



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Minutes – Wednesday, May 1, 2019 – 6:30 p.m.**

1. Call to Order

Chair Bull 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 Bull, City Planner Thomas Paschke called the Roll.

Members Present: Chair James Bull; Vice Chair Chuck Gitzen, and Commissioners, James Daire, Chuck Gitzen, Julie Kimble, Michelle Kruzell, Michelle Pribyl, and Peter Sparby

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: City Planner Thomas Paschke, City Attorney Mark Gaughan, Community Development Director Janice Gundlach and Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd

3. Approve Agenda

MOTION

Member Gitzen moved, seconded by Member Daire, to approve the agenda as presented.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Review of Minutes

a. April 3, 2019 Planning Commission Regular Meeting

Commissioner Pribyl stated on line 162, she believed “Wausau” should be “Owasso”.

Chair Bull noted the word “Wausau” should be changed on line 102 as well. Line 59 should be changed from “Varian” to “Variance”.

MOTION

Member Daire moved, seconded by Member Pribyl, to approve the April 3, 2019 meeting minutes.

Ayes: 7

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.*

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.*

City Planner Thomas Paschke stated the Joint Planning Commission meeting with the City Council is slated for July 22, 2019.

6. Public Hearing

- a. Consideration of an Interim Use Pursuant to Section 1009 of the City Code to Allow Outdoor Storage of Semi-Trailers, Small Utility Trailers and Dumpsters at 2211 County Road C2 (PF19-002)**

Chair Bull opened the public hearing for PF19-002 at approximately 6:39 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing.

City Planner Paschke summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated May 1, 2019.

Vice Chair Gitzen asked if the dumpsters would be empty that would be stored on the property.

Mr. Paschke stated that the dumpster would be empty.

Vice Chair Gitzen asked if there was any requirement that dumpsters be on hard surfaces.

Mr. Paschke thought that one of the main reasons why staff is not requiring it to be improved from a dirt surface is because it is an interim use and is a short-term storage of items. He noted even the trailers would have to be on a paved surface so staff would not traditionally require improvements to be done. If it becomes a permanent type of storage and tied to a motor freight terminal or something else, then paving of the surface would be required.

Vice Chair Gitzen stated in condition two where it states, “trailers shall be parked”, he wondered if that should say “trailers and dumpsters”.

Mr. Paschke thought it was covered under condition one but could be added to condition two.

Member Pribyl stated one of the neighbors that commented on the Interim Use, her email suggested five years, but it looks like recommendation is for a three-year Interim Use.

Mr. Paschke stated that was correct. He stated Interim Use can range from a year upwards of five years and in this case the applicant is looking to extend an additional three years. The previous one was three years.

Member Pribyl stated Interim Use aside, if this was a permanent use would any screening be required from the street given the business use across the street or is there no screening required.

Mr. Paschke stated he did not believe screening would be required given the zoning within the area.

Member Kimble stated it looks like on page three there were two instances of non-compliance. One has to do with fencing and the other has to do with the remaining fuel canopy and she wondered if there was non-compliance, why are those items not on the list of new conditions.

Mr. Paschke stated those are permitted use items so are not part of the Interim Use and have been extrapolated out because those sites are permitted under the Code and are not appropriate for them to be included in this Interim Use. Mr. Paschke noted those items were included in the original Interim Use. Back when those were established the Community Development Director at that time wanted the whole site to be included in the Interim Use.

Public Comment

No one came forward to speak for or against this request.

Chair Bull closed the public hearing at 6:40 p.m.

Commission Deliberation

Member Kimble stated she drove by the site and looked at it and was okay with supporting the Interim Use for three more years.

Member Sparby indicated he was also in support of continuing the Interim Use for an additional three years and thought it made sense for the locality and the restrictions the City is putting on it.

Chair Bull asked if the Commission was okay with the dumpster and small storage trailer additions.

Member Sparby indicated he was in support of that as well.

Chair Bull stated he would like to add to the condition that the dumpsters will be empty in the lot.

Member Kruzel indicated she was in favor of the extension as well after driving by the location.

Member Pribyl stated she was in favor as well with the caveat that in three years if there is another request for an extension, she would like to have the City consider a condition for some type of screening of the area with the dumpsters.

MOTION

Member Kruzel moved, seconded by Member Daire, to recommend to the City Council approval of a three-year Interim Use to allow outdoor storage of semi-trailers, small utility trailers, and empty dumpsters, at 2211 County Road C2, subject to the following conditions of (PF19-002):

- 1. Trailer and dumpster storage and staging shall be implemented consistent with the submitted plan dated 4/23/19.**
- 2. Trailers shall be parked/stored along the periphery of the property and there shall be a minimum 10-foot setback from the west, north, and east property line.**
- 3. All trailers must have a minimum 5-foot separation between each trailer.**
- 4. The center area shall remain free of trailers or dumpsters and be used as the access and fire lane.**
- 5. Shipping containers, cabs, or other storage is not permitted.**
- 6. No hazardous or dangerous materials shall be stored in the trailers. No materials that are likely to attract vermin or other pests shall be stored in the trailers.**
- 7. All trailers shall be locked and secured.**
- 8. The site shall be allowed up to three small contractor utility trailers.**
- 9. The site shall be allowed up to 12 dumpsters ranging in size from 3 to 40 yards.**

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

b. Consideration of Conditional Use Pursuant to Table 1006-1 and Section 1009 of the City Code to Allow a Motor Freight Terminal at 2340 Rose Place (PF19-006)

Chair Bull opened the public hearing for PF19-002 at approximately 6:55 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing.

City Planner Paschke summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated May 1, 2019.

Member Sparby asked how many other motor freight terminals there are in Roseville.

Mr. Paschke thought there were maybe six.

Member Sparby asked if there have been any issues with non-compliance with the conditions the City has set on those.

Mr. Paschke stated some of them are pre-existing non-conforming and operate much differently than those that have received approval. It was not until last year that Motor Freight Terminal was put into the Industrial District as an actual line item use and then as a Conditional Use. He noted the City has not had any new motor freight terminals since Koch Trucking came in 2018.

Member Pribyl asked if it was in the Planning Commission's purview to suggest a solution to the 10-foot setback requirement.

Mr. Paschke thought it was up to the applicant to come up with a solution. He thought the key was there are standard setbacks that need to be achieved with respect to the pavement and parking area for storage and the condition for parking of trailers. The applicant needs to devise a way in order to achieve that, so the applicant is not running in non-compliance with that.

Member Pribyl stated her concern with use is that the impervious area is now pretty close to the maximum and significantly more than what it used to be. If the applicant can do the setback with greenspace versus pavement and jersey barriers, she thought that would be a better solution.

Public Comment

Steven Aanenson, 3314 Owasso Heights Road, Shoreview

Mr. Aanenson stated he is CEO of Old Dutch Foods and as the owner of the adjacent property had some concerns. He stated his company, at one time, rented the property from Brenntag, the chemical distribution company that owned the property and his company was in negotiations to buy it from them but there was significant pollution in the soil from the chemicals that had spilled over the years and there were wells that were used to aerate the soil to pull the chemicals out of the soil. He wondered if that has been cleared by the EPA or is that remediation going to continue and if so, if the soil is being paved over, how is that going to happen.

Mr. Aanenson stated the other concerns he had is how many trucks per day are going to be traveling in and out of that site. It is on the end of a cul-de-sac where the driveway next to is located on Rose Place and could significantly cause an issue for them going in and out with semi-trailers.

Mr. Aanenson stated he was also concerned with the activity that will be taking place and if it will be a cross docking location or just a storage operation and what kind of a building will be built onsite, if any. He stated as long there are no issues with his concerns, he did not have any opposition to the project going forward.

Chair Bull stated there is a plan for a building and the building will house accounting and their headquarters personnel and meeting the City Code Standards.

Mr. Paschke stated as it relates to the building, it is to be used for some small warehousing and will have a service area for their trucks with a two-story office in the front area. As it relates to the number of trucks, the applicant refers to thirty to forty yard moves a day. It will not be used as a cross dock facility. Product will be brought in and most of these are multi-modal type of vehicles. He stated there will be some storage on site. He stated in regard to environmental he believed he saw a letter from the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) regarding that, but he did not have the specifics of that. He stated the key to that issue is the applicant will have to make sure the site is cleaned up to the level that it needs to for the type of development being done. He thought that might have been a part of the applicant's demolition permit, but he did not have specifics.

Mr. Aanenson asked if the spur line will continue to be used.

Mr. Paschke stated the applicant will not be using the spur line, the storage containers will be trucked in from the facility off of Snelling and Energy Park Drive. There are other sites the applicant will be bringing the containers from and staging them to do their delivery.

Margaret Schmidt, 2995 Northview Street

Ms. Schmidt stated the previous gentleman mentioned the site is hazardous and she was not sure why that information would not be a part of the packet and be considered before a decision is made. She was surprised that is not a part of the City Planning Commission

Chair Bull stated Mr. Paschke explained that the site, in order to be developed, would have to meet the MPCA standards for any new development so it would be addressed as a part of the planning process going forward. He stated as the Commission looks at Conditional Use Permits, that is one step in approving it and as property is developed then the various organizations within the City are involved with the engineering standards for that.

Ms. Schmidt asked if the provisional is approved without that and then the City goes into the MPCA work.

Mr. Paschke stated under the applicant's demolition permit that is reviewed by staff and with the understanding that if a site is contaminated the appropriate agencies are contacted, whether by the City or by the applicant or property owner. The applicant has to go through a process with the MPCA in order to clean the property up to the appropriate standard for the applicant to develop on. He stated that is a separate and distinct process outside of what the Planning Commission is doing, which is the Conditional Use process to support or permit the use of the property as a motor freight terminal. The applicant could develop the property as a permitted use with

something other than a motor freight terminal and the City would not necessarily know of contaminants or that type of things unless the City received information from the MPCA or had advanced understanding of those types of chemicals being onsite. He noted the City does not get involved in the requirements of the MPCA.

Ms. Schmidt asked if there is no rule in the Committee that the applicant for the item has to be at the meeting.

Chair Bull did not think there was a rule that the applicant had to come to the meeting to speak in regard to the application.

Ms. Schmidt thought that was odd and felt it should maybe be added to the rules.

As no one else wished to address the Commission, Chair Bull closed the public hearing at 7:15 p.m.

Commission Deliberation

Member Kimble stated she was in complete agreement with the last speaker and thought the applicant should show up at the meeting to talk about their request unless there was a hardship. She did not know what the City needed to do to enforce that, but she thought it was important. She stated she did not have any questions and would generally be in support of this item.

Chair Bull asked if there was anything in the City Policy about applicants appearing.

Mr. Paschke indicated there was not anything that he was aware of requiring the applicant to be at the meeting. He thought it was strongly encouraged that the applicants are, and it was his understanding that both applicants were going to be represented at tonight's meeting.

Member Sparby stated he would support this as a motor freight terminal and thought the staff report made sense and meets the conditions.

MOTION

Member Sparby moved, seconded by Member Kimble, to recommend to the City Council approval of the requested CU for a motor freight terminal at 2340 Rose Place pursuant to §1009.02.C and §1009.02.D.37 of the City Code, subject to the following conditions for (PF19-006):

- 1. All tractors, trailered containers, and trailers storage/parking must be located behind the building and a minimum of 10 feet from all property lines. To satisfy this requirement, a site-specific striping plan must be submitted for review and approved by the Planning Division.**
- 2. All building and site improvements shall meet the requirements of the Zoning Code, specifically §1006.02 and 1006.05.**

3. **All tractors, trailered containers, and/or trailers that are being worked upon shall be located/stored at the rear (west) of the site nearest the shop building.**
4. **The applicant must submit a plan that details where licensed and unlicensed trailers will be stored and acknowledge that no greater than 20% of the trailers will be unlicensed. The site must be inspected at least once a year for compliance with the plan and if found to be non-compliant, measures shall be taken to comply.**

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

- c. **Request for Approval to Rezone Property from Low Density Residential-1 (LDR-1) to Low Density Residential-2 (LDR-2) and Approval of the 6-Lot Midland Legacy Estate Preliminary Plat for Development of 6 Twinhome Dwelling Units Including an Outlot that May Lead to 2 Additional Twinhome Lots in a Future Plat (PF19-003)**

Chair Bull opened the public hearing for PF19-003 at approximately 7:15 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing.

Senior Planner Lloyd summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated May 1, 2019.

Member Sparby asked if the conditions being proposed be handled during the platting process. He wondered why these conditions were being inserted during the rezoning process.

Mr. Lloyd stated the application is for rezoning and platting. The conditions are related to the plat element of the application. He noted some of the conditions will not be taken care of until the Final Plat.

Member Sparby stated he was curious because there was some LDR-2 on County Road B as well, the Stonecrest Townhomes, and he wondered if there was any comparison in terms of how these homes will fit into a similar LDR-2 in the area because it is mainly LDR-1 in that area.

Mr. Lloyd stated it is mainly LDR-1 in the area with one LDR-2 development in the middle of LDR-1 but it is larger and organized inside an interior street. Aside from that the high-density property adjacent to the site on the end, it really is just a single-family neighborhood. He was not sure what sort of consideration Member Sparby was inquiring about. The amount of traffic that is expected from half a dozen new homes is not going to add an appreciable amount to County Road B. There are not those kinds of externality considerations that staff has given any real attention to.

Member Sparby recalled the City received some other applications to subdivide in this area because there are some larger lots and he was giving some consideration to what is in the area and juxtaposing the LDR-2 with what has been added.

Member Kimble stated for confirmation when staff talked about Comp. Plan Guidance, was staff talking about the 2040 draft Comp. Plan or the 2030 Plan.

Mr. Lloyd stated because the 2040 Comp. Plan update is still a work in progress, the actual effective Comprehensive Plan is the 2030 Comp. Plan. Although having said that the guidance of both of them is the same.

Member Kimble thought the vacation of easement will happen, but should it not happen for some reason, would this developer still go forward with the first six.

Mr. Lloyd stated the developer has the ability to wait for the whole thing until the easement vacation question has been answered but it is not a given but there is reason enough to go forward as it is. He was not sure if the overall development might be shelved if the last couple of lots are not available through that vacation process and the replatting of Outlot A but there is certainly advantage enough to continue forward with platting and moving forward in that regard. If the easement itself is not vacated, it does not compromise the proposed development of the six lots because the entire easement on the outlot, which is not a development lot.

Member Kimble stated as a point of clarification, if the Planning Commission were to recommend approval of the rezoning but not recommend approval of the Preliminary Plat, in fact with the zoning, there could be more density on that site then the size.

Mr. Lloyd indicated that was conceivable. The LDR-2 District itself allows up to eight units per acre. This site would be pretty close to an acre in size, maybe more, and there would be eight units on it if everything came together in the way that the developer is hoping. Nominally it could a little denser but that will depend on exactly how it is developed to meet lot size requirements or setback requirements and so forth.

Member Daire asked if the possible eight units would include the two units that are potential in the outlot.

Mr. Lloyd stated the allowed density in the LDR-2 District is up to eight units per acre with any one-acre site that means, at least nominally, it could be developed with that number of units. He did not believe there was any way to get more than the six units being proposed in the Preliminary Plat.

Vice Chair Gitzen stated the plan is showing two-and-a-half-foot side yard easement and he wondered if that met the City Code.

Mr. Lloyd stated in the LDR-2 District easements and setbacks are a different beast. The easements that are there are probably not necessary because the easements will

not be functioning drainage areas with the storm water management plan. Within a development like this there is not a side setback requirement.

Vice Chair Gitzen asked if the 70 by 90 piece will need to potentially come in for rezoning also added to a new plat.

Mr. Lloyd stated it depends and is unclear to him what the regulatory regime is for property that has been under the right-of-way. He supposed the real answer might depend on what it was zoned or guided before the easement was granted.

Vice Chair Gitzen asked if the City would need to approve a split for that parcel.

Mr. Lloyd stated it could be achieved through a couple of different ways. He reviewed some of the different types of approvals. He noted he did not know what mechanics are required that, but it is subject to the subdivision code requirements in some way.

Vice Chair Gitzen stated in regard to the park dedication fee as a requirement, but looking at lines 98-99 it talks about tree replacement and he wondered if that should be rolled down into the requirements, how is that handled.

Mr. Lloyd stated that does not need to be a condition of approval because it is a normal code requirement that needs to be met. The Tree Replacement Plan sort of prioritizes replacing trees on the property as is reasonable. There is also a tree replacement fund that can be contributed to instead of replacing trees in the development.

Member Pribyl asked if the development moves forward with six units and at some point, in the future it wanted to develop the outlot, if the stormwater is put in as shown, it is discharging onto the outlot now so she wondered if it would be required to be redesigned.

Mr. Lloyd stated he was not qualified to answer things about stormwater. He would be completely confident that the stormwater plan would accommodate the future development as well as meet the needs of the six being shown on the plan.

Member Pribyl understood the maximum driveway width per unit is twenty-six feet so if the units are paired there could be driveways as wide as fifty-two feet.

Mr. Lloyd indicated that is correct.

Member Sparby asked if the City always handles the Rezoning and Preliminary Plat together. He was not sure if it was better to handle the Rezoning and Preliminary Plat separately.

Mr. Lloyd stated because this particular plat relies on lot widths are area minimums that are below the existing zoning district of the LDR-1 Zoning the City could not approve a Preliminary Plat without rezoning it first or at the same time.

Chair Bull stated the developer conducted an open house on the property and it was attended by local residents and others of interest and was overwhelming positive response. He noted he was in attendance as well and the applicant met all of the requirements the City put there.

Mr. Todd Ganz, Integrity Land Development

Mr. Ganz stated in reference to the outlot, if the vacation happens and the outlot stays as it is only one single family detached townhome can fit onto that property. Two cannot fit because the square footage and the acreage is not enough. He stated this is Phase One, when the vacation gets done then Phase Two will start.

Member Sparby stated on the outlot, his recollection is it is a sloped area and wondered if that was correct.

Mr. Ganz stated that was correct.

Member Sparby asked what the positioning be of the potential unit on the outlot.

Mr. Ganz stated right now it is high enough on the north side and it would be a full basement walkout towards County Road B.

Member Sparby asked if the outlot is vacated is it Mr. Ganz intention to proceed with building the additional unit on the outlot.

Mr. Ganz stated it was.

Member Pribyl stated she had a couple of concerns, the backyard because of the stormwater area looks like there is little useable backyard space for the residents and wondered if there is any possibility of moving the buildings closer to Eustis to give some level area for the residents. Her other concern was the width of the driveways and if there was a way to taper the paired driveways so that at Eustis the driveways are twenty-six feet wide rather than the full fifty-two feet wide, which might save some money and ability to plant more trees and be more pleasant for the neighborhood and for the residents.

Mr. Ganz stated the driveways are designed to that width to show the maximum impervious area that could happen. To actually build them that wide would probably not happen.

Public Comment

No one came forward to speak for or against this request. Chair Bull closed the public hearing at 7:41 p.m.

Commission Deliberation

Member Pribyl stated she was leaning towards the approval of the Rezoning and Preliminary Plat.

Member Kruzel agreed.

MOTION

Member Gitzen moved, seconded by Member Kimble, to recommend to the City Council approval of the proposed rezoning and preliminary Midland Legacy Estate plat of the residential property at 2433 County Road B, based on the content of this RPCA, public input, and Planning Commission deliberation, with the following conditions for (PF19-003):

- a. The applicant shall pay the \$20,000 Park Dedication Fee before the approved final plat is released for filing at Ramsey County.**
- b. The applicant shall create a homeowners' association or similar organizational structure to ensure the proper maintenance of the storm water management practices that will be implemented pursuant to an approved storm water management plan.**
- c. Future planning of the proposed Outlot A will elicit an additional park dedication fee for each development lot platted within or including Outlot A; such park dedication fee(s) shall be paid by the applicant at that time.**

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

Recess

Chair Bull recessed the meeting at approximately 7:54 p.m., and reconvened at approximately 8:01 p.m.

Vice Chair Gitzen asked Chair Bull to recuse himself from the next agenda item because of previous statements made.

Member Daire stated Chair Bull is not materially benefiting from his participation and the fact that he has an opinion on the next item should not exclude him from the conversation.

Member Kimble asked what the nature of the comments were.

Vice Chair Gitzen stated Chair Bull signed the petition which indicated Chair Bull is against the rezoning and in several statements at the open house that was published, if

the comments were correct which is the basis for which he asks for Chair Bull to recuse himself.

City Attorney Gaughan stated his understanding of the situation is that Chair Bull signed a petition that was directed to this body and to the City Council advocating one angle to this request. First and foremost, as he understands the case to be, he did not see any reason that there is or any potential for a violation of an ethics code provision under the Roseville Ethics Code. However, it is important to note that the integrity of the process often times is founded in maintaining a sense of impartiality and unbiased view by bodies considering proposals and publicly voicing or going as far as signing a petition declaring a position already being staked out can sometimes create the appearance of a bias or partial view coming into a public hearing. His opinion and recommendation is that the Chair does recuse himself from participating in his official capacity during this item. It does not mean the Chair gives up his first amendment rights and can certainly participate as a resident. However, given that this is a body that is considering an action, it is most appropriate for recusal.

Chair Bull stated he and the City Attorney discussed this previously and he has full disclosure that he is an affected property owner, or a property owner within the notification area. He stated he is not an affected property owner by this property, he lives west and north of the subject development. He stated in considering whether to recuse himself or not, as discussed, he believed he owed it to the community to act as a Planning Commissioner and to assist with the diligence of the research and analysis he has put into it and to recuse himself from any voting on the issue at all. He stated he will not be voting on the issue but will assist in the procedural matter at hand.

Member Pribyl stated she was going to recuse herself from this item. She indicated she did not have any involvement in this project and no current involvement with CommonBond but in the past, the architectural firm she works for has done design work for CommonBond several years ago so to eliminate any potential impression of bias, she was going to recuse herself from this agenda item.

Member Pribyl left the meeting.

d. Request by CommonBond Communities for Consideration of a Comprehensive Land Use Plan Map Change, Zoning Map Change and Conditional Use at 165 Owasso Boulevard and 3011, 3029 and 3033 Rice Street (PF19-004)

Chair Bull opened the public hearing for PF19-004 at approximately 8:06 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing.

City Planner Paschke summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated May 1, 2019.

Member Sparby stated with the Neighborhood Business Zoning that is in place at this time what could potentially go in there currently.

Mr. Paschke stated he did not know all of the different uses that are permitted under Neighborhood Business but any of those could go there and maximize the property.

Member Kimble stated residential density between four and twelve units, small scale business and institutional areas.

Mr. Paschke stated there are some commercial type businesses that are in there.

Member Sparby asked what other types of neighborhood businesses are located in Roseville.

Mr. Paschke stated there are small offices, small restaurants, gas stations because those are pre-existing and have been given those designations but he thought in most cases it is smaller sized commercial retail because most of the neighborhood business are found on corner nodes of what could be considered busier intersections so it could be arterials and collector streets where it is typical to find a neighborhood business.

Member Sparby asked how many vehicles the developer expected to be on the property. He deferred that questions to when the representative comes forward.

Member Daire stated it was considered in the 2040 plan the housing goals and goals for affordable housing and he noticed that there are numerous senior multi-family projects going on and he wondered how many affordable units are there in the pipeline and how is the City progressing towards its housing goals with the new construction that has come online and has the City accomplished any of those goals.

Mr. Paschke stated most all of the new projects that are either under construction or have been constructed in recent years are either more of a market rate product, such as the Applewood Point or are an assisted living product such as Cherrywood or the project that is being constructed at County Road C and Dale Street. The project currently being constructed across the street is also a market rate age restricted project. He believed this would be the first affordable senior project built of the ones that have been constructed over the last three to five years.

Member Daire asked how the City has been progressing according to the best knowledge Mr. Paschke has toward the City's affordable housing goal.

Mr. Paschke believed this would address part of that goal as it relates to the housing plan that the City has created with respect to a need.

Member Daire asked if Mr. Paschke had any idea how the City is progressing toward the City's housing goals such as affordable housing with the ones under construction.

Mr. Paschke indicated none of the developments under construction are affordable, these are either a market rate product or are assisted living. He stated this project would advance and achieve the goal of providing affordable housing under the housing plan.

Member Daire thought it sounded like the City, so far, has not made any progress toward its affordable housing goals and this is the first step toward those goals.

Mr. Paschke thought that was correct and not necessarily the City making progress, it is the City doing a study that says there is a need and the City set goals, objectives and policies to try to get there but it is more the developing community that tries to achieve those goals more so than the City. These projects come in and the City either supports them or not.

Member Daire stated he has some questions about the subsidies required or to be asked for by the developer.

Mr. Paschke stated the questions asked are not necessarily germane to this particular request. The Community Development Director is at the meeting that might be able to answer Member Daire's questions.

Member Daire stated it is germane in the sense that the Planning Commission is looking at the City's future and if this is approved then what else is needed.

Chair Bull stated he has gone through the Housing Study and the study of 2018 did not include the developments on County Road C and Dale or County Road C and Lexington and that consideration of the Rice Street Senior that is in Little Canada. It did indicate that as people move into senior units the City does have naturally occurring affordable housing with the seniors moving out of their homes. There is some transition but do not have any idea of how many people from Roseville will move into those units and vacate their homes and become naturally occurring but there will probably be some.

Chair Bull stated one of the things the Planning Commission struggles with is when it gets Comprehensive Plan land use changes which comes in with a project, tying that change with a project. He stated because affordable housing is being brought up and emotions get raised with that versus if this were a sixty-unit apartment building that is coming in. Is there anything that ties this change that is being considered for a recommendation to the affordable project.

Mr. Paschke stated conditions cannot be placed on the Comprehensive Map Change or the Rezoning. Conditions can be placed on the Conditional Use, which staff has, which supports the applicants increase in density for the project. This is no different from other Comp. Plan Amendments for changes in land use or zoning. There is an ability to specifically restrict that change to a given project that is coming forward.

Chair Bull stated if this were approved by the City, the developer has stated it plans on acquiring the property in the future and have not done so yet, the property owner would have the option of building, developing, selling for development anything within that high-density zoning capacity.

Mr. Paschke stated in this case he would state that is not correct, the City cannot tie conditions to the site for Comp. Plan Amendment or Rezoning. The approval of the Conditional Use Permit is specific to CommonBond Communities coming forward with their proposed development, with plans in hand for the City to review and approved before the City allow for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment to become final as well as the Rezoning. Those are the conditions listed in the Conditional Use Permit request. He stated the Conditional Use is tied specifically to this project. He stated this project, as proposed, will not go forward unless all of those things come together.

Vice Chair Gitzen stated he had a question on the Comprehensive Land Use Plan Map change on lines 33-35. He stated the way he reads this; the Planning Commission is a recommending body to the City Council so the Planning Commission can recommend the Zoning and Land Use change, but the City Council can still make their own decision. He wondered if that was correct.

Mr. Paschke stated that was correct, in this case, as policy makers, the City Council has the final decision and the Planning Commission, as well as the City Council have very broad discretion to review these or other goals and policies to determine whether or not there is support.

Vice Chair Gitzen stated the way he read the lines is the Planning Commission is required to make the recommendation but that does not necessarily happen, and the City Council can still make a final decision.

Mr. Paschke stated that was correct.

Vice Chair Gitzen stated the other part is the housing study that was completed in October 2018, does that have to be accepted by the City Council.

Community Development Director Janice Gundlach stated the housing needs assessment was directed to be updated by the EDA. The EDA was presented that study in October 2018. The EDA has been presented the findings of that study, but she would not say the EDA has necessarily accepted the findings, but the EDA commissioned the study and reviewed the information and it is a guiding document with the City of Roseville.

Vice Chair Gitzen asked if the EDA has accepted the housing study as a guiding document.

Ms. Gundlach stated as it relates to the housing needs within the community. She stated in regard to Chair Bull's comments earlier about the development on County Road C and Lexington and the developments on County Road C and Dale, both of those projects were contemplated when the housing needs assessment was done. Those units coming online were already factored into that needs assessment. When the housing assessment identified 166 affordable senior housing units in the community it already factored in those projects. She also clarified that those projects

assumed one hundred units at the County Road C and Lexington project when in fact only 93 are being built.

Member Kimble asked if there are other examples of HDR next to LDR in the City.

Mr. Paschke stated ninety percent of High Density Residential, if not more, lies directly adjacent to Low Density Residential and Medium Density Residential in some cases. There may be some areas that lie adjacent to commercial, such as the high density that is off Hwy 36 where there are commercial businesses on the south side of Roseville.

Member Kimble asked if the City has a list of available sites for Multi-Family Residential in the City.

Mr. Paschke stated he was not aware of any vacant, undeveloped, high density residential land that is available in the City of Roseville for development. He stated there are some sites for medium density. He showed a map to the Commission.

Ms. Gundlach stated the City Council, a couple of weeks ago, in trying to develop their City Policy Priority Plan, the Council talked about adding housing as a priority. While the City Council and EDA have not hammered out the details of that policy priority plan some questions that were sparked from Councilmembers as a result of adding housing as one of their goals was that exact question. How much HDR land is available in the community to be developed. She stated it is less than fifteen acres as an aggregate, everything added together. When looking at the size of those parcels that are available, most of them are two acres if not smaller and are scattered around the City in different locations. That is not to say high density cannot be developed in the community mixed use districts but specifically to HDR, there is less than fifteen acres available in the community.

Member Kimble stated this requires at least 5/7 of the Planning Commission and the Commission is currently down to five voting members which means whatever the outcome, it needs to be unanimous to move forward.

City Attorney Gaughan stated it did not need to be unanimous, a 4/5 vote could do it but keep in mind that requirement has no practical impact on this matter because the Planning Commission is an advisory Commission and whatever vote is taken it has no binding effect on whether or not this project goes forward or not or whether the applications are approved or not.

Member Kimble appreciate Mr. Paschke's summary addressing the fact that there is not a strong recommendation for or against this. She stated when she looks at the report with all of the different policies, there is a comment after goal eight that states the requested land use map change and initial proposal by CommonBond meets several of the above goals and policies and there is a lot listed. She asked if "by several" is it meets fifty percent, eighty percent, ninety percent and she wondered if in

the future the Commission could have a check next to it if it meets it so there is better clarity.

Mr. Paschke stated he would say it would meet all of these whether specific to the project or general to the projects process because some of them have to do with engagement.

Member Kimble asked for confirmation that the current neighborhood business district, neighborhood zoning on the corner would allow up to twelve residential units at its max per acre.

Mr. Paschke believed that was correct under the current zoning.

Member Kimble stated she was going to interpret Mr. Paschke's narrative as generally a support of the project from staff, based upon his verbal description earlier.

Mr. Paschke stated that was a correct assessment. He noted the brown areas on the map are High Density Residential and the areas that are darker yellow are yellow are Medium and Low Density Residential.

Member Sparby stated in terms of the traffic study, did that account for overflow parking at all in that area or are there any parking restrictions in the area.

Mr. Paschke stated he did not know what the parking restrictions are in the area and he did not think the traffic study looked at parking specifically, it had more to do with vehicles coming and going and the maximums found at peak hours.

Member Sparby stated there was also some discussion of daycares in the packet. He wondered what the licensing process for a daycare is in the City of Roseville.

Mr. Paschke was not sure what Member Sparby was referring to but the zoning code, depending on which district would either permit certain types of daycares or maybe require them as a Conditional Use. State Statute lays out certain parameters under which the City has to support daycares under statutes. There can be an in-home daycare up to a certain number of children or adults.

Ms. Leah Stockstrom, CommonBond Communities

Ms. Stockstrom stated she is a project manager in the acquisitions and development department. She introduced the Executive Vice President of Real Estate Cecil Bedor; Director of Advantage Services Jessie Hendle; Regional Property Manager Jesse Madden; and Regional Manager with the Advantages Service Team Joshua Love. She noted CommonBond architect was also at the meeting, Tom Wasmone, principal with Firm Ground Architecture and Ryan Nickels, job captain on the project.

Ms. Stockstrom made a presentation to the Commission about the project and community concerns.

Member Kimble asked what the average number of units for CommonBond developments are.

Ms. Bedor stated it varies from nine units to over one hundred units per development. The average for new construction is between fifty and sixty-five units depending on the financing source.

Member Kimble asked if there is any less density that could be achieved here and still allowing the project to be feasible.

Ms. Bedor did not believe so. She stated when CommonBond runs their numbers there is a broad group of funders that are needed to cobble the money together to do the project and try different scenarios and what the Commission sees before them is what CommonBond believes can be funded. If there are less units CommonBond does not think it could be funded.

Member Kimble asked if the project is contingent on getting any financing.

Ms. Stockstrom stated CommonBond will be applying for four percent low income housing tax credits as well as housing and infrastructure bonds through the State.

Ms. Bedor believed this will be a very competitive project for the State. The State is very interested in ensuring that affordable housing is dispersed.

Member Kimble asked if CommonBond ever looked at operating the first floor similar to Oppidan's project where Oppidan has integrated daycare into the same building or has CommonBond ever integrated a coffee shop or something that is available to the public.

Ms. Bedor stated she is fairly new with CommonBond so did not know the answer to that specifically, but she did know that CommonBond is working on another project which will have active first floor space. She stated it is a difficult thing for CommonBond to fund.

Member Sparby asked if CommonBond had a breakdown of people on site, residents, staff projected, and the number of vehicles projected.

Ms. Bedor stated this is a typical apartment building other than the fact this is for seniors so there may not be as many vehicles or visitors.

Mr. Madden stated on senior properties there is not as many vehicles that are necessary for them to have so there are not as many parking spaces on the properties to accommodate one for one. This property however has more parking spaces than units. It is in very good position for onsite parking. He guessed with sixty units there will probably be 45 vehicles. He stated on a property like this there would be a part time property manager, someone from Advantage Services at about twenty hours a week and a part time maintenance person.

Member Sparby asked how overflow parking will be handled.

Mr. Madden stated what would normally be done is there would be stickers for the residents to have on their vehicles along with visitor parking space.

Member Sparby asked if there was an anticipated schedule for trash collection.

Mr. Madden stated with the size of this building there will probably be a four-yard internal container that would be picked up probably once a week. He stated the maintenance person would handle this.

Member Sparby asked what types of screening have been proposed for this property, such as berms or fencing.

Ms. Stockstrom stated neighbors typically prefer privacy fencing so CommonBond has been talking about typical privacy fencing with the neighbors.

Member Daire stated in one of the illustrations, a berm was shown with wrought iron fencing behind it and he gathered from what was stated that the residents nearby do not care for the wrought iron and are looking for more privacy. He asked if berms were discussed along the back for privacy.

Ms. Stockstrom thought there were different responses from different neighbors. She thought some residents were in favor of a berm with fencing and others just wanted privacy fencing.

Member Kruzel asked if there were going to be thoughts or considerations for people with disabilities to live within those apartments and will these be ADA accessible.

Ms. Stockstrom stated through one of the programs CommonBond's is applying for CommonBond's is required to do universal design throughout the building. Typically, universal design includes handrails along one side of the corridor and extra grab bars in the showers along with ADA units and all of the floors will be serviceable by elevator.

Member Kruzel asked if there will be any staff onsite for help with people with special needs.

Ms. Stockstrom stated there will be Advantage Services staff onsite part time but there is not anyone onsite full time.

Ms. Bedor stated this is really independent living for seniors.

Mr. Love stated there will be an Advantages Coordinator on site between sixteen and twenty-four hours a week and will focus on the stability and independence of the residents. Ways this is done is through service coordination. Having residents come

to the office and talking about what the resident needs help with is what the coordinator will help with. He reviewed the services that will be offered to the senior residents.

Member Gitzen asked if CommonBond had other units in Minnesota that butt up to residential communities.

Ms. Bedor was certain CommonBond did and could get the City that information.

Chair Bull appreciated CommonBond doing the traffic study. He stated on page five regarding expectation of there being an additional five vehicles trips in the A.M. period and sixteen in the P.M. peak period. He stated with 45 vehicles he was trying to understand the calculation.

Mr. Madden stated he did not know what the driving habits will be, but he does not how many vehicles the developments have at different size properties for senior properties.

Mr. Paschke believed the number is correct based on standard transportation modeling.

Member Daire stated as far as CommonBond knows, was the traffic study modeled on age specific behavior.

Ms. Stockstrom believed it was from her review of the report.

Ms. Gundlach indicated the traffic study was based on age specific behavior.

Member Daire stated with the number of senior buildings going up he would think that wise property managers and builders are thinking beyond the senior search so if this was age specific traffic behavior that shows level of service continuing then what happens if a young married couple begins to occupy the two bedroom unit or when the development transitions out of the senior project into something that is more market rate or available to people who are younger.

Ms. Stockstrom stated as part of the funding structure CommonBond signed a declaration of land use restriction and that would include the age restriction that runs with the property for up to forty years. Additionally, CommonBond is a long-term owner so it would not be sold and would not become a market rate property.

Ms. Bedor stated with nearly the fifty years that CommonBond has been around the company has sold one property that was an assisted living property and that is because CommonBond is not in that business. She stated Common Bond's expectation is for as long as the company is around the properties will be held in perpetuity and the property is being built and constructed for senior housing.

Consider Extension of the Meeting

Chair Bull stated the Commission has a standard curfew of 10:00 p.m. meeting time unless it is extended by a majority vote of the Commission. He would like to propose a motion to allow this meeting to continue past 10:00 p.m. should the proceeding happen.

Motion

Member Bull made a motion to extend the meeting past 10:00 p.m.

Vice Chair Gitzen stated he would rather wait until the meeting was closer to 10:00 p.m. before any action was taken to extend.

Chair Bull withdrew his motion and continued with the public hearing.

Public Comment

Ms. Julie Christiansen, 2951 Galtier Street

Ms. Christiansen stated she is in favor of affordable housing but was not in favor of this project. She stated she had concerns regarding the parking. Right now, the proposal is seeking to increase from the normal HDR standard to thirty-two units per acre with the possibility of sixty units and each of the units could have anywhere from two to four people in them. There is no parking on south Owasso so Woodbridge would be the next overflow parking. She stated her concern is she will be fifty-five this year and will be working for another twelve years. Fifty-five is not old. When looking at this senior housing she personally did not think that she was old, but she thought there will be more cars than will be handled in that parking lot, if there are potentially two drivers in each apartment along with visitors. She really thought the parking needed to be looked at and that the parking lot will not accommodate realistically the parking there.

Ms. Bonnie Koch, 1996 Langton Lake Drive

Ms. Koch stated she was speaking on behalf of the League of Women Voters in the Roseville area. She stated three years ago the League did an affordable housing study for the five cities in the league and based on the study findings the League presented their recommendations on affordable housing needs to the City Council during the period when the City was gathering community input for the soon to be updated Comprehensive Plan and the League was pleased that most of the recommendations made were included. One of the interesting things is that data from the study that came through the Metropolitan Council showed that in Roseville, forty percent of the renters, which includes seniors, are cost burdened. She stated there is clearly a need for affordable housing options for them. It is clear that CommonBond's request for land use changes fit within the Roseville Comprehensive Plan and meet the needs of the senior segment of Roseville residents who need housing at an affordable level. She stated the League of Women Voters in the Roseville area encourages the Commission and Council to support CommonBond's request.

Ms. Ashley Petroske, 177 South Owasso Boulevard West

Ms. Petroske stated the proposal put the driveway on her property line. She asked what the setback requirements are between high density and low density residential. She also asked what the buffer zone requirements are between high density and low density residential as opposed to using their yards as some sort of buffer. She stated Rosedale Estates is less than a half mile from the proposed site and is the most consistent comparable as it is less than a half mile south on Rice Street. This high-density project has a hundred feet of rolling green buffering the high density dwelling from the low-density residential homes. This is closest precedent the City has to this project. She stated there are no assurances that can be made that should zoning be changed to conform to this plan that the private sellers, James and MaryJo who approached CommonBond with the opportunity to sell would not because there is not a valid purchase agreement right now that is fully executed. There is no guarantee that the owners would not seek out another party to sell their property to once the zoning has been changed. The proposal cannot be tied to the rezoning. This should make everyone uncomfortable because rezoning opens up the floodgates for rezoning, not this particular project. She did not know how the City could tie the project and the rezoning together, but it is irresponsible not to do so. She asked what the City would do if the rezoning occurs and CommonBond is not able to make their project feasible for any issue.

Chair Bull stated the City does have the opportunity to go in and request rezoning of a property and it is done periodically.

Ms. Petroske stated once the property is rezoned it is rezoned until another petition is put in place to rezone the property again back to LDR.

Mr. Paschke stated the rezoning and Comp. Plan Amendment do not occur if this project does not come forward by CommonBond as proposed. If CommonBond is unable to get funding or to make this project work and this project does not come forward, then the appropriate ordinances and resolutions that are necessary to move this project forward as proposed do not get recorded and the process basically dies, and the land stays as is.

Ms. Petroske stated the owner of this property owns three properties on the other side of South Owasso and she saw the same thing happening on the other side of the street.

Chair Bull stated when the City receives application for land use change or zoning the City has timeframes in which it needs to respond to that in and he is hearing that CommonBond would have to come forward with their plans for this but CommonBond is not planning to acquire the property for quite sometime so how does that play into having this and still meeting the timeframe.

Mr. Paschke stated there are a couple of things, one is the plan moving forward under the City process and CommonBond receiving their specific approvals and then it is

CommonBond meeting the conditions specifically of those approvals that are not time restrictive based on State Statutes.

Ms. Margie Schmidt, 2995 Northview Street

Ms. Schmidt stated she moved into her home in January and before she moved in, she looked at the zoning for that corner and also called the City of Little Canada to see what was happening at the A&W site and was told a restaurant was being considered there. She understood that would increase the traffic but did not ever think that there would be this big of a property that would go in. She stated she was for affordable housing but did not think this is the place for it. She stated there is a lot of affordable housing in the neighborhood already. She did not think putting sixty-two more units on the corner is fair to the neighborhood.

Mr. Stewart Roberts, 3061 Rice Street

Mr. Roberts stated he lives literally in the shadow of this proposal. He would like to take the attention away from the affordable housing issue, which he did not think was really being addressed in Roseville and the CV of CommonBond is really high quality. He stated CommonBond is well known in the community that cares about these things. He stated what is being discussed is a proposed development which is going to put sixty some units on a block that currently only has twenty housed on it. This will be a massive intrusion of people, cars, building, visual in the area and will tower above the trees. He stated this is spot zoning a small little place. He stated this project does not make any sense in this location. He stated there is real estate available in Roseville that is zoned for this type of project. He did not think this made any sense. He stated there is a lot of confusion about how much of this is Conditional Use and how much is Rezoning. He thought it was really important to stop this. He stated he has a lot of issues of how the information was put out to the residents because this whole idea of how many units are available to be put into an acre is blown out of the water when looking at the fact that there are only twenty units on the block right now which is representative of the neighborhood. He would suggest the architects go back and redo this solar study because he has dealt with solar a lot and there is something seriously wrong with the shadow study that is done at 5:00 p.m. on December 21st. He stated his house will be shaded by this three-story building. He asked if the City has looked at the legal aspects of this spot rezoning. He thought if this is opened up this could open up the City to some legal problems by the homeowners because this is spot zoning. It is very specifically done, and the owner of this property approached this non-profit organization in order to sell this property. The owners have been scheming this for a long time and is not something new and the residents have been waiting for something like this to happen. He stated this is not appropriate and not appropriate for the neighborhood.

Chair Bull asked if the City Attorney would like to respond.

City Attorney Gaughan stated it was not appropriate to respond to a legal question at this time.

Mr. Peter Heppner, 3030 Woodbridge Street

Mr. Heppner stated he was in opposition to the rezoning and he stated the consensus of the neighborhood is that the rezoning will be extremely damaging to the neighborhood's viability in the coming years. He stated he and his wife along with several others distributed a petition across the neighborhood asking the City to decline rezoning these properties. This petition has gathered 86 signatures including signatures representing eighty-five percent of the houses that are within the five-hundred-foot radius. He stated in talking with his neighbors it has become extremely clear that the vast majority of those living in the surrounding area are against this proposal. He stated the neighborhood is concerned that this proposal will be the first of many and that the neighborhood will be continually developed until there is no neighborhood left at all. He stated he understood redevelopment can be a very attractive proposal however this project has much broader implications for the future of the City's housing market than just this single property. The fact of the matter is that Roseville cannot expand, and available land is already limited. As a new homeowner that moved in less than a year ago, he can tell the Commission that Roseville is a very attractive City with established neighborhoods, many parks and great amenities, however it will not remain so if the City's focus becomes redevelopment. If Roseville decides it is a City whose goal it is to redevelop then that redevelopment will continue to creep in to and destroy the City's well-established neighborhoods. To give a concrete example of how this project will become a precedent for the future of their neighborhood, consider the fact that Mary and Jim also own several properties adjacent to each other on the other side of South Owasso Boulevard. If this rezoning is approved, it is almost certain that these properties will be next on the docket. Likewise, what is to prevent someone from purchasing the homes of his neighbors as the neighbors move out of the neighborhood directly because of this proposal and rezoning those as well. Once the City sets a precedent that it is willing to spot rezone well established neighborhoods and make way for high density properties the precedent will be used as leverage to continue to rezone. Once the rezoning has started where will the line be drawn of how far that rezoning can continue. That question is much more difficult than to simply deny rezoning altogether. He asked the Commission to consider the broader context of this proposal beyond what CommonBond decides to do with this specific piece of land, the City must consider the impact that this precedent will have on the future of the City. It is clear from the response he has received from the residents in his neighborhood that his neighbors are fearful for their investments and for the future of the neighborhood. He urged the Commission to take the neighborhood concerns to heart and decline to rezone the properties.

Ms. Rosemary McMonigal, 204 Woodland Avenue

Ms. McMonigal showed a map of the neighborhood and indicated she and her husband live two homes away from the property and were never notified about this project or about the fact that there was going to be any kind of a neighborhood meeting or public meeting about it. She understood she lives twenty feet beyond the five hundred foot radius and she suggested to Roseville's City Planners that in the future when looking at the radius staff should evaluate it based on perhaps what the lot sizes are so that someone who lives two houses away will learn about the project

from the City because she learned about the project, as an architect, from CommonBond.

Ms. McMonigal stated she is an architect and owns her own firm for thirty-five years and is doing a project for CommonBond and is known for affordable housing and senior housing. She said it was really awkward to be doing work for CommonBond and living two houses away from the project but not know anything about the project. She noted the City states it is going to use traditional and innovative ways to notify the public but there is nothing innovative or that worked for notifying her. She stated her company could have been a part of the solution and could have helped brainstorm ideas that would have worked with the City and with the neighborhood, instead her firm is looking a project that the majority of the neighborhood opposes, and she understands why. She stated she was in conflict but would have looked a project like this and as part of a brainstorming session would have asked if twenty-four units per acre would have worked because she thought twenty-four units would have been acceptable without it being rezoned.

Mr. Paschke thought it might be less than twenty-four because it is less than two acres. What would be supported is whatever the Code would support.

Ms. McMonigal stated the chart on page 5, line 180 shows twenty-four and wondered if the chart was incorrect.

Mr. Paschke stated for high density twenty-four units is the minimum that is allowed but would still need a Comp. Plan Amendment and Rezoned. He stated in regard to the notification, there are probably a number of people that did not get noticed that would have wished to have been notified, however Roseville has spent countless hours trying to figure out its distance requirements for public notification. The City spent years modifying and tweaking and going through amendments in order to establish a process the City felt was fair. When projects come in the City Staff is bound by the City Ordinance in order to do that and cannot expand that unless directed by City Council to do something outside the guise of the Council.

Ms. McMonigal asked if the traffic study was done before or after 694 and Rice Street was closed.

Mr. Paschke believed it was before that.

Chair Bull indicated the information shows the traffic study was done after Rice Street was closed due to flooding of water.

Member Daire stated a point of information the State Statute requires that the City notify for zoning changes people within 350 feet of the proposed project boundaries.

Ms. McMonigal stated Mr. Paschke was kind enough on Monday to explain to her that State Statute is actually 250 feet, but that Roseville does 500 feet and as she pointed out to Mr. Paschke there are cities in the Metropolitan area that do one

thousand feet, especially when it is related to something like this when a house is two houses away but not getting noticed.

Ms. Julie Strahan, 1260 Shryer

Ms. Strahan stated she was at the meeting in support of affordable housing. She stated pursuant to the Commissioners Code, Section 2.03, in the conflict of interest, it indicates that if there is a conflict of interest the person is also supposed to abstain from discussion. She stated she was disappointed that if Chair Bull has come out in opposition to this project elsewhere that Chair Bull would take part in the discussion, not just the voting portion. She stated as someone who does not live immediately adjoining to the neighborhood but as a seventeen-year resident of the City, knowing many parts of it well, having children who attended the schools and was very well versed in all portions of this City. It seems just ingenuous that some of the comments that have been made, people do not seem to understand what the capacity is and seem to think this is assisted living or a hospital where there is going to be fifty people that work there. She realized that if it adjoined her house she would have many concerns but to say that person is for affordable housing and then to have such a closed mind seems very hard to believe that and makes it a bit embarrassing as a fellow resident that a person would come out so harshly without being willing to or threatening to sue the City if the City makes such a choice.

Ms. Strahan stated some comment was made earlier about how affordable housing takes place when seniors move out and she would like to point out that the two-bedroom house across the street from her house sold for \$320,000 cash in 2018. She stated there is not affordable housing in the bulk of Roseville. She stated there are places to live in a trailer but if a resident lives next to those the residents' goal is probably to get rid of those the next time the opportunity arises as well. She stated if Roseville's goal is to have affordable housing, because the residents need that for their families and schools, the schools are peopled with kids who do not have the funds to live in these fancy houses and the senior high rises are in no way affordable. She stated she could not live anywhere else in Roseville except for the home she lives in now and could not afford to live anywhere else in Roseville. As a teacher and her husband who is a public servant do not have the funds to live elsewhere in this City. She stated this is offering an opportunity for people who make thirty fifty percent of the median income in the Twin Cities to have a safe, affordable place to live. Looking at housing, it is the basis of all pieces for providing a stable society and structure. All she hears right now is "Not in my backyard" and that is embarrassing

Ms. Strahan stated it was also unfair that people can have comments from floor because she was at many meetings where when people commented or clapped from the floor those people were told to stop yet there are people at this meeting who think it is okay to belittle and to clap and be rude. She stated she was really embarrassed the way people have acted. She stated another issue she has is that she does not know the family that came forward and approached CommonBond but to belittle them and to assume that the family is up to no good is unfair. She wondered what if the family gave those parcels of land to their Church, another non-profit, would there be that much anger toward them for what that family has chosen to do. She stated that could

have been seen as very benevolent. She indicated she did not know the family but to assume the family has some malevolent reason for making that choice does not speak well for the people who have stood up and spoken their mind this evening. She stated she was disappointed by the people who have spoken, and she firmly believed the City needed affordable housing because the City needs to diversify what the City's basis of support is in the community. It cannot be just one group of people because then the City's whole housing stock is diminished.

Chair Bull reminded everyone that the City expects to have respectful discussion and asked everyone to abide by that.

Ms. Mary Heppner, 3030 Woodbridge Street

Ms. Heppner stated she lived behind the proposed rezoned property. She stated her and her husband purchased their house less than a year ago and it was actually the 7th house bid on and none of them were by high density facilities. When touring over eighty houses the main deal breaker was being by high density living places. She stated her and her husband wanted to live in a community and to know their neighbors by name. She stated Roseville was picked because of the phenomenal school district, beautiful parks and sidewalks and the overall feel of the community. If she would have known that this high-density facility was going to be up against her backyard this property would not have been purchased and would not have paid what was paid for the house. She stated her family loves the house because the backyard is large and private. The neighborhood was picked because John and Gloria are across the street, Ashley is the brown house on the corner and Lloyd and Barb are next door. This felt like the perfect neighborhood to start their family, to be known and to know their neighbors. If this gets rezoned, many people are going to leave and will break up the community. The neighbor two houses down was actually going to remodel fifty thousand dollars into her house and now she is not, and she is moving. Many people will not remodel their homes because of this, because the residents are nervous of the value that will be gotten out of selling in the end and many residents will not stay because of that. Spot rezoning breaks up community and this is not what her family would have signed up for if her family would have known.

Ms. Gina Ciganik, 953 Lydia Avenue West

Ms. Ciganik stated she moved to this community almost twenty years ago because she saw in it a place that is close to the downtown that had real opportunity for connectivity, for diversity, for walkable streets, for corridors with buses. She lives in an area where there is senior housing at the corner of Lexington and County Road D. There are some condo buildings that have also become some rental over the years and townhomes, and she loves that this community is supportive of housing for all. That is what she has seen recently when looking along the corridors, it is about the future, it is about seniors, as people have talked about moving into a place where the senior does not have to mow their lawns anymore. She noted this community has gotten very expensive and there is not a lot of affordable housing left. She appreciates the staff and that these really meet the goals of the City, the gap in affordable housing and she really hopes that is met. She stated people often dehumanize and look at the building, but these people may be your friend and neighbor. She stated she knows

CommonBond and does have a history, in the past, of developing affordable housing and when she developed affordable housing, like CommonBond, she sat down and discussed with the community on concerns and how to connect. She stated one of the things she is excited about is her parents are aging up in Hibbing and she will not be able to care for them closely, she is looking at where her parents could live in her community, close by her where she could care for them and be close and she is looking at the new housing units, affordable housing. She stated people have some really skewed ideas of what affordable is. She wanted to commend the City for all of the work being done and all of the studies the City is doing and following through on things. She stated she wants to see diversity and all of this and she does not want to keep pointed at these places as evil because the people moving into them will be neighbors and eventually friends. She really hoped the City will support this project.

Mr. Craig Klausung, 447 Rose Place

Mr. Klausung stated as explained in the staff report, “Actions taken on a Comprehensive Plan Land Use Change and Rezoning Request are Legislative. The City has broad discretion in making land use decisions based on health, safety and general welfare of the community”. The first thing to be considered, he hoped, is the health, safety and welfare. Staff addresses this on page 7 of the report. “Proposed use will not be injurious to the surrounding neighborhood, will not negatively impact traffic or property values and will not otherwise harm public health, safety and general welfare.”, he stated he has experience on both a planning commission and city council with projects like this and often times fear and concern run ahead and take grip of emotions. If the staff analysis and this project is looked at objectively this is a project that makes sense for that location and is one that the community needs. That addresses the question about may you make this change. He would like to speak quickly about should the City make the request to change. He suggested the City ought to make the change. The Comprehensive Plan is precisely that, it is a plan and not an end in itself, it is a roadmap for how to get to a certain place. The City needs to ask itself where is the place the City wants to be as a community. If other portions of the plan are looked at, it talks about it being a welcoming community and mentions “housing is a basic human need and an essential component of the quality of life in a community, maintaining diverse, safe, affordable housing. It is one of the most critical matters facing the City of Roseville over the next twenty years. The availability of a variety of housing types, styles and price ranges which allow residents to move through life cycle housing change is a key factor in maintaining a communities ability to thrive well into the future.” This project helps get the City to its destination. It provides affordable housing, it provides a different variety of housing and addresses life cycle housing needs, all of which are identified in the Comprehensive Plan. This project is desperately needed and fits with the area. He stated he has been involved in a lot of these decisions and have been involved in the community for over thirty years. If he thought for one moment that this would harm the neighborhood or harm the community he would not be speaking in favor of it and he asked the Commission to recommend a change that the Comprehensive Plan be reguided to High Density Residential and recommend that the Zoning be changed to High Density Residential and that the requested Conditional Use Permit be granted.

Ms. Heather Anderson, 3034 Woodbridge Street

Ms. Anderson stated she was opposed to this change. She agreed that the traffic study was done on April 10th, which was way after those exists and on ramps were closed on 694 so she did not think anything is indicative of what is seen now. There could be up to 180 residents in this building because there are two bedroom and one-bedroom units. She stated she is very concerned about the parking. She asked Mr. Paschke through an email, if in the past, Roseville has ever changed from low density to high density and she knew he said on the zoning map there is a lot of high density next to low density and she is not disagreeing with that but those are things that have been around potentially for many years. This is a change from low density to high density and this is spot zoning. She stated Mr. Paschke went back five years for her and did not see any change. This is not something that Roseville has been doing and is not something Roseville should begin to do. She stated she is concerned about the buffers. Her property is kitty corner from this project. She stated this is a neighborhood and the residents want it to remain a neighborhood.

Consider Extension of the Meeting

Chair Bull stated the meeting has reached its curfew time and the Commission needs to make a motion to extend the meeting or to table the meeting to another time.

MOTION

Member Daire moved, seconded by Member Kruzel, to extend the meeting until 11:00 p.m.

Vice Chair Gitzen stated he would be in favor of extending the meeting since the residents are here, but he thought 11:00 p.m. is the hard cut off and what the Commission should hold the meeting to.

Member Sparby agreed.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried

Ms. Mindy Greiling, 2495 Marion Street

Ms. Greiling appreciated all the work the Planning Commission did on the Comprehensive Plan and was proud of the plan that the City ended up with. She stated she went with many of the people in this room to the many meetings the City had on the Comprehensive Plan, working with consultants to get that ready and she sat at a table that was full of advocates for affordable housing and thought it was such a wonderful process where the whole community got to help the Planning Commission and City Council work on the Comprehensive Plan. She stated she is also a member of the League of Women Voters. She stated when the League saw the Comprehensive Plan and especially number seven in the packet tonight where there is housing for all people, all stages of live, etc. She stated she read the information in the packet and was surprised that staff did not make a recommendation on such an important project and then she heard Mr. Paschke and understood that staff is

standing by the Comprehensive Plan and it speaks for itself, hence it is a recommendation, based on the Comprehensive Plan. She thought this site is perfect in the sense that it has a transit stop right there. A lot of people who live in affordable housing do not even have a car and will need to be able to get out and about through transit and as someone mentioned, fifty-five is not really old. She indicated she was seventy-one and can still take the bus. She stated if someone does not have a car that person has to be able to take the bus and in the winter in Minnesota, if a senior, would not want to walk too far to get to the bus stop. If everyone wants to have quality of life living in Roseville, then transit is essential for affordable housing. A lot of the concerns revolves around how the property is going to be managed and she thought just by looking at the presentation and the process that CommonBond has had, so far, a pretty good inkling for anyone who does not know CommonBond on how the company does things. She stated she has toured one of their projects and saw how it was managed and it is beautifully done. She thought everyone that is worried about the management and how the building is going to look or be maintained could put their minds at rest about that. Everything CommonBond does is perfectly managed and absolutely gorgeous. She urged the Commission to support this worthy project.

Mr. Randy Neprash, 1276 Eldridge Avenue

Mr. Neprash stated he speaks in favor of the proposed changes. Roseville needs affordable housing, even more so, Roseville needs affordable housing for the elderly. This is clearly well established. He recognized that the City is not a creator of housing, but the City has a role and more importantly, a responsibility to see that these needs are met. The discussion about the lack of progress on this was fascinating. If he understood the comment from CommonBond, the City has not seen a new affordable housing unit for the elderly in Roseville since 1978, that is forty-one years. As a twenty-five-year resident of the City he is ashamed of that and he thought everyone should be. This is an opportunity to rectify that. This is an excellent developer and the City has seen CommonBond's capacity this evening. CommonBond has also shown a high degree of responsiveness to both the City and the neighbors. This is a good location, this type of building, this type of parking, this type of minor traffic increase is entirely appropriate for a major arterial street like Rice Street. The City has a whole set of positive findings from the Planning Division staff. There is no reason to believe that approving this single request opens any floodgates whatsoever. A similar proposal that is not on Rice Street can easily be rejected and denied. The bottom line, in his mind is this is the best example of this type of project that this City is liable to see for a long time. If this project is rejected, he will be that much more ashamed of Roseville's lack of progress on meeting affordable housing needs.

Mr. Wayne Skogstad, 3042 Woodbridge Street

Mr. Skogstad stated he has lived in Roseville for thirty-two years and has coached hockey, baseball and works for the City of Roseville for the parks for twenty-two years. This is going to be basically in his backyard. He did go look at one of CommonBond buildings in Little Canada and the parking lot there is in front of the building. If he cannot stop this project from happening he thought CommonBond should look at the way the building in Little Canada is designed and copy it in

Roseville because he really does not want plows in the middle of the night behind his house or garbage trucks in the back on the weekend or people flying through the parking lot, which would be in his backyard. He stated he wants this project to stay on Rice Street, if nothing else. If this is going to be a go project for the City and everyone else wants it then he really thinks the parking lot should be in the front of the building even though he did not want a three-story building in his backyard to look at. He did not think there needed to be a hundred parking spaces behind the building with plows and trucks, etc using it. He would rather have the parking on Rice Street. He did not want to hear a bunch of noise in his backyard.

Ms. Sarah Barsel, 1276 Eldridge Avenue

Ms. Barsel stated she wanted to speak in support of this project and specifically in support of CommonBond. She stated she was the co-chair of the Ramsey County Adult Services Committee for six years. For three years Ramsey County Adult Services Committee worked with CommonBond staff with regard to one of their high-rise facilities which is called Skyline Tower and were uniformly and over three years impressed with the quality of their staff and how CommonBond addressed the needs of their residents. She stated Ramsey County Adult Services held an event in CommonBond building and were very pleased with the conditions and the people who were residents there. This was a senior low-income building. She hoped her speaking will go some distance to allaying some of the concerns. With respect to affordable housing for seniors in Roseville, there are two facilities, one is Coventry and the other is The Roseville Seniors which is a Highrise building on Larpenteur adjacent to Greenhouse Village Coop. People function with those as neighbors, but these are insufficient in numbers for the number of seniors that are in Roseville. She understood the concerns about noise, garbage trucks and transportation. She stated there are things that cannot be controlled and she thought the residents need to look at what are the responsibilities as citizens and what are the responsibility of the Planning Commission because the City has a change in population and the City has to find ways to meet all of the needs. She urged the Planning Commission to support this.

Mr. Terri Skogstad, 3042 Woodbridge Street

Ms. Skogstad stated she is the daycare provider that people have mentioned. She noted she grew up in this house and has seen the neighborhood change from farmland to what it is today, so change does not bother her. What bothers her is opening up Rice Street for her daycare families that is concerning her. Having the zone change and who knows if CommonBond will be the ones to build there. Her concern is not with CommonBond, her concern is with thirty people looking into her yard and she has tried to keep a safe community for her daycare children. She stated this project does not fit into her community. She stated she did not want this project in her neighborhood.

Ms. Leslie Studenski, 3055 Woodbridge Street

Ms. Studenski stated she was speaking on behalf of her neighbors Tim and Courtney Beran who live at 3050 Woodbridge Street and were not able to attend but have a written statement for her to read. “We have lived on Woodbridge Street since 2011 and we are against this project. We have been concerned with increasing traffic on

Rice Street for years. This project will only further increase this problem as well as the existing problem of vehicles using Woodbridge Street, a residential street, as a cut through to bypass traffic at the stoplight at Rice Street/South Owasso Boulevard. In addition, this project will disrupt a nice, quiet, residential neighborhood. We choose to live here because of the large, beautiful lot and putting a parking lot with large beaming lights in our backyards will destroy the neighborhood. This project is also inappropriate near a daycare. We live next to the daycare and our concern for the safety of the children if this project is developed. We are also concerned with the rising property taxes in Roseville each year while the City continually supports projects that diminish the quality of our neighborhoods. We believe this specific development will not only cause a major disturbance to our neighborhood but lower our property values as well. This project should not be developed here. We do not support it, nor will we support any elected officials who attempt to move it forward.

Ms. Tara Jebens-Singh, 1056 Sherren Street

Ms. Jebens-Singh stated she has lived in Roseville for approximately twenty-five years and her family specifically moved to this community because it was welcoming and because it has multiple kinds of inter-generational housing. Different kinds of houses that were built at different times so that every family was not a cookie cutter of the other and is why her family chose this community. She stated her family is proud of all of the amenities, schools and parks and she was at the meeting in support of this project because she advocates and works professionally in support of seniors and senior services in the North East Metro. Her company works diligently to make sure that the services and homes and amenities that we owe our most valued community members who have built this City, that we provide places so the seniors can continue to age in place, the seniors can continue to contribute to our communities as volunteers, as solid leaders and members within our communities and we owe them a place to stay, to live with dignity and contribute to our community and in order for us to do that we have to stand by our Comprehensive Plan to provide affordable housing. There is not affordable housing for seniors in the Northeast Metro. The waiting list to get into affordable housing for seniors is heartbreaking. Families are turned away all of the time that are looking for help. She thought the City owes it to the residents to create a community that we want to live in for the next twenty-five years and to support the folks that have built this community. She encouraged the Commission to do the work that is and has been done and to be proud of the Comprehensive Plan that has been put together. She encouraged the City to support this project.

Mr. Shane Spencer, 294 McCarrons Boulevard South

Mr. Spencer stated he was in favor of this project. He stated given the space he lives at on McCarrons Boulevard, he is looking at the Rice/Larpenteur revitalization project and to him, this project, while being farther north on Rice, also fits within that vision of the revitalization plans. He hoped the Commission consider being in favor of this project.

Mr. Craig Christiansen, 2951 Galtier Street

Mr. Christiansen stated he and his wife bought their house twenty-one years ago and the main reason was because it was a quiet neighborhood. He felt that this proposal by CommonBond does not fit the neighborhood. Mr. Paschke will know that there are other areas in Roseville that are already zoned High Density that can be used for this project and is already zoned High Density. He stated he was not in favor of the project.

Mr. Jim Studenski, 3055 Woodbridge Street

Mr. Studenski thought the Commission needs to understand what the conditions are. He wondered if anyone knew the building height being proposed. He asked what the parking setbacks were from the residential properties.

Mr. Paschke stated he did not know off the top of his head with those specifics, but the goals and standards of the Zoning Ordinance would need to be achieved. He stated CommonBond has only proposed a concept plan right now.

CommonBond Representative indicated the project is proposing a thirty-foot setback right now.

Mr. Studenski stated the traffic item has come up about the study in regard to the 694 ramp being closed and in addition to that all of April North Owasso Boulevard was closed at Burger King so there was very little traffic for the traffic study. He stated the Comp. Plan for the City, the 2030, the current level of service for Rice Street is Level C so he was confused how a Level A can be a current situation and when looking to the 2030 and 2040 projections Rice will go to a Level of Service E and F and staff is indicating there will be no change with this development. He asked at what time does the City contact Ramsey County regarding their Rice Street improvements and if there is going to be any needs for right-of-way. He stated medians are being added to improved roads along South Owasso and Rice Street. He asked if this project would still be feasible if the only entrance on the south side becomes a right in and right out due to a median at that interchange. He stated as far as the site itself, will there be an EAW or what will be required for a site review. He stated the discussion that this project meets the Comp. Plan criteria, is there any spot in Roseville that would not meet the requirements for the affordable housing. All of the statements that are called out that say have been substantially addressed or requirements are all general statements so that it appears the same thing could happen at Woodbridge Street, if someone bought up six or eight lots and many other areas. He thought the City needed to spend some more effort into where things should go and instead of doing the spot zoning it is laid out where these should go because none of the area in the North East area of Roseville calls out any change at all. Another component on the traffic study is it states that the existing condition would be a shopping center. He wondered if that was correct.

Member Daire stated it would not be a shopping center but could be a neighborhood business.

Mr. Paschke stated it could be a retail strip center.

Mr. Studenski stated there was discussion already about if there was affordable housing already in the City. It seems like there has been conflicting discussions on that. He asked that the City make sure everything is reviewed and evaluated before a recommendation is made.

Mr. John Cook, 3021 Woodbridge Street

Mr. Cook stated if CommonBond wants to be a part of their neighborhood then design the building to fit in the neighborhood, don't be a sore thumb and stand out.

Mr. Tom Wasmoen, CEO Firm Ground Architects

Mr. Wasmoen stated there are a lot of emotions running high with this item on both sides and he appreciated both sides and hearing everything. He stated he wanted to clear up a few things. Jim and Mary have been clients of theirs for two years trying to figure out what to do with this property. In the end the family decided not to do the development themselves and decided to sell the property. He stated Mary's dream has always been to do affordable housing on the property and he suggested CommonBond and to reach out to see what their interest would be. The reason he suggested CommonBond is because there is nobody better to do this kind of work. He stated CommonBond is in communities and hold the properties for a very long time and keep them up. He stated affordable senior housing would not have residents that would be a threat to a daycare. There has been senior housing that has had a daycare in the building because of how the two interact so well together. He stated there have been a couple of listening session with the neighbors that directly about the property and the neighbors were considerate and listened to them and voices concerns. He stated CommonBond is not done listening to the residents and will continue to work with the residents because it is very important. Once CommonBond gets the approval to move forward with this portion of the process, a civil engineer and landscape architect and structure engineer will be hired. He stated there is a long an important process ahead of them in order to be approved and the details are considered in depth in every way, shape and form.

Mr. David Secker, 2996 Northview Street

Mr. Secker stated he lived a block away from this. He stated he heard earlier that the goals were met and whoever established that the goals were met did not talk to the neighbors because goal six, to preserve and enhance the residential character and livability, no one talked to the neighbors in the backyard. What happens in the backyards and adjacent areas will change. He stated he was not opposed to CommonBond and thought the properties were well maintained. He thought the building being proposed does not fit into the neighborhood. If CommonBond wants to live in the neighborhood, he was a fan of it but not with that structure. He asked the Planning Commission to consider that.

Angie (no last name provided), 2934 Galtier Street

Angie stated she has lived in the residential area since 2005 and feels it is family oriented with great neighbors. Through the years the traffic has gotten crazy. Galtier

Street goes right through to Rice Street with a lot of cut through traffic. She stated she opposed this because it does not make sense and is not the right spot for this. She asked that this project be redesigned to fit into the neighborhood. She believed there needed to be affordable housing for seniors.

Ms. JoAnn Borden, 3016 Woodbridge Street

Ms. Borden stated she is not in favor of this at all. She is the homeowner that was going to do a significant remodel and have now changed her mind. Whatever the decision, the buffer fence, planting of trees, whatever it is, she will never have the privacy she has now. She will always have that three-story building looking down on her backyard. She stated she was not opposed to affordable senior housing and thought Roseville needed it but does not fit in this neighborhood. She noted there is also deeded lake access with a lake association, and she wondered how that would affect the deeded access to the lake.

Mr. Dave Kacmaynski, 225 South Owasso Boulevard

Mr. Kacmaynski stated he has lived at his home for twenty-four years and at that time there was no Owasso Hills so that brought in some condos and single-family homes and the traffic had totally changed from that instance and traffic traveled very fast. Since then the road was altered to slow down the traffic at some point but it is still quite fast. He still sees vehicles going fast but he thought with adding another sixty occupancies at the corner the residents will not just go down Rice Street, the people will go to Rosedale Mall and people go right through the stop sign by the park. With what CommonBond is saying regarding traffic flow, he does not believe it. He has seen the increase since he has moved in. He stated he did not agree with the project.

A resident commented that the City should care about the seniors but what about the youth and the families. She thought Roseville would want to keep the families there and bring more families in as well to keep things growing. It is not all about the people that are fifty-five or older it is also about the other residents as well.

Ms. Joelle Font, 2972 Woodbridge Street

Ms. Font stated she is right across from the CommonBond on the Little Canada side and when CommonBond built that the development should have allowed for another building there and kept them all together.

Chair Bull closed the public hearing at 10:50 p.m.

Commission Deliberation

Chair Bull stated there is ten minutes left of the meeting before the 11:00 p.m. hard stop he wondered if the Commission wanted to continue the meeting or table it and bring it up at another meeting.

Vice Chair Gitzen thought this item should be continued at another time. He did not think the best discussion happens when a person is tired, and the Commission has

been at this for four and a half hours. He stated the Commission does not want to rush into something and would vote for a continuance.

Member Kruzel agreed with that.

Mr. Paschke stated the next Commission meeting would be June 5th.

Ms. Bedor stated June 5th would be too late for CommonBond's funding applications and going to the City Council and would respectfully ask the Commission to take a vote at the meeting if possible.

Vice Chair Gitzen wondered if there was a possibility of having another meeting in May.

Mr. Paschke stated the Commission could have a special meeting.

Chair Bull thought having a special meeting would require advance notice out to people and the public for publication.

Member Sparby thought because this is a recommending body, he would prefer to go down the line and have the Commissioners state how each one feels about this item and make a decision to move forward with the process. He indicated this will go to the City Council next to hear the discussion.

Chair Bull thought the Commission will have significant discussion and he takes the staff recommendation very serious when staff told the Commission to go through the goals and policies and evaluate them as to which ones are being met or not being served by a change of this nature. He thought the Commission needed to go through those which will take some time. He suggested this item be tabled until the June 5th Planning Commission meeting.

Member Daire stated the next meeting was too far off and needed to be dealt with now.

Member Bull asked what would need to be done to schedule a special meeting.

Mr. Paschke stated the Commission needs to talk amongst themselves whether or not it is appropriate to table something that an applicant has brought forward and spent a lot of time and energy on to determine whether or not it is more appropriate to sit through another fifteen or twenty minutes to act on this request. If it is a special meeting the Commission needs to determine at what point the Commission can meet again to achieve a vote. He stated the City only has a certain amount of time to act on this. He would be cautious of that as well with respect to the State Statutes and extending timelines. He noted this has already been expanded once to move it to the June 3rd City Council meeting.

City Attorney Gaughan stated this is an advisory Commission and there does need to be a final decision made by the City Council and by delaying the recommendation the Commission is placing time constraints on the actual action decision making deliberation by the City Council so he did think it was appropriate, even though there is a few minutes left before the 11:00 p.m. curfew that this body get its recommendation one way or another and knowing that the City Council can disregard the recommendation or adopt it anyway. The Commission needs to get their recommendation to the City Council so that body has the time it needs to make its decision on this project.

Chair Bull entertained a motion to suspend the rules to have the curfew at 11:00 p.m. and continue the discussion and deliberations on this item. He would also entertain a motion to table this item if that is what is sought.

A. Comprehensive Land Use Map Change:

MOTION

Member Sparby moved, seconded by Member Gitzen, to recommend to the City Council the property (165 Owasso Boulevard, and 3011, 3029, and 3033 Rice Street) be re-guided from a Comprehensive Land Use Map designation of LR (Low Density Residential) and NB (Neighborhood Business) to HR (High Density Residential) and to recommend to the City Council the property (165 Owasso Boulevard, and 3011, 3029, and 3033 Rice Street) be rezoned from an Official Map classification of LDR-1 (Low Density Residential-1 District) and NB (Neighborhood Business District) to HDR-1 (High Density Residential-1 District) and to recommend to the City Council approval of the requested CU to increase unit density for the CommonBond project from 24 to 32 units per acre subject to the following conditions for (PF19-004):

- 1. The approval of a Comprehensive Land Use Map Change of 165 Owasso Boulevard, and 3011, 3029, and 3022 Rice Street from LR (Low Density Residential) and NB (Neighborhood Business) to HR (High Density Residential).**
- 2. The approval of a rezoning of 165 Owasso Boulevard, and 3011, 3029, and 3033 Rice Street from LDR-1 (Low Density Residential-1 District) and NB (Neighborhood Business District) to HR-1 (High Density Residential-1 District)**
- 3. The Comprehensive Land Use Map Change and Rezoning will not be finalized by the City Council and published for effectiveness until plans have been submitted confirming compliance with all other City Code standards with regard to the final development plans.**
- 4. The CU shall be specific to 60-units of affordable, multi-family senior housing as proposed by CommonBond Communities.**

5. **Maximum density shall be limited to 32 units per acre.**
6. **The Project meets the development requirements of §1004.06 Multi-Family Design Standard, §1011 Property Performance Standards, and §1019 Parking and Loading Areas of the City Code.**
7. **A sidewalk connection should be considered on both the south and east sides of the proposed development to connect into the existing pedestrian crossings at the Rice Street/South Owasso Boulevard intersection.**

Member Sparby stated he thought there has been very good arguments on both sides and really appreciated everyone coming to the table and he specifically wanted to say that he thought that Peter and Mary Heppner and Wayne really laid out the case very well for that side of the table and he supported this moving forward as a recommendation of approval to the City Council. What he heard from the developer is that CommonBond is certainly willing to work with the neighbors that are nearby, and he thought that was an encouraging sign. He thought CommonBond was willing to work on fencing and thought there still needs to be some discussion regarding height and location. He thought the biggest tipping point for him is that this is a fairly major corridor on Rice Street, and he thought the City is going to see a variety of uses pop up over time whether that be different types of businesses, residential, and other things. He really appreciated what the residents were saying that live in that community, but he thought the City is going to continue to see development and he thought this project has quite a bit of merit and his recommendation would be to support the project.

Vice Chair Gitzen thought City Attorney Gaughan's comment about the Commission being a recommending body is true and the discussion was great tonight. He understood the neighbors concern and would also like to have the City Council have discussion on the affordable housing issue. He stated this does not end tonight and will still go to the City Council for deliberation and a final decision.

Member Daire stated he could not remember when he agonized over a project so much. He stated as long as this passes sort of a marginal agreement with the Comprehensive Plan, that for him the decision would have boiled down to something emotional rather than factual. Being a career planner, he hated to admit that. He thought the project had a lot of merit and did not know of another developer that is more reputable than CommonBond. He thought stacking the building as close as possible to Owasso and Rice Street is going a fair distance to minimizing the impact of the building. In his experience, people react emotionally to what may happen, and it turns out not to be quite that way. He thought this is one of those projects where how he feels about it is probably not going to be as bad as he thought. On the other hand, he did empathize with the neighbors who want a quiet neighborhood. He stated he was thinking about the proposed residents of the project and those people are not the ones driving sixty miles an hour down Owasso Boulevard. He would be very surprised if those people did not get the criticism of going too slow. He stated it certainly seems like the property owners are assembling property along with Owasso

Boulevard and Rice intersection. He would not hold his breath that the marvelous muffler guy will be there forever and that would open up four properties and he agreed with people in saying this is just the first step. He believed the properties across the street are going to go that way too. He stated he did not think when the City is looking at an alternative use for this site that there is anything that suggests itself as being more reasonable than what is being proposed right now. The land has been assembled. He stated he was using a map that came out and he was noticing what the addresses were on the people who were signing the petition against this and he felt a certain kinship with their concerns. He was thinking that if this does not go with CommonBond, it will go with somebody and CommonBond is a known entity and the City can work with them. He thought the concerns of the neighbors can be met. He stated he was going to abstain from voting.

Member Kimble stated she was going to speak in favor of this project and echoed to just about everything that has been said.

Consider Extension of the Meeting

Chair Bull stated as part of the meeting curfew he referred to the Rules of Procedure and noted since discussion is not complete and the Commission meeting is past the 11:00 p.m. curfew, this discussion needs to be continued to another meeting date.

MOTION

Member Sparby, seconded by Member Kimble, to move to suspend the rules.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

Member Daire stated he decided he was not going to abstain from voting. He stated it is his feeling that a significant amount of conversation has to be held with CommonBond and its architect to come up with something that is attractive instead of being a posterboard. He stated he was going to come down in favor of the project given that.

Member Kimble stated she did empathize with everyone at the meeting and it was and is a hard decision. She would believe that the people that might live in this project are also real people that can be really good neighbors and if this goes forward and the City Council approves it, she knows that CommonBond will work with the neighborhood on the issues raised at tonight's meeting. She stated she was going to speak in support of the project.

Member Kruzel stated she would also support the project and really empathize and feel very torn to listening to the neighbors. She really felt there is a need and Roseville needs something that is affordable and if this is the spot that is calling and meets the standards and the City works with CommonBond, she encouraged the neighbors to continue the discussions and work with it. She stated Roseville needs to move and be progressive in what it is doing for the families whether old or young.

Chair Bull stated in the staff report there is a reference to a study recommended of the Rice Street Corridor and he wondered if that study has been done or where that is at.

Mr. Paschke thought that was in reference to the 2030 plan that talked about the City in the future doing a comprehensive corridor study along Rice Street that has not been started. He did not know if it has actually been discussed for the entire corridor.

Chair Bull stated the reason he asked is one of his concerns is what has been referenced as the spot rezoning and should there be an overall plan. What is going to be happening along Rice Street in the Roseville segments of that. He also did not think that the goals and policies in the staff report have totally reflected that those are all met by this project of CommonBond. He thought items such as goal one, it talks about land use patterns, land use changes, new developments that contribute to the preservation and enhancement of the community's vitality and sense of identity. It is his opinion that this project does not enhance.

An audience member voiced his opinion in regard to Chair Bull recusing himself.

Chair Bull stated he did not recuse himself from discussion, only from voting.

Member Sparby called to question.

Chair Bull stated there is a discussion on the floor and a call to question cannot be called with discussion on the floor. He stated the neighborhood identity is not preserved by changing the nature of the project. There are many other goals that are met for the diversity of the housing but he did not feel it is a true representation that all of these are met by this project and as he said earlier, he takes serious of staff's recommendation that the Commission go through those goals to evaluate which the Commission feels would be met by this project or which would be hampered to the neighborhood.

Vice Chair Gitzen called to question.

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

7. Adjourn

MOTION

Member Kimble, seconded by Member Sparby, to adjourn the meeting at approximately 11:19 p.m.

Ayes: 6
Nays: 0

Motion carried.