



**Special Planning Commission Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Draft Minutes – Thursday, May 13, 2021 – 7:00 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 Kimble called to order the regular meeting of the Planning Commission meeting at
3 approximately 7:00 p.m. and reviewed the role and purpose of the Planning Commission.
4
- 5 **2. Roll Call**
6 At the request of Chair Kimble, City Planner Thomas Paschke called the Roll.
7
- 8 **Members Present:** Chair Kimble; Vice Chair Michell Pribyl, and Commissioners
9 Michelle Kruzel, Tammy McGehee, Karen Schaffhausen, Erik
10 Bjorum and Emily Leutgeb.
11
- 12 **Members Absent:** None
13
- 14 **Staff Present:** City Planner Thomas Paschke, Community Development Director
15 Janice Gundlach, Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd, Community
16 Development Department Assistant Staci Johnson
17
- 18 **3. Approve Agenda**
19
- 20 **MOTION**
21 **Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Leutgeb, to approve the agenda as**
22 **presented.**
23
- 24 **Ayes: 7**
25 **Nays: 0**
26 **Motion carried.**
27
- 28 **4. Communications and Recognitions:**
29
- 30 **a. From the Public:** *Public comment pertaining to general land use issues not on this*
31 *agenda, including the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update.*
32
- 33 None.
34
- 35 **b. From the Commission or Staff:** *Information about assorted business not already on*
36 *this agenda, including a brief update on the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update*
37 *process.*
38

39 None.

40

41

42 **5. Other Business**

43

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

45 Community Development Director Janice Gundlach introduced Mr. Jeff Miller and
46 Ms. Rita Trapp from HKGi who made a presentation on the Zoning Code Update and
47 asked for feedback from the Commission.

48

49 Ms. Trapp started off the presentation with the update to density standards for mixed
50 use districts. She asked for Commission input or questions.

51

52 Member Pribyl wondered about the distinction between Mixed Use 2A and 2B. She
53 thought it looked like there was a little more density in 2B, but she noticed the
54 housing types allowed are the same and later on the building height allowances seem
55 to be reversed. 2B allows taller buildings than Mixed Use 3 does.

56

57 Ms. Trapp explained there are use differences between 2A and 2B once the
58 consolidation is done. There is a difference in height, 2A is only 35 feet so it is the
59 smaller height where 2B is being proposed to allow up to 55 feet or 65 feet with a
60 CUP. There is a difference between the two districts in terms of scale and intensity.
61 HKGi did recommend distinction between those two. 2A seems to be neighborhood
62 business in its character and scale whereas 2B is more similar to more of a
63 community business or where there is more intense use. That is why they did not
64 consolidate all the way down to have just one mixed use area.

65

66 Member Pribyl was not sure what distinctions there were between 2B and 3.

67

68 Mr. Miller currently thought the Districts MU-1, MU-3 and MU-4 really relate to
69 each other as far as neighborhood community and regional business and CMU is a
70 different animal as far as zoning districts. It is their understanding with the Comp.
71 Plan, with the intention of bringing those business districts clearly into play as mixed-
72 use districts means they are more aligned with the CMU. He noted they are using the
73 Comp. Plan as a guide. He indicated those can be looked at to see if there is any need
74 to distinguish between MU-2B and MU-3.

75

76 Chair Kimble asked if there will be more description in the Zoning Code or
77 introduction to these various zoning districts that differentiate or describe what was
78 said.

79

80 Ms. Trapp indicated once in the zoning districts; it will become a little more obvious
81 because there will be additional language. She noted this information will be used
82 and they will make strike changes in the Code as it is today.

83

84 Member McGehee agreed with Member Pribyl and thought originally there were the
85 four levels, as proposed by staff, to have those four levels within the SMU District

86 because that was their mixed-use district and there was a lot of discussion about
87 having the intensity based on positions along either Cleveland Avenue or along
88 County Road C and then moving back and then there was also the issue where these
89 regions bumped against residential housing along Caris Drive. If they are going to go
90 ahead and make a blanket, MU classification to allow housing and so on in all of
91 these districts than it does not seem to her that it makes any sense to try to maintain
92 this area and she agreed with Member Kimble that it is very confusing and it is not
93 clear that these various differences that have been spelled out for Twin Lakes, there is
94 only one parcel left to develop there so it seems it is just additionally confusing to try
95 to run this.

96
97 Member McGehee asked if MU-1 is neighborhood business, she is really not familiar
98 with all of the sizes of buildings in that are in the small neighborhood businesses but
99 if the idea is to have some limited housing among buildings in the neighborhood
100 business then she did not see any benefit in adding a minimum to that. If someone
101 has a small, private business that is run on the first floor and that person has the space
102 to put one or two apartments up above, she thought that should be an available option
103 and by adding these minimums they are not helping out small business. She also
104 indicated she did not see anywhere in these business districts where the City is going
105 to have cottage units or similar that are described there and how this is all going to fit
106 together. She thought all of those housing types are nice to have in the City's
107 toolbox, but she did not see in any of what is being discussed here, where it is
108 showing anywhere from ten to thirty-six units, that a lot of those housing types are
109 realistic in the City's business districts. She was not sure the minimums should be
110 there.

111
112 Ms. Trapp thanked Member McGehee for her comments. She noted she will have to
113 go back to do some calculations, but she thought the change or the insertion of the
114 community mixed uses/mixed use 2 is probably more confusing at this point because
115 of the way the Commission is used to thinking about it and seeing it. She noted she
116 was not so concerned about the confusion, necessarily for others because how the
117 City Code is currently set up, and they are not talking about changing it significantly,
118 each district, other than the use tables is handled kind of individually in how their
119 standards are set forth.

120
121 Ms. Trapp explained there were the four levels and staff did take a hard look at it and
122 felt like they were not ready because it was for Twin Lake specifically and it was not
123 really identified in the Comprehensive Plan. Again, they are trying to stay true to the
124 Comprehensive Plan. They wanted to do more combination or consolidation in this.
125 They did really feel like there was a distinction between 2A and 2B. She also noted
126 that there were two new areas that were identified for community mixed use, one
127 being HarMar and one being the shopping center on Hamline. Because of that there
128 are new areas that are being looked at to use the form base standard. Information will
129 be added about frontages to help guide that should redevelopment occur. That is one
130 of the reasons why staff is proposing it the way they are, but more discussion can
131 occur.

132

133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179

Ms. Trapp indicated regarding the cottage homes, the reason why they are thinking about providing all of these is just more flexibility. It is true that the City may or may not see all of these different housing types, but the more choices provided the more flexibility there is to make something that work on the site or for the market.

Chair Kimble asked since the housing types are being named, what if there is a new type or a type is missed, what are the implications then.

Ms. Trapp explained there are two ways of addressing that, if the Commission or staff identifies that there is a new type of housing then they could go through proactively and make an adjustment to the code. If not, an applicant can request a zoning text amendment to add something in. She hoped these are broad enough that they capture most of what is seen in the future. She noted this is accurate for what they have now and if there are changes then the City will either go through this process again or someone will ask for something to be added.

Member McGehee explained something that will be coming up late is the build forward that was laid out for Twin Lakes as opposed to the traditional setback. There has been a significant amount of pushback in the community, displeasure with that building type, that build forward that does not make it feel like a suburb. The City has gotten several complaints about building along Larpenteur that went with that model. She thought moving forward, that model might be fine by itself but is not one that seems to be appreciated or desired in other parts of the community.

Chair Kimble asked for confirmation that the minimums really are confirming what is in the Comp. Plan so that there is consistency between both.

Ms. Trapp indicated that was correct.

Mr. Miller explained the housing types are also reflected in the Comp. Plan, those districts include medium or high density residential and the description of them.

Ms. Trapp continued her presentation on Scale and Intensity and how it relates to the Comprehensive Plan.

Member Pribyl thought in MU-2B, with it being HarMar, potentially considering stepping it down as it approaches the single-family neighborhood. Fifty-five feet would be quite objectionable to the neighbors immediately to the east and south but if it is further away it might be less objectionable.

Ms. Trapp noted she would make sure that is still on their radar to discuss.

Member McGehee asked that be looked at across the board because she felt everywhere this would bump up to residential the City needed to be cognizant of that.

Chair Kimble thought it would be really helpful to understand the scale of these districts and then of course adjacency is so important. She understood the CUP and

180 that some conditions can be created to help control, but it felt to her often that CUPs
181 are almost in the reverse, almost a negative and almost a way to stop something so
182 when a developer comes in with a project it is almost like they are “guilty until
183 proven innocent”, kind of a reverse psychology and she was curious about that. She
184 understood that it gives some controls, but does it sometimes give controls for wrong
185 reasons.

186

187 Ms. Trapp explained the reason why a CUP is generally the choice to use over
188 rezoning in cities.

189

190 Ms. Gundlach thought Chair Kimble was correct that not many of the buildings in
191 Roseville are above 65 feet. Regarding the CUP, she thought the trick will be when
192 they actually get the text amendment language in front of the Commission and have
193 an opportunity to identify what are the conditions under which they would allow the
194 increased height. They also have to remember that there are some general health,
195 safety and welfare conditions that apply to all conditional uses. In addition to sort of
196 the very project specific type of conditions and the problem with that being open to a
197 lot of interpretation is a conditional use requires a public hearing with notification to
198 the neighborhood and a lot of time the testimony that comes forward during those
199 processes can impact the interpretation of those general health, safety, and welfare
200 standards. If the Commission is not comfortable with that, it just needs to be
201 recognized and discussed as a part of the text amendment language discussion.

202

203 Ms. Gundlach also wanted the Commission to be very cognizant of the scope and
204 timeline and the cost of this overall project. She indicated a few things have come up
205 in the last meeting, a couple of things have come up in this meeting where there is
206 interest in looking at certain things, but those things were not identified in the original
207 scope and go beyond the mandatory updates that the City is talking about doing in
208 order to comply with the City’s Comp. Plan and then they also were not noted as a
209 part of the section two, which is the option updates. She thought examining the
210 Conditional Use process was something that came up at the last meeting and then
211 there was discussion briefly about sort of the build to designs which was also not
212 identified in the scope and that is not to say those items cannot be looked at but it is
213 going outside of the scope of the work that HKGi was hired to do, it is going to
214 prevent them from meeting their timeline and it is going to prevent them from
215 meeting their budget so that may be something that is set aside momentarily while
216 staff seeks additional authorization to broaden the scope of the work. She did not
217 want HKGi to be caught up in additional work as this item proceeds forward.

218

219 Member McGehee explained she was cognizant of both issues but on the other hand
220 she thought the issue of the Conditional Use and the issue of the build to actually
221 came up as a part of this discussion because it would appear that they had different
222 things for different districts and it seemed to her that what was growing out of this
223 desire for consolidation was to actually pick one set of guidelines that would fit
224 everything and she did not think that was anything that the Commission brought up.
225 But if this is going to be a meaningful process to actually work a little bit on the City
226 Code and Comprehensive Plan and planning this community going forward she

227 thought both the build forward and the Conditional Use Permit are important issues to
228 discuss, and she hoped that HKGi can set those things aside and staff can bring it to
229 the Council and see that the Commission is actually authorized to do this kind of
230 work because she thought it was important. As far as the Conditional Use she saw it
231 as a valuable way for example, in the case of HarMar or the case of any of these
232 things that abut residential areas, the Conditional Use Permit would allow on a certain
233 size parcel to get the build back and to get things pulled away or made somehow
234 compatible with neighboring communities or neighboring business. She thought it
235 provides flexibility for staff and for the Council and to some extent, for the developer
236 to come up with things that work well all around.

237
238 Member Schaffhausen in regard to scope, she explained one of the reasons why she is
239 not asking a lot of questions is that not only is this the first time of her running
240 through something like this but in addition to that, it seems like the main focus of this
241 project is to align the Zoning with the Comp. Plan and she would look to staff in their
242 help and guidance on what fits and what does not. It is not that she is not up for
243 discussion, but it is just one of those where as far as the point and focus of this
244 meeting is how do they want to proceed with this. She is equally cognizant of what
245 staff is saying and respect that and appreciate the opportunity to have this discussion
246 and personally she is in need of guidance on what is in scope and what is out of scope
247 so that they can figure out what is relevant so that the Commission does not end up in
248 a four-hour meeting but rather a two-hour meeting. Otherwise, they can go down a
249 rabbit hole on all of this to a detail.

250
251 Ms. Gundlach explained HKGi has tried really hard to put the language in red in both
252 the print materials and presentation to highlight the high-level summary changes that
253 staff thinks needs to occur to align with the Comprehensive Plan. She noted she did
254 not want the Commissioners to feel that the other concerns are not important because
255 she did agree that they are meaningful if they are going to do this discussion. That is
256 why staff has asked the consultants to take notes on this and have this document for
257 staff to go back to the Council with later on to show them the things that came out of
258 this process that they were not able to address with the timeline, scope and budget and
259 they can start thinking about the timeline, scope, and budget for those other items.

260
261 Mr. Paschke explained the discussion about building forward and any of those design
262 standards is definitely something that would be separate and take a lot of time and it
263 would be helpful for staff to know if there are other Commissioners that share the
264 same thoughts and opinions that Commission McGehee has on building forward
265 design and/or any of the other design standards that the City has currently in Code.

266
267 Ms. Trapp continued with the presentation regarding intensity standards in the Zoning
268 Code.

269
270 Mr. Miller reviewed the intent of the required updates of the Zoning Map and the next
271 steps to take.

272

273 Chair Kimble explained regarding the next two meeting and the draft text
274 amendments, trying to understand how extensive those are, and she wondered if there
275 was any ability if these were going to be extensive to get them a little sooner than the
276 Friday before the meeting.

277
278 Mr. Miller indicated that could be discussed.

279
280 Ms. Gundlach explained staff will try their best to get the changes out as soon as
281 possible but it is really hard to try to turn this stuff around in less than a month.

282
283 Member Leutgeb asked regarding community outreach, as a renter in Roseville, she
284 wanted to make sure that the community outreach is not only including property
285 owners but also tenants, both residential and business tenants because she thought
286 these zoning changes regardless of whether they are required to align with the Comp.
287 Plan or optional updates, may affect somebodies desire to continue leasing properties
288 in the City.

289
290 Ms. Gundlach indicated staff definitely notified property owners and renters of all
291 residential property and one the business property, the property owner was notified.

292
293 Mr. Lloyd did not think staff notified commercial tenants for this item.

294
295 Ms. Gundlach indicated staff can look at including those people in the next
296 notification.

297
298 The Commission and staff discussed notification areas.

299
300 **6. Adjourn**

301
302 **MOTION**
303 **Member Pribyl, seconded by Member Kruzel, to adjourn the meeting at 8:33**
304 **p.m.**

305
306 **Ayes: 7**
307 **Nays: 0**
308 **Motion carried.**

309