

ROSEVILLE
REQUEST FOR COUNCIL ACTION

Date: June 21, 2021
Item No.: 7.g

Department Approval



City Manager Approval



Item Description: Consider Amending the Park Dedication Ordinance – City Code Chapter 1103.06

BACKGROUND

State law allows cities to have a park dedication ordinance in their subdivision code whereby land, cash or a combination of such can be required to help to satisfy plans for recreational facilities, open space and address the new needs that the development creates. To have a park dedication ordinance, cities must have a Parks and Recreation System Master Plan, a parks and recreation section in the City Comprehensive Plan and a Capital Improvement Plan.

At the January joint meeting with the Parks and Recreation Commission, the City Council requested that the Commission review the park dedication ordinances of neighboring communities to see what is being done, or can be done differently in Roseville, in order to be able to capture park dedication on developments that significantly impact the city’s Parks and Recreation system. This request was made because there have been several recent high-density residential developments that have occurred that did not contribute park dedication under the current ordinance.

At your May 10, 2021 work session, staff shared the result of this research and discussed some possible adjustments to the park dedication ordinance to ensure that the city is capturing park dedication on impactful development whenever possible. Staff shared four possible changes, which are now included in the proposed ordinance amendment.

In addition to the proposed language, the City Council wondered about the possibility of capturing park dedication on all developments with increased density, including one that does not involve a plat, replat or lot split. While it appears at least one community may do this, at this time, it is not recommended to add language beyond the discussed triggers within the subdivision code (plat, replat or lot split) as state statute authorizes park dedication specifically as part of a city’s subdivision code. To be clear, with the proposed amended language, a scenario could exist where a developer buys an existing parcel, does not change the platting in any way, and builds many units, and the city would not be able to capture park dedication. However, this scenario is rare and utilizing triggers within our current subdivision code, as recommended, seems to be the most reasonable course of action and the most consistent with most of the communities that we examined.

Another question that was raised at the May 10 meeting was the purpose for the one acre minimum to assess park dedication. It was mentioned that this “floor” on developments where park dedication can be assessed was intentional to try to ensure that small developments, or lot splits, were not onerously impacted by a park dedication assessment. Although this is a fair observation, it is worth noting that the park dedication ordinance has a built in nexus to ensure that the park dedication assessment is proportional to the impact on the park system. For example, a resident who has an existing home on a large lot and splits the lot into two in order to create a second single family home on the new lot, would be assessed only one unit (currently \$4,250) or 10% of the land. Either

39 dedication assessment method would be proportional to the new home’s (and presumably new
40 residents’) impact on the system. It is also important to note that many small impacts will eventually
41 combine over time to create large impact on the Parks and Recreation system, particularly as the
42 number of large parcels remaining in Roseville are relatively few.

43
44 Based on the conversation at the May 10 work session, a proposed ordinance with adjustments
45 (Attachment A) and an Ordinance Summary (Attachment B) is included in your packet. As this
46 would be a part of the subdivision code, this proposal has been reviewed by Community
47 Development staff and they are supportive of the proposed changes.

48
49 As a review, the following changes are proposed:

50
51 1. Remove “Net Increase in Development Sites” Requirement

52 The current language requires a “net increase of development sites.” This language appears
53 to have excluded at least one recent significant development from the park dedication
54 contribution even though it will have a significant impact on the Parks and Recreation
55 system. Staff spoke with seven other metropolitan cities who confirmed that they would
56 assess park dedication in incidences where a development increases the number of users on
57 the Parks and Recreation system but does not yield an increase in lots.

58
59 2. Remove “Land involving one acre or more”

60 This language limits the city’s ability to assess park dedication on small developments and
61 does not appear to be present in other cities’ ordinances that were reviewed.

62
63 3. Non-Residential Land vs. Cash Amount

64 The cash amount for a non-residential parcel is currently 10% of the Fair Market Value of
65 the total land value. The land amount has lagged behind and is currently at 5% of the total
66 land. At this point, they are inconsistent and the land amount should be considered for
67 reconciliation to 10%, which is equal to the cash.

68
69 4. Utility Dedications Not Qualified

70 The suggested language is a clarification of the existing practice that “required” pathways
71 should not be considered to satisfy the park dedication requirement. If they are not required
72 and they make sense for a park and recreational amenity and/or special connection, then the
73 city can consider those as separate cases.

74
75
76 **POLICY OBJECTIVE**

77 To ensure that adequate resources are captured to accommodate the impact that new development
78 has on the Parks and Recreation system.

79
80 **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

81 Park dedication plays an important role in ensuring that the Parks and Recreation system can
82 accommodate the increase in usage that development brings. When these funds are not captured,
83 improvements that are necessary to accommodate increased use must be funded in other ways.
84 Although park dedication does not cover ongoing operation and maintenance costs, the land or cash
85 received from park dedication can ensure that the infrastructure is in place to accommodate demand.
86

87 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**
88 Consider a motion to amend the Park Dedication Ordinance - City Code Chapter 1103.06 as
89 outlined.

90
91 **REQUESTED COUNCIL ACTION**
92 Consider a motion to amend city code amending the Park Dedication Ordinance – City Code
93 Chapter 1103.06 as outlined.

94
95 -and-

96
97 Consider a motion to approve the Ordinance Summary (Attachment C).

Prepared by: Matthew Johnson, Assistant Parks and Recreation Director

Attachments: A: Proposed Ordinance Change, Park Dedication (#1103.06)
B: Ordinance Summary
C: DRAFT Minutes of May 10, 2021 City Council Meeting
D: Minutes of the April 6, 2021 Parks and Recreation Commission Meeting
E: Summary of Dedication Triggers from Neighboring Communities
F: Slides

City of Roseville
ORDINANCE NO. ____

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SUBDIVISION CODE 1103.06: PARK
DEDICATION

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1: Title 1103, Section 06 of the Roseville City Code is amended to read
as follows:

1103.06: PARK DEDICATION

- A. Authority: Minnesota Statutes 462.358, subdivisions 2b and 2c permits the City to require dedication of park land, or cash in lieu of land, as part of the subdivision process in order to fulfill its plans for recreational facilities and openspaces. The City Council, at its discretion, will determine whether park dedication is required in the form of land, cash contribution, or a combination of cash and land. To properly use this authority, the City will base its determination on existing development, the need created by the proposed development, and the plans and policies of the City embodied by the Parks and Recreation System Master Plan, Pathways Master Plan, and Comprehensive Plan.
- B. Condition to Approval: Park dedication will be required as a condition to the approval of any subdivision, ~~plat, replat or lot split of land involving one acre or more and resulting in a net increase of development sites~~. The Parks and Recreation Commission shall recommend, in accordance with Statute and after consulting the approved plans and policies noted herein, either a portion of land to be dedicated to the public, or in lieu thereof, a cash deposit given to the City to be used for park purposes, or a combination of land and cash deposit.
- C. Park Dedication Amount: The portion of land to be dedicated in all ~~residentially zoned~~ areas shall be 10% ~~and 5% in all other areas~~. Park dedication fees shall be reviewed and determined annually by City Council resolution and established in the fee schedule in Chapter 314 of this Code, and the fee shall be paid as part of the Development Agreement required in Section 1102.05 of this Title.
- D. Utility Dedications Not Qualified: Land dedicated for required for pathways, street right-of-way or utilities, including drainage, does not qualify as park dedication.(Ord. 1530, 7/10/2017)

SECTION 2: Effective date. This ordinance shall take effect upon its passage and publication.

Passed by the City Council of the City of Roseville this ___ day of _____ 20XX.

50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71

Signatures as follows on separate page:

Ordinance – 1103.06: Park Dedication

(SEAL)

CITY OF ROSEVILLE

BY: _____
Daniel J. Roe, Mayor

ATTEST:

Patrick Trudgeon, City Manager

City of Roseville

ORDINANCE SUMMARY NO. _____

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SELECTED TEXT OF THE ROSEVILLE CITY CODE,
TITLE 11, CHAPTER 1103.06, PARK DEDICATION**

The following is the official summary of Ordinance No. ____ approved by the City Council of Roseville on June 21, 2021:

The Roseville City Code is hereby amended to modify/clarify specific requirements within Roseville City Code, Title 11, Chapter 1103.06 Park Dedication, more specifically amending Chapter 1103.06 to update the conditions for which park dedication is required, update the non-residential land dedication amount and clarify the non-qualified dedications.

A printed copy of the ordinance is available for inspection by any person during regular office hours in the office of the City Manager at the Roseville City Hall, 2660 Civic Center Drive, Roseville, Minnesota 55113. A copy of the ordinance and summary shall also be posted at the Reference Desk of the Roseville Branch of the Ramsey County Library, 2180 Hamline Avenue North, and on the Internet web page of the City of Roseville (www.ci.roseville.mn.us).

BY:

Daniel J. Roe, Mayor

ATTEST:

Patrick Trudgeon, City Manager



**Regular City Council Meeting Minutes
City Hall Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Monday, May 10, 2021**

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

1. Roll Call

Mayor Roe called the meeting to order at approximately 7:18 p.m. Voting and Seating Order: Willmus, Strahan, Etten, Groff, and Roe. City Manager Patrick Trudgeon and City Attorney Mark Gaughan were also present.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Approve Agenda

Willmus moved, Strahan seconded, approval of the agenda as presented

Roll Call

Ayes: Willmus, Strahan, Etten, Groff, and Roe.

Nays: None.

4. Public Comment

Mayor Roe called for public comment by members of the audience on any non-agenda items. No one indicated a desire to speak.

5. Recognitions, Donations, and Communications

a. 2021 National Police Officer's Memorial Day and National Police Week Proclamation

Mayor Roe read the 2021 National Police Officer's Memorial Day and National Police Week Proclamation.

Etten moved, Willmus seconded, proclaiming May 9-15, 2021 as National Police Week.

Roll Call

Ayes: Willmus, Strahan, Etten, Groff, and Roe.

Nays: None.

b. Recognition of Fire Chief Tim O'Neill

Mayor Roe indicated this item is regarding the retirement of Fire Chief O'Neill.

Regular City Council Meeting

Monday, May 10, 2021

Page 2

City Manager Trudgeon thanked Chief O'Neill for his 32 years of service to the City of Roseville. He reviewed Chief O'Neill's history with the Roseville Fire Department. He indicated he has worked with Chief O'Neill for 14 years and have always been impressed with his work ethic, professionalism, and his terrific sense of civic pride for Roseville. He thanked Chief O'Neill for his years of service in Roseville and indicated he will be missed.

Mayor Roe read the Resolution.

Groff moved, Etten seconded, approving Resolution No. 11807, commending Chief O'Neill for his dedicated service to the community for the past 32 years.

Council Discussion

Councilmember Groff thanked Chief O'Neill for his service and all the things he has done in the community.

Councilmember Etten thanked Chief O'Neill and stated he appreciated the community focus of the Fire Department. He indicated Chief O'Neill was a huge asset to the community. He noted the Fire Station is a tremendous nod to Chief O'Neill's leadership and future Chief Brosnahan will be charged with carrying on that legacy.

Councilmember Strahan thanked Chief O'Neill for his years of service, and she was sad she did not really get to know him but was sure future Chief Brosnahan will be glad that all the fires have been put out already.

Councilmember Willmus echoed the comments of staff and the Council. He indicated when looking back at Chief O'Neill's accomplishments; they have been a tremendous benefit to the City of Roseville and helped guide the Council and community through some very difficult conversations. He noted Chief O'Neill's leadership was vital in seeing the Fire Station built and the transition of the fire staffing model. He commended Chief O'Neill and his family for those efforts and thanked the Chief for his service.

Mayor Roe echoed the comments made by the entire Council in various areas of work of the Chief, but he wanted to focus in on the connection that the Chief has to the firefighters. It was certainly evidenced in the concern for making sure that the City acknowledge the paid-on call firefighters in the transition to the full-time staffing model. He noted that not a decision made without due regard and good regard for all involved. He knows that the Chief's focus has always been on his firefighters, what is best for them, and he deserves a great deal of credit for that.

Roll Call

Ayes: Willmus, Strahan, Etten, Groff, and Roe.

Nays: None.

Assistant Chief Brosnahan explained Chief O'Neill has been a terrific mentor to him and all of the firefighters. Chief O'Neill has put in so much effort and dedication to make the Fire Department what it is today. He reviewed his history with Chief O'Neill over the years at the Fire Department and has felt Chief O'Neill has prepared him to take on the role of Chief and the mentorship has been amazing, and he will be forever indebted to him and his help over the years.

Chief O'Neill thanked everyone for the comments, noting thirty-two years is a long time to try to summarize the accomplishments and the thousands of fire calls and medical calls he has been on as well as the interaction with the community. He stated it has been a pleasure to serve this community and some of the most fun he has had was at the events on Fridays the Fire Department has had. He explained firefighters work everyday of the year and miss a lot of holidays and his family has been fantastic working through that. His family has had to do without him for quite awhile and he indicated he was kind of looking forward to bringing that to a close and spending some time lowering his golf score. All of the accomplishments listed is because he has been lucky enough to have a great team and a great group of firefighters and without them the Fire Department could not have done half the things they did. He explained Mr. Trudgeon has been fantastic to work with and for and has listened to some of the ideas he has had and were able to work through ideas he has brought forth over time. The support of the City Council has been great. He appreciated everybody's thoughts.

Mayor Roe thanked Chief O'Neill again and explained the City congratulated him on his tremendous service to the community and wished him well.

6. Items Removed from Consent Agenda

7. Business Items

- a. Receive Annual Comprehensive Financial Report, Auditor Communication Letter, and Reports on Compliance for Fiscal Year Ending December 31, 2020.** Assistant Finance Director Jason Schirmacher briefly highlighted this item as detailed in the Request for Council Action and related attachments dated May 10, 2021.

Ms. Rebecca Peterson, Redpath and Company presented the 2020 audit report to the City Council.

Mayor Roe asked in the timeliness of transactions with Ramsey County, is the City put in jeopardy of some of the requirements for timeliness of payment to the City when there are obligations that are owed to the City or the other way as well.

Mr. Schirmacher explained what that is alluding to is the City had three different joint projects with Ramsey County where the City was the lead on the projects and

money owed from Ramsey County was being delayed because there was some disagreement on the cost of the projects, which caused money from Ramsey County to be delayed by a couple of years. As of March 2021, all of it has been resolved and the City did receive the money from Ramsey County that the City was owed.

Groff moved, Willmus seconded, accepting the 2020 Annual Financial Reports

Council Discussion

Councilmember Groff thanked Ms. Pietrick for explaining some things to him and noted the report was thorough.

Roll Call

Ayes: Willmus, Strahan, Etten, Groff, and Roe.

Nays: None.

b. Park Dedication Ordinance Discussion

Parks and Recreation Director Lonnie Brokke briefly highlighted this item as detailed in the Request for Council Action and related attachments dated May 10, 2021.

Assistant Director Matt Johnson presented the Park Dedication Ordinance.

Councilmember Etten thanked Mr. Johnson for all of the research. Regarding the proposed language in a draft change to the park dedication, under B, "Condition of approval: Park Dedication will be required as a condition to the approval of any subdivision, plat, replat or lot split." He asked if something in that language has to say anything about adding units.

Mr. Johnson explained there is more depth to that. There is one community he examined that potentially proposes park dedication if there is any addition of density, but that seems to be the most aggressive. More commonly, what staff is seeing is that those are the triggers.

Councilmember Etten indicated he was making sure that it would tie into the fee schedule.

Councilmember Willmus thanked Mr. Johnson and the Parks Commission for their effort on this. He explained he was in general agreement with the direction the City is headed, including looking at the triggers and balancing with the fees and looking at incorporating pathways and sidewalks. He thought it would be an important component to look at when they look at any type of change that will result in any increase of density or higher use. He indicated a lot of recombination could be a replat that does not necessarily result in an increase in density. He wondered if he were to buy his neighbor's property and replat it into one lot instead of two, would

that be a trigger for park dedication. He did not know if it should be and that aspect should probably be looked at.

Mr. Johnson explained what many cities appear to do is rather than defining new lots, it defines new units. If the lots were be replated with adding a couple of units, it would be assessed park dedication versus potentially not. He thought that is a way to try to sort that out.

Councilmember Groff thought this is headed in the right direction. He concurred with the other Councilmembers on the wording because they want to make sure it is clear. He would want the intent to be that if the person is increasing the population, then there needs to be an increase in park dedication fees so that it covers the cost of maintenance and all the things that come with larger populations. He thought this is all good work. He is hearing from residents that they would like the City to do more with setting land aside rather than using the cash in lieu of land. He noted this is something he would like to look at in the future.

Mayor Roe thought that was a good policy discussion in terms of the benefits of small parcels of undeveloped property as open space and benefited the community because he did not think those were currently reflected in the Park Master Plan. He noted they should have the trigger by a net increase in either the number of residential units and/or commercial square footage on the property under consideration because then it is talking about the non-residential and residential impact. He noted one thing the Council could talk about is if there should be some sort of minimum threshold for park dedication.

Councilmember Strahan echoed Councilmember Groff's interest. There is a lot of concern by residents about development of undeveloped spaces in the City. She understood the one acre but as they are looking at infill and fewer one-acre plots available, she appreciated Mr. Johnson's work and the rest of the park staff in creating this and looking at best practices across other municipalities. She would be open to leaving that out.

Mayor Roe stated the general gist is that the Council is supportive of continuing to look at the changes. He thought there was strong support for resolving the discrepancy between the fee versus the land on non-residential. He also thought the codification of the sidewalk pathway disqualification was something that has general support as well as looking at the language about some sort of net increase in residential units on the commercial side.

Park and Recreation Commissioner Chair Greg Hoag stated the only thing he would add are comments that the Council made. He noted the Commission reviews each one very seriously with the land or the cash, completely understanding the land but he deferred to what the Commission gives the Council is a recommendation, noting that at any time the Council has the opportunity to change what the Commission

recommendation is. He noted the Commission looks at every parcel with the land more so first than the cash but some have been a real struggle when the land equates to the equivalent of a park bench. He stated it is tough in itself to swallow the land, unless it fits into a larger scheme nearby.

Mayor Roe stated that is what he was getting at in reference to what both Councilmembers Groff and Strahan brought up in terms of feedback received from residents. He agreed this was something worth having more conversation on.

Councilmember Willmus thought Councilmembers Groff and Strahan recognize the feedback that the Council has seen over the course of the last couple of years on various projects that have come along. He stated one of the things that the Commission has recommended and staff has pointed out, is that imbalance with the commercial being at five percent of land. What this would do, in essence, is move them a little closer to that equalizing and instead of five percent, making it ten percent across the board.

Chair Hoag indicated he will bring this information back to the Commission for further discussion.

Mr. Brokke indicated the Master Plan does have some guidance, especially in specific areas in the community. He noted this can be resurrected for Commission discussion in an upcoming meeting.

c. Consider Approval of Youth Commission Application Changes

Assistant City Manager Rebecca Olson briefly highlighted this item as detailed in the Request for Council Action and related attachments dated May 10, 2021.

Mayor Roe noted the one signature by the applicant on the last page is probably adequate and the applicant can just check the box on the first page about whether they want to be a voting member and not have to sign it twice. He also noted that under the voting member being subject to the complaint process of the City's Ethics Code, makes it sound like as soon as the individual starts on the Commission, there is going to be complaints coming in. He wondered if staff wanted to add something to that stating something like "...and the individual is expected to serve in accordance with the Ethic's Code," just to make it a clearer that it is not about getting complaints but rather the City would want the individual to serve in an ethical manner and make them subject to the complaint process, or something like that. He referenced the last page, release of information, item four "I understand that certain data on the youth as an applicant and as a member of a City of Roseville commission is public under Minnesota Law," and suggested explaining what that means to help people better understand what it means.

Councilmember Strahan wondered on page three, above the release of information, if there should be a notification of "initial each," like on the other page.

**ROSEVILLE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES FOR
APRIL 6, 2021 6:30 p.m.**

PRESENT: Arneson, Baggenstoss, Boulton, Brown, Dahlstrom, Heikkila, Hoag,
Lenhart, Ybarra

ABSENT: Carlson, Kim

STAFF: Brokke, Christensen, Johnson

1) INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Hoag introduced the virtual Zoom format for the meeting due to the COVID-19 pandemic. State Law allows for an exception to in-person public meetings during pandemics to ensure the safety of commissioners, staff and the public. The public was still encouraged to participate in the meeting using the Zoom platform.

2) ROLL CALL/PUBLIC COMMENT

Roll Call Commissioners: Arneson, Baggenstoss, Boulton, Brown, Dahlstrom, Heikkila, Lenhart, Ybarra, Hoag.

Chair Hoag called for public comment by members of the audience.

H. Weber, joined the meeting to thank the Commission for their service and to comment on the height of the basketball hoops at Autumn Grove Park. Mr. Weber estimates that the hoops are set at 10ft and 8ft. As a resident of the Autumn Grove Park neighborhood, Mr. Weber frequents the basketball hoops often. Overwhelmingly, on the occasions that he has visited only the 10ft hoop is being utilized. As a result of COVID he is hesitant to use the 10ft hoop with other groups of people. Mr. Weber has observed groups of children using the lower hoop. However, they have been Middle or High School aged children and anecdotally they could use the higher hoop but appeared to be utilizing the smaller hoop to dunk. He asked that the heights of the basketball hoops be looked into and that the lower hoop potentially be raised or have an adjustable height mechanism added.

Staff responded that typically hoops in the parks are set at 7ft and 10ft to allow all ages and abilities to use at least one hoop. In addition, if both hoops are at 10ft older players tend to use them for full court games which could potentially deter younger users.

Staff added that Maintenance staff were out today to check the hoop heights at Autumn Grove as a result of another resident who called requesting that the 7ft hoop be increased. Maintenance staff was planning to raise both hoops to 10ft at Autumn Grove as a result of the resident feedback. However, staff did ask that people keep an eye on if the higher hoops leave out younger users.

41 Mr. Weber thanked staff for listening to resident feedback and added that as a former basketball
42 coach he would never want to do anything to discourage younger participants of the sport.

43
44 Future Commissioner Ybarra asked staff if the basketball hoop that was in the parking lot at Autumn
45 Grove would be replaced. Staff responded that typically the department policy has been to not
46 replace basketball hoops that are in parking lots due to safety concerns.

47
48 **3) APPROVAL OF MINUTES – FEBRUARY 2, 2021 MEETING**

49 Commissioner Baggenstoss moved to approve the minutes. Vice-Chair Dahlstrom seconds.

50
51
52 **Roll Call**

53 **Ayes:** Arneson, Baggenstoss, Brown, Dahlstrom, Heikkila, Hoag, Lenhart.

54 **Nays:** None.

55 **Abstain:** None.

56
57 **4) INTRODUCTION AND OATH OF OFFICE FOR NEW COMMISSION MEMBERS**

58 The Oath of Office was completed by Commission Chair Hoag for new Commission members Leah
59 Ybarra and Nick Boulton. The new Commissioners introduced themselves to the group and provided
60 a brief overview of why they chose to join the Roseville Parks and Recreation Commission.

61
62 **5) PARK DEDICATION ORDINANCE ANALYSIS DISCUSSION**

63 Background Information

- 64 • January 25, 2021 – Joint Meeting with the City Council
 - 65 ○ City Council expressed interest in Park Dedication
 - 66 ▪ What others are doing, what can be done differently to maximize Park
67 Dedication
 - 68 ▪ Mentioned recent examples
 - 69 • New development by Sandcastle Park
 - 70 • Former Boaters Outlet located at Co. Rd. C
 - 71 ○ Both of these examples brought in a significant amount of new
72 residents which directly impacts park usage. However, they did
73 not qualify for Park Dedication under the current language in
74 Roseville’s ordinance as the new developments did not replat
75 or subdivide
 - 76 ▪ Review of neighboring communities and ordinances
 - 77 • Consideration of two other areas in the ordinance
 - 78 ○ Park Dedication amount
 - 79 ○ Utility Dedications not being qualified

- 81 • Staff research – legal aspects are yet to be sorted out
- 82 ○ Staff has connected with surrounding communities to understand how their
- 83 ordinances are written and in what scenarios they collect Park Dedication
- 84

85 Staff provided a brief overview of the history, purpose and land or cash options for Park Dedication.
86 Roseville’s Park Dedication Ordinance (1103.07) was reviewed with the Commission. Staff noted
87 that if pathways or right of ways are required as part of the development they would not qualify as
88 Park Dedication.

- 89
- 90 • Key Factors in Roseville that Activates “Triggers” Park Dedication:
- 91 ○ A “net increase” in development sites
- 92 ○ Can only capture for new lots being created
- 93 ○ Involves 1 acre or more
- 94

95 Outreach was completed by staff to 9 communities (Andover, Arden Hills, Burnsville, Champlin,
96 Cottage Grove, Mounds View, New Brighton, Shoreview and St. Louis Park) to understand their
97 Park Dedication requirements and triggers. Some of the key language differences appear to be:

- 98 • Do not require a “net increase” in sites but rather focus on increased density
- 99 • Some do capture Park Dedication on all units as long as they have not contributed Park
- 100 Dedication in the past
- 101 • Do not have a minimum acreage
- 102

103 Commissioner Baggenstoss relayed that he was happy to see this research on the agenda tonight as
104 population density is going to continue in Roseville and Park Dedication needs to address the
105 increases in order to offset the additional park usage.

106

107 Commissioner Dahlstrom questioned if there may be any unforeseen consequences to changing the
108 ordinance. Staff responded that they did not anticipate any consequences as Roseville is fortunate to
109 have a great location and people come to Roseville for the park system. In addition, staff noted that
110 the surrounding communities are currently utilizing similar ordinances.

111

112 The Commission discussed how Park Dedication funds are used to acquire new park properties and
113 how changing the ordinance language could have helped address the population density impacts to
114 the parks for development projects that did not qualify for Park Dedication.

115

116 Commissioner Arneson asked at what point the city would be willing to pay greater than the
117 assessed Fair Market Value (FMV) for parkland in southwest Roseville. Staff responded that the city
118 would be willing to pay a higher price. However, the exact amount over would be based on
119 reasonableness.

120

121 Chair Hoag suggested to consider stronger language around “useable parkland”.

122
123 The Commission reviewed the cash Park Dedication amount. Including, the most recent Park
124 Dedication comparison of surrounding communities.

- 125
- 126 • Park Dedication – cash amount
 - 127 ○ Reviewed annually
 - 128 ○ Part of the city fee schedule
 - 129 ○ Residential is \$4,250
 - 130 ○ Non-residential is *10% FMV*
- 131
- 132 • Park Dedication – land amount
 - 133 ○ Residential – land amount is currently at 10% of the land
 - 134 ○ Non-residential – land amount is currently at *5% of the land*
 - 135 ■ Non-residential has lagged behind and is not consistent with the cash amount of
 - 136 10%. Staff provided a suggestion that this discrepancy potentially be reconciled
 - 137 with the updated ordinance language
- 138
- 139 • Utility Dedications Not Qualified
 - 140 ○ Set periodically in ordinance
 - 141 ○ Utility Dedications Not Qualified
 - 142 ■ Land dedication for required street right-of-way or utilities; including drainage,
 - 143 does not qualify as Park Dedication (Ord. 1530, 7/10/2017)
 - 144 ■ This issue has come up recently with some Park Dedication proposals from the
 - 145 developer
 - 146 ■ Pathways and sidewalks are typically required as a part of a Public Improvement
 - 147 Contract
 - 148 ■ Staff is suggesting language to including “required pathways or sidewalks” in the
 - 149 proposed ordinance update
 - 150 ■ Currently in practice
- 151

152 The Commission had a clarification discussion on when pathways or sidewalks would be included in
153 a Park Dedication recommendation and how/who determines if a pathway or sidewalk is required.

154
155 Staff provided the draft potential Park Dedication Ordinance. The updated language has relatively
156 simple language adjustments that would allow the city to capture additional Park Dedication
157 contributions. Staff noted that Roseville invests heavily in the parks and Park Dedication is one way
158 to help offset additional usage that comes from new developments. Staff reiterated that the legal
159 aspects are yet to be sorted out. However, the redline changes are based on information gathering as
160 suggested by the City Council.

161 The Commission reviewed the draft potential Park Dedication Ordinance language.

162

163 Chair Hoag suggested adding the word “sidewalks” to Part D and possibly “useable parkland” to
164 Part B of the draft ordinance.

165

166 Next steps in the process for the Park Dedication Ordinance language review would be to:

167

- Consider a recommendation
- Sort out legal aspects and approach
- Schedule a meeting with the City Council to report back

168

169

170

171 Commissioner Arneson added that a definition of “useable land” may be helpful.

172

173 Commissioner Heikkila noted that residents and businesses are willing to pay a premium to live in
174 Roseville due to the location. He believes that developers would be willing to pay additional Park
175 Dedication in order to develop parcels that offer a convenient location and great park opportunities.

176

177 Staff and the Commission discussed next steps in the process to move the draft language forward to
178 the City Council.

179

180 Chair Hoag moved to recommend that the Parks and Recreation Commission, upon
181 recommendation from the City Council, has reviewed the suggested updates in the draft Park
182 Dedication Ordinance. The Commission agrees with the suggested ordinance updates that staff
183 has provided and along with the Commissions additional suggestions, recommends moving the
184 draft Park Dedication Ordinance forward for a legal review and then to the City Council.

185

Commissioner Baggenstoss seconds.

186

187 **Roll Call**

188 **Ayes:** Arneson, Baggenstoss, Boulton, Brown, Dahlstrom, Heikkila, Hoag, Lenhart, Ybarra.

189

Nays: None.

190

Abstain: None.

191

192 **6) POCAHONTAS PARK NAME CONVERSATION**

193 Staff provided an update on where the Commission left off last meeting with the Pocahontas Park
194 name conversation and outlined potential discussion objectives for the group, including:

195

- Briefly summarize resources and information received thus far
- Recommend possible next steps
- Hear feedback from the Commission

196

197

198

199

- Introductory information
 - Who Pocahontas the person was

200

- 201 ○ GARE process overview
- 202 ○ HRIEC and Parks and Recreation engagement overview
- 203 ○ Community Aspirations and Racial Equity Narrative
- 204 • Guidance from Groups/Experts/Community Leaders
- 205 ○ Feedback received to date
 - 206 ▪ Shannon Geshick of the Minnesota Indian Affairs Council
 - 207 ▪ Wayne Ducheneaux of the Native Governance Center
 - 208 ▪ John Bobolink of St. Paul Public Schools
 - 209 ▪ The Metropolitan Urban Indians Directors Group
 - 210 ▪ Numerous individuals in various capacities
- 211 ○ Additional proposed contacts
 - 212 ▪ Roseville Area Schools American Indian Parent Advisory Group
 - 213 ▪ Dakota representatives
- 214 ○ Individual study
 - 215 ▪ Reclaiming Native Truth documents
 - 216 ▪ Why Treaties Matter Webinar
 - 217 ▪ Reclaiming Bde Maka Ska Webinar
- 218
- 219 • Inform and engage the Community
 - 220 ○ Informal Engagement
 - 221 ▪ Individual conversations
 - 222 ▪ General Awareness
 - 223 ▪ News Media
 - 224 ▪ Community Events
 - 225 • Natural Resources events
 - 226 • Discover Your Parks (DYP) events
 - 227 ○ Formal Engagement
 - 228 ▪ Website (live)
 - 229 ▪ Newsletter (May)
 - 230 ▪ Direct mail
 - 231 • Prior to listening session
 - 232 ▪ Listening session
- 233
- 234 • Receive feedback
 - 235 ○ Expert/leader feedback
 - 236 ○ Informal feedback received through public comment
 - 237 ○ Website feedback
 - 238 ○ Informal conversations with neighbors
 - 239 ○ Discover Your Parks (DYP)
 - 240 ▪ 6 DYP events are planned for the summer of 2021

- 241 ▪ Commissioner
- 242 ○ Listening Session
- 243 ▪ Proposed date of September 7, 2021
- 244 ▪ Invite the neighborhood and other potentially impacted groups to hear from each
- 245 other and provide feedback to the Commission
- 246
- 247 • Equity lens
- 248 ○ Community Aspirations
- 249 ○ Racial Equity Narrative
- 250 ○ City of Roseville Racial Equity Action Plan
- 251 ○ Utilization of the GARE Racial Equity Toolkit to develop the process
- 252
- 253 • To do list
- 254 ○ Continued guidance from Native American Groups/Experts
- 255 ○ Further inform the community
- 256 ○ Individual study
- 257 ○ Continued conversations with neighbors/others
- 258 ○ Discover Your Parks (DYP)
- 259 ▪ Pocahontas Park DYP – August 4
- 260 ○ Listening Session on September 7
- 261
- 262 • Questions received from the Commission
- 263 ○ Among the Native American groups would they prefer that a new park name recognize
- 264 the Native American people? If yes, how might this happen.
- 265 ▪ This question was submitted by more than 1 Commissioner
- 266 ▪ Staff will ask this question to any future contacts that they speak with to gain
- 267 feedback for the Commission
- 268

269 Commissioner Lenhart commented that she would like to better understand the historical use of the
270 land in Roseville. In addition, she asked staff what type of feedback is requested on the website.
271 Staff responded that they have reached out to various groups to try to gather information on the
272 historical land use in Roseville but have not received responses. It was suggested that individual
273 Commissioners could research the topic and report back to the Commission. Staff added that the
274 website currently has just a general area to provide open feedback.

275

276 Commissioner Lenhart asked when the question of: “What would you suggest for a new name?”
277 should be asked. Staff responded that their suggestion would be for Commissioners to ask this
278 question throughout the remainder of the process.

279 The Commission discussed potential ways a final name could be chosen.

280

281 7) **STAFF REPORT**

282 a) **NEW OR RELEVANT COMMUNICATIONS AND UPDATE ITEMS**

- 283 • Ethics Training and New Commissioner Orientation – Wednesday, April 14
- 284 • The DYP sign-up sheet is now available online for Commissioners to sign-up to attend
- 285 • The Spring/Summer Parks and Recreation Brochure has been mailed to homes
- 286 • Recreation program registration opened April 6
- 287 • The Ice Show will be April 23 and 24 with limited spectators
- 288 • Earth Day at Harriet Alexander Nature Center on April 24 (10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.)
- 289 • Kite Day at Central Park Victoria Ballfields on April 24 (10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.)
- 290 ○ Free event
- 291 ○ Sponsored by Roseville Parks and Recreation, Do Good Roseville and Kiwanis Malt
- 292 Shop at the MN State Fair
- 293 • Staff requested input and feedback regarding COVID-19 and the upcoming large events that
- 294 Roseville Parks and Recreation hosts each summer
- 295 ○ Party in the Park (15,000-20,000 people)
- 296 ○ Parade (15,000-20,000 people)
- 297

298 8) **OTHER**

299 Commissioner Lenhart relayed that the Summer Spectacular Camp filled up within 1 hour upon the

300 registration opening. She suggested potentially expanding the program as it is so popular and helpful

301 to so many families. Staff responded that they appreciate the comment and with safety in mind staff

302 always works to do everything possible in order to maximize attendance for programs.

303

304 Commissioner Ybarra asked who makes the final decision to hold or cancel events such as the

305 Parade and Party in the Park. Staff relayed that it is a joint decision with the city's Emergency

306 Management Team in consultation with the Health Department and State of MN.

307

308 Meeting adjourned at 9:06 p.m.

309

310 Respectfully Submitted,

311 Danielle Christensen, Department Assistant

312

Dedication Triggers From Neighboring Communities

City	Trigger (Written in Ordinance)	Dedication applies without an increase in lots.
Andover	City of Andover shall require all owners or developers, as a prerequisite to approval of a plat, subdivision or development of land, to convey to the City or dedicate to the public use for park or playground purposes, a reasonable portion of the area being platted, subdivided or developed as hereinafter specified.	Yes
Arden Hills	<p>A. Pursuant to Minn. Stat. Section 462.358, Subd. 2b, except as otherwise provided in this section, the City requires all owners or developers, as a prerequisite to approval of a subdivision to convey to the City or dedicate to the public use a reasonable portion of any such proposal for public use as streets, roads, sewers, electric, gas, and water facilities, storm water drainage and holding areas or ponds and similar utilities and improvements, parks, recreational facilities, playgrounds, trails, wetlands, or open space, in such portions to be approved and acceptable to the City.</p> <p>B. As a condition of any conditional use permit or planned unit development under City Code Section 1355.06, the City may require as a term and condition of approval, the dedication of land or payment in lieu of dedication and park improvement fees if the project is determined to result in an increased demand for park land or park improvements. In establishing the amount required the City will take into consideration land and facilities provided by the developer and previous payments or dedications.</p> <p>6. Property being subdivided without an increase in the number of lots shall be exempt from park dedication requirements if similar requirements were satisfied in conjunction with an earlier subdivision. If the number of lots is increased, then the dedication shall be based on the additional lots created.</p>	It seems that the “new lots” provision only applies to parcels that paid park dedication once.
Burnsville	The city council shall require all developers requesting platting or replatting, or the development of unplatted land in the city to contribute lands, in the amounts listed below, to be dedicated to the public for their use as either parks, playground, public open space.	Yes
Champlin	The approval of all applications for every new development, subdivision of land, lot split or planned unit development in the city shall be conditioned on the dedication to the public by the applicant, or owner of the land to be developed if different from the applicant, of a reasonable portion of the proposed development, subdivision,	Yes

	lot split or planned unit development or, at the discretion of the city council, an equivalent amount in cash for part or all of the portion to be dedicated, for conservation purposes or for public use as parks,	
Cottage Grove	The City requires that when land develops or is subdivided, land shall be dedicated to the City for public use, or in lieu of dedicating land, cash shall be paid to the City for purposes of developing recreational facilities.	Yes
Mounds View	In all subdivisions to be developed for residential, commercial, industrial or other uses or as a planned development which includes residential, commercial and industrial uses or any combination thereof, a subdivider shall dedicate a reasonable portion of the buildable land of the proposed subdivision to the public or to be preserved for public use as parks, recreational facilities, playgrounds, trails or public open space.	Yes
New Brighton	The owners of land being subdivided shall dedicate to the City a reasonable portion of the land for use as public parks, playgrounds, trails or open space.	Yes
Shoreview	If the City Council reasonably determines that a proposed development or subdivision will increase the demand for public recreational uses, such as parks, playgrounds, trails and open space, the City Council, as part of any subdivision or development, may require the developer to dedicate, reserve, or otherwise convey to the City a reasonable portion of the total area of the proposed development or subdivision for public use as parks, playgrounds, trails or open space;	Yes
St. Louis Park	As a prerequisite to subdivision approval, subdividers shall dedicate land for parks, playgrounds, public open spaces and trails and/or shall make a cash contribution to the city's park fund and trail fund, as provided by this section. (d) Any increase in density of subdivisions shall be reviewed by the parks and recreation commission for reconsideration of park land and/or cash contribution requirements.	It seems that the “new lots” provision only applies to parcels that paid park dedication once.

**PARK DEDICATION
PROPOSED ORDINANCE
AMENDMENT**
PARKS & RECREATION



Background

- City Council requested to learn more about how other communities are handling Park Dedication (January 29, 2021).
- Research conducted by inquiring with many similar communities in the metro.
- Shared findings with the Parks and Recreation Commission (April 6, 2021).
- Shared findings and discussed next steps with City Council (May 10, 2021).

PARK DEDICATION

Questions from May 10

1. Density without a subdivision?
2. Minimum acreage?

PARK DEDICATION

Proposed Amendment #1: Modify Triggers

Park dedication will be required as a condition to the approval of any subdivision, plat, replat or lot split of land involving one acre or more and resulting in a net increase of development sites.

- Assessment of park dedication when lot lines are redrawn and new units created.
- Note: Under State statute, if park dedication has previously been paid on a specific parcel of property, only additional units can be assessed.

Proposed Amendment #2: Remove One Acre Floor

Park dedication will be required as a condition to the approval of any subdivision, plat, replat or lot split ~~of land involving one acre or more and resulting in a net increase of development sites.~~

- Removes the one acre minimum.
- Note: the use of a unit or percentage serves as a nexus between the impact and park dedication amount.

Proposed Amendment #3: Make Non-Residential Cash/Land Equal

The portion of land to be dedicated in all ~~residentially-zoned~~ areas shall be 10% ~~and 5% in all other areas~~

- Makes non-residential 10% in both cash and land.
- Removes the distinction between residential and non-residential.

Proposed Amendment #4: Clarify Required Pathways Impact

Land dedicated for required for pathways, street right-of- way or utilities, including drainage, does not qualify as park

- Clarifies that pathways/sidewalks that are required do not count toward park dedication.

Q & A