



**Variance Board Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Minutes – Wednesday, March 3, 2021 – 5:30 p.m.**

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

1. Call to Order

Chair Pribyl called to order the regular meeting of the Variance Board meeting at approximately 5:30 p.m. and reviewed the role and purpose of the Variance Board.

2. Roll Call & Introductions

At the request of Chair Pribyl, City Planner Thomas Paschke called the Roll.

Members Present: Chair Michelle Pribyl; Vice Chair Michelle Kruzel; and Alternate Member Karen Schaffhausen.

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: City Planner Thomas Paschke, Community Development Director Janice Gundlach and Community Development Department Assistant Staci Johnson.

3. Approval of Agenda

MOTION

Member Kruzel moved, seconded by Member Schaffhausen to approve the agenda as presented.

Ayes: 3

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Review of Minutes: December 2, 2020

MOTION

Member Kruzel moved, seconded by Member Pribyl to approve the December 2, 2020 meeting minutes.

Ayes: 2 (Pribyl, Kruzel)

Nays: 0

Abstain: 1 (Schaffhausen)

Motion carried.

5. Public Hearing

Chair Pribyl reviewed protocol for Public Hearings and public comment and opened the Public Hearing at approximately 5:36 p.m.

a. PLANNING FILE 21-002

b. Consider a Variance to Allow a Reduction in the Number of Required Trees and Shrubs to be Planted on the Twin Lakes Senior Residential Project Site at 2730 Herschel Street.

City Planner Thomas Paschke reviewed the variance request for this property, as detailed in the staff report dated March 3, 2021.

Member Schaffhausen wondered where the balance is when talking about creating some semblance of the fact that there are lots and everyone agrees on how the developer has done a great job on the landscaping and in addition to that with the zoning, thinking about it, and the fact that there are studies done and research done within urban areas where green space has reduced tension, provide all sorts of fun things such as tiny forests popping up as a part of zoning capacity. She asked where the City draws the line and is an open question because this project cannot meet that because the developer has scoped the building which opens this up to every builder can state it cannot be done and is the way the development will be built. She indicated that mean the City is changing its standards all of the time because the builder wants to maximize their revenue on the site so where is the balance for that because she could imagine that happening most times.

Mr. Paschke indicated from his perspective, the Code probably was ill-designed in the beginning so the balance might not be trees and shrubs because a site can only hold so many, no matter how it is developed. In the report, housing is being hamstrung by the Code in requiring far more trees and shrubs than a commercial development. He did not know if there was a balance as it relates to the project and what the City is trying to do. He thought the goal of any project is to get as much green space as possible, which by Code is 15% of a development site, at least as it relates to the Community Mixed Use District, which this is in. Number one is getting ample green space. The next is to provide within that green space the appropriate landscaping. Appropriate is not necessarily a number grabbed out of the sky, created in a Code. It is really more having to do with landscape standard and how trees are planted and the space in between evergreen and canopy and ornamental trees and certain shrubs. It is also how one might design that and then attempt to maximize it as best as possible. All of the residential properties that have required variances for these two sections of the Code, which are up to four now if this variance is approved, have maximized that space required to provide greenspace with the most trees and shrubs as possible before problems might occur as that landscaping continues to grow to maturity and beyond. He thought the real balance is to at least try to better understand what a more appropriate code standard for trees and shrubs with respect to multi-family is residential.

Member Schaffhausen asked how many times an adjustment can be made on this variance.

Mr. Paschke indicated the Code was created in 2010 and up until last year there never was a requirement to reveal project and require the trees and shrubs per the Code so until then this was not an issue. The City never ran into the problem until 2020 when the City started to do multi-family residential projects.

Member Schaffhausen asked if this project met the 15% green space requirement.

Mr. Paschke indicated it did. He believed there was more than 15% between the two sites combined.

Member Kruzel asked if there is a certain buffer layout with less trees.

Mr. Paschke indicated the applicant or landscape architect, if at the meeting, would be better able to answer the question.

Chair Pribyl invited the applicant to speak to the Commission.

Mr. Brady Halverson, landscape architect for the project, addressed the Commission. He indicated the trees and shrubs are spaced out to provide screening around them.

Chair Pribyl offered an opportunity for public comment with no one coming forward.

Chair Pribyl closed the public hearing at 5:53 p.m.

MOTION

Member Kruzel moved, seconded by Member Schaffhausen, adoption of Variance Board Resolution No. 154 (Attachment F), entitled “A Resolution Approving a Variance to Roseville City Code §1011.03.A.3.e.ii, Pertaining to Multi-Family Tree Installation Requirements and §1011.03.A.3.e.v Pertaining to Shrub Installation for Twin Lakes Senior.”

Ayes: 3

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

6. Adjourn

MOTION

Member Kruzel, seconded by Member Schaffhausen, to adjourn the meeting at 5:57 p.m.

Ayes: 3

Nays: 0

Motion carried.