

Commissioners:

Chuck Gitzen
Julie Kimble
Michelle Kruzal
Tammy
McGehee
Michelle Pribyl
Peter Sparby
Karen
Schaffhausen



Planning Commission Agenda
Wednesday, November 4, 2020
6: 30pm

Address:
2660 Civic Center Dr.
Roseville, MN 55113

Phone:
651-792-7080

Website:
www.cityofroseville.com/pc

Following guidance from state health officials, Planning Commission Members will participate in upcoming meetings electronically pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 13D.021.

Members of the public who wish speak during public comment or an agenda item during this meeting can do so virtually by registering at www.cityofroseville.com/attendmeeting

1. Call To Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval Of Agenda
4. Review Of Minutes

Documents:

[OCTOBER 7, 2020 MINUTES.PDF](#)

5. Communications And Recognitions
 - 5.A. From The Public:
Public comment pertaining to general land use issues not on this agenda.
 - 5.B. From The Commission Or Staff:
Information about assorted business not already on this agenda.
6. Public Hearing
 - 6.A. Request For Approval Of A Preliminary Plat Of An Existing Parcel Into Four Lots In Order To Build A Detached Townhome Development At 2442 County Road D (PF20-026)

Documents:

[6A REPORT.PDF](#)

7. Other Business
 - 7.A. 2021 Variance Board And Planning Commission Meeting Calendar

Documents:

[7A REPORT.PDF](#)

8. Adjourn



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Draft Minutes – Wednesday, October 7, 2020 – 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 **1. Call to Order**
2 Chair Gitzen called to order the regular meeting of the Planning Commission meeting at
3 approximately 6:30 p.m. and reviewed the role and purpose of the Planning Commission.
4
- 5 **2. Roll Call**
6 At the request of Chair Gitzen, City Planner Thomas Paschke called the Roll.
7
- 8 **Members Present:** Chair Chuck Gitzen; Vice Chair Peter Sparby, and Commissioners
9 Michelle Kruzel, Tammy McGehee, Michelle Pribyl and Karen
10 Schaffhausen.
11
- 12 **Members Absent:** Commissioner Julie Kimble
13
- 14 **Staff Present:** City Planner Thomas Paschke, Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd,
15 Community Development Director Janice Gundlach and
16 Development Assistant Staci Johnson
17
- 18 **3. Approve Agenda**
19
- 20 **MOTION**
21 **Member Pribyl moved, seconded by Member Schaffhausen, to approve the agenda**
22 **as presented.**
23
- 24 **Ayes: 6**
25 **Nays: 0**
26 **Motion carried.**
27
- 28 **4. Review of Minutes**
29
- 30 **a. September 2, 2020 Planning Commission Regular Meeting**
31
- 32 **MOTION**
33 **Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Gitzen, to approve the**
34 **September 2, 2020 meeting minutes.**
35
- 36 **Ayes: 6**
37 **Nays: 0**
38 **Motion carried.**

39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84

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.*

None.

6. Public Hearing

a. Request for Approval of a Zoning Text Amendment to Allow Drive-Through Facilities as Conditional Uses in the Community Mixed Use 4 District (PF20-027)

Chair Gitzen opened the public hearing for PF20-027 at approximately 6:38 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing. He noted this would go before the City Council on October 26, 2020.

City Planner Paschke summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated October 7, 2020.

Chair Gitzen asked if there are any other CMU-4 Districts in the City.

Mr. Paschke indicated there were not.

Member Schaffhausen asked what the rationale for the non-permitted to begin with based on the locations being discussed. She asked for some historical background.

Mr. Paschke reviewed the history with the Commission. He noted that he did not know the specifics as to why the Council did not want drive-throughs, but the City has changed codes related to drive-throughs under the conditional use scenario. He noted the Engineering Department requires traffic studies so from that standpoint staff can really pinpoint whether or not there will be impacts on the peripheral roads or the interior of Twin Lakes as well.

Member Kruzel asked if this is typical of what other cities allow. She could see that drive-throughs are a big business right now with COVID.

Mr. Paschke indicated he could not necessarily disagree because he thought the City was seeing that fast food, fast casual, and some other restaurants that are not the sit-down variety are booming right now. He thought it was the sector that continues to grow but he did not know if it would impact the Twin Lakes area or the CMU-4

85 District all that much because there is not that much more property to develop within
86 Twin Lakes.

87
88 Member Pribyl indicated she was thinking back to last year of the City approving
89 drive-through's and wondered how those are different than this.

90
91 Mr. Paschke indicated those drive-through businesses were in different zoning
92 districts which made a difference but those did require a Conditional Use like this
93 one.

94
95 Member McGehee asked if there was a way to allow this without making an overall
96 change. She thought that coming right off the freeway and because of the size of the
97 retail off 35 it made sense and could be handled in that area but she thought on
98 County Road C, whether or not it seems like there is going to be more impact,
99 especially once it gets close to the Dominion site and will put more pressure on
100 Snelling where there already are a lot of intersections and it seems that this particular
101 outlot and taste seems fine now that Mr. Paschke gave some background. She
102 thought this has developed into a more business area than a retail area and she
103 thought the examples of that distillery and Gracious Table are examples of the kinds
104 of things the City was thinking of and those do not have driven-throughs and do not
105 need it in the entire interior. She indicated she would support it in the whole CMU-4
106 District, but she did see a place for it at the apex off Cleveland and 35W. She
107 wondered if there was a way to approve a drive-through for this site and may the site
108 Mr. Paschke have talked about in front of Aldi's but not anywhere else.

109
110 Mr. Paschke explained the existing lots in front of Wal-Mart will not be removing
111 any berm or anything and those pads are pretty much set and building up to where it
112 can base on the existing grade and property lines. There will be little change to some
113 of those things there. If the Commission did not want it in the CMU-4 District, which
114 only impacts four properties that can develop, then the Commission would have to
115 recommend creating a separate and distinct zoning district to support that and other
116 uses. He noted that as it relates to the Dominion project, there will be a signal light
117 there and will assist in limiting the impact onto County Road C and Snelling Avenue.

118
119 Ms. Gundlach explained in addition to the traffic study, Mr. Paschke mentioned the
120 City updated its drive-through conditional use standards approximately a year ago
121 and there is a specific provision in those new standards that talk specifically about
122 queuing lanes being sufficient to accommodate demand including primary driving
123 entrance, exits, pedestrian walkways and not creating impacts to the surrounding
124 roadways. Even with the traffic study and Conditional Use there are multiple reasons
125 that staff could gather data to say not to a Conditional Use if the Commission chose to
126 make this change.

127
128 Mr. Eric Abeln, Heights Metro Architects addressed the Commission on behalf of
129 Panda Express.

130

131 Member McGehee thanked Mr. Abeln for his presentation. She noted she has not
132 seen any restaurants yet with a walk-up window and wondered if that is also a
133 possibility on this Panda Express Restaurant.
134

135 Mr. Abeln indicated a person would not be able to walk up to what is considered a
136 drive-through window. The industry and Panda Express itself, does a really good job
137 of trying to isolate and separate vehicular use from pedestrian use for safety issues.
138 There are designs in the works, but he indicated they were not far enough along in the
139 operational section for this building to provide more walk-up windows. The industry
140 has really been forced to move in that direction and those design conversations are
141 being discussed right now about how a business can have a pickup window where the
142 customer does not need to enter the restaurant and also can continue to operate on.
143 He thought the primary convenience for not only third-party delivery and first party
144 carry out option is that drive up window.
145

146 Public Comment

147
148 No one came forward to speak for or against this request.
149

150 Chair Gitzen closed the public hearing at 7:12 p.m.
151

152 **MOTION**

153 **Member Gitzen moved, seconded by Member Pribyl, to recommend to the City**
154 **Council approval of a Zoning Text Amendment to Allow Drive-Through**
155 **Facilities as Conditional Uses in the Community Mixed Use 4 District (PF20-**
156 **027).**
157

158 Commission Deliberation

159
160 Chair Gitzen thought with the controls in place he believed that the one that possibly
161 could go in front of Dominion will have plenty of opportunity to make sure that it fits
162 into that area before the City grants that Conditional Use.
163

164 Member Pribyl agreed and thought given the limited number of sites with CMU-4
165 and within that the limited number of sites that are actually open for development,
166 most of them seem that they would make sense for this with maybe one questionable
167 but that still have to go through the Conditional Use process. It feels like a simpler
168 means to achieve this goal of allowing some flexibility without adding another layer
169 of another type of Zoning District or overlay that makes it more complicated for just a
170 few lots.
171

172 Member McGehee indicated she was not as confident in all of the safeguards that
173 City has because sometimes it works and sometimes it does not. She was not
174 particularly in favor of making another more complicated zoning but she would have
175 favored this just on Cleveland Avenue because she thought the City has a variety of
176 problems along County Road C already and she thought there will be a lot of pressure

177 for whatever goes on around Dominium. She indicated she would like to sidestep
178 that and just have it contained on Cleveland Avenue.

179
180 Member Kruzel stated she would support the motion made considering there is
181 limited space that can be developed in that area and she thought the City could
182 hopefully contain what happens.

183
184 Member Sparby explained he supports this motion as well. Moving to Conditional
185 Use makes sense because it will still come to the Planning Commission to be sure it is
186 in line with the area and having it come back before the Planning Commission and
187 the City Council is a good check. He noted he would support the motion and thought
188 the other members on the Commission laid it out nicely as well.

189
190 **Ayes: 5**
191 **Nays: 0**
192 **Abstain: 1 (McGehee)**
193 **Motion carried.**

194
195 **7. Project File 0037: 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update**

196
197 **a. Discussion Regarding Zoning Code Update**
198 Community Development Director Janice Gundlach summarized the Zoning Code as
199 detailed in the staff report dated October 7, 2020.

200
201 Member McGehee indicated she added a few things under the main headings. She
202 reviewed the additions with the Commission. She suggested some sort of a checklist
203 under the sustainability section to be sure the City is getting from the development
204 some of the things that bring the City forward towards their carbon neutral goals that
205 have been set out.

206
207 Ms. Gundlach explained the City could do a checklist separate from the Zoning Code
208 update specifically. The items she is thinking of really relate to things that can be
209 built into the Zoning Code to really make it an incentive for developers who want to
210 develop in the City if doing sustainability items. The other point she would make is
211 that Public Works Engineering has gotten a Partners in Energy grant or an employee
212 plus creating an Energy Action Team and there may be some actionable items that
213 come out of that which would be incorporated into some of the Comprehensive Plan
214 goals. These are not necessarily related to the Zoning Code update specific. She
215 noted there are specific things or incentives that can be built into the Zoning Code to
216 encourage things that do not necessarily mean the City has to come to the table with
217 money. She indicated part of the purpose of putting together this scope of work is to
218 define for a consultant what the City wants out of them.

219
220 Member McGehee asked regarding Social Equity if staff was speaking about hiring
221 processes with contractors being used or City staff.

222

223 Ms. Gundlach indicated this is related to the Zoning Code and the Zoning Code is
224 generally related land use. There are some things out there that say Zoning originally
225 was invented to provide racial inequities across their built landscape. This is really
226 broad and what staff is talking about is asking consultants to come back to them with
227 some things that are in the Code right now or may not be in the City Code that could
228 address some of the racial inequities.

229
230 Member McGehee thought if the City was going to go forward with what she thought
231 some of the intent was in the Comprehensive Plan, large lot size is a big issue,
232 increased density is an issue but overall the City wants to have a variety of options.
233 In terms of the environment, the City could do more things with incentivizing native
234 plantings, etc. Things need to be done with trees as well. She also thought people are
235 expecting more walkability with shaded pathways. She thought the City should look
236 at and review parking lots. She also thought the City should make a comparable push
237 to get in some clean, small light manufacturing and small business so that those
238 people have a place to work other than Wal-Mart and Panda Express.

239
240 Chair Gitzen thought everything brought up was important to discuss. He thought
241 staff was asking the Commission to figure out what is missing on these tables right
242 now.

243
244 Ms. Gundlach indicated staff did a pretty good job with section one because the
245 Comp. Plan has a nice table at the end of the land use section that outlines what the
246 current zoning districts are and what needs to change and what parcels do not have
247 the right zoning based on the future land use plan. The other point is, if there is
248 something in section two that the Commission has discovered since being on the
249 Planning Commission please let staff know that as well. She noted the items in
250 Section two comes from an ongoing list the Council keeps and goes through after the
251 end of certain Council meetings.

252
253 Member Pribyl thought one thing that came up in a previous meeting was parking
254 requirements, especially with affordable senior housing in the City.

255
256 Chair Gitzen thought staff did a good job with putting this together.

257
258 Ms. Gundlach asked the Commission to review this information and get her possible
259 additions or changes before October 19th so she can include it for the Council review.

260
261 **8. Adjourn**

262
263 **MOTION**

264 **Member Pribyl, seconded by Member Kruzel, to adjourn the meeting at 7:40**
265 **p.m.**

266
267 **Ayes: 6**

268 **Nays: 0**

269 **Motion carried.**



REQUEST FOR PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

Date: November 4, 2020

Item No. 6a

Department Approval

Janice Gundlach

Agenda Section
Public Hearings

Item Description: Request for approval of a preliminary plat of an existing parcel into four lots in order to build a detached townhome development (PF20-026)

APPLICATION INFORMATION

Applicant: Michael Mezzenga

Location: 2442 County Road D

Property Owner: Michael Mezzenga

Open House Meeting: August 21 – September 4

Application Submittal: Submitted August 14, 2020; Considered complete October 8, 2020

City Action Deadline: February 5, 2021, per Minn. Stat. 462.358 subd. 3b

GENERAL SITE INFORMATION

Land Use Context

| | Existing Land Use | Guiding | Zoning |
|-------|----------------------------------|---------|--------|
| Site | Former one-family dwelling | MR | MDR |
| North | One-family, detached residential | | |
| West | One-family, detached residential | MR | MDR |
| East | One-family, attached residential | MR | MDR |
| South | One-family, detached residential | LR | LDR-1 |

This item has been pulled from the November 4, 2020, Planning Commission agenda.

Staff review of the planned development that would occur if the proposed preliminary plat were approved has brought additional development costs (e.g., extension of public sanitary sewer and water services into the property and installing fire suppression sprinklers in the dwellings) to the applicant’s attention. Consequently, the developer is considering development alternatives that may result in revisions to the proposed preliminary plat. Such a revised preliminary plat will not be ready for a public hearing at the November 4 Planning Commission meeting, but staff anticipates the item being placed on the December 2 agenda instead.

Prepared by: Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd
651-792-7073
bryan.lloyd@cityofroseville.com



REQUEST FOR PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

Date: 11/04/2020
Item No.: 7a

Department Approval

Janice Gundlach

Agenda Section

Other Business

Item Description: 2021 Variance Board & Planning Commission Meeting Calendar

1 **BACKGROUND**

2 Every year the City Council adopts a meeting calendar. For 2021, the following dates have been
3 identified for Variance Board and/or Planning Commission meetings as needed. As is customary,
4 these dates consist of the first Wednesday of every month except when these dates fall on a holiday.
5 In the event of a holiday, the date is adjusted appropriately. The 2021 meeting dates are as follows:

- 6
- 7 January 6, 2021
- 8 February 3, 2021
- 9 March 3, 2021
- 10 April 7, 2021
- 11 May 5, 2021
- 12 June 2, 2021
- 13 July 7, 2021
- 14 August 4, 2021
- 15 September 1, 2021
- 16 October 6, 2021
- 17 November 3, 2021
- 18 December 1, 2021
- 19

20 While it is recognized conflicts arise, if possible, please let staff know if you will be unable to attend
21 any of these meeting dates.

22 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

23 No formal action is necessary.

Prepared by: Janice Gundlach, Community Development Director