



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Minutes – Wednesday, May 5, 2021 – 6:30 p.m.**

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

1. Call to Order

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

Members Present: Chair Kimble; Vice Chair Michell Pribyl, and Commissioners Michelle Kruzel, Tammy McGehee, Karen Schaffhausen (arrived late), Erik Bjorum and Emily Leutgeb.

Members Absent: None

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

3. Approve Agenda

MOTION

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

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Review of Minutes

a. April 7, 2021 Planning Commission Regular Meeting

MOTION

Member Pribyl moved, seconded by Member McGehee, to approve the April 7, 2021 meeting minutes.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

5. Communications and Recognitions:

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

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.*

Member McGehee indicated she attended two webinars put on by the DNR on shoreland ordinances and variances that were very interesting.

6. Other Business

- a. Review and Provide Feedback on Zoning Code Update**

Mr. Jeff Miller and Ms. Rita Trapp, Hoisington Koegler Group, Inc., made a presentation on the Zoning Code update.

Member Schaffhausen joined the meeting at 6:54 p.m.

Member McGehee indicated when the Commission was going through the housing types, particularly at the tri-plex and quad, it really did not seem that they fit into the neighborhood styles of Roseville. She explained Roseville does have a variety of neighborhoods and some very clearly have a smaller lot and smaller house and there are distinct neighborhoods that have larger lots. She thought to try to make a one size, fits all, as she got to the final recommendations, she was not sure this is what most residents were looking for. She wondered whether the recommendation to divide the LDR, the LU into two formats and how much flexibility does the Planning Commission have to change the equivalent of LDR-1 to move it from four to six instead of from four to eight and then make the MDR go from six to eight or something like that. She did not know if the Commission has the authority to talk about things like that. She was also not sure what was meant by non-traditional in the presentation she went through. She thought in general, if looking at the style of most of the residential areas, if the City wants to increase density, the cottage style development seems to fit better given the sort of almost uniform story or story and a half in a lot of the neighborhoods.

Mr. Miller clarified the non-traditional plan for the Commission.

Community Development Director Janice Gundlach indicated regarding the density change, it was her understanding that the comp plan has been adopted and if the City were to change that the City would have to go back to the Met Council and propose an amendment to the comp plan.

Mr. Miller continued with the presentation on recommending renaming and consolidating of Districts.

Member McGehee suggested that if it is desired to increase the density in LDR, the cottage style of house might be more suitable with the existing Roseville home styles. The tri-plex and quad styles might work better in the LMDR districts.

Chair Kimble asked if Commissioner McGehee was now thinking of just the type versus the density. She thought the question about changing the density is not without a comp plan change.

Member McGehee indicated that was correct. She was speaking to the kind and also speaking to the density because, at least from what she is seeing and hears, she thought there is little appetite for much increased density in the residential areas, but people seem to be perfectly happy to have some areas of twinhomes and certainly to increase the density in the City with some of the things the Council has done to put some housing in the MU Districts.

Mr. Miller continued with their recommendation of allowed housing types in each District. He noted the recommendation is trying to line up the changes to the District with what the comp plan shows. He also reviewed the recommended residential densities.

Member Schaffhausen indicated she imagined fast forward to when it is time to do the community meetings, one of the questions might be, if the City does this LMDR and the size of the lots are changed and make them smaller, how would that start to affect some of the conversations with regard to variance and outbuildings and their size and what that looks like. She imagined this will be like dominoes where this starts to hang up and this is the first line and then it kind of follows through and the City will need to follow up to find out how the other things fit into that. She asked if that is coming yet where the City will have to go and fix those other options as well or will the City need to take those as a one off as they pop up, based on what is left to be developed in Roseville.

Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd explained that current regulations do not provide for things like storage buildings and detached garages, according to lot size. A larger detached garage or storage shed has more to do with the footprint size of the house, up to a certain maximum size. That is the same for people that have very small lots and for those who have very large lots. Beyond that there are less direct constraints that get to the improvement area and impervious coverage and meeting setback requirements, etc. There may be a reason to look at those provisions moving forward, especially if lot sizes are changing but those accessory structures are not pegged to lot sizes.

Member Schaffhausen explained she would like to have the opportunity to look at it because of the size of some of the houses. The quads are neat, but the question

becomes all of a sudden if it is all the need for a shed. Part of it is her lack of knowledge who is responsible for maintenance if someone has a tri-plex and if that property would get a shed if there would be an option. She noted she was thinking ahead and possible implications.

Mr. Paschke explained his answer would be that currently those types of things are allowed in the Districts the City has right now so not a whole lot is changing when looking at if there can be smaller lots and those type of things in a development or for that matter, even a four plex, six plex or eight plex, the code would allow an accessory dwelling, but it is really capped by the amount of coverage on the lot. He thought that may need to be tweaked but he did not know that these changes will impact how the City has enforced or allowed accessory sheds and or a garage or accessory building in any of those residential districts.

Member McGehee indicated she looked over all of the comments from citizens and has yet to see anyone asking for more density. In fact, that is the thing the City might most likely bump up against is people not wanting anymore density, particularly in the residential neighborhoods. She explained she was a little bit reluctant and did not know where the density mandate is coming from given the number of apartments that the City has been putting in. The other thing, she did not see where the City is going to put in equity in this. As the City begins to increase the density, one of the things that come up a lot in hearings and meetings is the sense of community and she thought there was a good sense of community and people really value that and also value their neighborhoods. She thought the City should think about moving forward. If the City is going to increase density, how does the City increase that density in a way that brings people in and makes them a part of the community that exists rather than overwhelming the existing community or makes it so dense that it is not a community or a neighborhood. She thought the City has done that in a couple of places and she thought it was important when thinking about this.

Member Pribyl explained she was thinking about the neighborhood she used to live in where there was a pretty broad range of single family, duplexes and apartment buildings and it felt very compatible. There were not any buildings that were really out of scale. Personally, she did not have concerns about things like putting duplexes or twinhomes in a low-density neighborhood if they are designed well and in scale with the neighborhood. Her questions relates to the building height. It felt a little bit random by going in five feet increments for the different districts. She knew those were related to the taller heights already allowed in the different districts but thinking about the number of stories in a building that relates to and also thinking about the City where there is not just LDR. The Districts will be next to each other, so she was thinking about the comments raised at some of the community meetings. Is there a step down or a range of heights allowed in the different Districts and the concerns of the neighborhoods next to the ones that allow taller heights. She wondered if there could be some sort of buffer so a low-density area with shorter buildings are not right next to taller buildings.

Mr. Miller thought it was an interesting idea to think about having a lower building height adjacent to residential. He noted he would have to think about how to actually implement that. As far as the building heights recommended, he was open to those being different but were trying to get them to match up with the scale that was identified in the comp plan.

Member Leutgeb thought that the comparison of reality to current zoning on lot size was interesting and she thought it was pretty clear that the more common current lot size of around nine thousand, there was a big discrepancy, percentage wise of what exists and what is written in code. She wondered what the consultants have seen elsewhere as codes have been rewritten.

Mr. Miller explained he looked a little bit at neighboring cities to Roseville but did not do a comprehensive look at it, but he thought seventy-five was perhaps typical for a lot of width. He noted every community is different and every community develops differently.

Member Bjorum explained he wanted to weigh in on the density. He saw a lot of comments from the meetings were regarding moving from renting to owning and he thought how that relates to some of the density discussed, he thought allowing for those duplexes and tri-plexes in some of these neighborhoods actually help that issue and make a more inclusive argument for that. He really appreciates the density the City is providing because it allows for some of those construction types that would allow for more of an economic threshold for people in them and it allows for those people to become more a part of the community and the neighborhood that those units are developed in. He thought that really sets that precedent that allows for those types of construction to be included in their neighborhoods and allows more people into those opportunities.

Member Leutgeb indicated that by adding some of this density the City is acknowledging that family structures and multi-generational families have different density requirements in housing. She did see that this is a clear alignment with the equity initiative by offering more types and more density in housing selections.

Member Kruzel thought the big thing is the change to make the housing more inclusive for all levels of income and equity across the board. She hoped this will touch on that and enhance that.

Chair Kimble observed and agreed that the housing density does help with the equity and also to aligning the nine thousand square foot minimum also makes it more affordable. She thought the idea of mimicking what is in the comp plan in the zoning was great because when developers come in, it just makes everything tight and clear. She thought it seemed like the primary type of unit that seems to be in some conflict with the LDR is the idea of the cottage housing because that is eight units on that acre but yet at the same time she thought when she looks at that particular kind of product she thinks a lot about seniors and a lot about building community around those kind of cottage developments and she thought there is a real opportunity for it. She

wondered if it is really practical to get eight units of the cottage type of home onto one acre. She wondered if the cottage homes should be allowed in the LDR. She thought it seemed like there are pros and cons for it.

Mr. Miller explained the fifty-five hundred number is in the higher districts but the attached housing types in the LMDR and MDR allow a minimum of thirty-six hundred square feet per unit, which is much smaller. The fifty-five hundred is a generous number in that it is really just being set by that maximum density of eight units per acre. He thought if they were looking for an ideal number for cottage courtyard housing, it is not fifty-five hundred and would probably be something smaller, but they are really sticking with the density that has already been adopted in the comp plan.

Chair Kimble thought another things the City should be focusing on is the height of the buildings in terms of how many stories and if it is making sense.

Mr. Miller agreed that 35 feet is really more like two stories or 2.5 stories. They are open to those numbers being something different. He thought they were basically saying that this reflects a difference in scale. Going higher as the density goes up and it provides one height per district. He asked if there were any suggestions for changing the building heights in the zoning districts.

Member Pribyl asked for clarification on the measurements for heights on pitched roofs and if it included half of the height of the slope on pitched roofs and on flat roof buildings if that includes the parapet or if it is the top roof sheathing.

Mr. Paschke explained the Code would say that as it relates to a gabled or hipped roof, that it is to the midpoint of the roof truss. It does go up a little on the roof truss system. On a flat roof, it is to the top of the roof system, not the part of the parapet, that might go up further than that. In the LMDR, thirty-five feet is really a two and a half story home. Three stories might be attainable out of the forty foot, maybe four but it would be a very tight four-story building.

Member Bjorum explained his concern with the five-foot increments is that it does not really align with construction or architecture. A story is not going to be added between LMDR and MDR if the difference is thirty-five feet or forty feet. He thought it would make more sense to do them in ten-foot increments and LMDR should really start at thirty feet or thirty-five feet maybe works but then MDR should jump ten feet which is more relatable to a construction type of story in a building.

Chair Kimble agreed.

Member Pribyl thought it might be helpful to look ahead to when this goes forward to a public hearing to have examples of buildings that are those heights for comparison. She also thought going back to the question of density and rental versus ownership, the idea of introducing duplexes and accessory dwelling units to her, allows more

people to be either renters or owners in some of the lower density neighborhoods. She thought was also an equity issue the City is addressing.

Ms. Trapp continued the presentation on the Non-Residential District Structure recommendations. She noted this will be discussed further when brought back for Commission review. She also reviewed Section One remaining discussion topics including Consider Allowing Increased Density in MDR with CUP.

Member McGehee indicated she would like to see the City's standard set of questions used in assessing CUP requests, particularly if they are going to expand the use of this tool.

Member Bjorum thought these seemed reasonable but thought it would be nice to have the City standard CUP information before the Commission fully agrees with this jump but on the surface it makes a lot of sense to him.

Ms. Trapp reviewed the idea of considering increasing the Minimum Green Space requirement in MDR and HDR with the Commission.

Member Schaffhausen thought about the number of times the Commission has gone through and had to pare down on the number of trees and she wondered where this fell into that same conversation where there is going to be trading going on.

Mr. Paschke thought the key to the Landscape Ordinance is that it probably should be reviewed as it relates to the amount of landscaping that it is seeking on certain lots. He thought when the City has run into the majority of the problem, it has to do with the multi-family requirement of one tree per unit, which staff is aware of and will look into and will most likely have a proposal to change that as a part of this process, probably in phase 2 than in phase 1.

Member Pribyl thought these were two different things potentially, on one hand, increasing the green space minimum overall would address some concerns that have been raised at other meetings about there being a lot of parking area and a lot of roof area, just increase in the green space on the site reduces the heat island effect, improves the appearance overall, even if the green space is not useable it is something that can potentially be looked at and enjoyed. She indicated usable outdoor space is a separate issue which is also important and could be a rooftop terrace or balcony but that is not addressing the other issues of overall aesthetics and incorporating nature and lowering heat island effects.

Chair Kimble explained the other part to it is, is it a part of the overall green space and not additive, just making sure that they are not doubling up too much, would be important.

Member McGehee indicated this is something she has been interested in for a long time and she agreed with Mr. Paschke. She agreed with Member Pribyl that there are divisions of places so that you can sit outside and maybe there are a couple of trees

and a picnic table versus a manicured flower bed by the front door. They are both green space but are very different. She thought both types of green space are important and if the City can make it all happen nicely would be great. She also thought the more density there is in an area the less green space there will be. She would like the City to think about the ratio as well.

Member Bjorum thought the green outdoor space requirement really just needs a better definition. He wondered if the City is going to deal with increasing or maintaining the green space then they may need to just define better what actually they are going to consider increasing. Especially, since there seems to be two sets of things here being discussed for the green space and he thought just having a clearer definition of what they should increase. He also wondered if this should be put in phase one or phase two. If put in phase one, does that mean as part of all the updates to all of the densities for medium, high, and low, this would be piggy backed into that group of considerations they are doing right now so as all of this is being worked out this could be included because that would be his preferred method for handling it.

Ms. Trapp indicated the phase one would be the elements they are working on right now, where changes are being made to lot size and densities and housing types. She reviewed the topic “Consider Increasing the CUP Threshold in the CMU Districts” with the Commission. She asked for concerns.

Member Pribyl thought it made sense and could not think of a reason why the City would need a CUP for that if the idea were to encourage and allow multi-family in mixed use.

Member Bjorum thought it seemed unnecessarily restrictive.

Chair Kimble agreed.

Ms. Trapp continued with the presentation on Establishing a BRT Overlay District, which is one of the elements of the comp plan.

Member McGehee thought the City should enhance safety and walkability because in most places they are talking about significant amount of traffic at significant speeds. They might want to also consider talking to MnDOT because MnDOT has been thinking about doing something like a pedestrian, non-motorized crossing between Rosedale and HarMar, which would be pretty significant, and the City might be able to tie into something like that.

Chair Kimble requested when this is looked at that the Commission have a visual of at least segments of this BRT Overlay District so the Commission can understand it because it is really great to talk about an enhanced pedestrian plan but how continuous is that along the overlay district because these are all great things but what does it really mean when looked at.

Ms. Trapp indicated they can add that.

Member Pribyl was also wondering if talking about safety and a pedestrian plan, it obviously goes beyond the individual parcels and goes beyond their scope. She wondered if the Public Works Commission and City Engineering could also be involved in some of that discussion as well.

Ms. Trapp agreed and thought the idea was, at least within individual sites that when redevelopment happens the City could think about it in terms of how the parking is laid out, how to make sure where the connections are, etc. The little enhancements overtime will knit together and there may be value in having people do that and really think about it.

Ms. Trapp reviewed the last topic of Implementation of the 10% Minimum Residential Requirement in the MU-2, MU-3, and MU-4 Districts with the Commission.

Member Pribyl indicated she could see a lot of problems with requiring ten percent on individual parcels or somehow trying to require ten percent throughout particular areas. She thought including it as a part of the purpose statement but not making it a hard requirement for each development makes a lot of sense.

Chair Kimble agreed and thought it was really hard to understand and would never work so then how would staff govern this if it were across that particular district. She thought the intent was good but in practicality in looking at it, it is really hard to understand how it could be done and enforced and is not really doable on a development by development, basis. She would be in agreement that pointing it back as a purpose statement might make more sense.

Member McGehee agreed with all of that, and it seemed that staff could make it easy to follow up on.

Member Bjorum asked if the City were to just include this in the purpose statement for these districts, the comprehensive plan still says the ten percent and he wondered if there is still a requirement for the developers in these districts to still have to meet that.

Ms. Trapp explained it would be something that staff would continually evaluate and think about every time a development would come through. She thought it would be something the Commission would have the opportunity to comment on. The Commission would be able to be more reflective of the location and the size of the development to say does it make sense or not that residential is a part of it, but it would be something that would be calculated over the entire things and something that staff would be looking at.

Ms. Trapp indicated her team will be putting together additional information about this in the coming months. She indicated she was glad that this is headed in a direction that made sense to the Commission and there are not big concerns.

Mr. Miller finished the presentation with the next steps for the Zoning Code update.

Chair Kimble thanked Mr. Miller and Ms. Trapp and staff for all the work.

7. Adjourn

MOTION

Member Pribyl, seconded by Member McGehee, to adjourn the meeting at 8:52 p.m.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.