevention and/or abatement. Generally a “nuisance” is anything that is injurious to health, indecent or offensive to the senses, or an obstruction to the free use of property so as to interfere with a comfortable enjoyment of life or property.

3. Property maintenance ordinances

Wessman v. Mankato,
No. A08-0273 (Minn.
Ct. App.
2008)(unpublished
decision)

Cities may choose to deal with the specific nuisance posed by dilapidated buildings through the adoption of a property maintenance ordinance. Such ordinances typically establish standards for exterior maintenance related to painting, siding, roofing and broken windows. City property maintenance ordinances should be drafted and enforced in a manner that is consistent with the State Building Code. Property maintenance ordinances should generally not attempt to regulate construction issues already regulated by the State Building Code, because such regulation may be pre-empted.

4. Hazardous and Substandard Buildings Act

Minn. Stat. § 463.15
See LMC information
memo, *Dangerous
Properties*

Cities that have not adopted a local ordinance regarding nuisances or property maintenance may still abate the public safety threat posed by dangerous dilapidated buildings through the Hazardous and Substandard Building Act in state statute. The Hazardous Buildings Act allows cities to order landowners to abate (through repair or razing) hazardous conditions on their property or to abate hazardous conditions itself and then seek compensation for the property owner.

D. City land acquisition

For more information
on city acquisition of
property see the LMC
information memo,
*Purchase and Sale of
Real Property*
Minn. Stat. § 282.01;
City of St Paul v State,
754 NW 2d 386,
(Minn. Ct. App. 2008)

Cities may also control development through the planned acquisition, development and potentially the resale of land by the city itself. Through purchase and acquisition programs cities can acquire the land they need for present and future public purposes such as parks, streets, public buildings, such as police and fire halls, and to reserve land for future residential and commercial development. Cities may also acquire land through the tax forfeiture process.