



**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 25th 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.