Commissioners:		Address:
Julie Kimble Michelle Kruzel Tammy McGehee Michelle Pribyl Karen Schaffhausen Erik Bjorum Pamela Aspnes	**Planning Commission Agenda** Wednesday, February 1, 2023 6:30pm Members of the public who wish to speak during public comment or on an agenda item may do so in person during this meeting or virtually by registering at www.cityofroseville.com/attendmeeting.	2660 Civic Center Dr. Roseville, MN 55113 **Phone:** 651-792-7080 **Website**: www.cityofroseville.com/pc

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

   Documents:

   JANUARY 4, 2023 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. Continued Business
7. Adjourn

Planning Commission Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Draft Minutes – Wednesday, January 4, 2023 – 6:30 p.m.

1. Call to Order

Vice Chair Pribyl 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 Vice Chair Pribyl, City Planner Thomas Paschke called the Roll.

Members Present: Vice Chair Michelle Pribyl, and Commissioners Tammy McGehee, Karen Schaffhausen, Pamela Aspnes and Erik Bjorum.

Members Absent: Chair Julie Kimble and Commissioner Michell Kruzel

Staff Present: City Planner Thomas Paschke and Community Development Director Janice Gundlach

3. Approve Agenda

MOTION
Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Bjorum, to approve the agenda as presented.

Ayes: 5
Nays: 0
Motion carried.

4. Review of Minutes

a. December 7, 2022 Planning Commission Regular Meeting

MOTION
Member Schaffhausen moved, seconded by Member McGehee, to approve the December 7, 2022 meeting minutes.

Ayes: 5
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.*

None.

6. Public Hearing

a. Consider a Request by AUNI Holdings in Coordination with FedEx for a Conditional Use to Allow a Parking Lot as a Principal Use at 2373 and 2395 County Road C2 (PF22-015)

Vice Chair Pribyl opened the public hearing for PF22-015 at approximately 6:33 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing. She advised this item will be before the City Council on January 30, 2023.

City Planner Paschke summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated January 4, 2023.

Member McGehee asked for additional information on some of the parking lot things that would be required.

Mr. Paschke indicated all of the current park lot requirements would be enforced for this parking lot. He believed the difference is in the way the parking lot is designed for parking vehicles. He indicated he has not had any discussion with the applicant regarding parking of vans and the potential requirement of islands. Islands are required every fifteen stalls and, in some cases, separate on the end of drive aisles in some cases but in most cases. That discussion has not occurred as it relates to this parking lot. He indicated the coverage is going to be eighty-five percent hard cover, fifteen percent green space.

Member McGehee asked if there was anything for EV charging.

Mr. Paschke indicated there was not anything like that and is not currently in the Zoning Code.

Member McGehee thought this could be a condition placed on the approval of this project.

Mr. Paschke was not sure it could be a condition.

Member Schaffhausen explained she went through staff recommendations and they kind of matched many of the requests from people that live around this as far as some

of their concerns. She asked Mr. Paschke to provide a one-to-one match regarding the provisions recommended that was provided in the bench hand out provided to the Commission.

Mr. Paschke explained that based on this proposal, the parking lot is set back currently from that north property line and twenty-eight feet from the west property line. He reviewed with the Commission the provisions in the bench hand out. He noted the goal is to be to have a greater setback on the two property lines and also the attempt to try to save some trees along the property lines, if possible. That is all going to depend on how the site is engineered and how much earth that needs to be moved and those types of things.

Member Schaffhausen thought it looked like staff was recommending both fence and some semblance of landscaping as well.

Mr. Paschke indicated that was correct because landscaping would be required to be planted as well.

Member Schaffhausen asked if the fence would help with lighting as well.

Mr. Paschke indicated it will because this parking lot will have some sort of lighting for the parking lot. Staff will collaborate with the applicant on the lighting, and he thought the goal is to make certain that the light that overflows and spills off of the property is far less than what the Code requires.

Member McGehee indicated in the plan, the stormwater pond has been moved over to the extra piece of land and she wondered if there was a reason to not actually move that one parking lot over, closer to their property and leaving the wetland alone, since that is where their employees are going to park.

Mr. Paschke thought the applicant would need to answer that question.

Vice Chair Pribyl asked if the reason why this was coming before the Commission as a conditional use was primarily because it is just a parking lot.

Mr. Paschke indicated that was correct.

Mr. Kevin Anderson, representing AUNI Holdings addressed the Commission.

Mr. Scott Pieper, owner of 2929 Long Lake building addressed the Commission regarding the building design and how it currently works with vans arriving and leaving. He noted the bottleneck is going to become parking for employees. He reviewed the available and projected parking lot spaces for employee vehicles with the Commission.

Member Schaffhausen asked how the employees will travel from the parking lot to the facility.

Mr. Pieper explained the way he would see it is a covered stairwell would be constructed to go from the parking lot down to the base. It would have to come in on the southwest corner.

Member Bjorum asked if that will need to be handicap accessible if accessible parking stalls are being provided.

Mr. Paschke thought the way around that will be the City path this being required. There will be a path that connects to the existing one and there is an assumption that the City sidewalk might be ADA compliant to take a person all the way down and around to get them into the building.

Mr. Pieper explained there is ADA compliancy on the north end. The sidewalk is compliant with two stalls outside and handicap accessibility inside the building.

Member Bjorum asked with the requirement in the packet of the City's eight-foot path, essentially it is not shown on this site plan so in reality this whole thing would be pushed further north to accommodate that.

Mr. Paschke explained that is incorrect, it will work with what is there, he believed. It is just an extension of the existing path.

Vice Chair Pribyl asked regarding the stormwater pond, she assumed that is potentially located where it is shown because of the natural grade of the site.

Mr. Pieper agreed that is what it appeared to be, but he thought if he received the City blessings it could be pursued in a little deeper context. He explained they would get the elevations exactly the way they should be and make sure it is correct.

Member Pribyl wondered if the existing wetland could be utilized in lieu of building a new pond or expand the existing wetland and potentially in that way provide an amenity for some of the residential uses that are nearby and also make the parking closer to the destination.

Mr. Pieper indicated they can work on that. He noted this is just a preliminary plan and nothing is etched in stone in terms of the architectural where it has to be exactly as shown.

Member Aspnes asked regarding the van parking. It appears to be a secure parking lot with controlled access. There was mention that there is already parking within the building for vans. She wondered how many vans Mr. Pieper saw being outside in this lot.

Mr. Pieper indicated there is van parking in the building and there will be no vans in this parking lot. This is strictly personal vehicle parking. Right now, there are fifty-one delivery vans.

Member Aspnes understood and indicated the parking closest to the building is considered employee parking, on the east end and then there is a second parking lot on the west side that shows van parking of fifty-three spaces with controlled access. If the vans are all parked within the building, then what is the purpose of the van parking lot.

Mr. Pieper explained the controlled parking is on the south end of the building. That is where the semi/vans come in and that is fenced and gated. It is secure and no one can get into that area without going through the security. He did not think that is the correct plan if it has fifty-three parking spots for vans. He indicated there was two sketches on this. The first one had vans but that is not what is going to be there, it was all for employee parking.

Mr. Anderson explained the plan he has had the van parking and employee parking with those two sites. He noted Mr. Pieper has talked to the controllers at Fed Ex more recently than he has so maybe this is just for employee parking now.

Mr. Pieper explained there will not be van parking there, that is Fed Ex's latest proposal per say. The reason being is the van parking, semi's that are coming in, has to be a secured location and nobody can get access to it because there could be packages in the van that are left overnight so it would have to be in a secured location. He reviewed Fed Ex business model.

Vice Chair Pribyl asked if the wrong plan was included in the packet how would that affect the Commission's discussion.

Mr. Paschke thought the Commission would want the appropriate plan in order to make a recommendation. He recommended tabling this item until the February meeting and in that timeframe, staff can get the correct appropriate plan and probably some additional details.

Public Comment

Mr. Don Bromen, explained he has been involved with Aquarius Apartments for forty-one years. He explained the building is beautiful with a wooded area surrounding it. He explained it is a hundred-unit building. He brought photos of the backline of the parcel for the Commission to review. He thought for them, having a buffer there with a berm would be ideal.

Mr. Frank Yaquinto, 2405 County Road C2, explained the main thing for him is he is worried about the property values of his and surrounding properties. He would like to be assured that his property values will not drop because of this. He thought it was kind of a drastic change to the area with traffic and the lighting from the parking lot.

MOTION

Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Schaffhausen, to table the Request by AUNI Holdings in Coordination with FedEx for a Conditional Use to Allow a Parking Lot as a Principal Use at 2373 and 2395 County Road C2 until the February 1, 2023 Planning Commission meeting. (PF22-015).

Ayes: 5
Nays: 0
Motion carried.

7. Adjourn

MOTION
Member Schaffhausen, seconded by Member Aspnes, to adjourn the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

Ayes: 5
Nays: 0
Motion carried.