



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Draft Minutes – Wednesday, July 6, 2022 – 6:30 p.m.**

- 1 **1. Call to Order**
2 Chair Kimble called to order the regular meeting of the Planning Commission meeting at
3 approximately 6:30 p.m. and reviewed the role and purpose of the Planning Commission.
4
- 5 **2. Roll Call**
6 At the request of Chair Kimble, City Planner Thomas Paschke called the Roll.
7
- 8 **Members Present:** Chair Julie Kimble and Commissioners Michelle Pribyl, Tammy
9 McGehee, Karen Schaffhausen and Erik Bjorum.
10
- 11 **Members Absent:** Commissioner Michelle Kruzel.
12
- 13 **Staff Present:** City Planner Thomas Paschke and Community Development
14 Director Janice Gundlach.
15
- 16 **3. Approve Agenda**
17
18 Member Schaffhausen arrived at 6:32 p.m.
19
- 20 **MOTION**
21 **Member Pribyl moved, seconded by Member McGehee, to approve the agenda as**
22 **presented.**
23
- 24 **Ayes: 5**
25 **Nays: 0**
26 **Motion carried.**
27
- 28 **4. Review of Minutes**
29
- 30 **a. June 1, 2022 Planning Commission Regular Meeting**
31
- 32 Member Pribyl noted on line 362, “gregarious” should be changed to “precarious”.
33
- 34 **MOTION**
35 **Member Schaffhausen moved, seconded by Member McGehee, to approve the**
36 **June 1, 2022 meeting minutes.**
37
- 38 **Ayes: 5**
39 **Nays: 0**
40 **Motion carried.**
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
86
87
88

5. Communications and Recognitions:

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

None.

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

None.

6. Public Hearing

a. Request for Preliminary Approval of a Major Plat to Subdivide Two Residential Parcels into Six Lots for Two-Family, Attached Homes (Twin Homes), One Lot for Retention of an Existing One-Family Detached Home, and One Outlot (PF22-005)

Chair Kimble opened the public hearing for PF22-005 at approximately 6:35 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing. She noted this will be before the City Council at their July 25th meeting.

City Planner Paschke summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated July 6, 2022.

Member Pribyl thanked Mr. Paschke for the presentation and for addressing some of the neighbors’ concerns raised in the emails sent. She indicated one email that is not directly related to the plat but one she remembered seeing as a comment was the possibility of lighting from this parcel onto other parcels. She asked Mr. Paschke to review the City policy regarding lighting.

Mr. Paschke did not know if there would be a restriction and did not know of any street lights that would end up going in on a private street. He noted he has not seen any plans for that. As it relates to the units themselves, the owners would be able to light their yard the same as any other owner on their property. Typically the lighting is shielded so it does not shine outside of the property.

Mr. Tom Brama, 3009 Troseth Road, owner, addressed the Commission. He indicated his concern is this is a very desirable area to live and it is hard for people to move into the area. They felt that by offering Twinhomes the cost would be lowered to people of getting into a desirable neighborhood where there is a mix of properties. He explained this is not an out of the ordinary use of the property and is not changing the character of the immediate neighborhood.

Member McGehee wondered what would the size of the home pads be.

89 Mr. Brama indicated the pads would be approximately twenty-one hundred square
90 feet with an unfinished basement.

91
92 **Public Comment**
93

94 Ms. Laurie Stark, 2999 Troseth Road, wanted to reiterate what the other plat maps do
95 not show and that is the block bounded by Old 8, Troseth Road and C2 are all single-
96 family homes. Surrounding that, there are all different kinds of housing. She sees
97 people wanting single family homes and she did not think the water management plan
98 addresses the whole neighborhood, it just addresses Mr. Brama's two plats of land.
99 She did not think there was much green space in that little area of Roseville and green
100 space is very important for the wildlife in the area. She thought that by developing
101 those two plots of land into this type of housing is going to reduce the green space
102 even more and the community already lost so much green space to the Edison
103 Complex. She noted she did not know any neighbors in favor of this project.
104

105 Ms. Jane Bates, 2980 Old Highway 8, stated she was overwhelmed when she hears
106 about not changing the character of a neighborhood and proposing to put in where
107 currently two families can live to adding six additional onto those two lots. She
108 indicated since 2003 she has supported a family, paid taxes, and done everything they
109 could to support a single-family home. Apparently the 2040 plan that Roseville
110 approved did incorporate a change from single family home to low density housing in
111 which she did not think the information was adequately provided to the residents that
112 live in a community. She indicated this could happen to anyone and any
113 neighborhood and breaking up single family homes and neighborhoods for
114 somebody's financial gain is unacceptable.
115

116 Mr. Roger Pascal, 2999 Troseth Road, indicated he has been in the neighborhood for
117 sixty-eight years and there has been eighteen splits so far and in the southwest corner
118 there are actually three houses where cattail ponds were filled in to provide more
119 splits. He indicated the neighborhood is already getting split up. He explained this is a
120 legacy neighborhood and pretty soon there will not be any nice lots because they will
121 all be broken up.
122

123 Mr. Brandon Kowal, 2960 Old Highway 8, added the way the private drainage system
124 was explained for this plat is that it will flow north and based on the report he
125 submitted from 2017, there is still a choke point at County Road D going north so the
126 old infrastructure does not support and has to change for this to work. He noted this
127 will not change overnight and a private system flowing north will not solve drainage
128 issues.
129

130 Mr. Michael Cassel, 3002 Troseth Road, explained he is the direct recipient of
131 stormwater runoff from the block that is being considered for new platting. He asked
132 what the current square footage in that area that is currently paved and impervious to
133 stormwater capture and how much of that area is going to be occupied by square
134 footage building, new drive. He noted on page eight of the packet there is material
135 that talks about the bio-filtration basin. Mention has been made tonight of some sort

136 of water neutral capture of drain on that area. He did not know what it was talking
137 about but when it rains heavy the water comes coursing next to his and his neighbors'
138 homes. This is not an insignificant problem and aside from the fact that there is
139 something to be said about a legacy neighborhood and he understood something in
140 the Comprehensive Plan about a missing middle but he wondered if this development
141 and five hundred-thousand-dollar twinhomes going to make a response of what is
142 needed. They have been under assault and he understood Edison is seeking a third
143 building off County Road D as well. He thought if the City took all factors under
144 consideration this project is not really in character with this neighborhood. He
145 thought there was something to be said for the character that is low density housing.
146 He wondered if this is the place for this type of development. He indicated he likes
147 the character of the neighborhood and is concerned about the character of the
148 neighborhood could be changing over time. He also wanted to understand better what
149 a bio-filtration BMP plan is because he did not have any confidence that the City has
150 adequately addressed the drainage problems that directly impact their home.

151
152 Chair Kimble closed the public hearing at 7:11 p.m. with no one else wanting to
153 address the Commission.

154
155 **Commission Deliberation**

156
157 Chair Kimble asked if staff had anyone that could explain what the bio-filtration
158 BMP plan was.

159
160 Mr. Paschke indicated he cannot speak to this directly but indicated he could answer
161 questions related to the stormwater management plan. He indicated this proposal, site
162 development that is required to create stormwater management is not something that
163 is supposed to assist in resolving the issues that are ongoing in this neighborhood.
164 That is a bigger, broader issue that needs to be addressed by this general area.

165
166 Chair Kimble explained this is a preliminary plat and the Commission is looking at
167 the plat against a relatively limited number of requirements.

168
169 Mr. Paschke indicated that was correct and there are somethings that are out of the
170 control of the Planning Commission to address or add conditions to.

171
172 Member McGehee thought there are rights of the citizens and should be represented
173 and she did not think there was much point to the Commission's activity if all the
174 Commission does is look at what the planning staff has combed through very
175 carefully and manicured so that it matches City Code and then give a rubber stamp to
176 that and send it the City Council. She indicated she was not sure that is the best way
177 the Commission can advise the Council or bring things forward because she feels
178 strongly and is very familiar with this neighborhood and she agreed with the people,
179 they are bounded by what she would call a multi-family effort or both New Brighton
180 and St. Anthony Village, which have put all of their stuff right up against the edge.
181 She noted she was on the City Council at the time the Edison project went through
182 and there was a lot of density and a lot of trees were removed and lost along with

183 green space in the neighborhood. She thought Sand Castle Park is a very tiny area and
184 is not like the other City parks that grace the area on the other side and she thought
185 this area on the other side of Old Highway 8 is in many ways a legacy neighborhood
186 and is under assault and also under viewed by Roseville because it is on the other side
187 of 35W. She also spoke about the water issues going on in Roseville as a whole.

188
189 Ms. Gundlach reviewed her discussion with the City Engineer regarding some of the
190 drainage issues in the area.

191
192 Member McGehee indicated she did not particularly have an objection to the
193 subdivision of this lot. She noted she did have an objection regarding the initial split
194 of the lots at the City Council because it was envisioned them having twin homes but
195 not six of them and particularly not in the back yards. She considered seven twin
196 homes on the two parcels to raise the bar to multi-family.

197
198 Member Bjorum understood Member McGehee's point but he would disagree simply
199 based on the fact that the LDR allows for the lot widths and square footages that the
200 developer is proposing so regardless of how large the existing lots are, what is being
201 set in front of them is clearly within the limits of the Zoning Code and
202 Comprehensive Plan.

203
204 Member McGehee agreed and reviewed what the Council envisioned the lots to be at
205 the time the lot was split. She noted she only raised these issues because they are
206 issues the City Council should think about because it was the Council that put these
207 things in place. She thought there was a lack of green space and she thought these
208 water issues are serious and she did not think these twin homes are affordable. She
209 noted these are issues that she would like carried forward to the City Council. She
210 would like, if at all possible, some kind of stipulation that these townhomes would be
211 sold as single, individual homes.

212
213 Ms. Gundlach did not think it was within the land use authority to dictate whether or
214 not something is owner occupied or rental. She explained relating housing type and
215 affordability and missing middle, the reason the City opened up the two family or
216 duplex housing type or LDR District was because the Comprehensive Plan calls for a
217 need for missing middle housing and that does not necessarily mean the same thing as
218 affordable housing. Affordability is a function of supply and demand and income and
219 missing middle is two, three, four family dwelling units. Nobody disputes the
220 \$450,000 or \$500,000 that is not affordable, but when comparing that to the Enclave
221 Townhomes that are listed for \$650,000 or the single-family homes at Midland
222 Legacy Estates that are listed for \$850,000, those are one family dwellings that are
223 owner occupied. \$450,000 is a little more in the middle for what people could expect
224 to pay for a single-family home. She explained affordability is a function of supply
225 and demand and the City has a system where of all the City's residentially zoned land
226 for one hundred years, eighty some percent of it has been zoned only for single family
227 homes of lot sizes of eleven thousand square feet. That has caused affordability issues
228 coupled with land price, materials, costs and now interest rates. Owning a single-
229 family home, certainly new construction is unattainable for many so the idea behind

230 opening up the City’s Zoning Code and allowing different housing types, specifically
231 missing middle housing types into their single-family neighborhoods would, over
232 time, to peel back what the City can actually have for affordable ownership units like
233 a duplex. That was the intention behind opening up two family dwelling units in the
234 LDR District and to be honest, it was going to be an even larger challenge to try and
235 take existing LDR District and rezone it to medium density to achieve a similar
236 density type. She explained this is going to happen with infill projects. The City was
237 very upfront with that. Where there are larger lots, that is an infill project and she
238 does understand and sympathizes with the neighbors who live next to these infill
239 projects because that is where it will be felt most.

240
241 Member McGehee indicated because the City is always talking about different
242 housing types, there are large lot areas in Roseville and she did not particularly like
243 them referred to as infill projects, that it is the goal to chop up all of the large lots in
244 Roseville because there are people who like large lots and she was one of them and
245 she explained she has one but she thought those areas and large lots should also be
246 available in Roseville unless it is the plan to have Roseville consist of all missing
247 middle and affordable rental housing. She thought the City did have to careful not to
248 chop up all of what the City has because there are some areas in Roseville that are
249 very desirable and carry a lot of the tax weight from the housing standpoint.

250
251 Ms. Gundlach explained the City is not the developer and not developing any land or
252 chopping up any parcels. The City is responding to developers, property owners who
253 wish to develop their land in accordance with Zoning Code requirements. The City is
254 just applying the code. If there is a large lot neighborhood that wants to maintain their
255 large lots and nobody wants to sell or subdivide, the City is not going to force that
256 upon anybody.

257
258 **MOTION**

259 **Member Bjorum moved, seconded by Member Pribyl, to recommend to the City**
260 **Council approval of the Proposed Brama Vistas Preliminary Plat, based on the**
261 **content of the RPCA, public input, and Planning Commission deliberation with**
262 **the three conditions listed in the RPCA (PF22-005).**

263
264 Member Bjorum indicated he was recommending approval because it is based on all
265 of the required criteria as set forth by the City’s Zoning Code and Comprehensive
266 Plan. He noted he did not like the plan either but there is no reason to deny it because
267 it meets all of the requirements and the issues that were brought up by Member
268 McGehee are very important and he hoped the City Council does consider those as
269 well.

270
271 Member McGehee indicated for the sake of the Council; she will be opposing this.
272 She agreed this meets all of the conditions but she was going to oppose it so that it
273 stands out when it goes to the Council so that it is not a unanimous things and is not
274 put on the Consent Agenda and does get the review that the Commission would like it
275 to have.

276

277 Member Pribyl agreed and noted she does not necessarily like the layout of this but
278 also do not feel that having twinhomes in the neighborhood with large lots ruins the
279 character of the neighborhood automatically.
280

281 **Ayes: 4 ayes**

282 **Nays: 1 nay (McGehee)**

283 **Motion carried.**
284

285 **7. Other Business**
286

287 **a. Discuss Phase Two Zoning Code Update Amendments**

288 Mr. Jeff Miller of HKGi, summarized the information as detailed in the staff report
289 dated July 6, 2022. She asked for feedback regarding the four identified areas for
290 sustainability requirements.
291

292 Mr. Miller made a presentation on Phase Two of the Zoning Code Update.
293

294 Staff and the Commission discussed EV charging station requirements for different
295 size businesses.
296

297 Ms. Gundlach indicated staff is looking for specific feedback from the Commission.
298 Staff is looking to see if the Commission is ok with the EV ready versus the EV
299 charging, the percentage and the overall number of parking that should trigger that
300 requirement.
301

302 Chair Kimble indicated given this is new she would err on the conservative side and
303 say minimum of thirty parking stalls versus twenty and include if it is burdensome.
304 The City can always see how it goes and increase this if needed rather than imposing
305 something that is a little stricter.
306

307 Member Pribyl agreed. She noted there are more and more electric vehicles out there
308 so there will be more demand from residents living in multi-family or people
309 shopping looking for EV charging stations. Getting something in the Zoning Code is
310 helpful and important and making this intermediate step makes sense.
311

312 Member Bjorum thought it was also ok to say there needs to be some on day one but
313 to have additional down the road may be needed. He has found that some developers
314 will go more than EV ready just because they know it is coming down the line and
315 forcing the minimum really tells them to just do the whole setup. He knew that with a
316 lot of these things it demands a much bigger electrical feed to do these projects when
317 done but he thought that was anticipated on the front end and a lot less damaging to
318 anybody doing development work. He thought having the split is probably very
319 important.
320

321 Member Pribyl indicated for new construction it is not as much as a cost and easier to
322 get them ready and to have electric service.
323

324 Member Bjorum understood there are varying stages of charging and all dependent on
325 the speed in which the vehicle is charged. He wondered if that was something the
326 City would add into that requirement.

327
328 Mr. Miller explained if this is of interest his team will look at that further and what
329 the best practice is right now.

330
331 Member McGehee thought it might be easier for the older buildings that do not have
332 the service to have the option to provide EV charging at the lower end of service.

333
334 Mr. Paschke indicated he was not opposed to that requirement but most of the
335 charging stations that have been approved for the City of Roseville is a separate fee
336 that goes right to the unit that then feeds the charging station. It is not coming directly
337 from the building itself and feeding it out. It is a separate line brought in by Xcel that
338 goes to a transformer tool that brings it to the station so that would not necessarily be
339 a concern or issue. He thought the issue was when reconstructing a parking lot the
340 requirement to install the EV stations which would be an extra expense to the
341 building owner.

342
343 Member Schaffhausen indicated she was not opposed to any of this but she knew
344 from a small business perspective, that cash flow their businesses and can barely
345 afford to survive. She thought this is something to consider and what the Commission
346 is talking about is not creating a lot. She wondered if a small business would be
347 forced to put in EV stations if they could not afford to install them.

348
349 Member Bjorum thought that is where the five percent kicks in. If the EV station
350 were to cost more than five percent of the entire project than there is an allowance in
351 there that the states the business would not have to do as many or something like that.

352
353 Chair Kimble asked what the definition is of reconstructing for a parking lot. She
354 asked if it would just be repaving or something more because that makes a different
355 as well.

356
357 Ms. Gundlach explained maintenance of existing stalls like repaving them would not
358 trigger this in staff's mind of implementing it. If there is an existing business doing an
359 expansion or adding parking and at the thirty stalls then at that point it would.

360
361 Chair Kimble thought staff should define what reconstructed means.

362
363 Ms. Gundlach reviewed the discussion and what he Commission would like to be
364 changed.

365
366 The Commission was in consensus with the changes to the Zoning Code with what
367 was discussed.

368
369 Ms. Gundlach noted all of the solar in the City is on a map on the website and she
370 noted the requirement for EV charging stations does not go into effect on residential

371 homes until it hits the apartment building level. The requirement is only for apartment
372 buildings and non-residential buildings and will be up to the owners whether or not to
373 install them.

374
375 Mr. Miller continued with his presentation on screening of solar energy systems. He
376 noted it is being recommended not to add a screening requirement.

377
378 Staff reviewed with the Commission why screening of solar energy systems is not
379 recommended.

380
381 Mr. Miller reviewed the proposed Minimum Tree Requirement for Multi-Family
382 Residential Development.

383
384 The Commission discussed the minimum tree requirement proposal with staff.

385
386 Ms. Gundlach summarized the Commission was ok with going with the one per
387 thousand of open space for multi-family but staff will go back and look at the model
388 standard, which does not impose differing standards for residential, commercial or
389 industrial.

390
391 Mr. Miller continued his presentation on Drought-Tolerant or Native Landscaping
392 recommendations.

393
394 Staff reviewed some reasons why having a Drought-tolerant or Native landscaping
395 list makes sense for the City for developers.

396
397 The Commission and staff discussed enforcement, rules and regulations and other
398 processes in the City regarding irrigation, lawn mowing and other landscaping and
399 sustainability.

400
401 Mr. Miller reviewed next steps with the Commission.

402
403 **8. Adjourn**

404
405 **MOTION**

406 **Member Pribyl, seconded by Member Schaffhausen, to adjourn the meeting at**
407 **8:41 p.m.**

408
409 **Ayes: 5**
410 **Nays: 0**
411 **Motion carried.**

412