



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting  
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive  
Draft Minutes – Wednesday, March 4, 2020 – 6:30 p.m.**

- 1 **1. Call to Order**  
2 Chair Gitzen called to order the regular meeting of the Planning Commission meeting at  
3 approximately 6:30 p.m. and reviewed the role and purpose of the Planning Commission.  
4
- 5 **2. Roll Call**  
6 At the request of Chair Gitzen, City Planner Thomas Paschke called the Roll.  
7
- 8 **Members Present:** Chair Chuck Gitzen; Vice Chair Peter Sparby, and Commissioners  
9 Julie Kimble, Michelle Kruzel, Tammy McGehee, Michelle Pribyl  
10 and Karen Schaffhausen.  
11
- 12 **Members Absent:** None  
13
- 14 **Staff Present:** City Planner Thomas Paschke, Community Development Director  
15 Janice Gundlach, Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd  
16
- 17 **3. Approve Agenda**  
18
- 19 **MOTION**  
20 **Member Kruzel moved, seconded by Member McGehee, to approve the agenda as**  
21 **presented.**  
22
- 23 **Ayes: 7**  
24 **Nays: 0**  
25 **Motion carried.**  
26
- 27 **4. Review of Minutes**  
28
- 29 **a. January 2, 2020 Planning Commission Regular Meeting**  
30
- 31 **MOTION**  
32 **Member Kimble moved, seconded by Member McGehee, to approve the**  
33 **January 8, 2020 meeting minutes as presented.**  
34
- 35 **Ayes: 7**  
36 **Nays: 0**  
37 **Motion carried.**  
38
- 39 **5. Communications and Recognitions:**  
40
- 41 **a. From the Public:** *Public comment pertaining to general land use issues not on this*  
42 *agenda, including the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update.*

43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88

None.

- b. **From the Commission or Staff:** *Information about assorted business not already on this agenda, including a brief update on the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update process.*

Forestry Task Force Update

Member McGehee explained the Task Force has had two meetings. At the second meeting there was discussion on three items. She reviewed the basic outline with the Commission. She indicated the issue has been that PWEC is made up of Public Works, Transportation and Environment and lately there has been a lot of interest in the sustainability, benchmarking, environment and has taken up quite a bit of their time but it clearly has things in development, some things in Park and Recreation and quite a bit in Public Works for storm water. As the city gets into resiliency and sustainability that will be more and more evident and there will be more of these topics that hit at least those three main departments and Commissions. The way the Commissions are currently set up no Commission can meet with another Commission; no Commission can set up Task Forces without Council approval. The idea was to pass along to the Council that there are many overlapping issues here that need to be discussed and how it should be handled.

Member McGehee indicated there will be one more meeting where public comments will be taken on any of these recommendations and then the recommendations will go to Council and the city Council will decide what to do with them.

Member McGehee noted Chair Cihacek of the PWETC initiated the task force by going to the city Council and asked the city Council to consider forming an Environment Commission but the Council does not want to do that and she personally was not sure that needed to be done either but she thought there did need to be task forces on some of these issues. She also thought there needed to be the opportunity to bring in experts within the community. She indicated she is in favor of these recommendations and going to the Council for a decision.

Member Pribyl noted a couple of weeks ago Alliance For Sustainability sponsored a discussion, East Metro Communities, talking about climate action and commission members from across the East Metro attended. There was discussion about how the different commissions in the different communities work together in their own communities and across the East Metro to try to come up with ways to address resiliency issues and other things. This seems like a good opportunity internally within Roseville to coordinate efforts as the city is looking at zoning changes to be consistent with the Comp. Plan.

Member McGehee agreed but felt no Commission was in the position to do it themselves given the structure that is in place now.

89 Member McGehee asked if the Commission had any issues or thoughts that she could  
90 bring back to the Task Force.

91  
92 Member Sparby thought a lot of the problem was jurisdictional. He wondered who is  
93 doling out the subject matters to the Commissions. He wondered if it was staff  
94 handling all that behind the scenes.

95  
96 Member McGehee explained staff would have to decide and it depends on what is  
97 spelled out. She indicated she talked briefly to Community Development Director  
98 Gundlach about energy efficiency and she explained what the city can and cannot do  
99 and incentivization. Those are issues, that energy piece of ongoing development,  
100 belongs here. She noted the Council, several years ago, decided to put in the Zoning  
101 Code to allow housing in the Commercial and Retail District, which is fine but there  
102 is nothing accompanying that to say anything about pathways and connections or any  
103 green space around the buildings or anything like that and it is kind of a heat island.  
104 It seems to her that the city missed planning, and certainly at the Council level should  
105 be looking at how the city wants that area to look going forward. What kind of  
106 amenities does the city want to provide other than just making Roseville look like  
107 downtown Minneapolis in one little desert area. When she was on the Council there  
108 was a lot of unhappiness with the build forward in the Zoning Code.

109  
110 Chair Gitzen thought it will be very interesting to see what the city Council does with  
111 the recommendations because it could take all sorts of form. He thanked Member  
112 McGehee for taking the time for joining the Task Force.

#### 113 Comprehensive Plan Update

114  
115 Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd updated the Commission on the Comprehensive Plan and  
116 indicated the issues have been addressed and are scheduled for formal authorization  
117 by the Met Council on April 22<sup>nd</sup>.

118  
119 Chair Gitzen explained he talked to Community Development Director Gundlach  
120 about the plan going forward and his understanding is once the Council has approved  
121 it staff will start to dig into it and may take a couple of months.

122  
123 Ms. Gundlach indicated the Planning Commission will have a role in the  
124 Comprehensive Plan and will take several months for staff to get organized on what  
125 the Zoning Code updates are going to be and staff will work together on strategizing  
126 how to advance that forward and give the Commission an idea in a couple of months  
127 about what that process is going to look like.

## 128 129 **6. Public Hearing**

### 130 131 **a. Request For Approval Of An Amendment To Title 10, Zoning, Pertaining To** 132 **Height Limitations For Detached Accessory Dwelling (PROJ0017)**

133 Chair Gitzen opened the public hearing for PROJ0017 at approximately 6:50 p.m. and  
134 reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing.

135

136 Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd summarized the request as detailed in the staff report  
137 dated March 4, 2020.

138  
139 Member Sparby indicated on the square footage, it was recommended to go to eight  
140 hundred from six hundred fifty square feet. He wondered if that was something the  
141 Commission should be considering in terms of an amendment at this time.

142  
143 Mr. Lloyd explained the request from the applicant certainly was to increase the  
144 square footage to something more than six hundred fifty square feet, perhaps eight  
145 hundred or larger. That is not an unreasonable suggestion, but staff was more  
146 comfortable waiting to see what policy changes have come through the new  
147 Comprehensive Plan update and take on that particular change later on. For now, the  
148 text of the Zoning Code should continue to state six hundred fifty square feet, at least  
149 by the recommendation being made.

150  
151 Member Sparby noted based on what he is seeing in Attachment A, there is certainly  
152 a lot of the ADU's that would not qualify under the city Code now.

153  
154 Member McGehee thought there was a distinct difference between and auxiliary  
155 dwelling unit and an auxiliary storage unit. She thought the six hundred fifty square  
156 feet was for the idea of having an aging parent or something like that. Something that  
157 could be added on and was not the intention to have the equivalent of an eight  
158 hundred square foot house in the backyard. She was glad, at this point it was left  
159 alone and did agree with the changes made for the height so it can go over a garage.  
160 She wondered how that works since there are so many single-story homes and if the  
161 home itself is not single story she thought staff tried to address that with the nine-foot  
162 floor to ceiling limit of the unit over a garage and if that was correct.

163  
164 Mr. Lloyd explained that is not how staff would have addressed that in this. With the  
165 overall height limit, even though the overall height limit would be thirty feet with this  
166 amendment, it would still be true that the overall height of an accessory building  
167 would not be allowed to exceed the overall head of the principal structure. There  
168 certainly would be plenty of locations in the city where an accessory dwelling unit  
169 would not be allowed over a garage on a single-story home by the proposed  
170 amendment.

171  
172 Member Sparby asked if a two-car garage would be adequate to house an accessory  
173 dwelling unit above it.

174  
175 Mr. Lloyd indicated it would be close in range for a six hundred fifty square foot  
176 accessory dwelling unit, but he thought it could be done. He noted there is room to  
177 evaluate those size constraints later on.

178  
179 Member Sparby thought this would be a logical time to review this because all of the  
180 amendments are being done.

181

182 Mr. Jeffery Lewis, applicant, addressed the Commission and indicated he did have  
183 examples of the accessory dwelling units that he could get to the Commission.  
184

185 **Public Comment**  
186

187 No one came forward to speak for or against this request.  
188

189 Chair Gitzen closed the public hearing at 7:15 p.m.  
190

191 **Commission Deliberation**  
192

193 **MOTION**

194 **Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Kimble, to recommend to the**  
195 **City Council approval of the proposed amendment to Title 10 regarding**  
196 **detached Accessory Dwelling Units, based on the content of the Request for**  
197 **Planning Commission Action, public input, and Planning Commission**  
198 **deliberation (PROJ0017).**  
199

200 Member McGehee agreed with the height change but she also agreed with keeping it  
201 at six hundred fifty square feet. She noted she has rentals, and a few are at four  
202 hundred square feet and she did not have any issues with renting those out and also  
203 had one at about six hundred square feet with two bedrooms which was also easy to  
204 rent.  
205

206 Member Pribyl agreed that the six hundred fifty square feet seems large enough for  
207 the intended use and also understand the applicants concern about if building over a  
208 garage, trying to maximize the use of that space and not having to something odd  
209 with whatever is left over. She thought it was worth future discussion to talk about  
210 what that means for practical applications.  
211

212 Member Sparby thought it was a little odd that the Commission is finding it  
213 appropriate to discuss part of what the applicant is bringing forward but not the other  
214 part because the applicants bringing forward the proposal, his issue is twenty-eight by  
215 twenty-six and is above the square footage limit but the Commission is refusing to  
216 discuss the fact that he is going to be above the six hundred fifty square feet. He  
217 understood the applicant can get by with a smaller unit, but this is talking about a  
218 situation where the applicant is trying to maximize the use of an accessory dwelling  
219 unit where the Commission is setting a maximum. The Commission is accepting the  
220 fact that there is going to be a lot that are less. He thought the city should have an  
221 open mind to consider if the maximum needs to be raised up at this time.  
222

223 Member Kimble asked what happens when someone comes to the city with a three-  
224 car garage. The city does not have any idea what will be brought forward in the  
225 future, should the city keep changing the Code as things are brought to them.  
226

227 Member Sparby thought it was all about reasonability. If a proposal is brought  
228 forward that is reasonable then the Commission should take the time to consider it

229 and if it did not make sense for the community and how planning is done in the city  
230 then it would be rejected. If reasonable and made sense it could be accepted. He  
231 thought it made sense to consider all aspects of what the applicant is coming forward  
232 with.

233  
234 Member McGehee asked if there is a variance process for this.

235  
236 Member Pribyl asked if the applicant wanted to build an accessory dwelling unit at  
237 seven hundred square feet could a variance be requested or is this indicating that  
238 nothing over six hundred fifty square feet would be allowed.

239  
240 Mr. Lloyd explained one of the reasons why staff received the Zoning Amendment  
241 request is, particularly with the height, the Zoning Code indicates the limit and it was  
242 not the intended limit or a very practical limit for allowing an accessory dwelling unit  
243 above the garage. Conceivably someone could apply for the variance on that but  
244 demonstrating why there are some unique circumstances, adhering to that parameter  
245 of it being unfair for that property owner, as opposed to something more general, that  
246 case is harder to make.

247  
248 Chair Gitzen thought there were a couple of ways the Commission could proceed. He  
249 thought Commissioner McGehee was putting the two items together. He noted the  
250 proposed motion could be voted on and what he is hearing from the other  
251 Commissioners is that six hundred fifty square feet is ok. He did not think the  
252 Commission was intentionally not discussing that part but felt ok with the limit  
253 suggested.

254  
255 Member McGehee indicated she did not want to amend her motion.

256  
257 Member Sparby suggested an amendment to the motion to update lines 68 of  
258 attachment B to read eight hundred square feet of living area.

259  
260 **Member Sparby moved to amend the motion to update line 68 of Attachment B**  
261 **to read “eight hundred square feet of living area.”**

262  
263 **Motion failed for lack of second.**

264  
265 Member Kruzel indicated she was ok with leaving this the way it is and understood it  
266 will be addressed later on possibly with the Comp. Plan.

267  
268 Member Sparby thought the time to address this is now and not to come back at some  
269 time when everyone in attendance might not even be on the Commission. He thought  
270 the city needed to get realistic with the plan, if these type of accessory dwelling units  
271 are being brought forward are in the seven hundreds then the city wants to make the  
272 best use of the Ordinance and that cannot be done if it is at six hundred fifty.

273

274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318

Member Kimble asked Member Sparby where he is seeing a number of the accessory dwelling units being over seven hundred square feet because she did not see that and most of them in the packet are well under seven hundred square feet.

Member Sparby indicated he was in agreement that many of them are under that threshold, but he also saw many at the bottom that are just over the threshold on attachment A, pages 6-7.

Member Kimble she thought these looked to be mostly under six hundred square feet in the right-hand column.

Member Sparby indicated there were a handful on the bottom around seven hundred square feet.

Member Kimble noted there appeared to be three out of two pages.

Chair Gitzen thought there was good discussion and called to motion.

**Ayes: 6**  
**Nays: 1 (Sparby)**  
**Motion carried.**

**b. Request By City Of Roseville For Approval Of An Amendment To Title 10, Zoning, Pertaining To Indoor Entertainment Centers (PROJ0047)**

Chair Gitzen opened the public hearing for PROJ0047 at approximately 7:30 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing.

Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated March 4, 2020.

Member Kimble asked for more information on how staff arrived at some of the not permitted, specifically the CMU-1 and CMU-2 and Industrial. She asked specifically about the Industrial because many of these uses require high ceiling heights that would be typical in an industrial building.

Mr. Lloyd reviewed the zoning map with the Commission indicating where entertainment centers are allowed and not allowed.

Member Kimble asked if staff knew of any of the uses that are currently located in any of the areas that indicate not permitted.

Mr. Lloyd explained staff did not. One of the CUP's was in the office park district. He showed the location on the map and noted there may be other locations that staff has not been made aware of yet.

319 Member Kimble did not think the city should be overly restrictive when there are  
320 types of buildings that can accommodate these businesses and some of these uses to  
321 her do not seem office related.

322  
323 Member Sparby wondered how and why firearm ranges are being brought into this  
324 because he thought it was odd to have mini-golf and firearm ranges in the same  
325 section and permitted and not permitted in the exact same areas.

326  
327 Mr. Lloyd indicated the reason for this is because it was brought to staff's attention in  
328 the last year or so and it is an opportunity to talk about whether the city is interested  
329 in allowing for that kind of use or not. There is plenty of spectrum there.

330  
331 Member Sparby asked if a license is not required currently for a firearm range.

332  
333 Mr. Lloyd explained the use is not currently allowed. The Zoning Code does not  
334 recognize it and it is not like another use. The same would be true for an archery  
335 range.

336  
337 Member Sparby asked if a firing range or archery range is not permitted if it is not  
338 listed in the Zoning Code.

339  
340 Mr. Lloyd indicated that was correct and because it is not similar to anything that is  
341 permitted that is addressed.

342  
343 Member Sparby thought that if something is not mentioned then it would be  
344 permitted.

345  
346 Mr. Lloyd indicated it is the opposite.

347  
348 Member McGehee noted on page one of two in attachment B it states "...when the  
349 code is silent on a particular use there is some judgement to be made about whether  
350 that thing being discussed is materially similar to other things that are addressed."  
351 She noted she had the same question because it is considered a judgement call by  
352 whomever is reviewing the activity.

353  
354 Member McGehee asked how staff is differentiating the different climbing structures  
355 that are in the businesses versus gymnasiums and athletic areas.

356  
357 Mr. Lloyd explained in his mind more about the focus of the place. Vertical  
358 Endeavors is an entertainment place and that would be the type of thing talked about.  
359 Health clubs, training facilities are regulated in the Zoning Code elsewhere and might  
360 also be permitted in the same places and not necessarily regulated differently but are  
361 already covered.

362  
363 Member McGehee indicated when she reviewed the list, with the exception of the  
364 shooting range because she did not think there would be much support from the  
365 public if advertised and the one thing that bothered her about this whole process. It is



366 stating no one came forward but the city does not have a newspaper and the city only  
367 sent out a newsletter every other month and so the city is really in a news desert in  
368 terms of finding this stuff out and is an unusual expectation to think that the residents  
369 of the community are all going to be watching the city meetings. She thought the  
370 Council and staff need to figure out how to get the information out to the residents, so  
371 the residents have some input. She thought this was a significant change. She also  
372 liked the buffer zone between residential and these types of businesses.

373

374 Member Schaffhausen asked if staff knew what the occupancy rate is in the Industrial  
375 space because she was thinking about businesses coming into these spaces. She  
376 thought if there was space and a business wanted to come into that area she would be  
377 open to that and she wondered how flexible the city can be with the not permitted  
378 component of those buildings.

379

380 Mr. Lloyd did not know if staff had that information. The city has as much flexibility  
381 as it wants because that is a legislative decision the city can make but the reality, in  
382 the short term, is that District was uniquely set up for manufacturing or not personal  
383 kinds of commerce and it may be worthwhile to review and possibly change that a  
384 little bit to allow for some of these spaces to get used as it seems appropriate. As it  
385 stands, without changing that in the Zoning Code, the District is not set up for the  
386 personal types of businesses.

387

388 Member Kruzal asked if Roseville aligned pretty well with other communities on  
389 what is being allowed in the city.

390

391 Mr. Lloyd explained the research he did with surrounding communities was focused  
392 or geared toward the city knowing about certain facilities in those communities and  
393 what the Zoning Code in that city said about it. There were a couple of communities  
394 that have things similar to what Roseville has.

395

396 Member Sparby indicated he was curious about the standard the city uses to apply to  
397 a facility offering an indoor attraction.

398

399 Mr. Lloyd explained that is a gray area that exists in the city's current Zoning Code.

400

401 Member Sparby wondered if some kind of language should be built in stating "indoor  
402 attractions where the principal purpose is a use", such as video games, bowling,  
403 inflatables, etc.

404

405 The Commission concurred.

406

407 Member McGehee indicated staff is repealing 303, which was in the business section.  
408 If it is repealed then none of the items listed in there would be a part of the code such  
409 as hours of operation. She noted she is of two minds regarding the entire issue of  
410 conditional use. On one hand, conditional use really provides the opportunity for  
411 general community input. The downside to that is once the city approves it the  
412 conditional use runs with the property and not the activity and is harder to get rid of.

413 It seems to her that neither is in this and she did not think there was enough structure  
414 to what the city is doing here to make her comfortable that staff has really figured out  
415 how to handle all of these amusement things now coming into the community and  
416 exactly where those businesses will be located and how to regulate them and are all  
417 the businesses going to have adequate insurance and does the city care as a  
418 community that people come to the city to recreate. She thinks it is a little too quick  
419 and too much at once and she thought the Commission would have more time to  
420 review it and wondered what the rush is to get it back to the Council.

421  
422 Mr. Lloyd indicated he personally did not know but a request for staff to get it done.

423  
424 Member Schaffhausen indicated she knew a little bit about the insurance and was not  
425 surprised that staff took that out because for someone to open up a business there are  
426 so many requirements from a loan perspective.

427  
428 Member McGehee wondered what if the owner of a business does not need a loan.

429  
430 Member Schaffhausen explained in most cases if the owner is stepping into it there is  
431 going to be some sort of additional assistance needed to do some sort of a build out.  
432 Even in the instance of significant capital there is still equipment and other things that  
433 go on top of that.

434  
435 Member Pribyl asked what the licensing process looked like for a firearm range.

436  
437 Mr. Lloyd indicated he did not know a lot about the licensing process.

438  
439 Ms. Gundlach explained there is not a public hearing associated with a business  
440 license. The language in the miscellaneous section applies to all of the licenses and  
441 gives the City Manager the authority to ask for a variety of different things to ensure  
442 the public health, safety and welfare is covered by that license. She indicated there is  
443 one other entertainment use floating out there that is waiting for a decision on this  
444 topic before moving forward. She thought there was a little bit of urgency to make a  
445 decision, but she did not think that should cloud the decisions made by the  
446 Commission or city Council.

447  
448 Ms. Gundlach explained regarding Commissioner McGehee's concern about all of  
449 the items in the business license for amusements currently that are being stricken, at  
450 the Development Review Committee meeting all of the businesses that actually have  
451 this license were looked at and none of them have conditions in their license that  
452 relate to any of the items in here. This list was generated at a different time when  
453 there were different types of concerns associated with these entertainment uses and  
454 based on the history of how the city has actually implemented the ordinance, staff has  
455 found no reason to keep them. She noted there are other sections of code that could  
456 cover a variety of different things related to hours of operation or noise or a parking  
457 or security issue.

458

459 Member Kimble indicated regarding the issue of insurance; it looks like on  
460 attachment C the City Manager has the right to ask for it. She would encourage staff  
461 to allow entertainment businesses in the Industrial Zone because so many of these  
462 uses would fit in perfectly in Industrial Zone and if it industrial is not being used the  
463 truck turning radius in that area would be perfect for additional parking. She noted  
464 this kind of conversion in industrial has been done all over the Twin Cities and some  
465 of these uses are perfect for industrial. She would encourage the city to continue  
466 looking at this.

467  
468 Chair Gitzen wondered if the shooting range portion be removed from the  
469 entertainment part because he thought there was some concern to allowing them.

470  
471 Mr. Paschke did not think a shooting range was buried in someone's zoning code and  
472 would be more in the licensing area and how it is licensed and what is allowed within  
473 the shooting range. He was not sure he has seen any zoning code where a fire range,  
474 gun range is allowed.

475  
476 Chair Gitzen asked what affect it would have on the rest of the proposal if the  
477 shooting range were to be removed from the entertainment section of the zoning code.  
478 He thought the Council could always put it in again.

479  
480 Mr. Lloyd explained the recommendation from the Planning Commission to include  
481 removing the firearms range from the zoning section and fee schedule and license  
482 section would be something the city Council would discuss further and either agree or  
483 disagree with the Commission.

484  
485 Member McGehee indicated she would feel more comfortable moving forward with  
486 this if the firearms range were stricken.

487  
488 **Public Comment**

489  
490 No one came forward to speak for or against this request.

491  
492 Chair Gitzen closed the public hearing at 8:11 p.m.

493  
494 **Commission Deliberation**

495  
496 **MOTION**

497 **Member Sparby moved, seconded by Member Kimble, to recommend to the**  
498 **City Council approval of the proposed amendment to Title 10 regarding Indoor**  
499 **Entertainment Centers, based on the content of this RPCA, public input, and**  
500 **Planning Commission deliberation. (PROJ0047).**

501  
502 Chair Gitzen asked if Member Sparby wanted to leave the Firearms Range in.

503  
504 Member Sparby thought it made sense based on the reasoning that staff put forward  
505 and Mr. Lloyd elaborated on to let that go through to the city Council to allow the

506 Council to consider the definition. It could be brought up that the Commission had a  
507 discussion on it.

508  
509 Member McGehee requested an amendment to the motion removing the firearms  
510 range be struck and allow the Council to put back in if the Council chooses.

511  
512 **Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Kruzel, to amend the motion**  
513 **removing the Firearm Range be struck.**

514  
515 Member Sparby thought it made sense to bring the definition forward as written to the  
516 city Council in order for them to consider that idea.

517  
518 Member McGehee disagreed and thought the Commission should take a stronger  
519 stand, pulling it out and allowing the city Council to put it back in based on what she  
520 heard. She thought this would force more discussion and public input during the  
521 hearing then if it goes forward as is.

522  
523 Member Sparby indicated he heard from staff that this is for the zoning whereas those  
524 more rigorous requirements would come as part of the licensing process and since  
525 those are not in front of the Commission it makes sense to bring this forward as a  
526 zoning definition.

527  
528 Member McGehee disagreed and explained by moving this forward as is it is  
529 indicating the firearm range can go here and she did not see a buffer or public input  
530 on this, and she thought there should be a stronger statement. To her this does not  
531 preclude anything that the Council wants to do. By removing it from this at the  
532 Commission level it is a stronger signal to the Council that the Commission is  
533 hesitant about that.

534  
535 Ms. Gundlach indicated the license requirements for fire arms are not really existent  
536 so one recommendation that could be made to the city Council is if the Council wants  
537 to keep the fire arms in the zoning code to leave the possibility open for it to be in  
538 these zoning districts so it is not automatically being excluded because it is not listed.  
539 It could be recommended to revisit the licensing requirements for these indoor  
540 firearms and firearm sales and then the Council could look at additional requirements  
541 specific to the firearms through the license part. That might provide opportunity for  
542 the public to comment because the Council can add a public hearing requirement to a  
543 license.

544  
545 **Ayes: 3**  
546 **Nays: 4 (Schaffhausen, Sparby, Kimble and Gitzen)**  
547 **Motion to amend failed.**

548  
549 **Ayes: 4**  
550 **Nays: 3 (McGehee, Kruzel, Pribyl)**  
551 **Motion carried.**

552

553 Member McGehee thought the issue with firearms range needs to be more broadly  
554 advertised in the community and more community input as to whether the community  
555 wants that.

556  
557 Ms. Gundlach thought there needed to be a suggestion for the city Council to consider  
558 reviewing the licensing requirements for firearms to consider a public hearing and  
559 notification in the neighborhood.

560  
561 Mr. Lloyd thought Commissioner McGehee was requesting that even before there is  
562 licensing requirements that apply to a firearms range, her preference in this motion is  
563 city Council get public input into including firearms in the first place and maybe that  
564 is a good first step. The Commission leave it in there but make sure there is more  
565 public involvement in having a firearms range in the zoning code in the first place or  
566 as a business license in the first place.

567  
568 Member McGehee agreed and explained once this is in the code it will remain.

569  
570 Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Schaffhausen, to encourage the City  
571 Council to get robust community input for firearms ranges before including in the  
572 zoning code, and if added to the zoning code, incorporate public notification  
573 requirements into the business license process.

574  
575 **Ayes: 6**  
576 **Nays: 0**  
577 **Abstain: Sparby**  
578 **Motion carried.**

579  
580 **7. Adjourn**

581  
582 **MOTION**  
583 **Member Pribyl, seconded by Member Sparby, to adjourn the meeting at 8:34**  
584 **p.m.**

585  
586 **Ayes: 7**  
587 **Nays: 0**  
588 **Motion carried.**

589  
590