



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting  
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive  
Draft Minutes – Wednesday, February 3, 2020 – 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 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; and Commissioners Julie Kimble, Michelle  
9 Kruzel, Tammy McGehee, Michelle Pribyl and Karen  
10 Schaffhausen.  
11
- 12 **Members Absent:** None  
13
- 14 **Staff Present:** City Planner Thomas Paschke, Community Development Director  
15 Janice Gundlach, Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd and Community  
16 Development Department Assistant Staci Johnson.  
17
- 18 **3. Approve Agenda**  
19
- 20 **MOTION**  
21 **Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Kimble, to approve the agenda as**  
22 **presented.**  
23
- 24 **Ayes: 6**  
25 **Nays: 0**  
26 **Motion carried.**  
27
- 28 **4. Review of Minutes**  
29
- 30 **a. November 4, 2020 Planning Commission Regular Meeting**  
31
- 32 **MOTION**  
33 **Member Kruzel moved, seconded by Member Pribyl, to approve the November**  
34 **4, 2020 meeting minutes.**  
35
- 36 **Ayes: 6**  
37 **Nays: 0**  
38 **Motion carried.**

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  
85

**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. Organizational Business**

**a. Nominate Vice-Chair for February – March 2021**

Chair Gitzen indicated with Member Sparby resigning from the Planning Commission there is a need to fill the Vice-Chair position for February and March 2021 until a new member is appointed. At that time, the Commission will then vote for a Chair and Vice-Chair for 2021 year.

Member McGehee nominated Member Pribyl.

Member Pribyl nominated Member Kimble. Member Kruzel seconded the nomination.

Member McGehee understood that Member Kimble’s position was extended for a year which is why she nominated Member Pribyl but if Member Pribyl did not want the Vice-Chair position then she would be fine with Member Kimble as Vice-Chair.

**MOTION**

**Member Gitzen moved, seconded by Member McGehee, to close the nominations.**

**Ayes: 6**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

**Member Pribyl moved, seconded by Member Kruzel, to appoint Member Kimble as Vice-Chair of the Planning Commission for February – March 2021.**

**Ayes: 6**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

**7. Public Hearing**

86 **a. Request for Approval of a Preliminary Plat of an Existing Parcel into Six Lots in**  
87 **Order to Build a Twinhome Development (PF20-026)**

88 Chair Gitzen opened the public hearing for PF20-026 at approximately 6:42 p.m. and  
89 reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing. He advised this item will be  
90 before the City Council on February 22, 2021.

91  
92 Senior Planner Lloyd summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated  
93 February 3, 2021.

94  
95 Member Pribyl as for clarification on the replacement trees because in the report it  
96 shows preliminarily that the trees are not required under the Ordinance but in Mr.  
97 Lloyd's presentation it sounded like the Forester confirmed that replacement trees are  
98 required.

99  
100 Mr. Lloyd explained he and the Forester have been talking about this project as well  
101 as the other projects tonight over emails the last few weeks. The trees or table that is  
102 a part of the tree preservation plan document that the Commissioners are reviewing  
103 tonight is one that he pasted over the one already there. There were some numerical  
104 errors in the table that were on that plan. The staff report did indicate that  
105 replacement trees would not be necessary but that is incorrect.

106  
107 Member McGehee indicated she was not aware of the fine details but assumed the  
108 single-family home will remain, but she learned from the resident that apparently the  
109 owner of the lot being developed, and the single-family home were owned by the  
110 same individual. When that person sold the home to the current owners on the west  
111 side of that site it was indicated the property line was different than what it is. Those  
112 people had been maintaining at least a strip of the property by their house. Since it  
113 was purchased a chain link fence was put up during COVID and with the chain link  
114 fence up there is not enough room next to their garage and she was sure that those  
115 owners need a buffer but there have been other places like this where the City has  
116 actually devised something up and made adjustments. She did not believe this was  
117 one of those cases, but she did think that given the proximity of that house, which is  
118 occupied as a single-family house, there needs to be some sort of buffer or  
119 accommodation between the developer and the other homeowner or the City put some  
120 additional buffering there but not a fence because that makes a problem for the  
121 current owners to navigate around their home. She asked staff for suggestions for  
122 this.

123  
124 Mr. Lloyd indicated he was not sure there was a good answer. Whether the shared  
125 driveway is 110 feet to the east of where it is proposed to conform to that nominal  
126 provision about the street and the recently adopted underlying problem that the  
127 property line is closer than the homeowners anticipated it to be, moving the street or  
128 not installing a fence does not give anymore room to that neighboring homeowner  
129 and short of deeding some land or providing an easement across there, he did not  
130 know what other solutions there might be and he did not think that any of those are in  
131 the City's purview.  
132

133 Member Schaffhausen indicated because of the issues that came up with the new road  
134 she asked Mr. Lloyd to explain if someone could come in a back way and try and do  
135 the same thing in other places. Her concern is if the City is setting a precedent with  
136 this or is this different enough to not be concerned.

137  
138 Mr. Lloyd explained the City does not have a clear definition yet, or a clear way of  
139 distinguishing what is a shared driveway, what is a street, public or private, and  
140 certainly establishing a definition like that and incorporating that into the City Code  
141 will be a way to clarify that. The way that staff has looked at it so far is the width of  
142 this shared driveway satisfies the fire lane width minimum but does not conform to  
143 any street width. There have not been any concerns by Public Works, the Fire  
144 Department, Police Department, or any other City Departments about this driveway  
145 being less than the width of the street.

146  
147 Member Schaffhausen asked if the Planning Commission needed to make some sort  
148 of definition regarding this or is staff working on one.

149  
150 Mr. Lloyd explained a definition would be helpful, but staff really has not discussed it  
151 yet.

152  
153 Member Pribyl indicated given the concerns regarding the access and screening at the  
154 neighbor's property, she wondered about the thirty-foot utility easement on the other  
155 side of homes. Would this be required or was the developer able to make it work.  
156 She wondered if the easement could be twenty-five feet and move everything over to  
157 make more room for a landscape buffer on the one side as an option.

158  
159 Mr. Lloyd explained that could be an option and staff could talk to the developer  
160 about it. He did not believe there is a minimum width for the easements. He thought  
161 it was partly driven by what the utility infrastructure is and how deep it is. He noted  
162 the shared driveway is on top of the utility easement as well so it is something that  
163 could be driven over by these homeowners or neighboring homeowners.

164  
165 Member Pribyl indicated she was talking about the easement on the other side.

166  
167 Chair Gitzen thought there was a minimum rear yard setback of 30 feet.

168  
169 Mr. Lloyd indicated that was correct.

170  
171 Member Pribyl asked if the homeowners could ask for a variance to deal with that. If  
172 the utilities were twenty-five feet that would be accommodating to the neighbors in  
173 the future.

174  
175 Mr. Lloyd explained the location of the homes, like the driveway and everything else  
176 are not a part of the plat approval and if the lot lines are approved in the plat and the  
177 easements are also approved in the plat and easements are changed with homes  
178 shifting rearward in the future as it is developed remains an option.

179

180 Member McGehee was not sure it is a good policy to make policy definitions on the  
181 fly now. There was a policy and if it is insufficient then she was not sure if now is  
182 the right time to back pedal. She liked Member Pribyl's suggestion for solutions to  
183 this, but she would like to have a firmer solution that what the City has at the moment  
184 because she thought it is a problem and if that were a home and there was something  
185 next to it, the City has more setbacks and developments are usually screened from  
186 existing properties. She thought this is an important issue and if the City does not  
187 have a clear definition than she was not sure if it should be modified in this particular  
188 case. The recommendation is to disregard it in its entirety.

189  
190 Member Kruzal explained the shared driveway and the easement are a really tight  
191 space where this development is going in so she thought the City needed to do what it  
192 can to help the current homeowners make this appealing to them because it is kind of  
193 invasive the way it is going in.

194  
195 Mr. Michael Mezzenga, property owner, addressed the Commission and explained as  
196 far as shifting the land lots to the east, his civil engineer had a talk with the City  
197 Engineer and the townhouses to the east have a pretty bad drainage issue and cannot  
198 take on any more water on the property. Shifting anything to the east would not work  
199 because of the swale that is going along the east side of these twinhomes, the slope is  
200 already at the maximum slope, to have that drainage go from the rear pond to the  
201 street. Normally some water can be allowed to drift to the east and be managed by  
202 those townhouses but apparently there have been some real issues with draining. He  
203 noted this is already at the maximum as far as how that water from this development  
204 is going to be drained into the street.

205  
206 Mr. Mezzenga noted this development did start out as a four-home development but  
207 when the Fire Marshal told him the homes needed to be sprinkled, which added quite  
208 a bit of extra cost, so it was switched to three twinhomes instead. These will be  
209 sprinkled and one of the stipulations of doing this.

210  
211 Member Pribyl wondered, given the questions that have been raised about the  
212 screening along the west property line, if the developer has any plans for a landscape  
213 buffer or fence or any kind of screening along that side.

214  
215 Mr. Mezzenga explained he was going to do something but was not sure what he was  
216 going to do yet because there is quite a bit of debris in that yard such as vehicles and  
217 other issues. He did want to screen it because it is not attractive.

218  
219 **Public Comment**

220  
221 Ms. Edenia Buboltz indicated she lives on the property directly west of the  
222 development. She explained this is going to impact their lives immensely with  
223 having this development built right next to their property line. She explained she  
224 does have their collector's conversion van parked by their back garage. The other  
225 thing that is really concerning is the wildlife and mature trees that are there. She was  
226 not sure all of the parties within the circle received the information about the new

227 plans and how it will have an impact on their quality of life. She stated with the new  
228 plan that has been proposed, the whole property would need to be clear cut, from her  
229 understanding, because it does not look like any of the trees can be saved. There are  
230 a lot of very mature trees and super cool wildlife there as well which will be impacted  
231 as well as the people that are in the townhome development on the east side of the  
232 proposal. She noted this will also affect the privacy she will have, which she  
233 considers a single-family property. Her goal is for this property not to be developed.  
234

235 Ms. Buboltz noted she has spoken to an attorney about adverse possession on part of  
236 the property line that she has taken care of since moving into her home, as far as  
237 mowing, weeding, putting class five rock down, etc. She indicated this coming  
238 summer will be the sixth year and the previous owner took care of the property as  
239 well because he owned and farmed the property.  
240

241 Mr. Mike Buboltz explained one of the biggest concerns, when talking about drainage  
242 going into the east side townhomes, he wondered how this property can possibly meet  
243 the permeability of the drainage. He thought it looked like there would be too much  
244 on the property to meet the drainage requirements. His other concern is will the road  
245 be considered a driveway or a public roadway.  
246

247 Ms. Buboltz asked if the change in the plan was because the Fire Department needed  
248 to get in and be able to turn around. She understood the financial piece and that the  
249 property was purchased to make money and she did not have a problem with that, but  
250 she did have a problem with what is going to happen with the property to make that  
251 money. She indicated she wanted to understand the sprinkler system and also how an  
252 HOA is going to work there and where will the garbage containers be located; will  
253 each home have a container or will there be a bin somewhere. She also wondered  
254 which school system this will impact. Currently where she is located, she thought the  
255 students went to Mounds View and most of the time there is a Mounds View bus that  
256 drops riders off and with the addition of this development to the massive project that  
257 is going up on old Highway 8 and how that is going to impact the school system. She  
258 explained she just received this information so was not able to clearly go through all  
259 of it. She also had a question about two sewer caps that were recently dug out, one is  
260 on part of her property and on part of the other property. There is also one way in the  
261 back of the property.  
262

263 Mr. Lloyd explained with respect to impervious coverage, the Zoning Code allows for  
264 up to sixty-five percent of the site to be improved in some way with built things,  
265 whether impervious or not. He believed this project is approximately forty-four  
266 percent impervious which is not yet nearing the limit. He indicated the driveway is  
267 indeed a private shared driveway and not a public street. With respect to the Fire  
268 Department's requirements, his understanding of them is on a townhome project, or  
269 any residential project, needs either to have a place for a fire engine to turn around in,  
270 adequately sized, or the building themselves have to be sprinklered. This is a  
271 requirement. The person developing a site needs to pick one of those methods of  
272 conforming to the Fire Department Code.  
273

274 Mr. Lloyd indicated he did not know anything about the sewer cap issue. He believed  
275 it was correct to state the homes will be in the Mounds View School District although  
276 the School District boundaries are not a regular part of what the Zoning Code or  
277 Subdivision Code seeks to use as reasons to approve or not approve something. He  
278 explained the City Engineer has recommended a conditional of approval that the  
279 developer needs to create a HOA for the new homeowners if this is approved. This  
280 will make sure the stormwater BMP's are properly maintained and the common areas  
281 are properly maintained. The City does not have any requirements about how the  
282 trash is handled.

283  
284 Mr. Michael Schmidt, 1300 County Road D West, indicated he has lived across the  
285 street from the property his entire life. He stated the property across the street from  
286 him has been an eyesore for him his entire life. It did have a house on it at one time  
287 and was demolished with a garage put up in its place and has never been maintained.  
288 He knew that The Buboltz's have done a lot of work and tried to maintain some  
289 semblance of the property, but it is not their responsibility to keep it up because it is  
290 not their property. He was glad something was finally being done with the property  
291 to help make the area better to live in. His concern is that there are a lot of  
292 apartments within the area and this will eventually become three duplexes that will be  
293 rented out. There is an element that comes along with that. This is a very small  
294 community because of County Road D and the property owners want to make sure  
295 the area maintains itself. Another concern of his is the green aspect of this. He did  
296 not see anything in the plans with respect to that such as solar panels, water  
297 reclamation or anything like that. His last concern was the change in the plans and  
298 that the developer went from four units to six units which concerns him because four  
299 townhome units would probably mean owner occupied to six duplex units that will  
300 more likely be rental.

301  
302 Mr. Lloyd commented on the City's ability to control properties being rented. He  
303 noted even though the dwelling units are attached these units are proposed to be on  
304 their own lots and may be sold separately.

305  
306 Chair Gitzen closed the public hearing at 7:36 p.m. as no one else wished to address  
307 the Commission.

308  
309 **Commission Deliberation**

310  
311 Member Pribyl indicated the Commission is asked to approve the plat and not  
312 anything else. She explained there were not any variances either. She felt like there  
313 might be some concerns about how this development is being done but the question  
314 for the Commission is the plat.

315  
316 Chair Gitzen indicated that was correct.

317  
318 Member McGehee thought there were a number of problems that exist with this, not  
319 the least of which is the City's own definitional questions. She indicated she did not  
320 think those questions and issues seemed to be answerable in this discussion.

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  
364  
365  
366  
367

**MOTION**

**Member Schaffhausen moved, seconded by Member Kimble, to recommend to the City Council approval of a Preliminary Plat of an Existing Parcel into Six Lots in Order to Build a Twinhome Development with the conditions listed in the RPCA. (PF20-026)**

Member Schaffhausen indicated she made the motion to approve because she believed there are some questions to be answered but as Member Pribyl pointed out that what the Commission is here to do is to look at the plat. Based on what the Commission is being asked to do, those questions have been raised and unless there is anything from a plat perspective and there is no variance, the Commission should move forward and approve this as presented.

Member McGehee thought in this case there are too many outstanding questions that do pertain to this plat and they pertain in a way that will affect ongoing zoning so she will not support the motion based on discussions and the comments by the residents as well as by the definitional problems the City has with its own definition for buffers and the fact that it shifted without much notice to the neighbors from townhomes to duplexes, which is a significant change.

Community Development Director Gundlach clarified the motion that was made. She noted the role of the Commission is to implement the Zoning Code as it currently exists. The Zoning Code as it currently exists does not include a 125-foot setback from the western property line where it is being defined as a street. The Zoning Code does provide some authority to the City Engineer and does not distinguish between a driveway and a street but the Code for the 125-foot setback applies to a street. The City Council can decide to look at the Zoning Code and change it in the future but right now the application has been made, a plat is before the Commission and it is the responsibility of the Commission to implement the Zoning Code. She explained there are no buffer requirements either but appreciated the property owners concern to the west as well as the concerns that Commissioner McGehee has made. At the building permit phase, once the structures are applied for a building permit, all of the requirements of the Code will be implemented.

City Planner Paschke clarified the difference between a duplex and a single lot development.

**Ayes: 5**  
**Nays: 1 (McGehee)**  
**Motion carried.**

- b. Request for Approval of a Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map Change from Low-Density Residential (LR) to Medium-Density Residential (MR) and a Rezoning from Low-Density Residential 1 (LDR-1) to Medium Density Residential (MDR) on Part of the Development Site; Preliminary Approval of a Major Plat to Subdivide the Whole Development into 20 Lots for Single-Family,**



**Detached Townhome Development, Variances to Side Yard Setbacks and Cul-De-Sac Street Length and Shared Access to McCarrons Lake as a Conditional Use. (PF20-029)**

Chair Gitzen opened the public hearing for PF20-029 at approximately 7:46 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing.

Senior Planner Lloyd summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated February 3, 2021.

Chair Gitzen reviewed the process for Commission discussion on the five different actions needed.

Member Kimble indicated it was mentioned that there was a great difference in grade in the plan and she asked Mr. Lloyd to walk them through what is happening with the grade. She wondered what the impact is on the easterly boundary with the skinny strip.

Mr. Lloyd and Ms. Gundlach reviewed the different grades on the property with the Commission.

Member Pribyl wondered if staff had a diagram that shows the lot in question for rezoning and how that overlays on the full site. It seemed like from doing a quick sketch overlay herself, it is primarily at the trail, the drainage basin, unit 16 and maybe a corner of 15. It is essentially one unit, which is what is allowed on the lot the way it is planned.

Mr. Lloyd indicated that is basically correct. He noted he did not have a diagram for this.

Member Pribyl asked for the overall site, medium density residential, how many units would be allowed for this size of site.

Mr. Lloyd believed there could be 48 units on its own. Obviously 48 detached townhome units would not be able to fit on lots like this.

Chair Gitzen indicated he would like more information on the zero-yard setback.

Mr. Lloyd reviewed the zero-yard setback with the Commission.

Chair Gitzen understood that usually with townhomes there are HOA's where the outside of the buildings are maintained but it was his understanding that these are single family homes and will maintain their own houses, so the five feet setback is for maintenance. He knew the City had to go with the zoning that is there now, and he would ask the applicant about this as well. He did think that moving the setback would be fine and is probably practical.

414 Chair Gitzen asked regarding the controlled access, which will get the Conditional  
415 use, if the Commission is allowed to put some conditions on that.

416  
417 Mr. Lloyd indicated that was right, as with any Conditional Use consideration,  
418 approval can include any conditions deemed necessary to prevent adverse impact, and  
419 protect the health, safety, and general welfare of the community.

420  
421 Chair Gitzen explained there is a trail dumping out onto McCarrons and then across  
422 there is the park area so he wondered if there was anything that the City could do to  
423 require the developer to put a crossing in there to protect the public.

424  
425 Mr. Lloyd indicated staff has been working with the developer on that and in fact,  
426 there are reason why Public Works Staff is reluctant to recommend flashing lights or  
427 some sort of larger improvements like that. The Rice and Larpenteur Vision Plan  
428 does promote certain street painting designs at intersections, crosswalks and so forth.  
429 This being a sort of public pedestrian way/multi-use path, in that vision plan area, that  
430 would do some sort of crosswalk, painting would need to be done. They are working  
431 with the designs in that vision plan to not only call attention to a pedestrian crosswalk  
432 there but to elevate it in light of its location in this vision plan area.

433  
434 Mr. Roger Anderson, applicant, addressed the Commission about the proposed plan.

435  
436 Member Kimble indicated it was really helpful to understand the addition of the extra  
437 lot because she did wonder about that and in a way adds a complication for the zoning  
438 request. She thought it helped to understand the reason for the zero-lot line request.

439  
440 Chair Gitzen agreed and also liked the comment that the HOA was not going to be  
441 responsible for maintenance of the homes but there will be required access easements,  
442 which could be a condition for the variance. He would be comfortable with the zero-  
443 lot line as long as there are access easements, which he has not seen before but  
444 thought they probably existed in other communities.

445  
446 **Public Comment**

447  
448 Ms. Susan Love, homeowner on Roma Avenue, west of the development. She  
449 explained the StarTribune quoted Ms. Gundlach saying the idea behind the tree  
450 ordinance is to motivate people to redevelop in a way that preserves the big trees.  
451 She indicated this plan instead destroys twenty-six of twenty-eight heritage trees and  
452 162 or 197 significant trees. There is a tug of war here, as has been pointed out,  
453 medium density zoning could allow up to forty-eight units. She noted on line 126 of  
454 the report, essentially tells them that if they argue to save trees and if they argue for  
455 fewer homes they could essentially and inadvertently be arguing for fewer buildings  
456 of greater density instead of single-family homes, which she and neighbors she has  
457 spoken with definitely do not want. The surrounding residents do want single family  
458 homes, just not so many. She explained she has previously made clear her views  
459 about limiting development in order to mitigate climate change, which affects public  
460 health and general welfare issues that development plans must not compromise. She

461 noted she stood by this conviction and urge the Commission to take this into  
462 consideration here. However, she knew the City is deeply invested in this  
463 development and design. She wished that residents living in close proximity had  
464 been specifically notified earlier in the process. She asked if the Commission is and  
465 remains in favor of the preliminary plat design included on page 14 of the packet,  
466 would the Commission consider a revision of the preliminary plat design, a revision  
467 that would preserve the neighborhood character and its unique sense of place in the  
468 woodsy neighborhood that would preserve a noise and privacy buffer and most  
469 importantly, preserve and make room for replacement trees that sink carbon, purify  
470 the air, and help keep the lake healthy. She asked if the Commission would consider  
471 moving the placement of the monument sign to the south of the road and eliminate lot  
472 one in order to reserve a wooded area composed of existing and replacement trees.  
473 This would provide a little of the woodsy feel along Gaultier Street that is valued by  
474 neighbors and lake walkers for the tree’s beauty, importance to the environment and  
475 positive impact on property values.  
476

477 Ms. Love stated in their repeal to the City Council regarding park fees, the developers  
478 have stated that because the land north of the road adjacent to the lake is quite small,  
479 it provides a much-needed amenity for the future owners. She put forth that the  
480 woods that the residents see and enjoy along Gaultier is a much-needed amenity for  
481 current residents of the neighborhood. When the Commission considers Motion C,  
482 which concerns the plat design, she asked the Commission to not pass the motion as it  
483 is but to consider all the concerns presented in the packets and from the community.  
484 She asked is if the Commission went forward with the preliminary plan to revise it  
485 from twenty homes to nineteen homes with the area currently marked as lot one  
486 reserved for existing and replacement trees.  
487

488 Ms. Rene Pardello, McCarrons Blvd N., explained she echoed Ms. Love’s concerns.  
489 She asked the Commission to take a step back and take a look at the bigger picture for  
490 a moment. She explained she has been impressed with Roseville’s new commitment  
491 to equity and diversity and on the Roseville website it states, “The City of Roseville is  
492 committed to taking tangible steps to normalize, organize and implement racial equity  
493 principles and tools with an eye toward impactful and sustainable outcomes that  
494 create a more equitable community.” She asked the Commission to keep that in mind  
495 because when she thinks about this situation and have reviewed the information from  
496 the Roseville’s City website, if she took a look at some census data and the lifetime  
497 housing options, on the Roseville website it states “the City Council and staff have  
498 been studying the census data. The data has shown an increase in total housing units  
499 and an increase in vacant housing”. Her question is why the City of Roseville is not  
500 buying this property and maintaining this greenspace to address the issues of climate  
501 change, to address the issues of stormwater. There will be issues around stormwater  
502 management. This system that the stormwater is going into is too old to manage what  
503 the City currently has, which is an issue. Once land is turned into concrete it is hard  
504 to go back. Regarding racial equity, the City knows that there is racial disparity in  
505 this Country and that wealth is built through home ownership, and through  
506 generational home ownership. The City knows that in the thirty’s there were racial  
507 restricted covenants in the deeds. It was illegal to sell a home to a black person or a

508 Jewish person. The City knows that these covenants existed in Minnesota and were  
509 prohibited in 1953 but did remain until 1968 with the Fair Housing Act, which  
510 explicitly made it illegal, yet today they can see the outcomes of that with the great  
511 racial disparity. They also know that this part of Roseville has the lowest medium  
512 household income in the City. Her question is, if the City is going to endorse,  
513 recommend this development, where the houses will sell for \$475,000 to \$600,000  
514 each, who can afford that. Which senior citizens can afford that in their retirement  
515 for a first level home and which communities of color can afford that when looking at  
516 the racial disparities that currently exist. By recommending the approval of this  
517 design, the City is reinforcing racial disparity and are contributing to systemic racism.  
518 She encouraged them to budget their values.

519  
520 Mr. Andrew Montain, South McCarron's Boulevard, stated he is a few houses down  
521 from the proposed development. He wanted to commend the others that spoke ahead  
522 of him. He indicated he sent an email to everyone which is included in the packet.  
523 He did not think the developers have acted in great faith. He noted he thought the  
524 developer was meeting the letter of the law often times but with also some  
525 compromises with staff. He did not think the five hundred radius is sufficient when  
526 there are neighbors nearby, especially on a large property and there are so few  
527 neighbors to contact. He indicated he will continue to inform his neighbors for more  
528 input. He indicated these developers are not Roseville citizens and are not members  
529 of the community and he thought the City should put some extra weight on what is  
530 being heard from the neighbors who are speaking. In his letter he talks about a  
531 document that has been referenced multiple times that Maxfield Research produced.  
532 Some of the language the developer has used has talked about a need and really the  
533 research from what he has read is really about demand and speculating as to how  
534 these properties might sell. As a neighbor, he did not think they will sell for what is  
535 being suggested there. Roseville has built a lot of senior housing where there is not  
536 just single level living but also assisted living. There is a lot of senior housing  
537 demand that is being met in Roseville.

538  
539 Mr. Montain stated his concern is also about the trees in a lot of ways. He was  
540 reading the City Code and Ordinance on tree preservation and it says the tree  
541 inventory should be done by a forester or an arborist. He looked it up and the person  
542 who did it, the Anderson Companies, Kurt Clays, does not have either of those  
543 qualifications listed in his linked in profile. It also says the species should be  
544 identified onsite and that has not been done. The trees are listed as maple and oak  
545 which are generalizations and not species. Those should be more specific  
546 information. He pointed out the length of the road as the maximum being five  
547 hundred feet, while he did not oppose the idea of a longer road going into the  
548 development, that is a way to circumvent the number of trees that are allowed to be  
549 cut.

550  
551 Ms. Janet Olson stated she just learned about this and it has been really interesting to  
552 hear what the neighbors that are closely affected are feeling. She encourages them to  
553 keep talking to the City about these important issues. She asked if South McCarrons  
554 Boulevard, the road itself, changing it all and is the trail going along the lake,

555 lakeside, being affected at all. She indicated this is going to be putting a lot of stress  
556 on the roads around the development and as far as repairing those roads, who is  
557 responsible for that. The trail that is going to cross South McCarrons from the  
558 development to the park, that particular corner going east is very hard to see what is  
559 happening along that road so that should be looked into more carefully. She thought  
560 it was important for the lake part, in the documentation she read, it was talked about  
561 that they will not do anything that the DNR would not allow but she thought it was  
562 important for the City to get a better feeling for what the developer is planning on that  
563 piece of property.  
564

565 Mr. Lloyd explained there are no changes proposed to the street itself. He understood  
566 that just by historical artifacts, part of the land that has been known as the South  
567 McCarrons Boulevard right of way, a wider expanse than the street itself, was  
568 doubled up with the St. Paul Regional Services and there is some vacation of excess  
569 parts of that right of way and that has been something the developer has worked with  
570 Ramsey County on to vacate those easements where it makes sense and the resulting  
571 right of way would be much more consistent with what a typical right of way would  
572 be for a street of that nature. The right of way proposes to change with this plat. The  
573 street and trail infrastructure that exists will not change. With respect to the traffic,  
574 the twenty-unit development is well below the threshold that the City has for traffic  
575 studies. He reviewed the City's road maintenance standards.  
576

577 Ms. Caroline Stoick, Roma Avenue, explained her family has lived in the same  
578 neighborhood for approximately 14 years and their taxes have almost doubled since  
579 moving to the area. She wondered if this would affect their taxes at all because living  
580 next to homes that will be between \$400,000 to \$600,000, she is not inclined to pay  
581 more just to have the privilege of living by them. She wondered what is going on  
582 with the condemned apartments that are on Larpenteur and how is that going to affect  
583 these houses because nobody is going to want to live in that expensive of a house and  
584 live next to a basically condemned bunch of buildings. She agreed regarding the  
585 access to the lake because that is a very blind corner. The topography of the land and  
586 the way the corner is people are not seen very easily.  
587

588 Ms. Gundlach explained she cannot speak to what this development would do to the  
589 County assessment of the value of the home. Taxes are really based on the value of  
590 the individual home and Ramsey County is the one that sets the value of the home.  
591 She indicated the Marion Brittany apartments to the south are not condemned. The  
592 City did revoke the rental license in November 2019 because of property maintenance  
593 issues. Since that time the owner of the property has hired a professional property  
594 management company to make improvements to those buildings and have put well  
595 over a million dollars into those buildings since that time and she believed at the next  
596 City Council meeting, at least three of those buildings will get a rental license back  
597 and expect in the coming months that eventually all of the buildings will also get their  
598 rental license back as improvements and investments continue to be made into those  
599 apartment buildings.  
600

601 Mr. Tom Elko indicated he lives directly across this development on Gaultier and  
602 Roma. He explained this development adds 20 two car garages with an additional  
603 forty outdoor parking spaces. He imagined between thirty and fifty additional cars  
604 coming out onto Gaultier Street. This is twice the size of his neighborhood. He  
605 indicated the Rice/Larpenteur vision prioritizes pedestrian and bicycle traffic and this  
606 does not fit with that vision. This is a car first development. He questioned the  
607 vision and if the little trail in the development is all it takes to meet the vision then he  
608 guessed that said a lot.

609  
610 Ms. Alison Cariveau, 1775 Barrington, explained she echoed the prior comments and  
611 would like a little more outreach regarding this development because she thought her  
612 home was just outside of the requirements but would affect them as well. This really  
613 will affect the traffic patterns, pedestrian patterns and the safety getting to the trail.  
614 She also suggested that more consideration be made for the trees being removed. She  
615 indicated she was also concerned about the impacts to the lakeshore and that some  
616 consideration be made not to degrade that.

617  
618 Mr. Andrew Montain, commented on the path through the apartment complex. He  
619 suggested a few alternatives as well safe crossings.

620  
621 Chair Gitzen closed the public hearing at 9:15 p.m. as no one else wished to speak.

622  
623 **Commission Deliberation**

624  
625 Chair Gitzen thought the Commission needed to discuss Items A and B together and  
626 put a motion together for that before discussing Items C and D in case the motion is  
627 to recommend denial.

628  
629 Member Kimble commented that she did sit on the Rice/Larpenteur Task Force as  
630 plans for this area were evolving and many meetings over an extended period of time  
631 and she recognized and appreciated all of the comments, she noted that was a pretty  
632 expansive community process and this plan has some consistencies with what  
633 everybody had agreed would work on this site.

634  
635 Member Schaffhausen asked if there is a way for the residents to have access to the  
636 information about the Rice/Larpenteur Task Force meetings.

637  
638 Ms. Gundlach explained the Rice/Larpenteur vision plan is an appendix to the  
639 Comprehensive Plan and can be accessed via the City website. She also noted the  
640 Rice and Larpenteur Alliance, which is the current form that this group has taken on  
641 has its own website at [www.riceandlarpenteur.com](http://www.riceandlarpenteur.com) to look at the vision plan as well  
642 as all of the other things the group is working on to vitalize this area of the City.

643  
644 **MOTION**  
645 **Member Pribyl moved, seconded by Member Kimble, to recommend to the City**  
646 **Council approval of a Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map Change at 196 S**  
647 **McCarrons Boulevard from Low-Density Residential (LR) to Medium-Density**

648 **Residential (MR), and the Requested Zoning Map Change at 196 S McCarrons**  
649 **Boulevard from Low-Density Residential 1 (LDR-1) to Medium Density**  
650 **Residential (MDR), based on the content of the RPCA, Public Input, and**  
651 **Planning Commission Deliberation.**  
652

653 Member McGehee explained that being unfamiliar with how the trails go, she was  
654 thinking that she agreed with the motion but she thought the developer should look at  
655 the trail and whether it is needed there or not or if it is safe there and whether the City  
656 wants to do something about a specific crossing because it is a blind corner so she did  
657 not think a trail should go there.  
658

659 Chair Gitzen indicated there is still another part to this item that needs to be discussed  
660 so Member McGehee will have a chance to bring up the trail then.  
661

662 **Ayes: 6**  
663 **Nays: 0**  
664 **Motion carried.**  
665

666 Chair Gitzen indicated the Commission can discuss the preliminary plat and  
667 subdivision variance at this time.  
668

669 Member Kimble indicated in listening to one of the comments, she wondered if there  
670 was any consideration of retaining some of lot one at the entry to be green with trees  
671 as one resident suggested.  
672

673 Mr. Anderson explained he did propose a landscape plan that goes along with the  
674 standards that are expected for this development. He indicated the area alongside lot  
675 one has a fair amount of area but there needs to be a drainage swale next to that home  
676 but there is no reason why some coniferous trees could not be added to the area to  
677 increase the buffer. He noted trees cannot be planting in the basin, which is not  
678 allowed by the Watershed, but trees can be put along the parameter. There is room to  
679 enhance that area.  
680

681 Member Kimble knew it was the desire of the resident to have the house removed  
682 completely but anything that can be done to help create some more tree density there  
683 would be appreciated.  
684

685 **Member Kimble moved, seconded by Member Kruzel, to recommend to the City**  
686 **Council approval of the Proposed Enclave at McCarrons Lake Preliminary Plat**  
687 **and the Subdivision Variance to allow a cul-de-sac Street Longer than 500 Feet,**  
688 **based on the content of the RPCA, Public Input, and Planning Commission**  
689 **Deliberation with conditions 1-3 in the RPCA recommended by staff and**  
690 **Condition 4 to beef up the greenery and trees along the westerly side of lot one as**  
691 **shown in the plat. (PF20-029).**  
692

693 Member Kimble indicated she did not have an issue with the length of road listed in  
694 the variance and her comments from before about the Rice/Larpenteur Task Force  
695 support enough of the recommendation.  
696

697 Member Kruzel agreed with all of it and liked that the developer spoke about the trees  
698 and greenery along lot one.  
699

700 Member Pribyl asked for a point of clarification, when Mr. Lloyd was presenting, she  
701 thought there was clarification on 3A and B about the language in the report.  
702

703 Mr. Lloyd explained it is by the Parks and Recreation Department recommendation to  
704 receive cash in lieu of land and that the \$72,000 amount and revision of the land for  
705 the trail connection. He indicated he would make sure the conditions are worded  
706 correctly before going to the City Council.  
707

708 **Ayes: 6**

709 **Nays: 0**

710 **Motion carried.**  
711

712 **Member Gitzen moved, seconded by Member Pribyl, to recommend to the City**  
713 **Council approval of the requested zoning variance to allow the homes on**  
714 **proposed Lots 2 – 20 of the Enclave at McCarrons Lake plat to be built with a**  
715 **zero setback on one side property line, based on the content of this RPCA, public**  
716 **input, and Planning Commission deliberation with conditions a and b as well as**  
717 **access easements.**  
718

719 **Ayes: 6**

720 **Nays: 0**

721 **Motion carried.**  
722

723 Member McGehee indicated it was her understanding when it comes to lakes that the  
724 City has the ability to be more restrictive than the existing State conditions, but do not  
725 have the ability to be less restrictive. She thought in making these conditions that the  
726 City should reserve the right to make it more restrictive if that seems to protect the  
727 safety and welfare of the people around the lake and the neighborhood.  
728

729 Mr. Lloyd explained all of that may be true but his earlier comment to the  
730 Commission was if there are additional conditions or concerns about the access there  
731 that the Commission focus those concerns or conditions on what might be built and  
732 where it might be built on the land itself. The City of Roseville does not have  
733 regulations that pertain to use of the lake, being a public water body. He did not  
734 know if it was appropriate to establish conditions that affect the use of the lake.  
735 Certainly, the effects of the upland improvements on the water quality, the amount of  
736 use the lake might see, based on the shared access seems entirely reasonable. He  
737 encouraged the Commission to keeps its focus on the upland area and the impacts of  
738 what happens there.  
739



740 Member McGehee agreed but would like to urge the people that spoke, if there are  
741 concerns, there is a McCarrons Lake Association that should have more information  
742 about what they are thinking about the lake. She did not think the Commission had  
743 enough information to make additional conditions, but she would like the individuals  
744 to present that at the City Council meeting if there were concerns.

745  
746 **Member Pribyl moved, seconded by Member McGehee, to recommend approval**  
747 **of the proposed controlled access as a Conditional Use, based on the content of**  
748 **this RPCA, public input, and Planning Commission deliberation.**

749  
750 **Ayes: 6**  
751 **Nays: 0**  
752 **Motion carried.**

753  
754 **Recess and reconvene**

755 Chair Gitzen recessed the meeting at approximately 9:41 p.m., and reconvened at  
756 approximately 9:51 p.m.

757  
758 **Chair Gitzen moved, seconded by Member Pribyl, to extend the time limit past**  
759 **the 10:00 p.m. deadline.**

760  
761 **Ayes: 6**  
762 **Nays: 0**  
763 **Motion carried.**

764  
765 **c. Request by BJHN, with Arthur’s Senior Care, for Consideration of a**  
766 **Comprehensive Land Use Plan Map and Zoning Map Change, and Conditional**  
767 **Use for a 13-Unit State Licensed Assisted Living and Dementia Care Facility at**  
768 **202 County Road B. (PF20-034)**

769 Chair Gitzen opened the public hearing for PF20-034 at approximately 9:52 p.m. and  
770 reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing. He advised this item will be  
771 before the City Council on February 22, 2021.

772  
773 City Planner Paschke summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated  
774 February 3, 2021.

775  
776 Mr. Paul Nelson wanted to make it clear that they are at the beginning stages of this  
777 and currently have two six bed care centers and are not committed to thirteen beds.

778  
779 Ms. Deb Nygaard made a presentation to the Commission on their Senior Care  
780 facilities.

781  
782 Member Kimble indicated she lives on the Shoreview boarder of Roseville and walks  
783 by this on Emmert all the time. She knew what it was and if walking by a person  
784 would never know it is anything but a single-family home. This blends right into the  
785 neighborhood and seems like it is a single-family home. She thought this was a very

786 cool concept. She noted in the report at the end, there were quite a number of notes  
787 from the open house, but it did not say if the applicant answered the concerns. She  
788 wondered if the concerns were solved.

789  
790 Ms. Deb Nygaard thought the biggest concern that was not solved was the person did  
791 not want the driveway on Albermarle Court. The biggest concern was there are  
792 already a lot of people trying to get out on that street and County B is busy during  
793 rush hour. The only thing stated was that shift changes typically happen at 6:00am,  
794 2:00pm and 10:00pm. She did not know if there would be a tremendous amount of  
795 competition.

796  
797 Member McGehee thought that the concept is wonderful. She liked the looks of it.  
798 She did not think this one looked like a single-family home, which the other ones do,  
799 and she would rather that it was the smaller version and look like the single-family  
800 home. She wondered if this was built to look like a single-family home with six  
801 residents, like the model, that seems to work really well elsewhere, did they need to,  
802 under those circumstances, change the zoning on this particular piece to make that  
803 work.

804  
805 Ms. Nygaard indicated something that is important to her in the senior industry is that  
806 when you do not sit around the same dining room table, you lose the feeling of  
807 family. It might be that there could be two different dining rooms, one for each wing  
808 so that it still feels like a family to the people who live there. When there are this  
809 many clients the building will need an industrial kitchen and two kitchens cannot be  
810 put in this building.

811  
812 Member McGehee noted her question was not really about how the development is  
813 constructed on the inside, she does a lot of volunteering with seniors and really likes  
814 the concept. She would be more supportive of the six-bed model and seems more like  
815 a single-family home. She wondered if the applicant would be interested in doing  
816 something like the other homes on this site.

817  
818 Mr. Nelson explained they could do a six-person bed home if the zoning did not need  
819 to be changed however, the business model of six people and how much it costs  
820 works but they would be able to reach more people by having a higher occupancy rate  
821 because each person would not have to pay as much. Also with staffing, there are  
822 two staff to six people and with 12-13 people there would be three or four staff,  
823 which is better. The current setup is great because it is like a home and the senior  
824 does get the attention except when one patient requires the two staff to care for them.  
825 He noted they are not looking bigger because they want to go bigger, they are looking  
826 bigger because they thought it would work better.

827  
828 Mr. Paschke explained as it relates to the Code, the Code would permit six  
829 occupancies and would not require the rezoning.

830  
831 Member Kimble agreed with Commissioner McGehee's comment that the six-person  
832 home looked nice and looks very single family but with particular site having MDR

833 on one side and a freeway on the other, she would be more comfortable with the 13  
834 unit one at this location because it is not embedded in a single-family neighborhood.

835  
836 Member Kruzel asked what the security for the clients would be.

837  
838 Ms. Nygaard explained there is a keypad at every door and is not shared with anyone,  
839 not even family members. The client cannot leave without a staff person putting in  
840 the code.

841  
842 **Public Comment**

843  
844 No one came forward to speak for or against this request. Chair Gitzen closed the  
845 public hearing at 10:26 p.m.

846  
847 **MOTION**  
848 **Member Kimble moved, seconded by Member Schaffhausen, to recommend to**  
849 **the City Council approval of the Property (202 County Road B) be Reguided**  
850 **from a Comprehensive Land Use Map Designation of LR (Low Density**  
851 **Residential) to MR (Medium Density Residential) as well as the property be**  
852 **Rezoned from an Official Map Classification of LDR-1 (Low Density**  
853 **Residential-1 District) to MDR (Medium Density Residential) according to the**  
854 **staff report.**

855  
856 **Ayes: 6**  
857 **Nays: 0**  
858 **Motion carried.**

859  
860 **MOTION**  
861 **Member Pribyl moved, seconded by Member McGehee, to recommend to the**  
862 **City Council approval of the requested Conditional Use for allowance to**  
863 **construct a 13-unit state licensed residential facility of assisted living and**  
864 **memory care, with a dementia care focus, subject to findings a-f in the RCPA.**

865  
866 **Ayes: 6**  
867 **Nays: 0**  
868 **Motion carried.**

869  
870 **8. Project File 0037: 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update**

871  
872 **a. Introduction to the Zoning Code Update Project and Team**  
873 Community Development Director Gundlach reviewed the Zoning Code Update  
874 Project and indicated the City hired HKGi Consultants.

875  
876 Mr. Jeff Miller and Ms. Rita Trap introduced themselves and made a presentation to  
877 the Commission.

878

879 Member McGehee thanked HKGi for the packet and concepts and for the 2030  
880 Comprehensive Plan. She thought the plan was very easy to use and is feeling very  
881 confident about this going forward. She noted the use of popups at least as described  
882 in the packet was fairly targeted and she explained there were popups used for the  
883 2040 Comprehensive Plan and they were not effective. They were sort of put in  
884 places where people shop and what the City got was a lot of response by people who  
885 do not live in Roseville. She also thanked HKGi for the collection of public input  
886 during this trying time. She indicated she was very impressed with the information  
887 provided and looked for to this moving forward.

888  
889 Chair Gitzen thanked HKGi for the presentation and staying for the entire meeting.

890  
891 Mr. Miller summarized the upcoming steps in the Zoning Code update.

892  
893 **9. Adjourn**

894  
895 **MOTION**

896 **Member McGehee, seconded by Member Schaffhausen, to adjourn the meeting**  
897 **at 11:00 p.m.**

898  
899 **Ayes: 6**

900 **Nays: 0**

901 **Motion carried.**

902  
903