

**Commissioners:**

Chuck Gitzen  
Julie Kimble  
Michelle Kruzell  
Tammy McGehee  
Michelle Pribyl  
Peter Sparby  
Karen  
Schaffhausen



**Planning Commission  
Agenda**  
Wednesday, November 6,  
2019  
6:30pm

**Address:**  
2660 Civic Center Dr.  
Roseville, MN 55113

**Phone:**  
651-792-7080

**Website:**  
[www.cityofroseville.com/pc](http://www.cityofroseville.com/pc)

1. Call To Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval Of Agenda
4. Review Of Minutes

Documents:

[OCTOBER 2, 2019 MINUTES.PDF](#)

5. Communications And Recognitions
  - 5.A. From The Public:  
Public comment pertaining to general land use issues not on this agenda.
  - 5.B. From The Commission Or Staff:  
Information about assorted business not already on this agenda.
6. Other Business
  - 6.A. 2020 Variance Board And Planning Commission Meeting Calendar

Documents:

[6A REPORT.PDF](#)

- 6.B. Consider Agenda For Upcoming Joint Meeting With City Council

Documents:

[6B REPORT.PDF](#)

7. Adjourn



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting  
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive  
Draft Minutes – Wednesday, October 2, 2019 – 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 and Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd.  
16
- 17 **3. Approve Agenda**  
18
- 19 **MOTION**  
20 **Member Kruzel moved, seconded by Member Pribyl, to approve the agenda as**  
21 **presented.**  
22
- 23 **Ayes: 7**  
24 **Nays: 0**  
25 **Motion carried.**  
26
- 27 **4. Organizational Business**  
28
- 29 **a. Swear-In New Commissioners, Tammy McGehee and Karen Schaffhausen**  
30
- 31 Karen Schaffhausen read the Oath of Office and was sworn in by Chair Gitzen as a  
32 Planning Commissioner.  
33
- 34 Tammy McGehee read the Oath of Office and was sworn in by Chair Gitzen as a  
35 Planning Commissioner.  
36
- 37 **5. Review of Minutes**  
38
- 39 **a. August 7, 2019 Planning Commission Regular Meeting**  
40
- 41 Commissioner Kimble indicated on line 337, the word “city” should be changed to  
42 “company.”

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

**MOTION**

**Member Kimble moved, seconded by Member Sparby, to approve the August 7, 2019 meeting minutes as amended.**

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0**

**Abstain: 2 (McGehee, Schaffhausen)**

**Motion carried.**

**6. 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.*

City Planner Thomas Paschke noted the Annual Joint Meeting of the Planning Commission and city Council is slated for November 25, 2019. At the November meeting staff will be bringing forward the draft agenda that was previously brought forward for the Commission to consider. He noted if there is anything the Commission wants to add or change to please send that information to him.

Chair Gitzen noted November 25<sup>th</sup> is Thanksgiving week and he wanted to make sure everyone will be available to meet with the Council.

Commissioner McGehee thought there seemed to be a lot of issues raised in the last Planning Commission meeting regarding park dedication fee and she wondered if there was anything beyond what she read about how that was going to be discussed later or moved forward or was anything going to happen other than the discussion that was in the minutes.

Chair Gitzen asked if there was a meeting on that already.

Community Development Director Gundlach thought the park dedication discussion was in regard to the amount that was triggered for the request at 2720 Fairview and that was discussed at a city Council meeting and the Council moved forward with the fee as was originally proposed. Staff did not add that to the agenda for the joint meeting. That issue is usually taken up by the Parks and Recreation Commission, but staff could add that topic to the joint meeting if the Commission would like to discuss it. She noted the city Council did see those comments in the Planning Commission minutes and have recommended at some point the Park and Recreation Director

89 provide some background to the Commission so staff could look at setting that up as  
90 well.

91  
92 Commissioner McGehee thought as the city moves forward with developments that  
93 are within the Commercial Zone around Rosedale and then the way this one is, it is  
94 possible the Planning Commission might want to recommend something by way of  
95 greenspace around housing in these commercial areas and retain some of that parks  
96 and recreation funding for projects specifically related to the project that is going on.

97  
98 Commissioner Sparby thought that item was going to be on the agenda because the  
99 Commission discussed it pretty extensively at the last meeting and being that it comes  
100 through the Planning Commission he did not think it was just a Parks and Recreation  
101 and city Council things because the Planning Commission are the ones  
102 recommending the approval or denial of these developments with, sometimes, a big  
103 price tag park dedication fee attached to them. Even if it is a general discussion it  
104 should be brought up in the joint meeting to see what headway could be made.

105  
106 The Planning Commission consensus was to request the Park Dedication item be  
107 placed on the Joint Council meeting agenda.

108  
109 Ms. Gundlach indicated that item can be added to the agenda along with tree  
110 preservation that was added after the draft agenda was sent out.

111  
112 **7. Public Hearing**

113  
114 **a. Request for Approval of a Microbrewery as a Conditional Use At 2704 E**  
115 **Snelling Drive (PF19-018)**

116 Chair Gitzen opened the public hearing for PF19-018 at approximately 6:42 p.m. and  
117 reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing. He advised this item will be  
118 before the city Council on October 21, 2019.

119  
120 Senior Planner Lloyd summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated  
121 October 2, 2019. He reported staff recommends approval of the proposed  
122 microbrewery as a conditional use at 2704 E. Snelling Drive.

123  
124 Member McGehee asked where the food truck parking was going to be and how  
125 many food trucks will there be.

126  
127 Mr. Lloyd indicated the city does not have any parking requirements for food trucks,  
128 but the applicant can certainly answer the questions for the Commission.

129  
130 Member Sparby asked since the brewery is not allowed under the zoning code in this  
131 location, what happens in five years if the brewery is right up against the  
132 Brewery/Microbrewery threshold or looking to exceed it a little bit but are still within  
133 the wheelhouse of somewhere near 3,500 barrels. He asked what the process would  
134 be.

135

136 Mr. Lloyd explained the city process that would need to occur. He thought the most  
137 likely path forward would be for the brewery to seek an amendment to the zoning  
138 code that might address breweries as conditional uses or different space in a different  
139 zoning district that would permit a brewery beyond the 3,500 barrels might be the  
140 answer.

141  
142 Member Pribyl noted there was discussion about traffic and traffic patterns and there  
143 is a traffic report related to adjacent streets and wondered if there was any traffic  
144 impact study done related to this use versus the previous restaurant or just the  
145 assumption that the traffic would be very similar.

146  
147 Mr. Lloyd indicated it was the assumption that these would be very similar and given  
148 the size of the parking area he would be surprised if there would be as much traffic  
149 for the proposed brewery as there may have been for the restaurant. Staff would not  
150 usually ask for a traffic study unless the proposed use is something that is much larger  
151 or known to have much higher volumes of traffic than a restaurant and retail store.

152  
153 Member Pribyl indicated the brewery is intending not to serve food and wondered if  
154 there would be any impact to the conditional use permit if the brewery would decide  
155 to serve food at some point or is that allowed still under the microbrewery.

156  
157 Mr. Lloyd explained that could be allowed as well and could be another use going on  
158 at this site. This approval is really about the production of beer. The tap room that is  
159 a part of this is a permitted accessory use and the brewing would also be permitted in  
160 this location.

161  
162 Chair Gitzen asked if the applicant would still need to go through the liquor licensing  
163 process.

164  
165 Mr. Lloyd imagined that a city liquor license would be required along with the  
166 serving as well and it would be the state that regulates the production.

167  
168 Mr. Paschke noted the entity that regulates the production would be the state  
169 Agriculture Department.

170  
171 Chair Gitzen invited the applicant to come forward.

172  
173 **Ms. Kelly Molar**

174 Ms. Molar explained in regard to the food trucks, at this point in time the  
175 microbrewery plans on having one food truck come to the establishment per day and  
176 would be located on the east side of the parking lot just outside the door.

177  
178 Ms. McGehee asked if the microbrewery had any plans for the use of the kitchen.

179  
180 Ms. Molar indicated at this time there is not any specific plans for the kitchen. In the  
181 future it has been talked about maybe renting out the kitchen space to different food  
182 truck vendors to prep and store their food or different caterers.

183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228

Member Sparby was interested in the hours the business will be in operation.

Ms. Molar explained the microbrewery was planning on being open seven days a week. It would not open until later in the afternoon to start with and during weekdays it is looking to be open as late as 11:00 p.m. and on weekends as late as midnight, maybe 1:00 a.m.

Member Kimble asked for a clarification on Attachment C that gives a summary of the business and in the second paragraph it states the business is estimated to produce 2,000 barrels a year but then later in the paragraph it states the business is going to level out at 1,000 barrels a year. She asked if the 2,000 barrels was just the capacity for the equipment.

Ms. Molar indicated that was correct.

Member McGehee asked Mr. Paschke what the hours are for the other microbrewery in the city.

Mr. Paschke indicated he did not know and was not sure if the license or the code limits them.

### **Public Comment**

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

Chair Gitzen closed the public hearing at approximately 6:58 p.m. with no one appearing for or against.

### **MOTION**

**Member Sparby moved, seconded by Member McGehee, to recommend to the city Council approval of the proposed microbrewery as a conditional use at 2704 E Snelling Drive (PF19-018).**

### **Commission Deliberation**

Member Sparby thought the plan made sense along with staff supporting the proposal as well as fulfilling the conditions of the Conditional Use.

Member McGehee indicated she was going to support this and thought it was a popular idea in Roseville. She thought this was a good location and a good site and the parking is adequate.

Member Kimble thought it was very consistent with the discussion the Planning Commission had with the Comp. Plan and wanting unique and local entities.

229 Member Kruzel thought the fact that this will be a nice gather space for the  
230 community at a different end of the city.

231

232 **Ayes: 7**

233 **Nays: 0**

234 **Motion carried.**

235

236 **b. Request for Approval of An Amusement Area as a Conditional Use At 1955**  
237 **County Road B2 (PF19-019)**

238 Chair Gitzen opened the public hearing for PF19-019 at approximately 7:01 p.m. and  
239 reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing. He advised this item will be  
240 before the city Council on October 21, 2019.

241

242 Senior Planner Lloyd summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated  
243 October 2, 2019. He reported staff recommended approval of the proposed  
244 amusement areas as a conditional use.

245

246 Member Kimball asked if this is the end of the building where the urgent care was  
247 located.

248

249 Mr. Lloyd indicated it was.

250

251 Member McGehee explained in the long list of licenses and conditional permits  
252 required when it indicates it was discussed there seems to be a problem, not with  
253 approving this but the fact that there is a daytime specific commercial use that is well  
254 defined and understood and then the size and popularity of what goes on at night is  
255 really quite different. She noticed the Police Department indicated it was happy with  
256 this provided there was not any alcohol served so she did not know if that should be  
257 made a condition of approval or not. She was having a hard time visually virtual  
258 reality as an activity.

259

260 Mr. Lloyd indicated how the code deals with those different kinds of things is a  
261 matter that can be discussed.

262

263 Mr. Paschke indicated the zoning code does not limit the hours of operation for any  
264 commercial use so any of the other businesses in this mall could have nighttime hours  
265 as well.

266

267 Member McGehee indicated this business will need to get a license which does  
268 specify that it cannot operate between 11:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. She did not think  
269 there was any problem with that.

270

271 Member Sparby asked in Chapter 303 of city Code that defines amusement and  
272 wondered if Mr. Lloyd could elaborate at all what that means in terms of provides  
273 areas within a building providing for capacity of eight or more customers so he  
274 wondered if that meant eight or more in the building in the area that is designated for  
275 game playing or how is that spliced out.

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  
319  
320  
321  
322

Mr. Lloyd explained what that means is the building may be much larger and other things happening there but the amusement elements of it can reasonably be expected to have eight or more people either using them or using them and waiting. There may be more people on site doing things that do not fall under the amusement regulations but as in this case there are eight to fourteen in a group and there may be some smaller groups that fall in that threshold that don't need to be regulated but the anticipated size of the group doing an activity for entertainment puts it into the category of defining this as an amusement area.

Member Pribyl asked if the CUP were approved would it be for the entire building.

Mr. Lloyd explained the approval would go along with the tenant space because that is what their plans are reflecting.

**Mr. Christian Peterson, Representing Dream Trace, Inc.**

Mr. Peterson explained the applicant is trying to put this exciting VR facility in this space. He reviewed the VR experience with the Commission and indicated he was at the meeting to answer questions.

Mr. Peterson noted it was not the intention of the company to be looking for an alcohol permit for this facility.

Member Sparby asked if the amusement fits with the definition in terms of the eight or more at one time playing games.

Mr. Peterson explained since there will be more than eight people in the facility being amused the company was disappointed to find out that the company had to go through this permit process. In terms of whether eight people are amused at any one point in time inside of a business is quite broad and he would agree as a citizen of the city to perhaps have that legislature looked at to be a little more definitive.

Chair Gitzen wondered what the target audience was for the client.

Mr. Peterson reviewed the equipment that will be used with the VR experience and noted this will have value for many different age groups.

**Public Comment**

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

Chair Gitzen closed the public hearing at approximately 7:26 p.m. with no one appearing for or against.



323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355

**MOTION**

**Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Kimball, to recommend to the city Council approval of the proposed amusement area as a conditional use at 1955 County Road B2. (PF19-019).**

**Commission Deliberation**

Member McGehee thought this business was something new, exciting and local and the uses will be really good and will be a benefit to the community in many ways. She thought as the Commission looks at the definitional issue that Commissioner Sparby brought up the Commission should also look to the fact that this is a kind of activity that might go well if there was housing nearby and this business license specifically indicates it needs to be in a commercial zoned area.

Member Sparby reiterated that should this type of activity really be falling under amusement. He did not think there was a good answer based on the definition. He did not want to hold anything up because he thought it was good idea and a good use of the space, but he thought it would be good to revisit that definition.

**Ayes: 7**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

**8. Adjourn**

**MOTION**

**Member Sparby, seconded by Member Schaffhausen, to adjourn the meeting at 7:31 p.m.**

**Ayes: 7**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**



# REQUEST FOR PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

Date: 11/06/2019  
Item No.: 6a

Department Approval

Agenda Section

*Janice Gundlach*

**Other Business**

Item Description: 2020 Variance Board & Planning Commission Meeting Calendar

1 **BACKGROUND**

2 Every year the City Council adopts a meeting calendar. For 2020, the following dates have been  
3 identified for Variance Board and/or Planning Commission meetings as needed. As is customary,  
4 these dates consist of the first Wednesday of every month except when these dates fall on a holiday.  
5 In the event of a holiday, the date is adjusted appropriately. The 2020 meeting dates are as follows:

- 6
- 7 January 8, 2020 (moved from January 1<sup>st</sup> due to New Year's holiday)
- 8 February 5, 2020
- 9 March 4, 2020
- 10 April 1, 2020
- 11 May 6, 2020
- 12 June 3, 2020
- 13 July 1, 2020
- 14 August 5, 2020
- 15 September 2, 2020
- 16 October 7, 2020
- 17 November 4, 2020
- 18 December 2, 2020

19  
20 While it is recognized conflicts arise, if possible, please let staff know if you will be unable to attend  
21 any of these meeting dates.

22 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

23 No formal action is necessary.

Prepared by: Janice Gundlach, Community Development Director



# REQUEST FOR PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

Date: 11/06/2019  
Item No.: 6b

Department Approval

Agenda Section

*Janice Gundlach*

**Other Business**

Item Description: Consider Agenda for Upcoming Joint Meeting with City Council

## BACKGROUND

Each year, the Planning Commission meets with the City Council to review activities and accomplishments from the prior year and to discuss the upcoming year's work plan. With the Planning Commission fulfilling a statutorily required role to enforce the City's Zoning Code, many of the matters that appear before the Commission are a function of the City's adopted Zoning Code and are not necessarily dictated by the Commission itself. If applicable, other issues that may require further discussion or consideration by the Planning Commission would be discussed during this joint meeting.

This year's joint Planning Commission and City Council meeting is scheduled for November 25, 2019. In preparation for that meeting, staff has compiled the below list of activities/accomplishments from 2018 and other potential topics for discussion:

## ACTIVITIES & ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The Planning Commission held 14 meetings in 2018. Those meetings resulted in the following major activities/accomplishments:

- Recommended a final draft of 2040 Comprehensive Plan to be submitted to the Metropolitan Council
- Zoning Code text amendments regarding the following topics:
  - Design and dimensional standards to support multi-family housing in the Regional Business district
  - Text amendments (mainly definitions) related to revisions to the use table within the Centre Pointe PUD
  - Text amendment regarding taprooms, breweries, and brewpubs
- Plat review at Rosedale Center
- Two Conditional Use requests for drive-through facilities (Portillos & Chick-fil-a)
- Conditional Use for 1900 County Road C (contractor yard)
- Centre Pointe PUD Amendment for 4<sup>th</sup> hotel
- Conditional Use for increased building height at 2650 Lexington Avenue (The Pointe)
- Interim Ordinance regarding drive-through facilities in NB, Neighborhood Business districts
- Two residential in-fill plat requests
- Rezoning, Comprehensive Plan Amendment, and Plat requests regarding Hand-in-Hand Christian Montessori School at 211 N McCarrons Boulevard

- Comprehensive Plan, Rezoning, and PUD cancellation for 1700 Hamline Avenue
- Interim Use for two temporary overnight homeless shelters

#### **TENATIVE WORK PLAN FOR UPCOMING YEAR**

As stated previously, the Planning Commission’s primary role is to fulfill its statutory requirement to review and enforce Roseville’s Zoning Code. As such, many of the items the Commission will work on in the upcoming year are not dictated by the Commission itself, but are reactionary. Beyond this, in the coming year staff anticipates the Commission may work on the following City-initiated items and/or known land use requests currently in process:

- Zoning Code updates to reflect the City’s 2040 Comprehensive Plan (following Metropolitan Council acceptance)
- Other various Zoning Code text amendments that may be necessary to address conflicts and/or problems with existing language
- Land use requests, including plats and conditional uses, in support of several Twin Lakes redevelopment projects
- Land use requests to facilitate Rosedale Mall expansion plans, likely to include a Conditional Use and a PUD amendment and/or cancellation
- A Centre Pointe PUD Amendment request for the remaining vacant lot in Centre Pointe

Lastly, Commission members have previously requested the following items be added to the agenda for discussion:

- Amend the tree preservation ordinance to prevent unreasonably high costs associated with the “cash-in-lieu of tree replacement payment” when the property cannot practically accommodate the replacement tree requirements (in light of two variance requests processed in July)
- Park dedication as a condition of subdivision approval, specifically the cash-in-lieu requirement (in light of the park dedication determination for redevelopment of 2720 Fairview Avenue)
- Revise “amusements” definition and determine whether or not a conditional use should be required and, if so, in what zoning districts (in response to the recent request by Dream Trace at 1955 W Cty Rd B2)

#### **OTHER DISCUSSION ITEMS**

Staff has not identified any other topics at this time. Staff would request the Commission discuss if there are other topics to bring to the City Council’s attention that are not otherwise included herein.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends the Commission discuss the content herein and provide feedback to staff in preparation of the agenda for the joint Planning Commission/City Council meeting on November 25, 2019.

Prepared by: Janice Gundlach, Community Development Director