



**Planning Commission Special Meeting  
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive  
Draft Minutes – Thursday, June 10, 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, and Department  
16 Assistant Staci Johnson.  
17

18 **3. Approve Agenda**

19 **MOTION**

20 **Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Kruzel, to approve the agenda as**  
21 **presented.**  
22

23 **Ayes: 7**

24 **Nays: 0**

25 **Motion carried.**  
26  
27

28 **4. Communications and Recognitions:**

29 **a. From the Public:** *Public comment pertaining to general land use issues not on this*  
30 *agenda, including the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update.*  
31

32 None.  
33

34 **b. From the Commission or Staff:** *Information about assorted business not already on*  
35 *this agenda, including a brief update on the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update*  
36 *process.*  
37  
38

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

None.

**5. Other Business**

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

Community Development Director Gundlach indicated this item has been reviewed previously by the Planning Commission. She turned the item over to city consultants, Mr. Jeff Miller, and Ms. Rita Trapp.

Mr. Jeff Miller started the Zoning Code Update presentation with text amendments. He indicated the intent is to try to go over the highlights and summarize what is in the text amendments. He indicated this has been reviewed a couple of times at the high level, the recommendation level and now at the recommendation level. He noted the intent is to have this go to a public hearing at the Planning Commission and then to City Council adoption in August.

Residential Districts’ Amendments were reviewed by Mr. Miller.

Member Leutgeb indicated there was a distinction in the table between the multifamily dwellings of five to eight units and then eight or more. She asked for clarification on eight-unit dwellings because it seemed like it was a grey area and could be confusion there.

Mr. Miller explained that has been an issue and thought it was corrected. He indicated it should be five to eight and more than eight. There are instances in today’s code where there is an overlap. He noted he will look at that to make sure it has been caught but the intent is that it is five to eight and then more than eight, rather than eight or more.

Member McGehee explained on page four of the packet, the Statement of Purpose, when it is talking about the statement or purpose, she thought it would be helpful to everybody reading the Code to see what the relevant goals are and have them listed.

Mr. Miller noted that comment and continued with his review of the Residential Districts’ Amendments.

Member McGehee indicated relating to the lot depth, she agreed with the area and the frontage but some of the issues that she thought staff has been struggling with are the irregularity of some of the lots being proposed and that maybe something staff wants to think about whether that helps them to define the lots and the kinds of shapes they like.

Ms. Gundlach explained the Subdivision Code has a provision about irregular shaped lots and she thought that provision was sufficient to address the issue being mentioned.

86 Mr. Miller continued with his presentation.  
87

88 Member McGehee regarding the setback, in some of the residential parts there is  
89 indication about the first story being eighteen feet. Then the second story, the  
90 direction was that the setback that is near a residential area begins after the third  
91 story and she wondered if one would want to consider that being after the second  
92 story, if in fact that first story is already eighteen feet high. Also, it seems, just  
93 from an aesthetic point of view, if up against a residential side, if the idea is a  
94 combination of aesthetics and gradual building up, when talking about something  
95 that may be up to a hundred feet, to simply step back after the third story and then  
96 just go on up at least seems to her neither aesthetic nor really doing what they  
97 would hope up against a residential area.  
98

99 Mr. Miller believed the reason they are above the third story is because that is in  
100 line with what the current CMU District allows.  
101

102 Mr. Paschke indicated he would have to look in the City Code but believed along  
103 the greenway frontage there is a provision about stepping back residential  
104 buildings. The main level is at grade for one level and then it steps back a certain  
105 distance for the remainder of the building.  
106

107 Mr. Miller explained the other comment regarding one hundred feet, he thought  
108 the other tool the City has is in HDR, anything higher than fifty-five feet requires  
109 a CUP so the City would still have the opportunity there to require another step  
110 back.  
111

112 Member McGehee thought they seem to be big on articulation and where there  
113 are doors and windows and everything else and if they are trying to make this  
114 more palatable up against residential areas it seems the more articulation they  
115 have on that facing side, the more palatable it is.  
116

117 Mr. Miller indicated step backs can cause challenges for the developer because  
118 they are losing development capacity. He explained this was looked into and one  
119 of the things they discussed, either/or, and the way it is in the update is if a  
120 developer decided they would rather not do the step act, they would rather move  
121 the whole building back that eight feet, then this is saying the developer would  
122 not have to do an additional step back if the whole building is moved back.  
123 Developers do not always prefer to do that step back.  
124

125 Member McGehee explained the question she had throughout the review is if the  
126 City was looking to make this the best, most cost effective, and easiest thing for  
127 the developer or is the City trying to come up with some sort of a balance between  
128 the residents who live in the area and already have an investment and what is next  
129 to them. It maybe a little more of a challenge but at the same time there are  
130 existing residents in Roseville for whom, whether it is eight feet back or not,  
131 looking at a fifty-five-foot solid wall, which is definitely not as attractive than if  
132 driving around other communities where there are step backs. She indicated this

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

is a desirable place, so the City did not have to continually bend over backwards to make it easy and cheap for people to develop in the City.

Mr. Miller understood Member McGehee was asking that they maybe think about it being above the second story instead of the third story.

Member McGehee noted that is only if the first story is eighteen feet high because eighteen feet is more than a standard story.

Mr. Miller asked if Member McGehee was proposing another step back if buildings were higher than three stories.

Member McGehee indicated that was correct if next to a residential area.

Chair Kimble thought there were other ways to deal with this other than step backs and designing the building ahead of time might, rather than some flexibility and other controls might make it more challenging for everybody.

Commissioner Pribyl agreed regarding having so many definitions of exactly what needs to be done with the building design to meet the goals. Multiple steps are expensive and depending on the type of construction can get quite expensive to do multiple step backs and that might limit the ability of the developer to do other things that could enhance the building such as adding more landscaping, better materials, other things that can make it aesthetically pleasing without the structural complexity. She also wondered where the eighteen feet came from and noted she could not find where in the document it is at because she saw a reference to eighteen inches but not to eighteen feet.

Member McGehee indicated she could have missed seeing it correctly, but she thought it was on something where the first floor was commercial.

Mr. Paschke believed the reference was eighteen inches in the Code as it relates to the first floor. He also stated what the requirement is currently in the Community Mixed Use District under the greenway frontage.

Ms. Trapp reviewed the Mixed-Use Districts' Amendments and the Employment Districts' Amendments with the Commission.

Mr. Miller reviewed the new BRT Overlay District and the definitions and amendments with the Commission.

Chair Kimble indicated there is both detached and attached townhome and she wondered if the detached was considered a twin home.

Mr. Miller explained they are trying to clarify that the detached duplex is on one lot versus the twin home would be on two lots. That is the situation currently and they are clarifying that.

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  
225  
226

Ms. Trapp reviewed some of the next step's staff and the consultants will be working on.

Member Leutgeb was curious how they are planning on notifying property owners and residents about the new updated web page for this project.

Ms. Gundlach explained at this point a lot of the engagement has been electronically, but staff has sent postcards to property addresses that have been directly impacted and then properties that lie within five hundred feet of directly impacted properties. That is where staff is steering them to the story map and the webpage. There were some links on the home page of the City website for several months. This has been put in the City newsletter and staff has been doing outreach through the email updates and posting on NextDoor as well as the City's Facebook page. Staff has tried to use a lot of different engagement methods to make people aware of what is going on. As it relates to equity, are they using the right tools, she was not one hundred percent positive that they are, but they are trying to do what they have experienced works and using those tools. She indicated staff would be happy to take the Commission's feedback on what else can be done.

Member Kruzel thought there was discussion at another meeting to reach out to the different areas, perhaps block captains, tap into those. She knew with Park and Rec doing different park events there might be a way to have some type of engagement there as well.

Ms. Gundlach thanked Member Kruzel for her feedback.

Member McGehee thought there was a lot of mention of changing parking lots, and she did not think there was a good definition in this and wanted to suggest that staff look at the St. Louis Park project where they have incorporated a nice change for their parking lots. In terms of the plantings, she suggested they now have a tree company that is their consultant and maybe when they are talking about these plantings the consultant should be contacted to talk about the plants that are going to be the most successful and how to water them. She noted there is a specialist in house but not much and the expertise the City has is used elsewhere. She found that the Council may want to go over the table of uses but as they have changed all of these districts, some of the tables of uses do not seem right anymore, particularly as they mix residential in. Some of the clear places are places where they have excluded childcare, when in fact, they are talking about employment districts in residential areas where childcare might be really important. She indicated she was still really in favor of a seventy-five percent improvement area overall. She noted they put this in most places, but it was not put in all places and since they are unifying, it would be nice to have it all over. She thought as part of the planning of this whole thing, there is a whole section of Roseville that is being talked about between Rosedale and the industrial area and the commercial area at Har Mar and she thought someone, the Council, staff for

**Special Planning Commission Meeting**

**Minutes – Thursday, June 10, 2021**

**Page 6**

227 the Planning Commission might try to come up with a vision for how they want to  
228 look when they are done, and she did not see that vision. She indicated these  
229 were some of the bigger questions that she thought about as she read through all  
230 of the materials over the last several months.

231  
232 Chair Kimble thought that was a lot of different thoughts and wondered if Ms.  
233 Gundlach had any feedback.

234  
235 Ms. Gundlach indicated Member McGehee and she had a conversation over the  
236 phone about this and she indicated she had concerns about broaden the scope of  
237 the work and keeping them on track and Member McGehee understood that. She  
238 thought it was good that Member McGehee brought the list of issues up and  
239 indicated the list could be sent to her email. She noted she will keep notes on  
240 additional items that will be brought forward to the City Council for them to  
241 decide if they want to have the consultants tackle them.

242  
243 **6. Adjourn**

244  
245 **MOTION**  
246 **Member McGehee, seconded by Member Pribyl, to adjourn the meeting at 8:19**  
247 **p.m.**

248  
249 **Ayes: 7**  
250 **Nays: 0**  
251 **Motion carried.**

252  
253