



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Draft Minutes – Wednesday, March 3, 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 Chair Gitzen called to order the regular meeting of the Planning Commission meeting at
3 approximately 6:00 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 Julie Kimble, and Commissioners
9 Michelle 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 Pribyl moved, seconded by Member McGehee, 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. February 3, 2021 Planning Commission Regular Meeting**
31
- 32 **MOTION**
33 **Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Schaffhausen, to approve the**
34 **February 3, 2021 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.*

Mr. Paschke thanked Chair Gitzen for his years of service on the Planning Commission. He noted Chair Gitzen has been a great asset to the Commission.

Chair Gitzen explained he has enjoyed his time on the Commission and noted staff has been very nice and supportive of everything the Commission has done.

6. Public Hearing

- a. **Consideration of a Request by Roseville Leased Housing Association II, LLP (Dominium, Inc.) For a Conditional Use to Allow The Construction of a Five Story, 277 Unit, Senior Residential Project at 2730 Herschel Street (PF21-002)**
Chair Gitzen opened the public hearing for PF21-002 at approximately 6:08 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing. He advised this item will be before the City Council on March 22, 2021.

City Planner Paschke summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated March 3, 2021.

Member Kimble asked if staff knew what the parking ratio was, stalls per unit.

Mr. Paschke indicated he did not have that information, but he knew as a part of the review of the Oasis project, staff did review the parking. These projects are not parked the same, so a parking study was done to conclude the parking ratios provided are adequately met based on the study. He believed that what staff concluded was the senior project as well as the multi-family project were to be parked based on the number of units and then a .25 for overall units, which is far greater than what he believed provided both in the underground and surface parking on both sites.

Member Kimble wondered if there is a service that comes or will come to the development.

Mr. Paschke did not believe there was a bus service that comes to the site and he was not sure if it will in the future. That has been a challenge for Roseville for a number of years, trying to get Metro Transit to expand its service to certain areas in the City.

86 Member McGehee agreed with Member Kimble because she looked at the EAW and
87 it seemed to her that there is an underestimate on the parking availability. When it is
88 based on the unit and there are a number of two-bedroom units and the over fifty-five
89 units where there are two individuals, there could easily be two vehicles. She thought
90 the City made a mistake at Sienna Green where there is obviously not enough
91 parking. She was not sure that the study should not be looked at again. She believed
92 it indicates a use permit is needed because the development is exceeding the
93 maximum number of units on that particular project.

94
95 Mr. Paschke indicated to his knowledge, 277 was consistent with what was supported
96 in the past, which was a part of the EAW, and that number has always continued
97 forward. The Conditional Use is necessary because it is more than three units.

98
99 Member McGehee asked if staff had any information on what some of the stores or
100 entities are going to be in the front section.

101
102 Mr. Paschke indicated staff did not know that information at this time. The City has
103 not received any plans and he was not sure when commercial activity will begin. He
104 assumed that later in the year staff might see some activity out there related to
105 perhaps some commercial development.

106
107 Member McGehee wondered about this because a lot of units are being added and
108 there is not a bank on that side of Snelling and there is not any daycare or a
109 drycleaner in that area and it seemed to her that would be services that the people
110 living there might need.

111
112 Member Kruzel asked if the apartments will be market value for seniors. She also
113 wondered how many senior housing units have been done over the past couple of
114 years versus multi-family and low-income housing in the City.

115
116 Community Development Director Gundlach noted this development will be the first
117 senior affordable housing project, other than the Commonbond project in the City.
118 She reviewed the different housing types in the City that have recently been built
119 along with the density question brought up previously. She noted the projects will
120 share parking and amenities and really act together. When averaging the density out
121 for both projects across both sites it is at the 36 units per acre. The EAW will show
122 on the family side the number of units being proposed was actually less than what
123 could be allowed under Code whereas on the senior side it went a little bit above but
124 when averaged across both sites it was within the allowance under the CU.

125
126 Member McGehee asked what the annual income is for the sixty percent AMI and for
127 the fifty percent AMI.

128
129 Ms. Gundlach indicated staff would need to look it up.

130
131 Member McGehee asked if it were staff's understanding that the pool would be
132 shared with the seniors and the gazebo will be shared by the housing unit. She noted

Regular Planning Commission Meeting

Minutes – Wednesday, March 3, 2021

Page 4

133 staff indicated all the amenities would be cross shared, but the amenities do not like
134 they are in the position on the sites for cross sharing.

135
136 Ms. Gundlach deferred to the developer to answer these specific questions about the
137 pool and gazebo.

138
139 Chair Gitzen asked if there has been any public input since the report has been put
140 online.

141
142 Mr. Paschke indicated he has not received any emails or phone calls on the project.

143
144 Mr. Ryan Lunderby, Dominion, Inc., addressed the Commission.

145
146 Mr. Lunderby indicated in regard to the shared amenities, they will certainly allow
147 residents from both communities to utilize the amenities. In regard to the pool and
148 gazebo, he saw those primarily being used by the residents of the particular project,
149 given the location and what those properties are geared towards. If residents from
150 one community would like to use the amenities, staff could make that available. On
151 the income limits, the differences between the sixty percent income level and the fifty
152 percent income level change depending on the household size. He reviewed the some
153 of the different household sizes and percentages for each and he also reviewed the
154 parking requirements with the Commission.

155
156 Member Pribyl asked if these units are strictly 55 plus or are there any parents with
157 adult children or caretakers moving in with them.

158
159 Mr. Lunderby explained the guidelines are that the head of household needs to be age
160 55 or older. It is possible that there could be a HOH that could potentially have an
161 adult child or even a child younger than that. He thought the vast majority of seniors
162 on average are actually older than that 55-year-old limit. The average age is
163 somewhere in the seventies.

164
165 Member Kruzel asked if the building is handicap accessible and would there be leases
166 with disabilities.

167
168 Mr. Lunderby indicated there are two types of units. Type A units are designed to
169 meet all ADA standards and then there is a Type B unit that meets all fair housing
170 requirements.

171
172 Mr. George Johnson, Senior Designer at BKV Group, addressed the Commission and
173 reviewed the different styles of units with the requirements.

174
175 Member McGehee wondered how long Dominion the manager for this building will
176 be.

177

178
179
180
181
182
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

Mr. Lunderby indicated there will be a thirty-year affordability requirement that comes along with the financing the City of Roseville is helping to issue on the project.

Member McGehee asked why there are not any solar panels or charging stations on this project.

Mr. Lunderby thought it was mostly due to the costs of the project. He indicated the revenue stream is capped by the income limits and rents that translate with those income limits set by HUD.

Mr. Lunderby reviewed the amenities on site for the residents.

Public Comment

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

Chair Gitzen closed the public hearing at 6:50 p.m.

MOTION

Member Kimble moved, seconded by Member Schaffhausen, to recommend to the City Council approval of the proposed 277 units of senior affordable apartment units as a Conditional Use at 2730 Herschel Street, with the condition noted in the staff report dated March 3, 2021 (PF21-002).

Member Kimble thought staff showed this project was consistent with all of the elements that are needed for the Commission to look at for Conditional Use. She thought this was a great project for the City.

Member Schaffhausen thought it was exciting to see this project continue to move forward and taking land that was sitting dormant and turning it into something functional and she thought it created a neat opportunity for the City.

Member McGehee explained the uniformity of the project bothers her from the standpoint of having no diversity of income in these buildings. She found that problematic across the board and when there are this many units all with the same general conditions in one area, she actually found that not a wonderful thing for the people living there or for the City. She wished the City could do better by people moving into Roseville. She was happy by the nearness to the parks and was excited about the pathways that the City is helping to development and that the developers have added in there. She would like to see more greenspace around the buildings, and she would like to see less density.

Member Kruzel thought the price point and affordability was refreshing to see.

Member Pribyl appreciated the efforts of connecting to trails. She shared to some extent about the density. On the one hand she thought density was important to the

225 City but on the other hand, she envisioned living in one of the buildings and thought
226 these were very large buildings. She did think overall this is a good addition to the
227 City and this area in particular.

228
229 Chair Gitzen thought this is a good development. He indicated this concerned him a
230 little bit with the amount of extra five hundred and some units. He liked the price
231 point as well.

232
233 **Ayes: 6**
234 **Nays: 0**
235 **Motion carried.**
236

237 **7. Other Business**

238
239 **a. Receive Information from HKGi Regarding Task 2 of the Zoning Code Update’s**
240 **Scope of Work and Provide Feedback**

241 Community Development Director Gundlach introduced Mr. Jeff Miller and Ms. Rita
242 Trapp, consultants at HKGi.

243
244 Mr. Miller and Ms. Trapp from HKGi made a presentation on the Zoning Code
245 update to the Commission. It was noted the intent was not to propose anything but
246 were identifying inconsistencies and also identifying things to be considered by the
247 Commission.

248
249 Member McGehee asked in regard to Scale & Intensity, was that something the City
250 decided to add or was that something the Met Council had in the requirements for the
251 plan.

252
253 Mr. Miller indicated that was not something he has seen in other plans, so he believed
254 that was not the Met Council.

255
256 Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd explained the reason for the Scale & Intensity that was in
257 the Zoning Code.

258
259 Mr. Miller continued with the presentation to the Commission.

260
261 Member Pribyl indicated when talking about housing types and density and some of
262 the issues like scale, it would be nice to have examples both in photographs as well as
263 three-dimensional massing ariel or site plans that the Commission could get a better
264 sense of what those look like.

265
266 Member Schaffhausen asked in order for this process to move forward did the
267 Commission need to figure out first where the gaps are and then figure out how to fill
268 the gaps and on top of that add in the other things from a zoning perspective to make
269 sure the City is checking all the boxes off.

270

271 Mr. Miller thought that was a good way to describe it. He continued presenting the
272 Mixed-Use Analysis with the Commission.

273
274 Member McGehee described past mixed use developments and the actions the City
275 had taken with approving them.

276
277 Mr. Lloyd reviewed the purpose for converting the business districts to mixed use
278 districts in the City.

279
280 Member McGehee thought the 10% minimum needed some attention to impervious
281 surface, pathways, and green space.

282
283 The Commission discussed mixed use developments with addressing the 10%
284 minimum residential requirement.

285
286 Ms. Trapp continued with the presentation on Racial Equity and Inclusion in the
287 Zoning Code update.

288
289 Member McGehee thought the City terminated the plan they had at one point to try to
290 get smaller houses and tear them down with having people come in and develop
291 something. She is a big supporter of affordable housing remaining affordable and as
292 a City there is a wonderful opportunity to buy properties that failed for some reason
293 and partner with other places where the City could develop its own land trust and
294 keep those houses permanently affordable. Allowing the residents to build equity.
295 She thought building rental was great but there is no equity there. She thought as the
296 City thinks about equity, they need to think about housing that is not always rental.

297
298 Mr. Miller noted in the work scope that the City put together, most of the potential
299 zoning strategies are not things that would be required to be consistent with the
300 Comp. Plan. Both of the lenses are part of the second part of the project, which are
301 considerations, not required changes.

302
303 Ms. Trapp continued with the presentation on Sustainability and Resilience with the
304 Commission.

305
306 Member McGehee appreciated this and thought the presentation was really useful.

307
308 Member Schaffhausen understood why this needed to be done in phases, but it
309 seemed like there are things that probably should be considered and implemented
310 from Phase Two as a part of the Phase One alignment. She asked how staff wanted
311 the Commission to start thinking about this.

312
313 Ms. Trapp explained this conversation was brought to the Commission with these
314 topics instead of working through the Zoning Code phase one changes and then
315 bringing it to the Commission because HKGi wants to learn as much as it can about
316 this topics, prioritize or strategize what changes are made as a part of phase one,
317 keeping in mind where they may be headed as part of phase two.

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

Chair Gitzen allowed public comment.

Ms. Christine Soma heard that public comments would be asked for at a different format and she would try to stay engaged and be able to provide those at that time. She did indicate on the slide about Inclusivity and Diversity, it showed the importance of providing pathways or sidewalks or other things, abilities for people to get to food and to get to retail and other items and when Roseville was developed, obviously it was at a time when the focus was on the vehicles versus on pedestrians, so that is working against them but she wondered if there was a way to either add something in these potential strategies that would address that or if there was a way in some of the community outreach to ask members of the community if this is something Roseville can take on.

Ms. Trapp explained when talking about zoning, the challenge with sidewalks and trails is it is kind of a messy thing to try to deal with. These are things that can be discussed with staff and also those conversations are probably broader than just a Zoning Code.

Mr. Miller and Ms. Trapp finished the presentation with the Commission by reviewing the next steps with virtual meetings at the end of March and in April, and interactive online engagement on focus areas and mapping.

Chair Gitzen thanked Mr. Miller and Ms. Trapp for the presentation.

8. Adjourn

MOTION
Member Gitzen, seconded by Member Schaffhausen, to adjourn the meeting at 9:04 p.m.

Ayes: 6
Nays: 0
Motion carried.