



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Minutes – Wednesday, October 3, 2018 – 6:30 p.m.**

1. Call to Order

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

2. Roll Call

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

Members Present: Chair Robert Murphy; Vice Chair James Bull; and Commissioners, James Daire, Julie Kimble, Wayne Groff, and Peter Sparby

Members Absent: Commissioner Chuck Gitzen

Staff Present: City Planner Thomas Paschke, Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd, and Community Development Director Kari Collins

3. Approve Agenda

MOTION

Member Bull moved, seconded by Member Groff, to approve the agenda as presented.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Review of Minutes

a. September 5, 2018 Planning Commission Regular Meeting

Member Kimble stated on line 368, “Member Kimble thought there was a State Statute regarding this and should be included”. She thought it should be considered but not that the State Statute should be included in the language.

Member Daire stated on Line 322, flushed out should be changed to fleshed out.

Member Groff noted he sent some corrections to City Planner Paschke early in the day.

Member Sparby noted there were a lot of grammatical errors in the minutes which were minor. He thought the gist of what was being discussed was captured.

Member Daire stated there are a couple of typos on lines 466 and 475, referring to Table 119 and should be 1019 in both places.

MOTION

Member Kimble moved, seconded by Member Daire, to approve the September 5, 2018 meeting minutes as amended.

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.*

Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd updated the Commission on the scheduling of the remaining Comprehensive Plan meetings for 2018.

Chair Murphy stated with the dates of November 5 for the City Council meeting and November 7 for the Planning Commission meeting, the Commission is always challenged to get the draft of the City Council minutes. Short of watching the meeting or being there how can the Commission capture what went on at the meeting.

Mr. Lloyd thought staff can be ready to provide working notes from that meeting, particularly the more substantive comments that might come out of it so that can be part of the Planning Commission's discussion. Staff could email that to the Commission between the meetings. He was not sure staff could get the minutes to the Commission before the Planning Commission meeting, but staff can give an update about the City Council's feedback.

Chair Murphy asked if the City Council meeting minutes could be made available faster than normal that would be appreciated.

6. Continued Business

- a. CONTINUATION – Request by The Community Development Department to Consider Zoning Code Text Amendments To §1001.10 Definitions and Table 1005-1, Table 1005-5, Table 1006-1, And Table 1019-1 Pertaining to Breweries, Taprooms, Tasting Rooms, Brewpubs and Distilleries (PROJ17-Amdt35)**

MOTION

Member Bull moved to remove this item from the table.

Chair Murphy indicated he was not going to recognize the motion; the Commission was just going to remove the item from the table because this was a different meeting.

Chair Murphy opened the public hearing for PROJ17-Amdt35 at approximately 6:45 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing. He advised this item will be before the City Council at an October 22, 2018 meeting

City Planner Paschke summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated October 3, 2018. He reported this item has to deal with text amendments to the City definition section, §1001.10 Definitions and Table 1005-1, Table 1005-5, Table 1006-1, And Table 1019-1 Pertaining to Breweries, Taprooms, Tasting Rooms, Brewpubs and Distilleries.

Member Daire asked for a point of information, how many gallons are in a brewery barrel.

Mr. Paschke believed it was not quite 16 gallons for a full barrel.

Member Bull asked if Chair Murphy wanted to entertain changes at this time or during the Commission discussion.

Chair Murphy asked if staff involvement would be needed, his preference would be to have changes made during Commission discussion.

Mr. Paschke did not know why the Commission could not ask staff questions during Commission discussion. He indicated he was amenable to however the Commission wanted to move forward.

Chair Murphy asked to hold changes until Commission discussion.

Public Comment

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

Chair Murphy closed the public hearing at approximately 6:49 p.m.

Commission Deliberation

Member Bull stated on line 7, where it refers to cider and meads, that doesn't fit the description of beverages made from malt by fermentation. He noted a mead is a wine. He noted a tap room can be associated with either a brewery or a micro-brewery but in the Tap Room definition it talks about beverages that are made on the premises of a brewery when it can actually be made on the premises of a micro-

brewery as well. Staff is using a generic brewer but a very definitive brewery in its own definition. He thought that could get confusing.

Chair Murphy stated in the interest of having something the Commission can discuss and amend, could he suggest alternate wording for line 7.

Member Bull suggested striking cider and meads on line 7.

Chair Murphy stated there is the permitted malt in the definition, so it sounds consistent to delete them.

Mr. Paschke stated he was fine with that at this point but would lean on Mr. Lloyd to offer some suggested response to that as it relates to fermentation process.

Member Sparby thought on that point the City could adjust the language to state “beer or other beverages made from malt by fermentation or cider and meads”.

Mr. Lloyd thought that was the intent, unless it was the intent by the Commission to not allow for meads and ciders, but it seemed to be consistent with conversations that happened at past Commission meetings. Moving cider and meads before beer allows other beverages made from malt by fermentation be more directly connected to beer than appearing to be connected to the others.

Member Bull thought that was fine.

Chair Murphy stated line 7 should read “barrels annually of cider, meads, beer, or other beverages made from malt by fermentation”.

Member Sparby wondered if similar language should be added the brewery because he thought the big distinction between brewery and micro-brewery is the number of barrels being produced. He thought this should cover all of the craft beverages.

Member Bull agreed. He stated on line 14 and 16 in the taproom definition he saw the generic use of brewery.

Mr. Paschke asked if the Commission would like micro-brewery and brewery called out.

Member Bull thought “micro” could be put in parenthesis next to breweries so either one is applicable.

Chair Murphy stated the intent is to have language that is inclusive of micro-brewery and brewery.

Member Bull stated that was correct. He stated at the end of line 16, it notes “adjacent taproom”, adjacent taprooms don’t produce product, it is produced by the brewery or micro-brewery. He was confused by that wording. It may be served at

the adjacent taproom, but it is not produced. He stated on line 26 the first word is “wine” and he did not think breweries produced spirits of wine.

Chair Murphy asked if Member Bull was suggesting striking “wine”.

Member Bull indicated that was correct.

Member Kimble asked if there was another section that talks about wineries.

Mr. Paschke stated there was not. He stated there was discussion about that and realistically he did not think there would ever be a vineyard in Roseville or a place that would produce it. He thought if someone would come forward and want to produce it, the City could discuss it then.

Mr. Lloyd stated spirits of wine is an archaic term for purified alcohol. How that fits into distilleries he was not sure but apparently that is a term not necessarily related to wine making although it might also not be a current term but may be in State Legislature somewhere.

Chair Murphy asked what the intent of the phrase being proposed on lines 25 and 26 was.

Mr. Lloyd thought it was from other Statutes or Code listed in that fashion about distilleries and not necessarily to include wine making or some sort of spirits from wines.

Chair Murphy believed Mr. Lloyd’s explanation meant sense to him.

The Commission agreed.

Member Sparby felt at that point, if it is antiquated language, he would be all right with getting rid of it as well.

Member Bull stated in regard to the Tasting Room, one of the items he brought up at the last meeting, he did not see addressed and was not sure how to address it or word it and in the distillery, the distillery may be making a primary liquor such as a gin but in their tasting room the distillery serves mixed drinks with various liquors and the other liquor should not have to be made at the distillery as well. He did not know if the City wanted a primary ingredient produced by the distillery or how to word it to make sense in the definition. He was trying to be not so specific to lock things down and cause trouble in the future.

Member Daire asked if that would turn a tasting room into a bar.

Member Bull stated this would be like a tap room but for a distillery.

Member Daire stated if it is intended for the consumption of hard liquor made into various kinds of cocktails, is a bar equivalent to a tasting room.

Member Kimble thought a Tasting Room was intended to showcase whatever the distillery is producing. She wondered if a sentence could be added that it doesn't mean there won't be other spirits mixed with that which is distilled on the property.

Mr. Paschke noted he would find some type of wording to fit what was discussed.

Member Bull stated on lines 38 and 39, there was discussion on the location of a patio and it being on the front or side or the back if that was the property. These lines indicate the patio needs to be at "the furthest away from any adjacent residential zone or use." There could be a parking lot in the back of the building so the patio is not the furthest away from the side and he thought that was something the City would still want to permit. He did not agree with the wording.

Chair Murphy thought the Commission talked about this last time and the wording on line 38 "Where appropriate and applicable..." and as he read the sentence, the first choice, if it can be done is to put it the farthest away but if it can't be done, it is all right because it is not appropriate or applicable if the layout does not permit that.

Member Bull thought it left open "for appropriate and applicable" to interpretation.

Chair Murphy asked Mr. Paschke if that was the intent.

Mr. Paschke stated that was his understanding. There is the second sentence which requires it to be "...25 feet or more from a residentially zoned or used property" as well so the two work together and allow staff to be able to work with someone on where the patio should be located. Keep in mind this might be a pre-existing site that has a number of challenges. He thought the Commission talked previously about the "appropriate and applicable" which is consistent with existing design standards the City currently has in the Code that is enforced. He believed the Commission felt that was appropriate to have it remain in the structure of this requirement.

Member Bull stated lines 48 and 49 talks about the "residentially zoned or used property", if there is a property that isn't zoned residential but happens to have a resident, what would happen if a resident started to use a property that was not zoned residential next to a tap room. Would the tap room then not be in compliance or would it be in compliance because it was at the time it started.

Mr. Paschke stated residential use property means that currently it is in residential use, not that somebody goes into a commercial building and uses it residentially because that is not an allowed use. It would have to be something that is in place at the time this proposed use comes forward. These standards would not apply if a property changed or was rezoned because that is after the fact. This use, the proposed tap room or outdoor patio area would be then considered pre-existing, non-conforming because something next to it came in after the fact.

Member Sparby stated on line 15 and 16, he thought the wording should be updated similar to the other language previously discussed for the sentence "...of beer or other beverages made from malt by fermentation". Additionally, when brew pubs are talked about it goes into malt liquor and he thought updating that to the language the Commission came up with might be a good idea there as well. Thinking malt liquor would fall under the beer or something brewed from malt by fermentation as well. He thought that would be a catch all that could be used.

The Commission agreed.

Chair Murphy thought the wording was fairly close. He asked the Commission for changes to Table 1019-1.

Member Bull thought per some email received from residents that there should be some discussion for the parking in Table 1019-1. He stated it looks the wording in the table is that patio occupancy is additive to indoor occupancy as calculating the number of parking space. One thought he had was if it would be appropriate not to be additive because people would be sitting out on the patio other than sitting indoors.

Chair Murphy thought there could be patrons sitting in both places if the weather was conducive.

Member Bull thought there could be but did not feel it would be at capacity. For instance, if a place held forty people and twenty could be put on the patio, he did not think maximum capacity would be hit of both at the same time. He wondered if it was a better way to calculate the number of parking spaces that are applicable, or the density numbers used. Is there a reason to have a credit for bike parking spots. The City is trying to encourage neighborhood businesses where people have walkability and bike-ability to them. Member Bull asked whether there is some allocation that should be put to that.

Mr. Paschke stated from his perspective, having a parking requirement for patios is something that will probably be given serious consideration with the updated zoning ordinance. There are a number of them and during the course of the six to eight months there are pressures on all of those uses that have outdoor seating areas on the parking areas and those neighborhoods and that is throughout Roseville. From his perspective, the current seats inside the building would also cover seats outside for a minimum parking standard. There are many sites that it is not the case and end up having quite a few additional vehicles that are required because of the outdoor seating area on a site. In some instances, it has been problematic, and he thought the goal was to really look at this and try to figure out better ways to have minimum standards for all of the different types of uses and the outdoor area should not be considered any different than the indoor area when in use. He did not know how to split it up during the winter months but never the less, there should be a parking ratio for it which is why Staff proposed it in the table.

Member Bull stated that was one of the reasons why he thought the City should raise the parking requirement on the indoor because that will be a year-round number without any fluctuation of a patio and at the times a patio will be used it is more conducive to walk or bike to an establishment.

Member Sparby thought the Commission received some good communication this week from members of the public as well and a big component of the Comprehensive Plan was talking about walkability and now the City is proposing a requirement here that is going to essentially force a small taproom or something of that nature to build a gigantic parking lot and then people will need to walk through gigantic parking lots to get to these small local taprooms. The City needs to keep that in mind when discussing this. He noted there needs to be one parking space for each employee at the maximum capacity of that facility. There also needs to be one parking spot for every two seats plus one parking spot for every three patio seats, if there are a lot of tables in the facility there is going to be a gigantic parking lot that will be forced upon the local taprooms and he thought, as already seen, that no one will come with those requirements. He thought the Commission needed to take a closer look at this and potentially revisit. Maybe put some kind of requirements in but taprooms in Minneapolis do not have any parking spots. He thought this requirement was too excess to impose on the small business owners.

Member Daire asked what the rationale was for having one space for two seats inside and one space for three seats outside. He thought the City would want to be kept consistent.

Mr. Paschke thought the rationale is that a taproom is not like a restaurant, the taproom doesn't serve food, there are closer seating where people congregate. Theoretically there could be a high volume of people in the building. He thought it was noble that people are going to walk or bike to these facilities, but he was not certain that the majority of them will. He thought the concern given to the City and where these are to be located within the community and its adjacency to residential areas more so than industrial or very large commercial areas, like in Minneapolis or St. Paul these standards are most appropriate. He noted he was just the planner that looks at things from a much higher level and looks into a lot of stuff. If the Planning Commission sees things differently, the items can be modified. His personal feeling from reviewing this is that all of those requirements in the table are not over burdening for someone who actually is having a production facility, having people show up and having outdoor patio seating and having a lot people inside in a taproom sitting down drinking their wares and from his perspective are necessary in order to provide ample parking for that use because the majority of people are not going to walk to these facilities, at least not in the beginning. Many people will drive.

Member Kimble asked what the parking requirement was for a restaurant.

Mr. Paschke stated a restaurant's requirement is all based on seating. It is one space for every three seats.

Member Bull asked if there was an idea for seating and employee parking for the Culture Works space that was brought forward.

Mr. Paschke stated he was not sure but from the top of his head, looking at the number of seats in the building and given the same requirement as a restaurant, it would have required seven spaces because that is how the current code reads.

Member Sparby thought additionally something to consider is the Planning Commission is setting the minimum standard, which is the absolute bare minimum and seems high target to him.

Member Bull asked if the City takes employees into consideration under any other classification.

Mr. Paschke believed the City did but did not know off hand which classifications they are.

Member Bull noted he was struggling with this item.

Chair Murphy stated he was struggling as well. The City wants to be business friendly but on the other hand if the bar is set too low then there will be parking on the street, traffic obstruction, and noise in the neighborhood so he thought there was a significant downside also if the standard is set too low.

Member Daire asked if the City had any local patronage numbers that relate either to tables or seats in terms of how many people are coming by car. He wondered if there are any studies.

Mr. Paschke indicated the City did not have any information like that.

Member Daire asked if these are approximations being made. The City is stating that a micro-brewery, tasting room or taproom is kind of like a restaurant so the City wants to apply the same criteria for parking to these as the City does to a restaurant.

Mr. Paschke stated that was correct. Most people are going to drive, there will not be any food served and these will not function like a restaurant, so the City is seeking a higher standard from a taproom than from a restaurant.

Member Daire stated the thing he is driving towards is the City wants to be relatively uniform in the requirements or if there is deviation from those the City should have very good and substantiated reason for doing so, so the City is not dragged into court based on arbitrary and capricious standards. If these standards are some that are current in other suburbs or Minneapolis, he would feel the City would be on more solid ground, but he did not know whether that is the case or not. He thought if other cities were applying to similar kinds of facilities the City could use that as a rationale for adopting that standard for parking. He indicated he would feel more comfortable and he personally did not want to get the City into a situation where the City is

brought to court for having parking standards or other things that are not substantiated or backed up by practice.

Mr. Paschke stated the Commission is given the broadest discretion to design standards the way the Commission feels is appropriate to address this situation. The City does not need to follow any other municipality because that municipality may not have followed some other municipality when creating their standards. The Commission has to look at it and determine whether or not the Commission feels that these appropriate for that particular uses it is addressing. If the Commission is not, then it can be modified and sent forward to the City Council. It is not being arbitrary and capricious to come with a standard the Commission feels is appropriate for the City.

Member Kimble asked if the City ever had different minimum parking requirements where one of these kinds of uses might be adjacent to residential versus in a commercial versus in a more industrial area and can staff differentiate.

Mr. Paschke was not sure if the question could be answered. He thought the uniqueness of Roseville is that most all of the commercial areas are adjacent to residential areas unless in the Rosedale area and the heart of the core. That is probably the only area that does not lie in direct proximity except on the north side of the Rosedale core. Everywhere else the rest of the commercial and industrial areas are somehow, someday in close proximity to residential whether high or low density residential.

Member Sparby thought another thing he gathered from the email the Commission received from the public was that Bent Distillery would require a minimum of 57 parking spots. He felt that was a pretty small operation and would require almost 60 parking spots. He thought it would be tough for them to even locate in Roseville under these standards. He saw this as a solution looking for a problem right now. He did not think it was a problem and the Commission was trying to come up with a cohesive, comprehensive piece of the Ordinance to cover this and he felt the City has already covered it very well. He thought the parking standards will need to be seen organically as it develops and then later on if standards are needed the City can impose them depending on how the City sees businesses pop up. He thought the City needed to leave some discretion to the business owners. He thought imposing any type of standard at this point without enough information will frankly discourage any business from coming to Roseville and organizing under these Ordinances. He stated he would like to see this left out of the equation for now and revisit it at a later date. He would like to move forward with everything else but leave the parking standards out of the Ordinance for now. That way the Ordinance would be solid, and the Commission can move forward with the other comprehensive program.

Member Daire stated lacking something the Commission can compare this requirement to, staff indicated for restaurants the requirement is one parking space for two seats, there are a lot of restaurants with outdoor seating, so he wondered if the City applied the standard of one parking spot for every three seats.

Mr. Paschke stated it was just the opposite. Anything pre-existing would not apply. This is a new requirement in which the City would be moving forward with.

Member Daire stated in any event, whether it is going to be three seats per space or two seats per space, the City should be consistent. He stated he would be challenged to see why outdoor space should be allocated any differently than indoor space.

Member Bull thought the restaurant requirement was one space per every three seats.

Mr. Paschke indicated that was correct.

Member Bull stated his fear of not addressing this is the Commission is not the decision body, it goes to the City Council and he thought it behooves the Commission to give the Council some guidance. The more guidance the Commission can give the Council, the better it is going to be for them to make the decisions. He thought. Like anything, this can change, and he would like to see the City be less restrictive than more restrictive to start with. He suggested this be consistent with the restaurant capacity where the City requires one space for every three seats. If residential on-street parking becomes an issue the Commission may need address it to higher standards or have some no parking zones on the streets or something to mitigate but he thought the City needed to be business friendly and try to have something that is open because the City does not know where this is going to go or what the parameters are. That way the Commission can give the City Council some guidance and be consistent with the restaurant capacity and move forward.

Member Kimble asked if there was the additional employee requirement with the restaurant code.

Mr. Paschke indicated he did not have the code in front of him, but he did not believe it spoke to an employee number. His suggestion would be to at least have a parking requirement because if the City does not have one it will be very difficult for staff to work with businesses if there was not a minimum standard for them to utilize. Whatever the Commission decides to come up with staff will move forward with.

Member Sparby thought that Commissioner Bull brought up an excellent point about providing some guidance to the City Council. The one thing he would note is that he feels like the taprooms are different because people may stop in for one beer and stay a short amount of time versus a restaurant where a person would sit down and have a meal. He thought more parking was appropriate because there will be less coming and going from the establishment. He would like to see the minimum standard be one for every four seats because then there would be one vehicle for a four-top table, which is industry standard. The one for four would set the minimum requirement a little higher. He thought there was a direct correlation there between table and vehicle size. He would like to see it a little higher because then the business owner can come in and add parking spots if needed but that sets the minimum standard a little less stringent than a restaurant for the reasons he articulated.

Member Kimble stated one of the things that struck her that she thought was important is that it seems like the norm for the millennials is taking an Uber wherever they go so the people do not drink and drive. She thought that seemed to be the norm and would push up against the issue for more parking.

Member Bull stated a taproom could also be an off sale where someone stops in to pick up a growler to take home and not stay to have a drink. He indicated he was not opposed to the one for four.

Member Groff understood Commissioner Daire's point of keeping consistency. He thought there was some value to that. He also saw Commissioner Kimble's point of view as well because he hoped people were becoming more responsible with drinking and driving. He thought there needed to be a recommendation to the City Council but for less parking than what is required in the Code being proposed.

MOTION

Member Sparby moved, seconded by Member Bull, to reword Table 1019-1 Minimum Parking Standards to read: One space for every four spaces in a taproom/tasting room.

Member Daire asked if that would include employee parking.

Chair Murphy indicated it would not.

Member Groff stated one concern he would have is would the City be able to address concerns or problems in the future quickly or is it going to be that the business is already there and would not apply to them. He did not want to create a problem before it can be solved.

Chair Murphy did not know how to address that concern, but the City has a process and it takes time to address issues.

Member Sparby thought the City also wanted to set it against a parking standard that is so high that the business cannot ever be proposed for a Conditional Use or anything like that.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

Chair Murphy asked if the Commission had any other comments on the tables.

Member Bull stated looking back at what the Commission has recently done with changing the tables from not-permitted to conditional and wondered why the City would want all of these various uses to be not permitted versus conditional. He stated this would leave open the possibility that these uses can be considered by the City.

Member Bull stated in Table 1005-1, Neighborhood Business, he understood not allowing a brewery because of the size but a micro-brewery/distillery could be a small local business and tasting room/taproom could also be very small. He thought the condition could be the size of the operation and could fitting to a neighborhood business and if the Commission were to make that conditional then those types of businesses could be given consideration.

Mr. Paschke thought those changes were what was proposed at the last meeting and accepted with the changes (in blue). There is only one change as it relates to the tables that comes from that meeting. He thought the second point has to do with impact and he thought discussion and recommendation was the City did not want to impact neighborhood businesses because those are small nodes, mostly directly adjacent to single family residential homes and the goal based on the information staff received through the Culture Works project was that was a great concern and is why this was proposed as is. If it is the Commissions desire to change that staff will make the change and move it forward.

Mr. Paschke stated Conditional means that a business can move forward and can be a difficult bar sometimes at least from planning division standpoint and or Planning Commission standpoint to look at a project and deny it if there are not a lot of conditions tied to those projects versus keeping it not permitted and allowing things that might be impactful to be in high business districts which are larger business properties and perhaps in not close proximity to residential.

Member Kimble thought it would be interesting to survey the residents of Roseville because to Commissioner Bull's point, many of these small taprooms and micro-breweries are cropping up in residential neighborhoods across St. Paul and Minneapolis and as far as she can see most people seem to like to walk to them. She thought this was a kind of vibe people are seeking in an amenity, but she did not know if Roseville was different, but it was hard to create those neighborhood place to meet if the City does not even consider it.

Member Bull stated what the City has heard over the last few years in the surveys are that residents want more meeting places in Roseville. He thought if this was changed to Conditional it would be a possible way to do something. If it is not permitted, then a business cannot even try to get approval to go into a residential district.

Member Kimble asked if in the table the microbrewery, taproom and tasting room and brewpub should be changed to conditional.

Member Bull stated he would also change the distillery because that could be small as well. He stated regarding brewery there is a 3,500-barrel minimum which would require a larger capacity size for them and he thought that would warrant not including them in the small neighborhood businesses and such. He stated he would change Table 1005-1, and 1005-5.

MOTION

Member Bull moved, seconded by Member Groff, to designate in Table 1005-1 under Neighborhood Business to change microbrewery, distillery, tap room and tasting room be designated as conditional. Table 1005-5, microbrewery, distillery, tap room and tasting room be designated as conditional in CMU-1 and CMU-2.

Member Bull pointed out on page 4, Table 1005-5 is continued there, and microbreweries is included there and would be included in the motion. He stated he would like to include distillery be included in the motion for Table 1005-5.

Chair Murphy stated brewery is not permitted in Table 1005-1 and Table 1005-5, would Commissioner Bull want to change that to conditional as well.

Member Bull stated he would not want it permitted but would consider a friendly amendment if someone felt differently in one of those districts.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

Member Kimble stated in regard to Table 1006-1 if distillery in the Office Business Park should be conditional.

Commissioner Bull thought it should be permitted because it is permitted in the Industrial District.

Member Kimble indicated she would be fine with that change.

Chair Murphy asked Mr. Paschke the reason for distillery not being permitted in the Office Business District.

Mr. Paschke stated the logic behind it is the City does not allow those types of uses no matter what type. The Office Business District is designed more for the Office Business type uses and not necessarily production type uses which would be more in the Industrial area.

Member Sparby wondered if that could be a conditional use so the City can set some parameters around there but if there was office business park that was under utilized it could be considered there. He stated he would be supportive of conditional for both the brewery and distillery, so the City can set some parameters if needed to accommodate others in the area.

Chair Murphy offered a counter view to that such as Centerpointe Business Park. A brewery and distillery seem out of place in that environment, not just because of a PUD but the City's prime office business park in there.

Member Daire asked if there was a restaurant/bar component in the hotels in that area. He wondered if the hotels have liquor licenses and if the hotels serve liquor, is it open to the public or only for guests.

Mr. Paschke believed some do and some don't. He stated it is a matter of what the hotel wants to do and is not typically open to the public.

Member Sparby thought the change might be one of the better things to happen to Centerpointe. When there is an office business park, to have some kind of establishment come in and bring some life in the area would be good. He also thought the possibility of a brewery with a tap room could add a lot of liveliness to the business park. He thought conditional made sense in order for the City to align it with the interest of the office business park.

Member Kimble agreed. She thought it would be a tremendous positive.

Member Bull stated the City often thinks of office business parks as employment districts where it is catering to the employees and by having these possible, the tap rooms and tasting rooms could be available for people staying in the area or who work in the area or visiting the area.

Member Groff stated he liked the idea of these types of businesses in this area because the parking is already there, and he thought it would make use of the space over a longer period of time and there wouldn't be residential close by. He stated he would support either conditional or permitted.

MOTION

Member Sparby moved, seconded by Member Groff, to amend Table 1006-1 to update an Office/Business Park brewery from not permitted to conditional and for Office/Business Park distillery from not permitted to conditional.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 1 (Daire)

Motion carried.

Member Daire stated he voted nay because he was thinking of the quantity that is produced. The distillery that is open to hard liquor and the brewery that would be producing in excess of 100 barrels a week. It strikes him that it is a production entity and is appropriate in an Industrial area where a large production facility would not be appropriate in an office business park. He stated the City has already permitted a brewpub, microbrewery, tap room and tasting room in the office business park. He wondered why the City needed to make conditional larger production units in that place. The will already have the livelihood in that area that the City is looking for as a permitted use in the office business park. He questioned the wisdom of putting a large production facility in the middle of a business park.

Member Bull appreciated Commissioner Daire’s viewpoint. As a point, the City does not have a volume on the distillery and is why he had trouble determining where it would be appropriate or not appropriate because a brewery the City knows what its volume is, but the City does not know the volume permitted for a distillery.

Member Kimble stated the breweries of today are not the breweries of yester year and a difference can be seen.

MOTION

Member Bull moved, seconded by Member Sparby, to recommend the City Council approval of amendments to §1001.10 (Definitions), Table 1005-1, 1005-5, 1006-1, and Table 1019-1 Minimum Parking Standards in support of definitions and allowance within specific zoning districts for taproom, tasting room, brewpub, microbrewery, and brewery based on the project report, public comments, and Planning Commission input (PF17-019).

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

Recess

Chair Murphy recessed the meeting at approximately 7:59 p.m., and reconvened at approximately 8:03 p.m.

7. Public Hearing

a. Request by Hand in Hand Christian Montessori For Consideration of a Comprehensive Land Use Plan Map Change and Zoning Map Change At 211 North McCarrons Boulevard (PF18-016)

Chair Murphy opened the public hearing for PF18-016 at approximately 8: 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 October 3, 2018. He reviewed the history of the site with the Commission.

Chair Murphy asked in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan the City did not change the designation of this land.

Mr. Paschke stated that was correct. The land designation is still low density residential.

Chair Murphy asked for a summarization of the differentiation between LDR-1 and LDR-2 with the zoning.

Mr. Paschke stated LDR-1 would be a standard, single family residential lot and LDR-2 could support small lot single family residential which is sprouting up in

different communities. It could also support a townhome development of some sort as well, attached or detached.

Member Daire stated on the map, how much areas are represented east of the proposed school site and the wetland area.

Mr. Paschke stated he did not know off the top of his head, but it is possible the developer might know.

Member Daire asked if it is a greater density, units per acre than what would be allowed in LDR-1.

Mr. Paschke stated that was correct.

Member Daire asked how many units does LDR-1 allow up to.

Mr. Paschke stated it allows up to 4 units per acre.

Chair Murphy stated the request before the Commission is to change the Comp. usage and change to LDR-2 as a request.

Member Kimble thought what Commissioner Daire is seeing is an inconsistency with what the definition is in the plan the Commission is looking at which may or may not be LDR-2. It looks like this could be LDR-1, the way it is laid out.

Member Daire stated what he is trying to find out is does this need to be an LDR-2 or would an LDR-1 satisfy.

Member Kimble asked if this public hearing for both Comp. guidance and the for the zoning that will follow.

Mr. Paschke indicated that was correct.

Chair Murphy stated regarding the Comp. Plan Use, that will be one motion and in order to pass that it will take a 5/7 vote. If that change takes place, then the Commission can consider a zoning change which would be a normal majority vote.

Mr. Paschke stated in looking at the slice of land on the map, he was not 100% certain that based on any design that the developer could get four lots that meet the minimum design standards under the zoning code which would be why the City would go with the LDR-2 to allow for a smaller lot, private road design and things like that which is more consistent with that.

Member Bull asked if there would be different lots. Would the residential and institutional be different lots.

Mr. Paschke assumed the project would be separate properties. He did not believe the project would all be one property. He reviewed the land area map with the Commission.

Member Bull asked if the southern two houses depicted in the diagram be considered corner lots by City standards.

Mr. Paschke stated the two houses may not necessarily be considered corner lots because there is not access to a public street, based on this proposal. The street is an interior street which is looked at differently.

Member Groff asked what the total acreage was on the property.

Mr. Paschke stated he did not have that off the top of his head.

Chair Murphy thought he read it was nine acres.

Mr. Brent Thompson, representing Hand to Hand Montessori School, made a brief presentation to the Commission. He noted their intent is to be cognizant of the city of Roseville's Priority Plan for developing the neighborhood.

Mr. Thompson noted the development is intended to be single family homes. He stated at the neighborhood meeting he proposed townhomes to go in the development and at the end of the meeting and speaking with many neighbors, one of their concerns, and the reason he changed it to single family, is that projects that had been developed in that area over the last ten to fifteen years were developed to be adjacent to the east of the school was a condominium. It is currently a rental facility. The neighborhood would like to stay away from townhome development there and becoming rental units. If kept as single family, the homes would be individually owned with less opportunity to become rentals.

Mr. Thompson reviewed the history and overview of Hand in Hand Christian Montessori with the Commission.

Member Daire stated he visited the site and noticed it is a one floor facility. It strikes him that bringing the building to ADA standards is not a big challenge. It would seem to him that the place where would be the most challenge is in the bathrooms.

Member Kimble asked if there will be gap in operations with the lease not renewing at Corpus Christi and the new building or will the school be able to come together for a seamless transfer.

Mr. Thompson stated the goal is to operate at the new building next fall. The Montessori would like to close on the property in February 2019 and leading up to that Mr. Paschke indicated the Montessori would need to go through the single-family process with the City to work out any issues, which would be the next item on the agenda with a close date in February 2019. January and February would be going to

the City for building permits in order to attempt getting fifty percent of the building ready to move the existing student body. The goal is to move approximately 450 students. None of the students are bussed, the students are driven through car pools and come from almost the entire metro area. A large client base comes from Woodbury wrapping all the way to Maple Grove and including the City of Roseville.

Member Kimble asked if the Montessori currently have a signed purchase agreement.

Mr. Thompson indicated the Montessori did have a signed purchase agreement.

Member Kimble asked if there were any environmental issues.

Mr. Thompson stated the only environmental issue that has come up is any hallways and floors that have VCT, there is a small level of asbestos in them. If any of that were to be removed, it would have to be dealt with correctly. As of right now there will need to be an update of phase one in order for the bank to ultimately sign off. He stated a phase two has not been required at this time.

Chair Murphy thought the National Guard used the building for storage and asked if there was any storage contamination on site.

Mr. Thompson stated there is no storage contamination. There is a document that indicates everything is out of the facility.

Chair Murphy thought one of the downsides of growth is concerns with traffic. He wondered if a traffic impact study will be done.

Mr. Thompson stated the school started as a home school-based school. Students only came three days a week. Over the last ten years, there has been an average of 150 students that come to the school three days a week. Traffic in the morning, three days a week, will be busy but Thursday and Friday will be less busy. In the afternoon, students are leaving periodically at different times based on their classroom schedule. At the end of the school day the traffic will be less intrusive.

Chair Murphy asked what the average faculty size would be.

Mr. Thompson stated there are currently fifty employees with seventy-five percent of that group is there every day and will probably increase to a staff of sixty to sixty-five employees if the school is in full operations and capacity.

Member Bull stated McCarrons Boulevard presents some challenges with high traffic with the intersection with Rice Street. He asked if a traffic study has been done.

Mr. Thompson stated there has not been a traffic study done at this point.

Member Bull understood staff is currently fifty employees for three hundred students, a one to seven ratio.

Mr. Thompson stated if a classroom has twenty-four students there will be two teachers in the classroom and some days there will be three, one would be an assistant that takes care of two classrooms but not necessarily every single staff member is a full-time employee. Out of the fifty employees on average fifty percent are full time staff. The other half will be part time staff.

Member Bull asked if that is only teachers or other staff as well.

Mr. Thompson stated it would be all of the above.

Member Bull asked on the housing side has the Montessori considered affordable housing.

Mr. Thompson asked what was meant by affordable housing.

Member Bull stated it would be any type of housing that can be kept within the poverty levels of the residents in Roseville and more affordable housing manor.

Mr. Thompson thought the comment from his perspective, when he drives around this neighborhood with houses across the street that are on the lake and going to the west of this property, he thought this area fits to have single family homes maybe not in the affordability part of it but to build a brand new home that can be \$375,000 to \$500,000 that holds the value of the neighborhood even though the homes would not be on the lake. He stated new construction is a cost driver. He did not view this to be a multi-family development.

Member Bull stated the City is not finding many opportunities for affordable housing, but it needed to be addressed within the community to find a way to get affordable housing and there are not a lot of properties to develop in Roseville.

Member Daire stated the original school was built in 1936 as part of the WPA project and at that time lead paint was pretty much what was used. He wondered when the National Guard moved out was there remediation for lead based paint.

Mr. Thompson stated in the original building structure, all of those windows are already gone. The building in the 1936 area has a clad window in it so there is very little lead-based paint. Possibly in some interior millwork but most of it is stained.

Member Daire asked if the Montessori will deal with the lead-based paint if there is any.

Mr. Thompson indicated it would be dealt with and cleaned up if necessary.

Member Daire asked if fifty personnel the number anticipated at full enrollment.

Mr. Thompson stated it was not. Currently for 350 student there are fifty employees, if the students increase to 400 to 450 the staff will grow.

Member Daire stated when he was at the site, he counted 115 parking stalls and it struck him that there is room for growth but with parents carpooling and bringing students in there will be different circulation patterns than what a car would have. He presumed part of the planning activity will deal with how to cycle parents in and out in the most expeditious manner.

Mr. Thompson stated that was correct.

Commissioner Gross stated he toured the building two years ago and found the WPA building very interesting. He wanted to make sure all of the issues with lead-based paint, mold, asbestos will be covered.

Mr. Thompson stated those issues will be taken care of.

Member Daire noticed that over at Corpus Christi there was a farmer's market and he noticed on the presentation marketplace activities, would this be something that would be brought over to the new building.

Mr. Thompson stated that was possible and the Montessori was looking to serve the community if the community will embrace it.

Member Daire noticed on the schematic an area for a soccer field and baseball field.

Mr. Thompson stated that was correct and he sent correspondence to Mr. Paschke to see if the City would consider taking some park dedication fees off the four lots because the Montessori wants to turn that field into a soccer field and a baseball field.

Member Daire asked if Mr. Thompson intended for there to be a community accessible recreation or park component to this plan.

Mr. Thompson stated that was correct.

Member Daire stated because Mr. Thompson was planning on doing that the Montessori was probably going to come forward for park fee to be waived.

Mr. Thompson stated the Montessori would pay the fee and use it to beautify the baseball diamond, but the intent would be to build that up, so the community and students can use it.

Public Comment

Ms. Keturah Pestel, 1080 Parker Avenue

Ms. Pestel stated she is a fifteen-year resident of Roseville. She stated she has known about Hand in Hand Montessori for about ten years. Her daughters went there for

preschool. Her children are currently students at Falcon Heights Elementary, but the family has stayed connected to the Montessori and still use lessons. Montessori's teach students about practical life and contributing back to your community. He stated her family has recognized the good work the Montessori has done, and Hand in Hand has good leaders. There are forward thinking people who consider other people's opinions at the Montessori. She stated the employees bring life and vitality to the school. She wanted to strongly recommend the approval and even though her family is not technically part of the Hand in Hand community when her family has gone to fundraisers or events her daughters still run in and are welcomed even though it has been a few years since her family has attended.

Mr. Brian Larson, 182 Skillman Avenue West

Mr. Larson stated he was in support of the redevelopment. He did have a few questions, one being traffic. On Elmer Street where the paint store used to be it is really hard to take a left turn onto Rice Street already so 250 to 300 cars in the morning and evening for child safety, that corner would need a light. Also, the corner of North McCarrons and William is a blind corner, near the four homes and he would not want traffic to go into that neighborhood because it is a scary corner and cannot see onto William if trying to cross.

Mr. Larson stated he did like the four single family homes and felt the homes will fit the neighborhood the best. He thought it might still be LDR-1 except for the private street. He thought that fits the homes to the side of it. His biggest concern and being supportive of the redevelopment, what he does not want to see happen is to have the development start, rezoning and Comp. plan change and have it change to institutional, have the project stop and then have the zoning not return to LDR-1. He asked if this project cannot be made to work due to environmental, funding or some other reason, is that this would be a temporary zoning change for the duration of a project so if it were not to work and another developer were to come in he would like to see LDR-1 zoning return to the property so that another developer would have a chance to do something.

Chair Murphy understood Mr. Larson's concern but if this did not work out another process would be needed to change it back.

Ms. Tara Anderson, 2040 Irene Street

Mr. Anderson stated she and her husband have been residents since 2009. Her family lives close to the building and great neighbors are priceless. She thought Hand in Hand Montessori School would be a great use of that property. She stated what excites her about this plan is that the Montessori want to preserve and share the green spaces the community loves. She could see the school sharing the gym space, a potential community theater, offering meeting places, preserving meeting places that exist, building walking paths for the community to use, having a ballfield and fixing it up and preserving the woods the community loves. She stated this will bring the community together. The Montessori focus places a high value on the natural play and peaceful environments. Students currently have gardens in which the students take care of and have the children take charge of the gardens. She could see this in

her neighborhood and felt the Montessori would fit right in. She wanted to point out that Hand in Hand is already an existing Roseville business that can be supported. It is a gem of a school. She stated her oldest daughter is a special needs and Hand in Hand allowed them to bring in multiple staff members to go to school with her every day and help her. It meant a lot to them to witness true partnership on behalf of a child when no one else was watching. She knew how hard Hand in Hand would work with outside groups to share the space because collaboration and peace is part of their motto. This building has been a school for many years, many decades in the community and is nothing new. She noted she was not concerned with traffic problems. School start times and schedules are staggered, and the Montessori has considered it very thoughtfully. The Montessori has made it work at their current locations and think about these things. She stated the McCarrons neighborhood want this building to be a school. She asked the Commission to give this plan a positive recommendation to the City Council.

Ms. Deloris Mordorski, 2046 Marion Street

Ms. Mordorski stated she was in favor of the project. She did not know anything about this particular school but was familiar with Montessori and about the caring approach that is taken to the individual. She liked the idea of this versus an intense dense property. She agreed with the concern if were to get changed along the way. She stated she supported this concept.

Mr. Rick Sanders, 363 South McCarrons Boulevard

Mr. Sanders stated he is on the south side of the lake in the community and asked the Commission to present this plan to the City Council with their support. When Hand in Hand had their neighborhood open house, the Montessori showed the neighborhood what kind of neighbors they will be. The Montessori came in and opened up their hearts by showing the residents what the Montessori wants to do with that property. He thought it was a great that the Montessori wants to restore the building and use it for the community. He stated this is a treasure to the City of Roseville. He thought this was the best plan for the development.

Mr. Joe Englund, 224 North McCarrons Boulevard

Mr. Englund stated he is directly across the street from the school and he whole heartedly support this proposal. He stated he could not think of a better use or better neighbors for this project.

Mr. Jim Moncur, 294 North McCarrons Boulevard

Mr. Moncur stated after touring the site three times with various groups he has had discussions at his home with neighbors and out of those discussions the neighbors tried to come up with criteria to judge proposals. He stated the first criteria the group came up with was any use should maximize the amount of existing open and green space remaining after the property was developed. The second criteria the group came up with was any use should minimize the impact on the surrounding area of any new construction, in this case, the introduction of residential housing units, four units are being proposed now which is considerably smaller than what was proposed in the first place. The four units are manageable. The third criteria the group came up with

was any new use should modernize and reuse the existing building for uses that were proven in the past to be non-intrusive and non-objectionable to the neighborhood. In this case, the building was a school for fifty years without substantial objection. Returning it to a school would seem non-objectionable. The fourth criteria the group came up with was any financing of the project should be preferably non-dependent on Roseville property taxes. The current application seems to address each of the four criteria him and his neighbors came up with in a positive fashion. He believed most of his close neighbors have no objection to the proposal and indeed would endorse such.

Ms. Diane Hilden, 466 Bayview Drive

Ms. Hilden stated she has lived in the neighborhood for twenty-seven years and have been involved with the Lake McCarron's Neighborhood Association. She stated when the whole thing about the Armory came up it was so disturbing to everyone to lose this building, this treasure. She stated she has toured the building on several occasions and heard good things about it. The idea of putting lots of houses in there did not seem to be the best solution. She would like people to be aware of the history of the building and that the original zoning was in fact institutional. At the neighborhood meeting there was a discussion about this building being a tremendous resource for the community. She thought the Montessori fits in the community well. She encouraged the Commission to support the use of the property and to make that recommendation to the City Council.

Mr. Bill Pearson, 2040 Woodbridge Street

Mr. Pearson stated he knows the property very well. He stated there was a lot of traffic during the time the Army National Guard occupied the building and it was not of a great concern to the neighborhood. There has also been use of the baseball field and parking on the street and thought it was neat to see that field being used. He thought Roseville needs more affordable housing.

Ms. Mary Englund, 224 North McCarrons

Ms. Englund stated when this came around the first time, she was very concern living right across the street. She went to the meeting at the church and one of the things that struck her after going to multiple meetings was that she did not want to live across from high density housing. She thought this project was community based and would benefit the neighborhood. She thought this was a great group and would be great neighbors.

Mr. Andrew Lund, 2077 Cohansey Boulevard

Mr. Lund stated his son went to Hand in Hand for a year or two and had a great experience. He was in favor of this school going in and agreed with what everyone has said about high density housing. He stated there were concerns about traffic. He stated currently there is no traffic because nothing is happening in that building. He wondered what the incremental traffic would look like. He did ask the City to take the traffic concern seriously whether there is adding a stop light or speed bumps where needed.

Ms. Sherry Sanders, 363 South McCarrons Boulevard

Ms. Sanders stated she has lived in the neighborhood since 2007. In 2012 her and her husband became the co-chairs for the neighborhood association that has been in existence for the last 27 years. She wanted to talk about how important this school would be. She had the opportunity at the open house to meet the owners, parents, teachers, students and the Montessori did open their hearts to the community. There is nothing negative for anyone. She stated in regard to traffic, she thought the school was in session 180 days out of the year which left another 180 days without traffic and did not think it would be a great concern. The fact that the Montessori wants to share their space with the community is a big deal. She stated she helps run the Community Garden on Rice Street and would welcome a Farmers Market on the property and would be ideal. She asked the Commission to consider telling the City Council that the Commission supports this project because the community does.

Chair Murphy thanked all of the community that commented on this project. He closed the public hearing at approximately 9:24 p.m.

Commission Deliberation

Chair Murphy stated the first discussion point is re-guiding the Comprehensive Land Use Map Designation.

Member Bull asked the applicant regarding public use of the property, how does that work as far as insurance and liabilities through the organization extend out to the public.

Mr. Thompson wondered what Commission Bull meant, if the space is rented out or leaving it open to the public in general.

Member Bull stated it could be the auditorium, gymnasium, through an open public gymnasium time or rented out.

Mr. Thompson stated if there is an open, public gymnasium time the Montessori insurance is going to cover that. There will also be a Community Development Director on staff that would oversee that event. If it is rented to somebody to use the building on a specific night, the group will have to supply the Montessori with insurance to ensure that the people the group is responsible for have liability coverage for what the group does.

Member Bull stated the information he received talked about the energy savings and efficiency and environmental and all in the design process and the construction process. He wondered how much a construction process is and how much is remodeling versus rebuilding. He stated he did not have a good feel for what the plan is.

Mr. Thompson stated the only building being removed is the garage and the fence off the back. The parameter of the building will not have any additions. This project will

be a huge remodel job. The hallways in the building are a perfect width and there will be very little structural work done to it. The only structural work that will be done is on the 1936 part of the building where it does not meet the current ADA codes that are established.

Mr. Thompson reviewed the remodeling plans with the Commission.

Community Development Director Kari Collins stated she wanted to have the survey enclosed in the packet reflected properly. The survey was from two years ago. She stated there should be no more than 87 responses in each category, so the Commission needed to look at each line separately.

Member Bull stated regarding the density of the use of the property. Two things certain in this job is people never want trees to come down for any reason and residents never come in pushing for higher density residential. Roseville does have a need for affordable housing units and the City needs to continue to look at every opportunity to try to increase that and make sure the City has affordable housing.

Member Bull stated he wanted to offer his personal knowledge with Hand in Hand. He knows several friends that make the trek to bring their families to Hand in Hand and would not have it any other way.

MOTION

Member Sparby moved, seconded by Member Kimble, that the property be re-guided from a Comprehensive Land Use Map Designation of Low Density Residential (LDR) to Institutional (Ins).

Member Daire stated he cannot find a map in his information showing which areas are to be LDR-1 or Institutional or LDR-2 and he wondered if there was a map.

Mr. Paschke stated he did not, but it was safe to say the open area with pond and wetland would be designated Low Density Residential and the field and school would be institutional. He thought the key was the Commission was supporting Hand in Hand moving forward with converting it to a school and that portion of it needs to be institutional.

Member Daire stated the reason why he raised the question of a graphic is because that is normally what the Commission has to deal with. If the Commission is going to be re-designating these it would be nice to know what the Commission is re-designating and how it is going to be arranged. He did not know if what the Commission is trying to do here is have it hash marked low density residential and institutional; however, it is put on the map or whether the City has something a little more specific than that. He stated he wanted something concrete to act on. He stated he was in favor of the proposal but wanted to know what he was in favor of in terms of the land designation.

Mr. Paschke thought the simplest thing to do would be to draw the line where the wetland is with the housing and make that low density and have the field and school institutional.

Chair Murphy asked Mr. Thompson if he agreed with that depiction.

Mr. Thompson agreed with Mr. Paschke. He noted the thing that will come into play again is that the Montessori has to take into a watershed part of it for both parcels and once that is figured out it will help him, and Mr. Paschke figure out where the property line will land.

Member Daire stated if that is the intent then the Commission should establish that in the motion. The western side will be low density residential and the eastern side of the design map would be institutional from Elmer Street to North McCarrons Boulevard.

Chair Murphy wondered if some language such as some portion of the property containing the existing structure be re-guided to institutional, which is the intent.

Mr. Paschke stated it can be reworded and staff will make it clear which is low density and which is institutional. A map will be crafted as it moves forward to the City Council, so it is clear to them what the Commission recommendation was for review.

Member Kimble thought it was important because right now the Commission is looking at a big green area and if there was not some designation it could end up being housing and thought it needed to be designated.

Member Daire stated it appears to him that the wetland area from the aerial photograph along with a buffer may well come into the back of the school building and may have to jog over in order to line up with the rest. Having said that the western part of the project from the path definitions will probably be a little misleading. He thought it should come down and jog over around for the wetland and low density residential. He would expect when staff gets into this further that it will be identified with wetland buffers and where the residential is going to go. He felt like this is a little vague when it comes down to making the recommendations. He stated he was in favor of the motion but wanted something a little more concrete.

Chair Murphy stated there was a plat map that was briefly before the Commission and he asked to see it again.

Member Kimble asked for purposes of this motion could the Commission state institutional would generally be the two-thirds of the site to the east and the LDR-2 would generally be the one-third of the property to the west and the lines would be drawn later.

Mr. Paschke stated LDR would be in the southwest corner and the remainder of that would be Institutional.

The Commission liked that idea and reworded the motion as follows:

MOTION

Member Sparby moved, seconded by Member Kimble, that the property be re-guided from a Comprehensive Land Use Map Designation the Southwest one-third of the property would remain as is, and the balance of the property would be guided to Institutional (Ins).

Member Bull asked at what point would it be appropriate to request a traffic study.

Mr. Paschke stated he was not sure but if the Commission believed a traffic study needed to be made before this change the Commission could offer it up as a recommendation to have a traffic study done in order for the Commission to determine if the uses would be supported. There will be an increase in traffic and he cannot say for certain if the roads can accommodate that, but he thought the chances of any traffic study determining there would be a need for signal lights on the County State Aid Highway are probably slim. It is just not traffic but accidents and other things that have to be taken into consideration and he did not see that a school would be adding that kind of traffic.

Member Kimble did not think there would be enough traffic within the context of a traffic study. Even as staff reviews the plans if there is a concern, she assumed that would come up and if there needs to be some kind of improvement staff would come back to the developer in some cases and she did not think that one parcel would be enough to generate enough traffic to make an impact.

Member Bull stated part of his concern was when he heard that everything was vehicle traffic without school buses. He stated he would feel better if he knew this project was not going to cause any traffic issues.

Member Groff thought school buses might be more of a problem going in and out and he did not see the vehicles being a problem. He did not think a traffic study would be necessary.

Chair Murphy stated when he first got the proposal, he was a little dismayed after the Commission put effort in a year ago. He stated the comments the Commission received via email and in person were all in support of this project. He thought it was a case of a good alternative that was not put on the table before. He stated he has heard a lot of support for the Montessori and this institution in particular and thought it was worthy of his endorsement.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

MOTION

Member Sparby moved, seconded by Member Groff, that the property be rezoned from an Official Map classification of Low Density Residential-1 (LDR-1) District to Institutional (INST) District and LDR-2.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

8. Adjourn

MOTION

Member Bull, seconded by Member Kimble to adjourn the meeting at 9:56 p.m.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.