



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Draft Minutes – Wednesday, September 7, 2022 – 6:30 p.m.**

- 1 **1. Call to Order**
2 Chair Pribyl 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, Vice Chair Michell Pribyl, and Commissioners
9 Michelle Kruzel, Tammy McGehee, Karen Schaffhausen, and Erik
10 Bjorum.
11
- 12 **Members Absent:** None
13
- 14 **Staff Present:** City Planner Thomas Paschke, Community Development Director
15 Janice Gundlach, and Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd.
16
- 17 **3. Approve Agenda**
18
- 19 City Planner Paschke added an item to the agenda. Appointing a Commissioner to the
20 City Visioning Process Committee.
21
- 22 Chair Kimble asked if this should be Item 6b or could the Commission do the
23 appointment at this time.
24
- 25 Mr. Paschke did not think it made a difference.
26
- 27 Community Development Director Gundlach explained she sent out a letter explaining
28 what the City Visioning Process Committee would do. She noted Commissioner
29 Schaffhausen was the first Commissioner who showed interest in serving on that
30 committee so if there would be no objection, that is who the Planning Commission could
31 appoint. She explained each advisory commission will have a representative on that
32 board along with several other stakeholders that will be selected.
33
- 34 Chair Kimble asked Commission Schaffhausen if she was still interested in serving on
35 that board.
36
- 37 Member Schaffhausen indicated she would love to.
38
- 39 **MOTION**
40 **Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Kruzel, to approve the agenda as**
41 **presented.**

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

Ayes: 6
Nays: 0
Motion carried.

4. Review of Minutes

a. July 6, 2022 Planning Commission Regular Meeting

Chair Kimble noted there were some grammatical changes made by Commissioner McGehee and herself that were sent into staff.

MOTION

Member Pribyl moved, seconded by Member McGehee, to approve the July 6, 2022 meeting minutes.

Ayes: 6
Nays: 0
Motion carried.

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.*

Ms. Linda Fearing, 2578 Pascal Street, explained she was at the meeting regarding an open house held by Chris and Kelly Schwagerl who is trying to get a development going at 2609 Snelling Curve. She explained this is a residential neighborhood and what is being proposed are two sixteen unit assisted living buildings. She indicated she attended the open house and what she gathered from it is their business is Home Grown Assisted Living and the owners have never developed anything in the past. She believed the husband is a social worker and the wife is somehow involved in assisted living. The property is currently owned by Ulta Holdings and Blake Olson is Ulta Holdings. She explained her understanding is the Schwagerl's are not planning on purchasing the property from Ulta Holdings but would be the developer and Ulta Holdings would retain ownership. Apparently the property would need to be rezoned for this development and it is her understanding that within the last year the City downzoned this entire strip along Snelling Curve for Low-Density Residential. There are actually four parcels that are in limbo. A couple have vacant homes on them, a couple others are part of what was Hurrah Greenhouse Properties as well as a City owned pond behind all of this. Many residents in the neighborhood are concerned that this development is not approved because of the concern of traffic, not an appropriate use for the neighborhood. She explained there are many other assisted living facilities within the City of Roseville so she did not know why anyone would think there needed to be thirty-two more homes in this neighborhood. She did not think it made any sense. She would appreciate at some point if the Commission could have a discussion on what the City envisions for this strip of property. She noted

89 there is some unique topography there and would like to know what realistically this
90 property would support and what can actually happen to it.

91
92 Mr. Paschke explained there has not been an application submitted yet. Only an open
93 house has occurred.

94
95 Chair Kimble indicated there have been no applications so the Commission is not
96 aware of any request for a rezoning.

97
98 Ms. Fearing explained the area is really concerned so they want to just preempt action
99 on this whole thing.

100
101 Senior Planner Lloyd reviewed the process to date on the property being discussed.

102
103 Ms. Dawn Norris, 1547 Sextant Avenue, explained she was also at the meeting to talk
104 about the Snelling Curve proposed plan. She wanted to reiterate that this is low-
105 density single-family home neighborhood and is not a commercial neighborhood.
106 The traffic is already busy with the nearby apartment building and is quite fast driving
107 through the neighborhood. She felt his plan would add to the traffic in the
108 neighborhood along with if it is assisted living or a multi-plex building, there is no
109 access on the back side to get in or out of the neighborhood. It appears there is a
110 wetland in the back and she thought the City wanted to preserve these areas.

111
112 Ms. Sandy McGiffin, 1379 Brooks Avenue W., indicated she was also at the meeting
113 regarding the Snelling Curve issue. The traffic is already bad because there are only
114 three ways in and out of the area. There is so much traffic on Brooks and Pascal
115 already and everyone seems to think this is a raceway. She noted there are a lot of
116 kids in the area. She did not know how trucks will go in and out, delivering food or
117 emergency vehicles in an out of there and there is just too much traffic and the roads
118 are not made for that. All the other exits for that are closed off when Snelling was
119 enlarged. She stated those street just cannot take it, it is already too tight and she
120 understood that the wetlands behind that area, which is behind Snelling Curve and
121 Snelling itself is mainly enlarged because of the runoff from Rosedale. She explained
122 Roseville used to be a beautiful place with lots of open space and now it is becoming
123 a concrete jungle with all of these tall buildings. She asked the Commission to please
124 think about this before things happen.

125
126 Ms. Teresa Foreman, 2490 Pascal Street, agreed with the previous speakers. She
127 explained she has been in her home for twenty-two years and has seen the homes
128 change to more young families with a lot more kids. She explained there are three
129 times the amount of kids in the area now than when she moved in. Traffic is more
130 and is faster and a lot of the traffic that comes from the current apartment building
131 comes down Pascal and is over a hill by Pocahontas Park and these cars fly through
132 the intersection. She knew there were discussions a few years ago about putting in
133 four way stop signs or speed bumps to slow the traffic and none of that ever happens.
134 Her concern is that the traffic will increase back in the dead end because there is no
135 access out to County Road C, where that property will be and she did not think it is

136 conducive to the neighborhood. She requested the Commission not approve this to a
137 higher density living.

138
139 Ms. Alison Dahlman, 2520 Snelling Curve, explained her family has lived there for
140 six years and she has four small children. She can attest to the fact that her largest
141 concern is, next to the Ulta Owner’s letter, which showed complete disregard for any
142 beautification of the City, care for the neighborhood, care for any of the people who
143 live in the neighborhood, or consideration of what is best. She would have been
144 much more open to someone who desired to work with the neighborhood and think
145 about how that could impact in a positive way. Her biggest concern is also the traffic.
146 There are children everywhere in the neighborhood and the neighborhood is turning
147 over with more children and young families coming in and there is no access in and
148 out beyond Pascal onto Snelling Curve. She indicated it is dangerous and not a good
149 spot for this type of use. If the person that owned Ulta Holding came to the
150 neighborhood and had a discussion about what might improve the neighborhood and
151 what might be a good use of that spot, it seems like there are a lot of people who are
152 interested in what might go in there. As a City Commissioner she thought they would
153 care about what is good for the City and the neighborhoods that are in it so she asked
154 that the Commission consider if this is really that.

155
156 Mr. Larry Sedgwick, 2498 Sheldon Street, explained he is a senior citizen and might
157 eventually into something like this in his current neighborhood but he was opposed to
158 this. He indicated he has been in his home for thirty-six years. He has seen
159 tremendous change in the neighborhood with younger families with a lot more
160 children. Brooks has a lot of traffic and his biggest concern is with the safety of the
161 children in the neighborhood. With a complex like this there will be a lot of vehicles,
162 more support vehicles taking care of assisted living people and will put the children at
163 danger. This is his biggest concern. He hoped the Commission will consider what
164 the neighborhood has to say if this comes before them.

165
166 Mr. Richard James, 2425 Pascal Street, explained he moved there four years ago and
167 it is wonderful neighborhood and quiet. Neighbors care about each other and the
168 neighborhood. He encouraged the Commission to look at the map given to them,
169 noting where the entrances are into the little subdivisions. He echoed what his fellow
170 neighbors have said about the traffic being his first big concern. His second concern
171 was he had a letter from the Ulta Holding Company that was submitted to the City
172 Council on September 2021 that talked about not only not allowing the low density
173 but also suggesting it go to high density and his concern is that the other piece of
174 property that is not being developed right now, if a higher density situation were
175 allowed on the property, he was concerned that a precedent would be set to allow
176 bigger properties to be built on these sites.

177
178 Mr. John Garrigues, 2520 Simpson Street, explained he agreed with everyone who
179 previously spoke. His biggest concern is that this was previously zoned and now the
180 developer is pushing to have it rezoned at a higher density. He indicated he lives
181 across the street from the old Harris Farm, that is a big parcel and if the very end spot
182 is rezoned his concern is that all of a sudden it will make it a lot easier for whoever

183 buys the rest of those properties who will want to have those rezoned to higher
184 density as well or even a higher density from where it is now. He wondered what it
185 would take for the neighborhood to push for a rezoning of their neighborhood, in that
186 area. He thought right now it is in LDR-1, which allows for up to six units. He
187 explained when he looked at the history of the zoning it spoke about the LDR zoning
188 which is a lower zoning from where the area is currently zoned at and he wondered
189 what they could do as a neighborhood to have it zoned as a single unit home versus
190 LDR-1. He thought everyone is concerned about the possible density in the future
191 and could change the makeup of the area.

192
193 Chair Kimble explained there was an ongoing process over the past two years where
194 the City looked at rezonings and she did not know if there is a process for a
195 neighborhood to come together to ask for a rezoning.

196
197 Mr. Paschke indicated currently the neighborhood is at the lowest zoning they could
198 have. There is no other zoning.

199
200 Ms. Gundlach reviewed the current and previous zoning with the Commission.

201
202 Chair Kimble mentioned that this has been a good practice round because if a
203 rezoning application does come in the neighborhood will have an opportunity at a
204 public hearing to make comments and she suggested everyone to come back for that
205 and make their comments again because the City has not seen any application for this
206 project being talked about. She suggested the neighborhood follow the notices and to
207 come back.

208
209 There was a brief offline discussion about noticing in the Roseville papers, which are
210 no longer.

211
212 Mr. David Scott, 2501 Simpson Street, stated his family moved into the neighborhood
213 three years ago. He thought the best part about Roseville is the open spaces, wetlands
214 with a lot of green area. He explained he came from a concrete jungle, living in
215 California and knows what that is like. He really appreciates the open spaces. He
216 appreciated the neighborhoods in Roseville because there was not that in Los Angeles
217 and they do not want to lose that. He feels less stressed with all of the open spaces in
218 the City and something they would like to hold onto.

219
220 Mr. Paschke explained the wetlands would not be removed or filled in, these would
221 be retained, especially that wetland. MNDOT and the City own it so it will not go
222 anywhere. Wetlands cannot be impacted.

223
224 Ms. Joan Mullen, 2530 Snelling Curve, across from the old nursery. She explained
225 she has lived there for nine years with her family. She indicated she was very
226 concerned about the accesses there. She has had to call FedEx, UPS, and other
227 delivery people to complain because they are all going way too fast on that road. The
228 road seems like there is not a lot there when first starting out but is almost like a
229 freeway and kind of mimics the Snelling traffic when there are big vehicles on there.

230 She agreed with everyone about the accesses in and out. Everyone uses them and it is
231 very busy. She added that the neighbors also deal with the noise pollution from
232 Highway 36 and Snelling as well as from the Fair in the fall and can be very bad
233 during the weekends.

234
235 Member Schaffhausen explained Chair Kimble was kind enough to reiterate this but
236 was worth noting that as far as tonight’s conversation, when, if this actually ever
237 comes to fruition as far as an actual issue, what are the next steps that the people in
238 here should be aware of. There was talk about their needing to be connected with
239 regard to the person that alerted them to begin with, staying up to date with the
240 website, but in addition to that, these conversations go where and what do they need
241 to do next so the neighborhood can continue to provide their feedback.

242
243 Ms. Gundlach indicated the City does not have any official applications yet and staff
244 does not know if the developer will come to the City or not. The neighborhood can
245 always call staff to see if the City has received an application and staff will be happy
246 to have one on one conversations with people. The residents can also watch the
247 Planning Commission agendas posted online and then those who own property within
248 five hundred feet of these properties would receive an official invitation to a Planning
249 Commission public hearing if and when one is scheduled and they can share that
250 notice with their neighbors as well. If a meeting is scheduled, there will be an online
251 packet of materials that people can view from the website.

252
253 Chair Kimble thanked the public for coming and speaking to them. She indicated the
254 Commission does listen to what is said.

- 255
256 **b. From the Commission or Staff:** *Information about assorted business not already on*
257 *this agenda, including a brief update on the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update*
258 *process.*

259
260 Member Kruzal explained she is on the Four Parks Board and their Annual event
261 called Tapped and Uncorked is coming up on September 23, 2022 from 6:00 p.m. to
262 10:00 p.m. at the John Rose OVAL. There will be a bunch of foods trucks as well as
263 a band.

264
265 Chair Kimble vouched that this is a great event and raises money for Roseville parks.

266
267 **6. Other Business**

- 268
269 **a. Discuss Phase Two Zoning Code Amendments**
270 Community Development Direct Gundlach summarized the Phase Two Zoning
271 Code Amendments.

272
273 Ms. Rita Trapp, HKGi made a presentation to the Commission on the Shoreland
274 Ordinance.

275

276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322

Member McGehee asked if Ms. Trapp could explain a little bit on how HKGi decided on the twenty percent, and when they are doing this, she believed, all of the watershed districts who have holdings and a say in all parts of the City have a list of plants that are a part of the restoration of shoreland that they recommend. That list of plants and how that is done and often grants are available to homeowners to assist with the plant purchases.

Ms. Trapp explained the intent is that the homeowners will be in consult with staff when looking at these things because she did not think residents would have any idea what type of plants would be suitable to plant. Relative to the twenty feet or twenty percent HKGi was trying to come up with an amount that was an improvement to a situation. They were trying to balance those needs and figure it out.

Ms. Trapp continued with her presentation on the key changes to the Shoreland Ordinance.

Member McGehee indicated she did not understand the really stark differences between the PUD process the City goes through and any other process the City goes through. She explained there is a reason why they do not have many of these but if someone reads through the reasons why the City has PUD in the Code, the aspirational part, it seems like what they would always want in Roseville for redevelopment is a long list of improved environment, improved use of the land, less impervious surface, all these things but yet the City makes it ten times harder. A fee has to be paid in the beginning and the applicant has to go through the entire thing and one of the things she thought was missing in the whole process, since she has been on the Planning Commission, is not having that impervious surface in any of the permitted places but this PUD process now includes a second coming back with the color renderings of what it is going to look like, which is actually very nice and since Roseville is a fully developed suburb and talking about a large part of redevelopment and when she thinks of the group that was just speaking before this item and everything they asked for was visioning of that large lot of land. The other thing was the lack of how to be more specific. The City needs to clarify how these decisions are made, need to clarify what is going to be looked at to make these decisions. She asked if that clarification would appear when it comes back to the Commission because somebody is going to decide on the suitability of a piece of property for something but she wondered on what and what are the findings. She noted under 6.4.2 in the comment there is a very telling thing that states “to reduce confusion and ensure conflict between different codes created”. She thought that should be corrected to not ensure conflict. She indicated she was looking for some of that clarification and did not see it in her review of the information in the packet.

Ms. Gundlach indicated regarding the suitability part, that suitability language is in the current Shoreland Ordinance and will continue if the City moves to the Model Ordinance.

323 Mr. Jeff Miller, HKGi continued the presentation on Electric Vehicle Charging
324 Ordinance and Definitions.

325
326 Member McGehee asked if there was a check and balance system in place for
327 when a developer comes in with a cost that is too high the City has the ability to
328 verify their figures, just to be sure.

329
330 Chair Kimble asked how the figures could be verified.

331
332 Member McGehee was not sure but thought maybe a third party might be able to
333 do that.

334
335 Chair Kimble thought there were so many variables that she was not sure the City
336 could get a third party to verify that.

337
338 Member Bjorum did not know what the legal ramifications would be for that.

339
340 Member Schaffhausen thought technically the five percent also helps small
341 businesses because that was one of the things discussed earlier.

342
343 Mr. Paschke agreed and thought there would be ways for staff to challenge the
344 numbers if they did not think it is correct. He did not think there needed to be a
345 checks and balance in the Ordinance but if staff believes it may be too high they
346 could question and challenge the amount and work with the developer on it.

347
348 Chair Kimble thought developers wanted to do this because it was a way to attract
349 people to offices and is important.

350
351 Mr. Miller continued his presentation on EV Charging Ordinance and Definitions.

352
353 Member Pribyl explained there is nothing in the Accessibility Code that
354 specifically addresses EV charging. She thought it probably would in the next
355 cycle and the model codes, at least what she has heard so far, will not be required
356 to be at an assigned, required accessible parking stall but at least some of the EV
357 charging stations will be required to have access isle and appropriate reach range
358 so they are not tying up a designated accessible stall, as close to the building for
359 EV charging but providing that accessibility at some of the charging stations. She
360 thought it might be more appropriate to think about providing an access isle and
361 providing the reach ranges at one of the charging locations and they might also
362 want to reference that requirement or the State Accessibility Code, whichever is
363 more stringent because when that goes into effect that might impact this as well.

364
365 Chair Kimble thought that made sense.

366
367 Ms. Gundlach explained staff talked about this a little this morning and she
368 thought it might be appropriate to pull out the requirement under the handicapped
369 stall because her concerns all along have been that she did not want the State

370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416

Building Official to tell them that they are implementing a requirement that is more restrictive than the Building Code and the accessibility requirements are in the Building Code so if they have those on the accessibility stalls that could be a red flag. If and when the change comes into place where the Building Code will require those accessible stall to have it that would not be a concern. She noted staff can work on this.

Mr. Miller continued the presentation on Landscaping and Screening Ordinance.

Member Pribyl indicated she had a question on the landscaping that was not presented on the slide but was in the handout, in paragraph six regarding mixed use building or development, it states each use shall be calculated separately to determine minimum landscape requirements. She found this confusing because these are two different kinds of definitions and wondered if that meant they would add the requirement if they felt the mixed-use building of residential and commercial that there would be one canopy and one evergreen per two thousand plus what would be required for commercial or is it whichever is more restrictive.

Mr. Miller indicated that is not a change.

Mr. Lloyd explained it would be a pro-rated thing. If a certain amount of the building is commercial type uses and a certain amount of the building is residential type uses then the landscaping would be divided by that pro-rated amount.

Member Pribyl indicated these are defined differently now so there is one defined based on the open space and one that is defined based on the gross building area or the linear feet of site parameter.

Chair Kimble thought if there were vertical mixed use then it could get sticky and be excessive.

Mr. Paschke indicated that is what the variance process might be for and how it would be done now.

Member McGehee asked if it would be possible to put anything in this encouraging the use of draught tolerant native plants and also pollinators and the ability to reduce the amount of irrigation necessary.

Ms. Gundlach thought that was a component of the incentives conversation that will be next.

Mr. Miller reviewed the Sustainable Building Features through Incentives with the Commission.

Member McGehee indicated she liked the list but when she went through them they all seemed equivalent. She did not see a high and a low. She thought it

417 would be different depending on the kind of project proposed. She thought the
418 developer should be able to get points for doing any of the things on the list.

419
420 Member Pribyl explained it depends on what the City's goals are by doing these
421 things because some of these are much more rigorous and require a lot more
422 investment and time as well as costs than others so she would not say they are
423 equivalent.

424
425 Chair Kimble indicated that was going to be one of her questions and was not sure
426 if these all needed to be listed or make a statement but there are a lot of
427 companies that are starting to incorporate elements of lead but not get the
428 certification and her question was if the developer had to get the certification or a
429 percentage to qualify. She knew this was a start but this was one of the questions
430 she had because there are companies that are not getting certifications anymore
431 but are still making huge progress.

432
433 Ms. Gundlach stated that is the exact issue staff has been talking about. Staff
434 thinks the first one on the list is the crème de la crème and what the City would
435 look for and if achieved would get the most points available in order to unlock
436 some of the incentives. Some of the other ones, developments could pursue those
437 without doing the lead B3. Staff also talked about the fact that it is expensive to
438 go through the lead process and there is the ongoing monitoring and maintenance
439 to make sure that they are continuing to honor the requirements under lead. If the
440 City does not require it, the City does not have the expertise to be tracking that.
441 Once the building permit is issued it is not tracked and that is going to be a
442 challenge with this incentive's conversation in general. If the development does
443 not want to get the actual certifications they certainly could unlock some of these
444 other standards.

445
446 Member Schaffhausen indicated because of what was recently proposed with
447 regard to the number of EV Stations like it being one, she thought what they have
448 done is created an incentive so as demand increases the City is actually providing
449 an incentive so there would be no reason really to go in and increase the number
450 of expectation for EV charging stations, in her mind, technically. She thought if
451 there was a required number of one that fear to providing an incentive there would
452 not be a reason to actually increase the number of required. What that means is
453 the way it is listed now is actually ok.

454
455 Ms. Gundlach wanted to clarify that where it states ten percent/twenty percent,
456 they are exceeding the requirements for EV charging by ten percent and by
457 twenty percent. The development still has to meet the minimum requirement and
458 then if they went above and beyond by ten or twenty percent that could be an
459 opportunity to unlock an incentive.

460
461 Member Schaffhausen explained if thought about, if today, demand is not high
462 enough, an expense, as a result of that expense is also high. What the City is
463 saying if the development is willing to take that on the City will offset that cost in

464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510

some way based on this incentive. By keeping the number low, as far as the expectation, that actually helps with keeping that number at that one based on the requirement.

Member Bjorum thought that just because it says low does not mean that it is not going to get done even more often than something that is high because if this is a point system and if he cannot going to do B but he wanted to get incentives on these he is going to hammer every single one of the low ones. There would be more opportunity to get it done and some of these items are a little less expensive so easier to obtain points.

Ms. Gundlach explained Member Bjorum’s comments are exactly what staff was thinking of when ranking low, medium, and high. When this was initially done points were assigned to them but was pulled back on it because staff wanted this conversation to remain more conceptual but that is the exact reason why some of those environmental issues are ranked as lower points because they are easier and sometimes less expensive to incorporate into a project.

Member Pribyl indicated she was wondering on the pervious pavements if that is something the City Engineer weighed in on at all. When the Commission looked at that before it has been a real challenge for maintenance in Minnesota and usually used in very limited areas. If this is something that a high incentive is being created for but is something that is not going to maintained over the long term, that is something the City really wants to not promote.

Ms. Gundlach indicated they did include Public Works staff on this list. There is recognition that pervious pavements require maintenance in order to keep them pervious and that is going to be a challenge, just like maintaining lead certification is going to be a challenge. That goes back to the sort of covenant conversation where if the development unlocked an incentive doing pervious pavements the covenant is going to obligate them to do the maintenance on those pervious pavements to make sure they remain pervious over time.

Mr. Paschke explained how the City currently address it is typically with stormwater management and there are requirements and things recorded against the property that specify that they have to keep it pervious in perpetuity because they are getting credit for stormwater through both the Watershed Districts and through the City of Roseville. It is a convenient or some type of document that is recorded that they have to do that or if they remove it they will have to go in and do new stormwater management which may be an even higher standard because it is x years down the road.

Member Pribyl wondered if that would make more sense as a part of the non-traditional stormwater system as an option rather than being its own thing and being a high shot at points.

Ms. Gundlach indicated staff could certainly lump it into that category.

511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557

Member Pribyl also wondered under stormwater systems by retention area, raingarden if the City is requesting something different than what the Watershed Districts would require.

Mr. Paschke thought it was, perhaps, it was more for commercial development in areas that would not normally provide the City with the bioretention, rain garden thing. They would build an underground storm system which is how most everyone deals with it. What this is doing is trying to get the developer to think a little differently to have a little more green area and to provide filtration and other things versus just providing a system underground.

Ms. Gundlach continued the presentation on potential zoning incentives with the Commission.

Chair Kimble thought if someone is really committed to sustainability they ought to be able to get more than one incentive.

Ms. Gundlach agreed.

Chair Kimble also thought with keeping it outside of the Code there will be feedback by developers along the way that will be beneficial.

Ms. Gundlach explained the research done showed them that no one is doing this. Everybody is tying it to public finance assistance. Nobody is writing incentives into their code so if Roseville did this the City would sort of be a leader.

Member McGehee asked if the City is going to include public financing as one of the incentives because all there is now, is density and height or changing the exterior or something.

Ms. Gundlach explained public finance assistance is not really a zoning incentive. It should not be in the Zoning Code and the City is very limited on what it can actually provide public financing assistance for. What staff is talking about is the City does have a public finance assistance policy and staff is talking asking the EDA to revise that policy to say any projects that receive public finance assistance have to do x, y and z related to sustainability. She listed some examples.

Chair Kimble thought it was really an adjustment to the EDA's requirements for public financing versus a public financing impact on this.

Ms. Gundlach indicated that was correct.

Member Pribyl thought the only thing she did not see on the list is related to production of water usage other than stormwater reuse. Really low use plumbing fixtures or very highly efficient irrigation, things like that for the other chart.

558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583

Ms. Gundlach indicated she would make note of that.

The Commission discussed other possible incentives and bonuses to be included in the Ordinance.

Chair Kimble indicated she liked staff's idea of just taking a look at what would happen if staff just probed a little deeper on the density bonuses to the underlying zoning.

Ms. Gundlach explained staff could do that. She reviewed the next steps with the Commission.

Chair Kimble thanked the consultants and staff for the presentation.

7. Adjourn

MOTION

Member Pribyl, seconded by Member Schaffhausen, to adjourn the meeting at 8:50 p.m.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.