



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting  
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive  
Minutes – Wednesday, June 5, 2019 – 6:30 p.m.**

**1. Call to Order**

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

**2. Roll Call**

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

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

**Members Absent:** None

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

**3. Approve Agenda**

**MOTION**

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

**Ayes: 7**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

**4. Review of Minutes**

**a. May 1, 2019 Planning Commission Regular Meeting**

Member Daire stated he wanted to commend the secretary for the phenomenal work. He stated on page 29, line 1327, Testimony of Mr. Craig Klausung, the word at the very end of the sentence is “subjectively” and should be “objectively”.

Member Kimble stated on line 844, a minor change. She indicated it should read “any less density could be achieved ~~her~~ here...”. Line 1680 Member Pribyl had recused herself and should be Member Kruzel. She also believed on line 1684 it was Cecil Bedor that made the statement and not Ms. Stockstrom.

Member Pribyl stated on line 1372 the comment was also made by Member Kruzel because she was gone. Line 209, she did not leave the meeting until between the lines 589 and 590.

**MOTION**

**Member Kimble moved, seconded by Member Pribyl, to approve the May 1, 2019 meeting minutes.**

**Ayes: 7**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

**5. Communications and Recognitions:**

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

None.

- b. From the Commission or Staff:** *Information about assorted business not already on this agenda, including a brief update on the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update process.*

Chair Bull reminded the Commission of the joint meeting with the Council on July 22, 2019.

Senior Planner Lloyd stated part of the intention would be to discuss at next months meeting, July 10<sup>th</sup>, items for conversation at the joint Council meeting. Feel free to bring suggestions for that meeting as well.

**6. Project File 0037: 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update**

- a. Review and Consider Proposed Edits To Draft 2040 Comprehensive Plan In Response To Review Letter From Metropolitan Council**

Senior Planner Lloyd summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated June 5, 2019.

Consultant, Ms. Erin Purdue was at the meeting and reviewed significant changes that were made to the 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

Member Sparby stated in terms of process, since the Met Council has changes at this point, since the City has gone through an extensive process of seeking public input and other things, what is now the process for if the City makes a change.

Ms. Purdue stated the Met Council does not require another public hearing or another resolution. Most of the changes are not substantive enough to warrant another public engagement but the City could do another public hearing if it wanted to.

Chair Bull thought the changes were more getting items in sync or there was an adjustment to the job number that the Met Council was dictating that the City update.

Member Sparby asked if the City were to reject one of the suggestions of the Met Council what then would be the process.

Ms. Purdue stated as part of the resubmittal process she would write up a letter back to them explaining how the City responded to all of the comments so if the City decided not to make one of the changes she would document the rationale for that and make a case for that to the sector rep. and then ultimately the full Council. She thought the big ones have already been covered.

Member Sparby stated he was curious about the discretion of the suggestions to the City plan.

Ms. Purdue stated in the letter there were requirements and also advisory comments and the advisory comments do not have to be addressed and some of those have been disputed with other communities she has worked with.

Chair Bull stated it looked like each section from the Met Council letter also included a contact name and phone number in case there were some questions that needed to be discussed.

Ms. Purdue stated that was correct. She stated the City has had some discussions with a few different people at the Met Council already.

Ms. Purdue reviewed the forecasts with the Commission.

Member Pribyl stated she is used to seeing floor area ratios expressed as a ratio and she asked if the floor area ratio on the forecast is expressed as a percentage.

Ms. Purdue indicated it was. The Met Council prefers it that way in order to do easy multiplication. She stated the F.A.R.'s were given from a survey of existing developments in the City and other cities in the Metro region just to get a feel for what kind F.A.R. the City expects for these types of uses.

Member Gitzen asked when the term F.A.R. is used is it defined somewhere for people who do not deal with this regularly.

Ms. Purdue did not think a definition was included in the plan but would be something easy to include.

Member Gitzen thought it would be nice to define the acronyms as a part of the plan.

Ms. Purdue stated it could be defined in the plan.

Member Kimble asked what the formula was to get the actual employees because the densities have changed so much, at least in office space.

Ms. Purdue stated the number of acres was taken and multiplied by the yield percent so that percentage is the amount of the district that is expected to develop as non-residential so in the Mixed Use Districts the City had a ten percent residential minimum so it was assumed that ninety percent of it is non-residential and it is multiplied by whatever area is left by the F.A.R. to get the square footage of whatever the buildout might take place.

Member Kimble thought the chart showed really high square footage allocations per person for office. Space per square foot per employee has gone down to 160 on average, 180 on the high side for open office environments. This results in being able to house more employees per square foot than in the past.

Ms. Purdue stated she could check on the date of those and there is enough wiggle room in those where the office would be located at. She stated the rest of mixed-use categories are for retail.

Chair Bull asked if there was any allocations for remote workers now.

Member Kimble thought that is where the 160 to 180 comes into play with the reduction of office space needed. She stated this is open plan versus demised offices.

Member Daire asked if these numbers would give the City a high.

Member Kimble stated the numbers would actually give a higher employee count because of the lower square footage per person.

Ms. Purdue stated even if the numbers for everything was reduced except Community Mixed Use drastically, the Community Mixed Use category in itself produces enough employment to meet the forecast.

Member Kimble stated the area would increase because instead of each employee getting 400 square feet, those employees might get 180. She indicated she did not see the column on the chart originally.

Ms. Purdue reviewed the Land Use changes with the Commission.

Member Kimble asked if the change impacts any redevelopment in the low density.

Mr. Lloyd stated the overlay shown; the buffer area that is surrounding the BRT stations encompasses much more land than the minimum density requirement actually applies to. That would only apply to these areas marked with the blue hash tag (development or redevelopment area) coding. Those would be the HarMar property and some areas across the street. Not in that same buffer area is Twin Lakes and some other places. It would not affect any development on any properties that don't have that expectation to be redeveloped in the next twenty years or do not have additional developments expected in the next 20 years.

Member Gitzen stated when looking at Chapter 13, Action and Strategies, one of the things listed is an implementation strategy. It looks like the area on the chart being shown has already been developed.

Ms. Purdue stated it would have to be implemented in a Zoning Ordinance so that is what that implementation strategy is referring to. She stated it was created on the Comp. Plan future land use map but when the Zoning Ordinance is redone it will have to be in there also.

Member Gitzen asked if that was a potential BRT Overlay area.

Ms. Purdue indicated that was correct.

Mr. Lloyd stated it is the expression of a policy to create one and then the actual overlay would be in the Zoning Code.

Member Gitzen stated he assumed the WSB is coming off of the corner of this map.

Ms. Purdue stated it could be taken off.

Ms. Purdue stated in the process of updating the map it was discussed with staff and there were a few development or redevelopment areas that were removed from the map. The previous version had scattered single family residential sites within there and were based on vacant lots and there was no basis to say whether those were going to redevelop or not so those were removed. That helped the density calculations quite a bit to remove the low-density stuff. Also, neighborhood mixed use sites were removed as well because it is not expected to redevelop.

Member Kimble asked if that answered the comment that stated Neighborhood Mixed Use allows for mix, the plan needs to provide defined share of individual land uses within the category. She asked how many of those were taken out.

Ms. Purdue stated the only one that was removed from the redevelopment sites was neighborhood mixed use. The category is still there on the map but there are not any development or redevelopment expectations in the neighborhood mixed use. The District is still there, and changes were made to talk about the expected percentages between residential and non-residential but there was not anymore detail then that. That is reflected in the use tables.

Member Gitzen asked if the maps will be updated as part of the 2040 Comp. Plan.

Mr. Lloyd stated the maps could be updated but once the plan is adopted staff will not update it because it will become out of date increasingly as time goes on, but staff could make sure the latest land use facts are represented on the map.

Ms. Purdue reviewed the changes to the Land Use table with the Commission.

Member Kimble asked if any of Roseville single family homes to Low Density count towards affordable if under a certain price or value.

Ms. Purdue stated it does not. The Met Council is looking at new affordable housing and not the existing homes.

Ms. Purdue stated the major change in the housing edits was the addition of some language related to Manufactured Housing preservation. She stated the City had a pretty robust housing implementation matrix in the plan and the description of all of the tools the City would be willing to use and one of them that the Met Council pointed out that needed to be added was some description of whether or not it was a priority for the City to preserve Manufactured Housing because it was a source of naturally occurring affordable housing. In talking with staff some language was developed but would like to discuss it.

Chair Bull stated in regard to the Land Use there were several items that had the asterisk and he wanted to confirm that Ms. Purdue received what she needed.

Ms. Purdue stated the Neighborhood Mixed Use category; the revised tables and the BRT overlay were the major things she wanted to go over. She indicated she received everything she needed.

Mr. Lloyd stated one more thing he remembers before moving on, there is a artifact of timing as much as changing regulation but there is a couple of large undeveloped lots between Snelling Avenue and Snelling Curve and the current 2030 plan shows that as Medium Density Residential and the Zoning Code has it as Medium Density Residential but the Comprehensive Plan update process over the last couple of years had that slated to change to Low Density and in the meantime there have been some people working on a redevelopment in the Medium Density development on the northern half or two thirds of that site. Until the zoning changes from Medium Density to Low Density that is a permitted project going forward.

Mr. Lloyd stated the version shown of the Land Use map reverts the area to a Medium Density because there is an ongoing development project that there has been an application process going on. In light of the fact that it is an ongoing project and would either become a legal non-conforming development as soon as the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning change and that permitted project is in the ground or the City would have to come back and sort of reguied it and rezone it for Medium Density so it is not a legal non-conforming development after it has changed. He stated staff is suggesting that it is maybe best at this point to leave it as a Medium Density site, again in recognition of a development that is working its way forward as opposed to changing it to Low Density.

Member Pribyl asked because that is partially in the Overlay District, given the fact that the development is slightly in process, does that mean that the higher density would not apply to them if this was later adopted.

Mr. Lloyd indicated that was correct. He stated up until the time the City has a Zoning Code amendment that creates the BRT overlay with that higher minimum density the standard density is in control.

Member Gitzen asked what the area is zoned now.

Mr. Lloyd stated it is zoned Medium Density now.

Member Gitzen thought that was what the Planning Commission was suggesting but the City Council was thinking low density residential.

Mr. Lloyd indicated he did not remember the order of events, but he did remember the series of open house meeting that were held a year and a half ago about various places that were changing a land use designation and that was one of them.

Member Kimble asked how the red line was drawn because is there anything that says lots should not be divided or parcels, that it should follow lot lines.

Ms. Purdue thought when the City gets to the Zoning stage the City would evaluate that and not have split zoning on a parcel. The red line on the map is simple a half mile buffer around the BRT stations. She thought the one site Mr. Lloyd was talking about is the only redevelopment site that is cut by that line or at least that one and one other but those refinements can be made on the Zoning map.

Member Kimble asked if the language that describes the buffer in the Comp. Plan define that it is generally at this point one half mile radius or whatever so it will be recognized that some tightening will be occurring.

Mr. Lloyd stated it is a fair observation that these are half mile radius' around a given point which does not really describe exactly where the stop and start is.

Member Daire stated it was his understanding that the half mile radius around the BRT stations is to encourage higher density development where it incurs in order to support the BRT concept. He wondered if that was correct.

Ms. Purdue indicated it was correct.

Member Daire stated it is not a buffer between single family residential and the BRT zone.

Mr. Lloyd stated the was correct, it was not intended to be a land use gradient buffer as much as it is to make sure the City is taking advantage of the transit services that are there.

Member Daire asked if Snelling Avenue considered a potential corridor for light rail development and the BRT is going in there as an alternative to light rail or a precursor to light rail if the ridership built up.

Mr. Lloyd stated he was not aware of that.

Ms. Purdue stated she had not heard that.

Ms. Purdue reviewed the Housing Section with the Commission and indicated Roseville's housing section did much better than others in terms of being specific about what kinds of tools the City is going to use to help support affordable housing. The only major thing other than correction to tables was the inclusion of Manufactured Housing Communities and how the City wanted to handle the existing communities.

Ms. Purdue stated she and staff had some conversations about this and developed some language that is included in this draft before the Commission that basically recognizes that manufactured housing is an important source of existing affordable housing and that the City may use any of the other tools that are mentioned in the chapter to preserve that housing type. She stated it did not get much more specific than that. She stated it can get more specific but wanted to bring that to the Commission for some discussion.

Member Kimble asked if the only manufactured housing the City has across the street from City Hall.

Mr. Lloyd indicated it was.

Member Kimble asked if this common language.

Ms. Purdue stated the City is not required to preserve the manufactured housing if the City chose not to. Every community has a different view on that. She stated she would say this is not out of the ordinary but completely up to the City. She stated the Met Council is not saying the City needed to establish policies that will preserve manufactured housing the Met Council wants the document to indicate what the City is going to do with it.

Member Kimble asked if in the City Zoning Code manufactured housing considered low density.

Mr. Lloyd stated it is actually considered high density. It is all about units per acre and not so much about building type.

Member Kimble asked if someone wanted to come in and do a new manufactured housing development it would have to be in a high-density zoning.

Mr. Lloyd stated that was correct. He believed the Zoning Code has it as a Conditional Use in a High-Density District. If there was a High-Density Zoned site to create one that would be something the City would take a positive action on whether to approve it or not.

Member Kimble asked if someone came into Roseville and did an economic analysis and found it was feasible to do high density multi-family across the street considering there are a bunch of multi-family senior, a park, would this kind of language guide them or get in the way of that happening because the City has now stated it wants to preserve Manufactured Housing.

Mr. Lloyd stated it only says that the City would consider it and may use tools to support the preservation of the housing in contrast to the alternative that the City will use those tools or will not.

Member Sparby asked how Manufactured Housing is defined.

Ms. Purdue stated it is not defined in the plan document, it would probably revert to how it is defined in the Zoning Code to be consistent.

Mr. Lloyd stated he did not know that definition off hand but was sure there is distinction between the kinds of structures that are in the community across the street versus pre-fabrication of more conventional looking single-family homes. Whatever definition the City would be working with is tight enough to specify the things that he thinks the City would be talking about and not getting in the way of other ways of building homes.

Member Sparby asked what it means when stating “vulnerable source of naturally occurring affordable housing.”.

Ms. Purdue stated that statement was referring to the fact that manufactured housing communities are turning over and going away, in general and the City may be losing existing affordable housing if that happens in Roseville so does the City want to preserve it or let it go into something else. That is why staff tried to be somewhat vague in using “may” rather than “will” in that statement about using preservation tools. If the Commission wants to take a more specific stance one way or the other it is up to the Commission.

Member Sparby wondered if “but” would work better then “and” before vulnerable in the sentence.

Member Kimble thought “and” worked.

Member Sparby stated “and” works but thought it read a little odd.

Member Daire stated to be clear, is Manufactured Housing Communities a euphemism for trailer parks.

Mr. Lloyd stated it is an updated term because many are not trailers but more permanently anchored to those sites.

Member Daire asked if either the City Council or Planning Commission established a policy relative to mobile home parks and if not, then ought the Commission suggest the City do develop policy regarding that or is this one of those topics that people do not want to touch.

Ms. Purdue stated whatever language is included in the chapter would be the start of a discussion about a policy if the City chose to get more specific about it or if there is a statement made in the Comprehensive Plan that the City is not going to use any specific tools to preserve the manufactured housing, if the City let nature take its course or the market forces work on it then it would not require any further discussion. It is up to how the City decides to handle it.

Chair Bull thought the City has some power to look at it on an individual basis since it is a Conditional Use within the High-Density Zone. Then if a proposal came forward the City can take a look at it which would then go through the Planning and City Council.

Member Daire asked if the mobile home park that is across the street was pre-existing any City Comprehensive Plans, so it is non-conforming.

Mr. Lloyd stated the was not correct. It is a High-Density Zoned site and it is an allowed use in that zone. He thought the only reason it might be non-conforming is that it does not specifically have a conditional use permit approving it but there is the substantially equivalent approval. He was sure it has a PUD that governed its establishment and development.

Member Daire asked for a point of information, how many manufactured housing communities exist in Roseville.

Mr. Lloyd stated it was just the one across the street from City Hall.

Member Gitzen stated he liked the language being used.

Member Pribyl stated if the language is left, in the housing tools matrix there is not anything that is specific to manufactured housing communities and the one tool she is aware of that has been used recently as a preservation tool is the resident owned coop. for manufactured home communities. She wondered if that was a statement that should be included as a tool to list.

Ms. Purdue thought it was a good point. This statement says that the City may use any of the tools that are in the matrix but if the Commission wants to specifically mention a resident owned coop. she was not sure that is a strategy that the City would have to implement, maybe support it if it were to convert to that. Staff could maybe include that in this section.

Ms. Lloyd stated Ms. Gundlach told him there is State authorization for those coops. so, it is definitely a State level regulation as opposed to a City level.

Member Kimble stated she was good with the language as well.

Ms. Purdue stated there were a couple of things in the implementation chapter that were not worthy. She stated the Met Council wanted to make sure the City fully described all of the programs and fiscal devices that were going to be used to implement the plan. She stated there was a lot of detail on that in the big implementation matrix that makes up the bulk of that chapter. She stated it was pointed out in the memo the Commission has and will go in the response letter as well. She stated staff did include the Zoning map and a description of all of the Districts that have been summarized. She thought the point of having that in there from the Met Council point of view is to be able to view what changes are going to be needed to be made roughly after the Comp. Plan is adopted.

Ms. Purdue stated staff also included the CIP for the Comprehensive Plan which will be attached as an appendix to that chapter.

Member Gitzen asked if the notes in Chapter 13, page 41-42 will also be included.

Ms. Purdue stated those would be included. She stated there is also a list of some of the major changes that would need to happen with zoning as well.

Member Daire stated on page 7 of Chapter 13, there is an insertion “create a BRT overlay district to increase housing density within a half mile of BRT stations”. That harkens back to the proposed Land Use Map with the circles around it. He noticed that in talking about implementation the responsible parties would be the Community Development Staff to create this Zone, if that is the way he is reading it correctly and that is something staff will do in the near future and how will this BRT Overlay District be funded and the answer is City Funds. He asked Mr. Lloyd to explain that. He wondered how much that will cost and where is the money going to come from within the City.

Mr. Lloyd stated that is going to be a part of the Zoning Code update that is necessary after the Comprehensive Plan update is completed. He did not expect there to be any extra costs to incorporate this BRT Overlay District.

Member Daire stated he is not to read this if he is going from the goal, which is to employ flexible zoning and property redevelopment. It merely consists of a map change backed up by the Planning Commission and City Council affirmation and that would be the extent of the City funds. Staff is not intending that the City designate an area, purchase the land, make it available. Staff is talking only about the paperwork costs.

Mr. Lloyd indicated that was correct.

Ms. Purdue stated she could tighten up the language a little bit to make sure it is clear. She stated one item to note, in the transportation section, which was not reviewed

because the changes are rather minor, the Met Council requested the City include a reference to Route 84 in the City and staff received a note from a resident that the Route does not go through the City anymore. She stated it was added and now it will be removed.

Member Gitzen stated he had a question on Map 8.4, Regional Park System, there is talk about the Regional Trail Search Corridors and he was curious about the legend and wondered if it should be cleaned up and take the things off that do not pertain to the map.

Ms. Purdue stated staff did remove the map shown previously, which was one LHB had created in the Parks Master Plan and replaced it with one that is directly from the Met Council. This is the Met Council's map and not the City's map. She thought staff could visually manipulate it and remove the categories that do not show up on the map.

Member Gitzen stated staff could reference where the map came from because he did not want to take credit for this map.

Ms. Purdue stated staff could do that.

Member Gitzen stated when he looks at the definition, the Regional Trail Search Corridor, these are not regional trails yet, but are potential trails that the Met Council has pointed out as a good spot for a regional trail.

Ms. Purdue stated the Met Council is designating that this is an area where the Met Council for an appropriate alignment for a regional trail.

Member Gitzen asked if the City implements that or would it be Ramsey County.

Ms. Purdue stated it would be the County or a larger parks district.

Chair Bull stated in Table 7-5 where it talks about the TAZ District, is there any definition of where those are or any map.

Ms. Purdue stated there is a map in the transportation plan that all of those refer to.

Member Daire stated on page 3, Chapter 7, it is a table that compares the 2010 Census with the estimate of 2020 population household and employment, projection to 2030 and 2040 and as he was going through this, he was wondering in TAZ 1875 it is showing a one thousand employee increase and he wondered what was happening there, what is forecast in 2030.

Ms. Purdue stated that number was adjusted based on the Met Council's bumping up of the employment forecast and nothing specifically is programmed for that area other than the transportation team basically generates this based on the Land Use Map to allocate all of those numbers and when the Met Council increased the number for that

decade staff needed to throw in an extra thousand jobs so that was one of the areas where staff looked at the map and thought it was plausible, there is not a whole lot of additional calculation that goes into it, it is a best guess but the Met Council looks at this when looking at roadway capacities and where there might be problems.

Ms. Purdue stated staff will make those changes and this will be taken to the City Council as well and verify all these changes and then submit back to the Met Council.

**7. Adjourn**

**MOTION**

**Member Gitzen, seconded by Member Kruzel, to adjourn the meeting at 7:45 p.m.**

**Ayes: 7**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**