

**Commissioners:**

Julie Kimble  
Michelle Kruzal  
Tammy  
McGehee  
Michelle Pribyl  
Karen  
Schaffhausen  
Erik Bjorum  
Emily Leutgeb



**Planning Commission Agenda**

Wednesday, May 5, 2021  
6:30pm

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

**Phone:**  
651-792-7080

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

Following guidance from state health officials, Planning Commission Members will participate in upcoming meetings electronically pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 13D.021.

Members of the public who wish speak during public comment or an agenda item during this meeting can do so virtually by registering at [www.cityofroseville.com/attendmeeting](http://www.cityofroseville.com/attendmeeting)

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

Documents:

[APRIL 7, 2021 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
7. Adjourn



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

*Pursuant to Minn. Stat. 13.D.021, Planning Commission members, City Staff, and members of the public participated in this meeting electronically due to the COVID-19 pandemic.*

1 **1. Call to Order**

2 Vice Chair Kimble called to order the regular meeting of the Planning Commission  
3 meeting at approximately 6:30 p.m. and reviewed the role and purpose of the Planning  
4 Commission.  
5

6 **2. Roll Call**

7 At the request of Vice Chair Kimble, City Planner Thomas Paschke called the Roll.  
8

9 **Members Present:** Vice Chair Julie Kimble, and Commissioners Michelle Kruzel,  
10 Tammy McGehee, Michelle Pribyl, Karen Schaffhausen, Erik  
11 Bjorum and Emily Leutgeb.  
12

13 **Members Absent:** None.  
14

15 **Staff Present:** City Planner Thomas Paschke, Community Development Director  
16 Janice Gundlach, Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd, and Department  
17 Assistant Staci Johnson  
18

19 **3. Approve Agenda**

20 **MOTION**

21 **Member Kruzel moved, seconded by Member Pribyl, to approve the agenda as**  
22 **presented.**  
23  
24

25 **Ayes: 7**

26 **Nays: 0**

27 **Motion carried.**  
28

29 **4. Organizational Business**

30 **a. Swear-In New Commissioners**

31 **• Erik Bjorum**

32 Vice Chair Kimble read the Oath of Office for Mr. Bjorum to repeat. She  
33 welcomed Commissioner Bjorum to the Planning Commission.  
34  
35

36 **• Emily Leutgeb**  
37

38  
39  
40  
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

Vice Chair Kimble read the Oath of Office for Ms. Leutgeb to repeat. She welcomed Commissioner Leutgeb to the Planning Commission.

**b. Elect Planning Commission Chair and Vice-Chair**

Vice Chair Kimble indicated this item to elect a Chair and Vice Chair and currently there is not an active sitting Chair. She asked for nominations for Chair.

Member Pribyl nominated Vice Chair Kimble to be Chair. Member McGehee seconded the nomination.

Vice Chair Kimble asked for other nominations.

**MOTION**

**Member Pribyl moved, seconded by Member McGehee, to elect Member Kimble as Chair of the Planning Commission.**

**Ayes: 7**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

Chair Kimble asked for nominations for Vice-Chair.

Member Kruzel nominated Member Pribyl to be Vice-Chair. Member McGehee seconded the nomination.

Chair Kimble asked for other nominations.

**MOTION**

**Member Kruzel moved, seconded by Member McGehee, to elect Member Pribyl as Vice Chair of the Planning Commission.**

**Ayes: 7**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

**c. Appoint Variance Board Members**

Chair Kimble indicated the Board needs to appoint three Commissioners to the Variance Board plus one alternate. She asked the current Variance Board Members if they would like to continue on the Board.

Member Pribyl indicated she would be willing to continue on unless other Commissioners would like to be on the Variance Board.

Chair Kimble asked the Commission who would be interested to be appointed to the Variance Board.

85  
86 Member Schaffhausen explained she would like to stay on the Variance Board if  
87 the Commission is fine with that.  
88

89 Mr. Paschke asked if Member Schaffhausen would like to remain an alternate or  
90 to be a member of the Variance Commission.  
91

92 Member Schaffhausen indicated she would like to be a member.  
93

94 Member Kruzal indicated she has been on the Variance for two years and would  
95 be happy to stay or would be willing to let someone else be on the Board.  
96

97 Ms. Gundlach reviewed what the Variance Board does and the meeting time.  
98

99 Member Leutgeb indicated she would be available as an alternate this year if no  
100 one else is eager to do so.  
101

102 **MOTION**

103 **Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Kimble, to appoint**  
104 **Members Pribyl, Kruzal and Schaffhausen to the Variance Board with**  
105 **Member Leutgeb as the alternate.**  
106

107 Mr. Paschke indicated a vote is not needed for this and will be passed onto the  
108 City Council.  
109

110 **d. Appoint Ethics Commission Representative**  
111

112 Chair Kimble indicated the Board needs to appoint a representative to the Ethics  
113 Commission.  
114

115 Member Schaffhausen volunteered to take the appointment to the Ethics  
116 Commission.  
117

118 **5. Review of Minutes**  
119

120 **a. March 3, 2021 Planning Commission Regular Meeting**  
121

122 Chair Kimble opened the floor to the Commission for changes to the minutes.  
123

124 Member McGehee indicated she forwarded some changes to staff.  
125

126 **MOTION**

127 **Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Pribyl, to approve the March 3,**  
128 **2021 meeting minutes as amended.**  
129

130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
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

Ayes: 7  
Nays: 0  
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.*

None.

**7. Public Hearing**

a. **Request For Preliminary Approval of a Major Plat to Subdivide the Development Site into Eight Lots for Single-Family Detached Homes and Shared Access to Lake Owasso as a Conditional Use (PF21-001)**

Chair Kimble opened the public hearing for PF21-001 at approximately 6:50 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing. She advised this item will be before the City Council on April 26, 2021.

Senior Planner Lloyd summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated April 7, 2021.

Chair Kimble asked if the Commission had any questions of staff.

Member Schaffhausen indicated she enjoyed reading the comments from the residents that live on Lake Owasso and some questions were raised that she wanted to make sure the City addressed. She asked in regard to the wetlands and if they are actually identified as wetlands, knowing that the land can be developed, what can or cannot the City do when it comes to this and how does that capacity in regard to wetland apply to this project and what can the City do about that, if anything.

Mr. Lloyd explained the City does have regulations regarding this in the Zoning Code as well as some other areas that are maintained by the Public Works Department that pertain to wetlands. There are plans from the developer about how each site might be developed with a driveway and generalized building footprint. All of those, so far, have been designed to conform to the minimum standards in terms of the wetland setbacks and the shoreline that backs from the ordinary high-water level. He noted the shoreland requirements do address the development area reduction or density reduction when wetlands and the shoreline itself might be within some parcel boundaries. Those regulations specifically state any part of a parcel that is below the

177 ordinary high-water level, lakeside of the shoreline, does not count in terms of the lot  
178 area for meeting the lot size requirements, whether it is depth or width or area.  
179 Further from that it says if wetlands cover more than twenty-five percent of a site  
180 there is some further reduction of the countable lot area. The figures that are in the  
181 staff report about the lot sizes all reflect those adjustments. Those lot size figures do  
182 not include any of what could parcel area below the ordinary high-water level, the  
183 shoreline and a couple of the parcels in particular in that block one, lots one through  
184 five, did need to be reduced in size by some amount because of the extent of the  
185 wetland that is on them. The City does have regulations about wetlands.  
186

187 Member Schaffhausen wondered why the City would be ok with taking cash in lieu of  
188 some semblance of land.  
189

190 Mr. Lloyd indicated the questions might be better directed to the Parks Commission  
191 but in general he thought the answer comes down to the City has a Parks and  
192 Recreation System Master Plan which identifies park land the City has and park land  
193 areas where park land is needed. This plan also identifies various improvements that  
194 are planning in the future for different places, different parks around the community  
195 and because in large part there is not a need identified in the Parks and Recreation  
196 System Master Plan for park land here or in this area, the dedication of park land was  
197 less appropriate, according to the judgement of the Parks and Recreation Commission  
198 than a dedication of cash in lieu of land which can be used for acquisition of land  
199 where parks are needed and can be used for improvements nearby where those  
200 improvements are called for in the plan.  
201

202 Member Pribyl knew the footprints shown on the drawings received are not  
203 necessarily the final ones but if these are relatively accurate, it looks like currently the  
204 plat shows that all of the homes would be outside of what is required by the City or  
205 Watershed in terms of wetland protection. These are not encroaching on the wetland  
206 area or even on the setback.  
207

208 Mr. Lloyd indicated that was correct. He showed the drawing and explained where  
209 the homes are to be located and the setback requirements.  
210

211 Member Kruzel indicated there is concern about the boat traffic in that area because  
212 the lake is narrow there. She knew the City cannot do much but for the folks that live  
213 in that area, the wakes may be an issue.  
214

215 Mr. Lloyd indicated the City does not have the ability to regulate what happens on the  
216 public water. The amount of boat traffic has its own ramifications and issues as well  
217 as the kinds of boat traffic. He explained it is the State's role to have regulations  
218 about that and to do enforcement.  
219

220 Chair Kimble explained somewhere in the documents that most of the driveways  
221 would have turn arounds. She noted this is close to where she lives and driving down  
222 Victoria there is a curve and can get busy. She thought this would be preferable if  
223 this moves forward. She also saw that the County was recommending no parking be

224 posted on this stretch of Victoria and wondered if that would go before the City  
225 Council for action.

226  
227 Mr. Lloyd did not think that would be a part of the City's action. It may be  
228 something that is incorporated into the public improvement contract since it is within  
229 the public roadway. He explained with respect to the turnarounds, that is in fact, a  
230 Zoning requirement for Roseville. Any new driveways and homes on County roads  
231 like this need to have that turnaround built into the driveway within the property.

232  
233 Chair Kimble did not think there would be the ability for individual docks at each  
234 single-family home parcel and all of the dock access would be on the shared access  
235 parcel.

236  
237 Mr. Lloyd believed that the plan is that the lots in block one would likely have their  
238 own docks and the City cannot prevent them from being put in. That would leave the  
239 shared facility for the homes across the street.

240  
241 Member McGehee agreed with Commissioner Schaffhausen's remarks. She  
242 explained after the last McCarrons meeting she was not sure yet, this is another case  
243 where the DNR is suggesting the City make some limitations but there is not a  
244 contact. She noted she had a call in to both the Public Works person who worked on  
245 the watershed as well as the DNR hydrologist for the East Metro and she has not had  
246 the time to get a call back to get this information. She found, herself, that she thought  
247 in general this packet is complicated and raises a number of environmental issues.  
248 This is a large area that has been undisturbed and certainly is part of the filtration  
249 system for the lake. She thought reading the comments that are in the next item  
250 tonight, she thought the interest on the part of Roseville residents is fairly strong in  
251 terms of protecting the environment and protecting the wildlife. She thought to say  
252 this change does not have impacts on public safety and public health when it  
253 definitely has a significant impact on the water and water quality in Lake Owasso,  
254 which is a public water and not just for Roseville residents but for residents of the  
255 State. She thought the City had to look at this very carefully overall and not overlook  
256 it because it may belong to other Departments and Commissions.

257  
258 Member McGehee thought while those homes are actually not in a bad position right  
259 along Victoria, the problem is that the City does not have any control if those  
260 property owners, given the shape of the lots, wish to make their way down to the  
261 water.

262  
263 Mr. Lloyd indicated that was correct.

264  
265 Member McGehee thought developing in this area at all is extremely problematic.  
266 She would like to see more of these questions answered about how the lake and  
267 lakeshore will be protected as long as tree preservation and a conservation easement  
268 along the entire project with only one shared access to the lake.

269

270 Member Bjorum asked if the City required curb and gutter to be built along this  
271 development on either side of Victoria.

272

273 Mr. Lloyd indicated the roadway standards that apply to a County Road like this  
274 would definitely come from Ramsey County. He would have expected to see that as  
275 a requirement if it were one and would have been communicated by the City Engineer  
276 and included in the packet. He thought Victoria Street has been rebuilt fairly  
277 recently.

278

279 Member Bjorum assumed the stormwater management that are shown on the plans is  
280 basically the percentage required when utilizing the whole of the lots together  
281 combined. He wondered if there was any requirement for that management system to  
282 be on each individual lot or is it just a percentage and can be combined at any point.

283

284 Mr. Lloyd thought there was some flexibility in how that is implemented.

285

286 Mr. Dwayne Sikich, applicant, Builders Lot Group, 9531 West 78<sup>th</sup> Street, Eden  
287 Prairie, indicated he was in agreement with the two conditions listed by staff and was  
288 at the meeting to answer questions. He reviewed with the Commission the conditions  
289 that have been imposed on this development.

290

291 Chair Kimble asked if there were any questions for the applicant from the  
292 Commission.

293

294 Member Pribyl asked where the trail will be located on the west side of Victoria.

295

296 Mr. Sikich indicated the trail will be on the east side of Victoria and is proposed to be  
297 one foot inside of the County right-of-way and in this case the potential location of  
298 the street is offset of the right-of-way. He noted the trail will be on the other side of  
299 the power poles. The reason for the trail is for the health and safety of the proposed  
300 homeowners so they will not have to walk on Victoria Street.

301

302 Member McGehee asked if the dead trees on the pad on the site or are they across the  
303 site.

304

305 Mr. Sikich indicated there are a fair number of trees across the site and there is not a  
306 plan to go into the wetland area, only the building areas of the lots. He noted this is  
307 to clean it up and make it look more park like.

308

309 Member McGehee indicated she was going to speak on behalf of residents that wrote  
310 in. The dead trees are nesting sites for varieties of flying squirrels, regular squirrels  
311 and also for a number of woodpeckers. She was hoping that the developer would  
312 contain its dead tree removal to the pad site rather than throughout the entire site.

313

314 Mr. Sikich indicated that is exactly their plan.

315

316 Member McGehee asked when the tree removal is planning to happen.



317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
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  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363

Mr. Sikich explained the actual tree removal will not happen until the City Council approval of the preliminary plat.

Member McGehee indicated there was a request from a resident which she would like to share. She explained the resident would like the developer to not take stuff down while there is nesting in the trees.

Mr. Sikich indicated some of the scrub brush is going to come down before that but as far as any tagged trees or trees that are tagged for tree inventory, will not be coming down until after City Council approval of the preliminary plat.

Member Leutgeb wondered if anyone could clarify regarding the proposed boardwalks on the lakeside properties. She wondered if this is a proposal, urging the use of boardwalks over paved or another impervious trail or is that actually going to be a requirement.

Mr. Sikich explained that is actually a requirement because they cannot add any impervious area into a wetland. The boardwalks either sit on some kind of a pad that does not affect infiltration and the wetland continues performing as it normally does with a boardwalk. He noted that is part of the DNR permitting.

Member Bjorum asked Mr. Sikich where the boardwalk will be onsite.

Mr. Sikich explained at this point they have not located those yet exactly. Some exhibits were provided to the City and the developer is not building those, that is the responsibility of the homeowner. When the lots are sold the boardwalks will not be installed.

Member Schaffhausen indicated when the wetland is discussed, in the homeowner's association a plan to make sure that the wetland is not disturbed.

Mr. Sikich explained this will be provided in the HOA and is not allowed in the DNR rules.

Member Schaffhausen wondered what can be done to protect the wetland. She thought the preservation is of value and pretty much every resident that has responded has this as a concern. She wanted to make sure the City is focusing on that concern at a broader level and what else can be done about it if anything.

Mr. Sikich indicated his company can talk with their development attorney and see if there is anything that can be added but the enforcement of wetlands or impacts to wetlands is the DNR.

Mr. Paschke reviewed with the Commission some things that the City can do and what was done in other developments. He noted some type of signage can be used to show the area as wetland along the buffer edge.

364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410

Mr. Sikich indicated he would not be against the City adding the signage as a condition of approval.

Member Schaffhausen asked if it is possible that all of the work Mr. Sikich is going through with regard to the DNR and all of that activity, could affect density in any way shape or form and changing the lots from five to four or anything of that nature.

Mr. Lloyd did not think so. The requirements in the Zoning Code have the unstated purpose of managing the amount of density allowed on a given site based on the presence of public water, such as the lake or wetlands. He thought that impact is already accounted for or rather this proposal is sort of below whatever kind of other limits that might practically impose.

Mr. Sikich indicated this project is a conforming one for the LDR One Zoning. Variances or rezoning is not being asked from them.

**Public Comment**

**Ms. Kristine Simonson, 3061 Rice Street, Roseville**

Ms. Simonson indicated she is a property owner at 2940 West Owasso Blvd. She expressed her concern related to the idea of density reduction and five lots rather than four or three. She noted the odd shape of the lots towards the lake and will have a very different feel when the docks are built.

**Mr. Cory Koger, East side of Lake Owasso**

Mr. Koger explained he had a couple of questions and concerns, specifically regarding the way the design is set up to have a minimum impact. He indicated there is little to no oversight by the DNR and is rarely out on this lake. He noted there are four different habitats on the south end of the lake which will be directly impacted by the docks. There is also seven hundred feet of wetland habitat in front of the proposed development and somehow the property owners will have to get their boats through them to get to their dock. He explained he also had concerns about runoff after the lots are developed. There is no regulation for pesticide application, no regulation for fertilizer application and will run into the lake and cause impacts.

**Ms. Wanda Davies, 767 Hynal Drive**

Ms. Davies expressed her concern with the traffic in the narrow space between the lily pads and cattails. She thought it should be a no-wake zone and would like to see Roseville make some effort to do that. She was also looking at the dimensions of the dock in the shared access for the conditional use permit and the dock is fifty feet long. That is a really long dock that could hold up to six docks. Given that the DNR is allowing cities now to regulate docks and some other regulation on the lake, she thought a decision on this CUP should be deferred until the Council has an opportunity to look at a new Ordinance with respect to regulating dock use and other things that the City is now permitted to do within the lake.

411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457

**Mr. Andrew Walz, 3097 Sandy Hook Drive**

Mr. Walz explained he has a bunch of concerns. He was concerned about the shape and quantity of the lots. The number one thing the City can do to preserve the wetlands is to reject this plan as proposed and reduce the number of lots or at least revisit the judgement call that was made about the irregular shape. He believed that was an exhibit of poor judgement and he did not think the exterior boundaries are so irregular that it warrants creating the hockey stick shaped lots with docks coming out of them. He thought the City, with this plan, will be setting the DNR up for failure in their ability to be able to protect the wetland areas. He would encourage the Council to have conversations with the DNR and watershed on some unanswered questions.

**Mr. Joe Bester, Shoreview**

Mr. Bester explained he has many of the same concerns that previous speakers have. He wanted to emphasize the sensitive nature of Lake Owasso. He reviewed the surrounding watershed around the lake with the Commission. He indicated the Bar Engineering report referenced in a letter he wrote the City the hypothesis going into it is internal excess nutrient loading was from in the lake and after some additional research Bar Engineering was surprised to find that in fact that it came from Central Park. This does underscore the fact that things that are close by really have a major impact on lake. Anything the City can do to help preserve trees and minimize impervious pavement and other things will help Lake Owasso in the long term.

**Mr. Ben Eide, 519 Hynal Drive**

Mr. Eide agreed about the density. He believed it is more than should be allowed in that area. Currently there are three lots, and the development should be allowed those three lots, but the development is going from three access points to the lake and trying to get six access points with their added access point. That will be a lot of docks going through that area. The docks will have to be at least two hundred to two hundred fifty feet each to get through the cattails out to the water and is a lot of dock surface going in and out each season and will cause a lot of wear and tear on that area of the lake.

**Ms. Ashley MacGregor, Little Bay Road**

Ms. MacGregor echoed all of the resident comments. She believed this is a thoughtful developer that is trying to check all of the boxes but what has to be remembered is that this is the chance the Planning Commission has to make a different choice. Once the development is in there is not much anyone can do if there are issues and problems. Now is the chance to decrease capacity on that side of the lake.

**Mr. Josh Kath**

Mr. Kath echoed a lot of the concerns that have been brought up. He wanted to draw attention to the City Code and that there is a deficiency because it is decades outdated. He thought the City is putting the cart before the horse if the City does not first address or consider some of those necessary or conversational points in the Code that should be discussed that these types of projects will have impacts on in regard to subdividing lots. He thought there was already a lot of shared easements on the lake,

458 and he thought the City Code was lacking regulatory authority over those as well and  
459 those easements seem to be growing and expanding.

460

461 **Ms. Heidi Walz**

462 Ms. Walz wondered if the developer would be willing to do another tour before more  
463 of the general public was aware of the area in order for people to better grasp what is  
464 being proposed.

465

466 Chair Kimble closed the public hearing at 8:10 p.m.

467

### 468 **Commission Deliberation**

469

470 Member Pribyl asked Mr. Lloyd for a follow up on the lots size, shape, and  
471 proportion. She thought some of it was dictated by Victoria and the wetland  
472 boundaries and some of it is to try to get direct water access for the five lots.

473

474 Mr. Lloyd reviewed the zoning requirements of the lots with the Commission.

475

476 Member McGehee asked if the City has an obligation to have anything subdivided.

477

478 Mr. Lloyd indicated the role in the City reviewing a subdivision request falls into  
479 what is called the City's quasi-judicial authority. With that authority, the City  
480 reviews a proposal against existing standards. Whatever State law might obligate of  
481 the City and whatever the City Codes allow or require and generally speaking,  
482 proposals that conform to the applicable requirements ought to be approved. They  
483 can certainly be approved with conditions to mitigate potential impacts that are  
484 identified by the Planning Commission.

485

### 486 **MOTION**

487 **Member McGehee moved to table pending information on the new 2019**  
488 **regulatory authority that has been published by the DNR and any other**  
489 **information from the DNR and Washington County and the hydrologist**  
490 **regarding the status of the lake that might have an impact on the City's ability to**  
491 **protect this area.**

492

493 Ms. Gundlach indicated she looked up the DNR's model Ordinance, which was  
494 updated in October 2019. She wanted to be clear that the City is not obligated to  
495 adopt the newly updated model Ordinance. As this relates to controlled accesses, it  
496 states they are permissible as a part of a subdivision and the only requirement in the  
497 new model Ordinance that is not currently in City Code for a conditional use  
498 requirement related to model controlled accesses is "If docking, mooring or other  
499 over water storage of more than six watercraft is to be allowed at a controlled access  
500 lot than the width of the lot must be increased by a percentage of the requirements for  
501 riparian and residential lots for each watercraft beyond six." There is also a table  
502 where it shows what the required increase in lot width is needed in order to go higher  
503 than six watercraft. Based on the lot width of this extra lot the developer would for  
504 sure be allowed six if the City decided to go ahead and adopt the updated DNR model

505 Shoreland Ordinance as it is related to controlled access. She wanted to make sure if  
506 the decision is to table action because the Commission is interested in what the new  
507 model Ordinance from the DNR says, the new model Ordinance would allow six  
508 mooring spaces on that controlled access lot.

509  
510 Chair Kimble asked if the DNR Ordinance was not adopted, what is allowed by the  
511 City.

512  
513 Ms. Gundlach explained the City Ordinance does not specify.

514  
515 Mr. Lloyd explained in recent conversation with the hydrologist he gathered that  
516 number is not actually different. The thing that may be changing or has changed in  
517 the new model Ordinance is that the cities would be responsible or be able to  
518 administer that calculation rather than the State being solely responsible for it. He did  
519 not think the numbers were really changing, it would be allowing the City to regulate  
520 it.

521  
522 Member McGehee thanked staff for the clarification and indicated she would change  
523 her motion from a motion to table to a motion to deny.

524  
525 **Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Schaffhausen, to deny based on**  
526 **the fragility of the lake, the impairment of the water already, the narrowness of**  
527 **the straight, with the lily pads. The ability of all of these lots together to be able**  
528 **to irradicate fifteen feet of weeds in order to get the boats out seems beyond**  
529 **anything acceptable to protect not only the quality of the lake but the health,**  
530 **safety, and welfare of the investment of the people who already have homes on**  
531 **the lake and for the people of Minnesota who use and value this lake. This is an**  
532 **excessive burden on this particularly fragile end of the lake with a particular**  
533 **depth of wetland as well as shallow, vegetative area as fish breeding ground.**

534  
535 Member Pribyl thought it seemed like a lot of the concern in this motion is around the  
536 number of individual lake access. She thought Mr. Lloyd stated if each lot is  
537 connected to the lake then the City cannot control their access. She wondered if there  
538 was any way there could be some kind of compromise where two adjacent lots share  
539 a boardwalk and a dock or would the City not have any control over that at all. She  
540 thought the homes themselves along Victoria seemed to make sense and the  
541 protection of the wetland seemed to make sense. She thought the hang up was where  
542 the docks and boardwalks will go so she wondered if there could be any kind of  
543 compromise.

544  
545 Mr. Lloyd did not believe the Shoreland Code has any provisions regulating docks,  
546 particularly when in the water. He thought that there are provisions for when docks  
547 are stored on the land. He reviewed the Shoreland Section of the Zoning Code related  
548 to this with the Commission.

549  
550 The Commission further discussed the option of tabling versus denying this item.

551

552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598

Member Schaffhausen wondered if there was a way to create that park space as that easement instead of cash in lieu of land. She understood the Parks and Recreation Commission requested cash.

Mr. Lloyd indicated it is not the Parks and Recreation Commission role to conclusively determine what the park dedication, it is a recommendation and the purview of the City Council to make a decision about that. It is certainly clear that there is some concern and maybe some possibility of having park land be the dedication somewhere along the wetland, but it may not be the jurisdiction and purview of the Planning Commission to recommend specifically formally something like that.

Chair Kimble reviewed where in the deliberation the Commission was at in the motion process. She asked Member McGehee if her original motion still stood.

Member McGehee indicated she would like the original motion to still stand and possibly then for the developer to work with staff to see if something could come forward that reflected the discussion of the community and Planning Commission.

Chair Kimble ask Member Schaffhausen if her second still stood to that motion.

Member Schaffhausen signaled her intention was yes.

Chair Kimble indicated this is a recommending body so the Commission’s motion to deny, if it were to pass would be a recommendation to the Council along with the comments made. She thought the Commission should vote on this motion if there were no other comments.

Member Bjorum thought that based on everything that was presented and everything that has been laid out by staff and the developer. Everything presented meets or exceeds the City’s requirements for the subdivision for the plot restructure. The issue the Commission has is the lake access points for each property that the City does not have legal standing to dictate. He noted it does not seem like if that is the case then the Commission does not have any legal standing to deny the motion to proceed because the Commission is denying something it does not have any control over. He wondered if that is the correct way to understand this. He personally thought the developer has done an excellent job in developing this subdivision and breaking the parcels up and really showing the understanding of the wetlands implications and he fully hear the residents who are concerned about the access points and the weed and shoreline degradation, but he wondered if that something that needs to be left to the next stage of the development to control. It does not sound like their legal standing; the Commission can deny something it does not have control over.

Chair Kimble thanked Member Bjorum for the comments and looked to staff to help answer the question because she wondered if the Commission is confusing its deliberation on the plat with the deliberation on the conditions of the Conditional Use Permit.

599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645

Ms. Gundlach asked what the denial motion was for. She asked if the denial was for the plat, is it for the Conditional Use or is it for both because she did have some legal concerns about the Commission's role to interpret and apply the Zoning Code as it exists today based upon an application in front of the Commission. She did not see the Commission having a legal reason to deny this plat. There may be some opportunity to get into the details with the Conditional Use in terms of mooring spaces and who gets to use the outlot because there are some conditions in the Conditional Use section that relates to that. She indicated she was very uncomfortable about the City's ability to deny this plat.

Chair Kimble indicated the call was on the motion for the Preliminary Plat. She asked if staff's suggestion was the Commission had to withdraw and reconsider the motions or just go ahead and take a roll call vote on the motion.

Ms. Gundlach indicated the Commission is a recommending body to the City Council. Member McGehee made a motion, and it was seconded so she believed the Commission is required to take a vote on it. If that motion fails the Commission can try again and if it passes then the Commission needs to move onto the Conditional Use.

Member McGehee explained as a recommending body, the Commission's recommendation goes to the Council and is ultimately the legal authority of the Council to decide what to do with it. As a recommending body the Commission is probably legal but not efficiently legal and there are findings that could be put together to justify the denial. She indicated she still stood behind the denial motion to go forward to the Council, who will make the final decision.

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

**Nays: 5**

**Motion failed.**

Chair Kimble indicated the motion failed and wondered if a new motion should be considered or should the Commission move one.

Mr. Paschke suggested the Commission make another motion if there is one to be made to support.

**Member Pribyl moved, seconded by Member Kruzel, to recommend to the City Council approval of the proposed Victoria Shores Preliminary Plat, based on the content of this RCA, public input, and Planning Commission deliberation, with the conditions listed in the RCA. (PF17-020).**

**Ayes: 5**

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

**Motion carried.**

646 Member McGehee explained she could make a motion to deny the Conditional Use,  
647 but she did not know on what basis because staff seems to think that all the boxes  
648 have been checked and she did not think it has anything to do with the health, safety,  
649 and welfare of either the lake or the residents or the people using the lake or the  
650 ability of the people on the lake and property owners to use the property. She  
651 indicated as she read this application she was surprised to move it forward. It is a  
652 problem and she thought it was evident. She did not think that staff's findings are  
653 accurate, that there is no implication here for health, safety, and welfare. She  
654 wondered if the Commission could put a limit on how many boats and how long the  
655 docks can be.

656  
657 Member Bjorum thought the issue was that the dock is considered to be on the public  
658 land because it is in the water so the City does not have the control to dictate the dock  
659 or number of docks or long the docks can be. That is all to a different regulatory  
660 body and the City does not have control over that.

661  
662 Member McGehee asked if the Commission had any control and can the Commission  
663 not grant a Conditional Use.

664  
665 Mr. Lloyd explained yes a Conditional Use can be denied if there is a public health,  
666 safety, welfare issue. He noted there is ten different criteria and four extra  
667 requirements that are discussed in the staff report providing for the framework of the  
668 review. The question of the shared access is not strictly speaking the dock and how  
669 many people might share it, the question would be, is there a public health, safety,  
670 welfare argument to be made against the residential use of the lakeshore land that is  
671 proposed to be shared. If it were a single homeowner with that land there would be  
672 zoning requirements pertaining what could be built on the land and where and how  
673 close to the shoreline, etc. Those same requirements apply to this if it is shared  
674 among them. The City absolutely has a role in regulating how that land is used but  
675 not how the public water adjacent to the land is used.

676  
677 Member McGehee asked if the City could regulate that there would be no boathouse  
678 and also that nothing could be stored on that land during the winter.

679  
680 Mr. Lloyd agreed, not because he thought it is an untenable position or something,  
681 but the qualification is the Commission can make those requirements or those  
682 conditions of approval, particularly if the Commission is making some findings about  
683 the health, safety and welfare/other provisions that relate to it.

684  
685 Member Kruzal explained if the Commission is doing its role, it would be to make a  
686 motion to accept this, if that is what is decided, and it goes to the City Council do not  
687 the homeowners and association and the DNR have some type of entity where they  
688 can work together to make these enforcement or changes.

689  
690 Member Pribyl indicated the Conditional Use is really just a shared access for the  
691 three homes on the west side of Victoria. What seemed to have been most of the  
692 concern and discussion what that the five other homes have their own access. This is



693 already shared by three households. She was not sure that, for her personally,  
694 denying this is going to help the other issue.

695

696 **MOTION**

697 **Member Pribyl moved, seconded by Member Bjorum, to recommend to the City**  
698 **Council approval of the proposed controlled access as a Conditional Use, based**  
699 **on the content of this RCA, public input, and Planning Commission deliberation.**  
700 **(PF17-020).**

701

702 **Ayes: 5**

703 **Nays: 2 (McGehee, Schaffhausen)**

704 **Motion carried.**

705

706 **8. Other Business**

707

708 **a. Review and Provide Feedback on Zoning Code Update**

709 Community Development Director Gundlach introduced Ms. Rita Trapp and Mr. Jeff  
710 Miller from HKGI who presented the Zoning Code update materials. She first  
711 presented the Roseville Sustainability and Resilience section and asked for feedback.

712

713 Member Pribyl thought it was a good idea to incentivize development to be more  
714 sustainable and thought there were things that the City could incorporate into the  
715 Zoning Code to encourage sustainability and push it in ways that are not currently  
716 addressed in the Zoning Code without putting requirements on some of the things that  
717 are more costly but incentivizing them would be fantastic.

718

719 Ms. Trapp asked if there were specific areas Member Pribyl was thinking about.

720

721 Member Pribyl explained she was thinking of things where there are costs involved.  
722 For example reducing the surface parking by putting parking underground. It is much  
723 more expensive putting parking underground, but it obviously has environmental  
724 benefits so if there are incentives that can encourage that without requiring it then she  
725 thought it would be a good move to reduce impervious surface and provide more  
726 space for trees and greenspace that everyone likes.

727

728 Chair Kimble asked if there might be some tradeoffs as well to get some relief  
729 elsewhere in the project.

730

731 Member Pribyl agreed.

732

733 Member McGehee thought TIF and the Sack Credits and various things that the City  
734 does offer, at least historically, the City has not asked for much in return for granting  
735 these things and she thought the City could and should. She also was very interested  
736 in some of the suggestions that were in the small pinups, such as rent to own on  
737 apartments that are being built. Affordable complexes. Most of the City's existing  
738 condos started as apartments and were converted later. She did not know if the City  
739 could do that, but it would be an equity path that the City could maybe think about.

740 She was not sure how it could be done. She noted that Edina’s efforts that was in the  
741 paper where they are setting up their own land trust so that some of the City’s houses,  
742 where in the past the City had a program where the City would buy them and tear  
743 them down and have something more expensive be built on the lot. Instead of doing  
744 that maybe possibly buying some of the homes that the City would have an  
745 opportunity to buy but keep them in the land trust so that the City could manage to  
746 keep them permanently affordable but yet pass on some equity to people who live  
747 there for a period of time and then were able to move on.

748  
749 Member McGehee indicated another thing in speaking of the trees and the diversity  
750 of upgrading the parking lots policy to meet the standards the communities like St.  
751 Louis Park has, which has a lot greener and pathway in the parking lots so that they  
752 are more permeable and more hospitable to pedestrians.

753  
754 Member Leutgeb asked Ms. Trapp how the consultants are reaching out with outreach  
755 efforts to specifically target and engage bipoc communities and socio-economic  
756 diverse communities in the engagement process.

757  
758 Ms. Trapp explained her company had prepared a few months ago a community  
759 engagement plan where they identified different groups that they could outreach to  
760 and this effort was really targeted at stakeholders or groups or individuals that would  
761 directly connect to the diversity, equity, sustainability, and resilience areas.

762  
763 Mr. Miller continued on with the presentation on Residential Districts, and Non-  
764 Residential Districts, including aligning residential districts with LU categories and  
765 housing types and uses.

766  
767 The Commission discussed with the consultants aligning residential districts with LU  
768 categories.

769  
770 Member McGehee asked regarding impervious surfaces and having a little greener  
771 around, what is the disadvantage of changing the medium to high from eighty-five to  
772 seventy-five being the highest that the City has for improved area.

773  
774 Chair Kimble thought that was the point of the CUP. The Conditional Use allows  
775 you to get up to the eighty-five, otherwise there is no CUP.

776  
777 Mr. Miller indicated that was correct.

778  
779 Chair Kimble asked if there is going to be some unique instance with existing  
780 properties and new properties where the changes create some kind of a conflict or  
781 unusual situation.

782  
783 Mr. Miller indicated this will be looked at before a final recommendation is made to  
784 try to minimize any non-conformities that are created.

785

786 Mr. Miller continued his presentation regarding the non-residential and mixed-use  
787 districts including development intensity/improvement area.

788  
789 Member Pribyl asked what the next steps will be for this item.

790  
791 Ms. Trapp reviewed the remaining steps that need to be taken at upcoming meetings.

792  
793 Ms. Gundlach indicated staff plans on scheduling an extra meeting in May and June.  
794 She suggested May 12<sup>th</sup> and June 9<sup>th</sup> to meet in order to discuss this item further. She  
795 explained the Commission needs more opportunities to talk about this item.

796  
797 Chair Kimble thanked Ms. Trapp and Mr. Miller for the presentation.

798  
799 **9. Adjourn**

800  
801 **MOTION**  
802 **Member Kruzel, seconded by Member Leutgeb, to adjourn the meeting at 10:18**  
803 **p.m.**

804  
805 **Ayes: 7**  
806 **Nays: 0**  
807 **Motion carried.**

808