



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Draft Minutes – Wednesday, July 7, 2021 – 6:30 p.m.**

- 1 **1. Call to Order**
2 Chair Kimble 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 Kimble, City Planner Thomas Paschke called the Roll.
7
- 8 **Members Present:** Chair Kimble; Vice Chair Michell Pribyl, and Commissioners
9 Michelle Kruzel, Tammy McGehee, Karen Schaffhausen, Erik
10 Bjorum and Emily Leutgeb.
11
- 12 **Members Absent:** None.
13
- 14 **Staff Present:** City Planner Thomas Paschke, Senior Planner Brian Lloyd,
15 Community Development Director Janice Gundlach and
16 Department Assistant Stacy Johnson.
17
- 18 **3. Approve Agenda**
19
- 20 **4. Review of Minutes**
21
- 22 **a. June 2, 2021 Planning Commission Regular Meeting**
23
- 24 **MOTION**
25 **Member Schaffhausen moved, seconded by Member McGehee, to approve the**
26 **June 2, 2021 meeting minutes.**
27
- 28 **Ayes: 7**
29 **Nays: 0**
30 **Motion carried.**
31
- 32 **b. June 10, 2021 Planning Commission Regular Meeting**
33
- 34 **MOTION**
35 **Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Schaffhausen, to approve the**
36 **June 10, 2021 meeting minutes.**
37
- 38 **Ayes: 7**
39 **Nays: 0**
40 **Motion carried.**
41

42
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

5. Communications and Recognitions:

a. From the Public: *Public comment pertaining to general land use issues not on this agenda, including the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update.*

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.*

None.

6. Other Business

a. Review Recommended Zoning Map Changes Related to Compliance with the City's 2040 Comprehensive Plan

Community Development Director Gundlach reported the Planning Commission has been working with the City's planning consultant, HKGi, since January regarding required and optional updates to the City's Zoning Code.

Mr. Jeff Miller, HKGi, reviewed the updates and indicated staff recommends the Commission discuss the recommended Zoning Map changes in preparation for the August 4, 2021 public hearing.

Member McGehee indicated she had a question about the number of MDR's on the site-specific rezoning map. She wondered, given all of the discussion that there has been, the different kind of housing the Commission discussed and the fact that with recent changes they are quite close to fifty-fifty owner versus rental, if these particular properties could be LDR2 or some other form that would allow for either smaller homes, smaller lots or some of the variance talked about. She did not see these particular sites, particularly the one that is near the park and Sunrise and a housing development with all single-family smaller homes. It seems like the forty-five foot appears to be a little bit strong given the area. Also, the one on Cleveland Avenue and County Road B, there are already a lot of townhomes there and there is a condo unit there which is only two to three stories tall and that is also an area that the residents had wanted park space.

Chair Kimble asked for a review of the history from staff.

Ms. Gundlach indicated all of the properties on the site-specific map were very specifically proposed to be rezoned based on that Comprehensive Plan outreach process. She did not know what the fifty percent is that was referenced because she did not believe the housing was split fifty-fifty, she thought it was more sixty-thirty in terms of the multi-family versus single family, but she guessed it depended on what housing Commissioner McGehee was considering.

89 Commissioner McGehee explained she was considering the addition of the two
90 housing units that are going up behind Byerly's plus a third one going up as well as
91 the one that is being proposed at the end of Plankton Lake. She thought the
92 completion of those will bring the percent to forty-nine.

93
94 Ms. Gundlach explained staff did an extensive evaluation of the City's split
95 percentage wise, based on housing type when staff presented an item to the EDA
96 because the City was getting even more interest from more apartment housing. There
97 was a discussion with the EDA about possibly putting a pause on some of the public
98 finance assistance associated with those projects. She indicated she did not remember
99 offhand what some of those numbers were.

100
101 Member McGee indicated she was concerned about the areas she mentioned were
102 small and she did not think there needed to be apartment buildings in those locations.

103
104 Mr. Lloyd explained regarding the Cleveland and County Road B location, there has
105 been a couple of iterations of proposals for something in the high density category
106 that was not approved but there was a broad recognition at that time that the single
107 family zoning or low density guidance of the Comprehensive Plan was really kind of
108 inappropriate there because it is tucked into a little corner surrounded by high density
109 and medium density development so the intention had been for quite some time
110 leading up to the Comprehensive Plan update and adopted in 2020, that it would
111 become a medium density property and the process would play out to have the open
112 house meetings about it and the public hearings to evaluate the medium density
113 guidance. He felt like something similar had happened with that medium density
114 parcel on Oak Crest, north of the Rosedale area. He indicated this rezoning effort is
115 really about actualizing those changes in the Comprehensive Plan and that sort of
116 adjustment process to reconsider what the zoning is on any of these properties really
117 begins that process again and from his experience in recent months and years with the
118 Comprehensive Plan and Met Council, the City does not have a lot of headroom
119 between the capacity that is demonstrated in their land use map and the average
120 community net density. They would not be able to reguide and rezone properties for
121 less density than they have them to any great extent without running into problems
122 with that base metric that the City is obligated to meet. Any change in the guidance
123 to down zone some of these properties might likely have some consequences that they
124 might have to resolve elsewhere by increasing density. He thought it was fair and
125 important right now to say these are the zoning changes that have been directed by
126 the Comprehensive Plan update and even though the City can always consider further
127 changes those changes are not without consequences.

128
129 Member McGehee appreciated staff's comments but knew these changes can be made
130 and she thought that the Comprehensive Plan process at least from the public side was
131 questionable. She thought it was a perfectly fair assessment and as the City has gone
132 through this process there was discussion about housing types the City does not have
133 and these are, in many cases, up zoning of places. She indicated the Met Council is in
134 favor of housing.

135

136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182

Ms. Gundlach did not think the Met Council would be concerned if the City decided to change these again, but she thought Mr. Lloyd’s comment about the total overall density, the City may have to find other places to make up for those units that the City would be losing by down zoning these in order to meet the commitment the City is supposed to have region wide. She explained she did not know the full history and where the numbers are at.

Member McGehee thought the City was ok there for these few changes which are pretty minor.

Chair Kimble commented in response to Member McGehee that she has been involved during the couple of years of review for the Comprehensive Plan update and all of the discussions and review and having attended a lot of the public meetings, she would be in support of staying on the path of approving what was put in place through the Comp. Plan process.

Member Pribyl indicated the August 4th meeting will be a public hearing for residents to voice their concerns and comments.

Mr. Miller thought one thing that has been accomplished is making the districts more flexible. He explained another big change is the current community business district, which is the largest business district. Today, that requires vertical mixed use for housing and that is being changed to allow housing that is not in a mixed-use building. That has the potential to be a big change.

Member Leutgeb explained she wanted to highlight the BRT Overlay District comment on the interactive map on the website. She noted there were many comments about increasing bicycle safety as well as pedestrian safety. She indicated for a point of clarification; she was a little unclear whether the BRT Overlay District only applied to the higher density properties in that district. Her concern would be that the City would have a piecemealed sidewalk or bicycle lane option that would come to an abrupt end when it comes to a lower density property.

Mr. Miller thought the intent for the bike and pedestrian connections are on the sites and not on the public right of way. It is really about the connections on the site from the buildings to the public sidewalk or trail.

Ms. Gundlach explained how in the past the City has made the gap areas a priority by going after grant funding to secure funding to close the connections and made sure those areas have been incorporated into the City’s plans to build trails and sidewalks to make sure those gaps are closed. On the BRT Overlay District the City staff has been very deliberate on requiring the actual development sites to think about what those plans need to be and some of that thought could be connections that go off site but the responsibility the developer has would for sure be on their site but there may be participation for other things offsite depending on what the City’s plan show or what the missing gap is. She would hope that the City has demonstrated an ability to work on those issues.

183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204

Member Schaffhausen added thinking about some of the projects that are coming up in Roseville and to the point mentioned that the City is working hard, if thinking about developments when being developed the City is making sure that connections are being made even before the development comes in. She thought the City was being very proactive in thinking how the connections will work.

Ms. Gundlach explained the City only has so much ability on the County and State Aid roads to be able to do things, other than to advocate that future plans try to accommodate better connections.

7. Adjourn

MOTION

Member Kruzal, seconded by Member Pribyl, to adjourn the meeting at 7:16 p.m.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.