



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Draft Minutes – Wednesday, April 4, 2018 – 6:30 p.m.**

1. Call to Order

Chair Murphy called to order the regular meeting of the Planning Commission meeting at approximately 6:30 p.m. and reviewed the role and purpose of the Planning Commission.

2. Roll Call

At the request of Chair Murphy, Community Development Director Collins called the Roll.

Members Present: Chair Robert Murphy; Vice-Chair Bull; and Commissioners James Daire, Chuck Gitzen, Wayne Groff, and Peter Sparby

Members Absent: Commissioner Julie Kimble

Staff/Consultants Present: Community Development Director Kari Collins, and Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd; Erin Perdu, WSB Consultant

3. Approve Agenda

MOTION

Chair Murphy moved, seconded by Member Bull to have item 6(b) come before 6(a).

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

Member Daire inquired how they will be discussing item No. 7. He noted item Nos. 7(g), 7(h), 7(j), 7(k), and 7(l) are handled by other agencies. He suggested they adopt these items first and then discuss the remaining items.

Chair Murphy proposed they discuss the 2040 Comprehensive Plan as a whole and then address each chapter separately for public comment before commissioner deliberations. He noted each chapter can be downloaded separately.

MOTION

Member Sparby, seconded by Member Gitzen to approve the agenda as amended.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Organizational Business

a. Swear-In New Commissioner, Wayne Groff

Chair Murphy administered the Oath of Office to Commissioner Groff.

b. Elect Planning Commission Chair and Vice-Chair

MOTION

Member Daire moved, seconded by Member Gitzen to recommend to the City Council that Chair Murphy continue to serve as Chair.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

MOTION

Chair Murphy moved, seconded by Member Sparby to recommend to the City Council that Vice-Chair Bull continue to serve as Vice-Chair.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

c. Appoint Variance Board Members

Chair Murphy noted that Member Kimble expressed interest via email in continuing to serve on the Variance Board. Members Gitzen and Daire, along with Member Sparby as an alternate, also expressed interest in continuing to serve on the Variance Board.

MOTION

Chair Murphy moved, seconded by Member Groff to appoint Members Daire, Gitzen and Kimble, with alternate Member Sparby, to serve on the Variance Board effective May of 2018, pending ratification by the City Council.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

d. Appoint Ethics Commission Representative

Member Bull expressed interest in continuing to serve in this role. He stated the Ethics Commission met one time last year.

MOTION

Chair Murphy moved, seconded by Member Sparby to designate Member Bull to serve as the Planning Commission representative to the Ethics Commission.

Ayes: 6
Nays: 0
Motion carried.

5. Review of Minutes

a. February 28, 2018 Comprehensive Plan Update Meeting Minutes

MOTION

Member Sparby moved, seconded by Member Gitzen to approve the February 28, 2018 Comprehensive Plan Update meeting minutes.

Ayes: 5
Nays: 0
Abstain: 1 (Groff)
Motion carried.

b. March 7, 2018 Regular Meeting Minutes

MOTION

Member Sparby moved, seconded by Member Bull to approve the March 7, 2018 Regular meeting minutes.

Ayes: 5
Nays: 0
Abstain: 1 (Groff)
Motion carried.

6. Communications and Recognitions:

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.*

Member Bull reminded the Commission of the required Ethics Training that will take place on April 11 at 6:30 p.m. The New Commissioner Training will take place on the same day at 5:30 p.m.

Chair Murphy inquired what the next steps were for the Rice Street/Larpenteur Avenue Gateway visioning project as it relates to the City of Roseville.

Ms. Collins responded St. Paul, Maplewood, and Roseville have had a lot of good discussion about the best way to incorporate the Visioning Plan of this area into the Comprehensive Plan. These are two distinct documents and the Visioning Plan is referenced in the Economic Development Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan. The Visioning Plan is meant to grow and evolve as policies and priorities shift with the

three communities and the Comprehensive Plan is a firm document. It is meant to complement the Comprehensive Plan and is available for people to refer to it.

Chair Murphy noted he read in the paper that staff recommended including the visioning document into the 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Collins explained there may be different interpretations of what incorporate means. The visioning document is mentioned in various chapters throughout the Comprehensive Plan and it will be included as an appendix item. They anticipate having a celebratory event in May where people can come and review the Comprehensive Plan, discuss potential projects, and brainstorm funding opportunities.

Chair Murphy stated he looked at the Gateway Plan on the Ramsey County website and compared it with the City's 2040 Comprehensive Plan. He did not find any short or long-term recommendations in the Gateway Plan that were not congruent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Collins noted that was the intent. There is nothing in the short and long-term recommendations that conflicts with the goals and policies of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map.

Member Daire noted there are three study areas identified in the Comprehensive Plan and he assumes it will look like the Rice/Larpenteur Visioning Plan. He inquired what status these smaller area plans have.

Ms. Collins responded these study areas are called out through the land use section of the Comprehensive Plan. It is almost as if Rice Larpenteur is identified as a priority area and the visioning plan drills down onto that corridor. Then there is another underlying visioning plan that looks at municipal borders and considers the corridor as a whole.

Member Daire summarized it is a finer grained assessment of a particular area with an idea for applying specific tools.

Member Bull inquired if Roseville will have any involvement in the Rice/694 redevelopment and redesign.

Ms. Collins responded she is unsure. However, with the current Rice Street project and traffic study, the County has done a significant amount of outreach.

Chair Murphy inquired how the comments on the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update will be passed along to the City Council.

Ms. Collins responded they will receive public input tonight at the public hearing and until it is adopted. They will package up all the feedback and minutes from this meeting and give them to the City Council. At the April 16 City Council meeting they

will look at the feedback from this meeting and receive additional feedback. In May, the City Council will make the recommendation to adopt the draft 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Murphy noted the plan will receive final approval in November or December 2018 after it has been reviewed by surrounding communities.

Member Daire inquired if the comments received from surrounding communities will be incorporated into the draft 2040 Comprehensive Plan and then presented to the City Council for final adoption.

Erin Perdu, WSB consultant, stated the feedback received from adjacent municipalities is advisory. It will be brought back to the City for consideration and it is up to them if they want to amend the Comprehensive Plan. The comments from the Metropolitan Council will need to be considered more seriously and some of them may be required changes.

Member Daire inquired if a negotiation between cities or a decision by the Metropolitan Council would preside in the instance of incompatible land uses with a neighboring municipality.

Ms. Collins responded it would be up to the Planning Division to look at the boundaries and make sure there is not a proposed project that could have a negative impact. She has already received plans from other municipalities that staff will review. The City shares borders with 13 municipalities.

Chair Murphy requested staff provide the Commission with an updated set of land use and zoning maps.

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

Janna King complimented the Planning Commission on the Comprehensive Plan. She noted the Land Use and Economic Development Chapters were very well done and encouraged the Commission to do small area plans over time.

Member Daire inquired if Ms. King had a particular study area in mind.

Ms. King responded HarMar presents tremendous opportunities and putting bridges over County Road B2 is a good idea. She was glad to see that Brixmor was not interested in residential on the Lexington/Larpenteur site. Edina is on their third year of a 50-year vision for Southdale and she suggested they look at what they are doing.

7. Public Hearing: Request by the City of Roseville to Approve the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update (PROJ-0037)

Chair Murphy opened the public hearing for PROJ-0037 at approximately 7:05 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing.

Member Daire requested clarification on if they are approving the draft 2040 Comprehensive Plan update or the actual 2040 Comprehensive Plan update.

Senior Planner Lloyd explained they are making a recommendation regarding the draft 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Perdu reported on the following changes made to the draft 2040 Comprehensive Plan since the meeting on February 28 and review by the City Council on March 19:

Changes Made for Readability

- Color blocks incorporated at the top of each chapter.
- Aligned bullets with text columns.
- New color palette for all charts and graphs.
- Removed unnecessary color from all tables.
- Reformatted housing matrix.

Member Bull noted the reformatting creates very wide left and right margins and this results in more pages.

Ms. Perdu responded the margins are considered mirror margins. If a person were to open it up in a binder and it is printed double sided, the widest margin is where the binding would be. The wider margins are also intended to make it easier on the eyes. This was also discussed at the City Council and they recommended to leave it as is. Formatting changes can be made depending on how they want it to look.

Structural Changes

- Scrubbed the document for repetitive language.
- Included a mini “table of contents” in each chapter.
- Goals and Strategies in same format/structure in each chapter.

Equity

- Revised language to broaden discussion of equity.
- Included a new icon to call out goals and strategies.

Member Daire referred to Chapter 1, page 5, first paragraph, second to last sentence. He inquired if the sentence should be changed to, “This image represents the “equity” approach.”

Chair Murphy suggested they handle these types of changes in a detailed email to Mr. Lloyd.

Member Sparby inquired if the inclusion of the icon originated in the discussion with the City Council.

Ms. Perdu responded she had suggested it to the City Council and there was consensus for this approach.

Member Gitzen suggested they decrease the size of the icon.

Member Sparby stated the use of an icon makes it feel gimmicky and he wants to keep it as clean and readable as possible.

Chair Murphy stated the idea was proposed as a way to string things together throughout the document. The document the City Council sees will have this icon incorporated into it and it can always be pulled out.

Ms. Collins commented every chapter may need some additional equity planning. It was important for the City Council to acknowledge where other equity language can be found throughout the document. If it is found to be too distracting, it can be removed.

Member Sparby noted if someone wants to see where all the equity themes are, they will have to page through the entire document.

Member Bull commented it is helpful to have a single icon that is highlighting a key point through the document. A person could do a word search on the word “equity” to find out all the references to it in the document.

Chair Murphy suggested they use a searchable icon.

Public Engagement and What We Heard Changes

- Expanded discussion in Chapter 2 to explain the public engagement methodology.
- Shortened “What We Heard” section in each chapter.

Other Changes

- Chapter 3: historic census data and local Dakota community information was added.
- Housing: additional language added about single family housing stock and existing affordability.
- Economic Development: expanded discussion on workforce development programs.
- Transportation: additional strategies were added related to East/West transit and railroad quiet zones.
- Parks: additional editing redlines from the Parks director.

Member Gitzen referred to Chapter 2, page 9. He stated the goals are in bold and the objectives are under it. However, in the other chapters, the objectives are called goals. He inquired why they did not just keep them as objectives and strategies. In Chapter 4, page 25, the objectives are called goals.

Regular Planning Commission Meeting

Minutes – Wednesday, April 4, 2018

Page 8

Ms. Perdu explained Chapter 2 included very general, overall goals for the City. She suggested they just refer to them as Goals in Chapter 2.

Member Gitzen referred to Chapter 4, page 25 and suggested they change the phrase “citywide objectives” to “citywide goals” for consistency.

Ms. Perdu noted she will make this change.

Member Bull stated all the goals are referred to in present tense and a goal should be future tense.

Ms. Perdu noted she has seen them written both ways and it is up to the Commission how it is to be written.

Mr. Lloyd noted the goals are from Imagine Roseville 2025.

Member Bull suggested it be written as an action they will carry forward to the future.

As an example, Member Gitzen referred to the first goal in Chapter 2, page 9, and suggested it be changed to, “Roseville will continue to be a welcoming community...”

Chair Murphy and Member Gitzen agreed it would be fine to leave it as is in present tense.

Member Sparby commented there was discussion on the goals of the Comprehensive Plan and Imagine Roseville. He inquired how to distinguish between them since they are separate documents.

Ms. Collins responded the confusion was between the Imagine Roseville visioning effort that took place prior the previous Comprehensive Plan update and the more recent Imagine Roseville workshop series that has been going on over the last year. Referencing both of these may cause confusion due to their similar name. It was concluded that the more recent workshop series should be taken out.

Member Sparby commented it is best to keep this document clean and remove references to the old Imagine Roseville project. He agreed to provide more specifics via email to Mr. Lloyd.

Chair Murphy recalled the recent workshop effort was never launched from the City Council, but the visioning process was.

Member Gitzen inquired if there was a place for people to access the referenced documents.

Ms. Perdu noted the appendix has not been incorporated into the document yet and she will provide a list of them. These will also be put on the website and will include the

results of all the public engagement, the Gateway Vision Plan, and detailed Surface Water Plan, Water Supply Plan, and Sanitary Sewer Plan. Others can be added as well.

Chair Murphy suggested the include electronic links on the City's website.

Ms. Collins noted most people will be viewing the Comprehensive Plan online and the links will be included in the margins of the document.

Member Sparby stated people are not going to read all the appendices of the document and it can be confusing.

Mr. Lloyd explained the Imagine Roseville 2025 was a yearlong intensive community visioning effort and resulted in an updated Comprehensive Plan. The purpose of this current update is an update to the planning that was done a decade ago. All of the goal statements in Chapter 2 come from the Roseville 2025 visioning effort and remains a fundamental part of the current plan.

Member Daire referred to Chapter 9, Resilience. They refer to greenhouse gas emissions of 2005 and use it as a benchmark. He suggested they include a reference to this benchmark in a footnote in order to have measurables and the ability to chart accomplishment toward that goal.

Public Comment

Chair Murphy closed the public hearing at 7:43 p.m.; none spoke for or against.

Commission Deliberation

Member Gitzen thanked Ms. Perdu and Mr. Lloyd for their work and he supports moving the document forward to the City Council.

MOTION

Member Bull moved, seconded by Member Gitzen to recommend to the City Council approval of the proposed 2040 Comprehensive Plan update, based on the information in the report, the input offered at the public hearing, and the Planning Commission's review of the updated comprehensive plan.

Member Bull noted there was nothing in the updates from the City Council that he objected to. There are some opportunities for minor wording changes that can be addressed, but it is a well put together document.

Member Gitzen agreed with Member Bull. This has been discussed thoroughly and the plan is readable.

Mr. Lloyd requested the Commission provide any additional comments or corrections to him by Monday, April 9. He reminded them they do have until the end of 2018 to submit revisions before it is officially adopted.

Member Groff noted he is new to the Commission and did not participate with them in these discussions. However, as a member of the Roseville community, he has followed the changes that were made. The document has been considerably improved and he supports the document.

Member Sparby commented he has been very impressed with the Commission and staff during this process. He noted that Chapter 1 can still use work with clarity on what the goals and objectives are of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

Member Daire referred to previous discussion on equity. He commented he heard from a colleague in Minneapolis who is going through a comprehensive plan process and found similar language that he referred to as “needlessly inflammatory.”

Chair Murphy referred to a memo they received dated April 4, 2018 from Mr. Ken Erickson and noted it will be incorporated into their public comments. He thanked staff for their work and fellow Commissioners for their attention to detail. He requested a roll call vote.

Ayes: 6
Nays: 0
Motion carried.

Member Bull acknowledged Ms. Perdu for her patience in working with them.

Ms. Perdu commented she appreciated the spirited debate and input they provided on all the chapters. It resulted in a robust document.

Ms. Collins noted the Planning Commission is welcome to attend the City Council work session on this item on April 16.

8. Adjourn

MOTION

Member Daire moved, seconded by Member Sparby to adjourn the meeting at 7:58 p.m.

Mr. Lloyd noted the next Planning Commission meeting will take place on May 2, 2018.

Ayes: 6
Nays: 0
Motion carried.