



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Minutes – Wednesday, July 6, 2022 – 6:30 p.m.**

1. Call to Order

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

2. Roll Call

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

Members Present: Chair Julie Kimble and Commissioners Michelle Pribyl, Tammy McGehee, Karen Schaffhausen and Erik Bjorum.

Members Absent: Commissioner Michelle Kruzel.

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

3. Approve Agenda

Member Schaffhausen arrived at 6:32 p.m.

MOTION

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

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Review of Minutes

a. June 1, 2022 Planning Commission Regular Meeting

Member Pribyl noted on line 362, “gregarious” should be changed to “precarious”.

MOTION

Member Schaffhausen moved, seconded by Member McGehee, to approve the June 1, 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. **Request for Preliminary Approval of a Major Plat to Subdivide Two Residential Parcels into Six Lots for Two-Family, Attached Homes (Twin Homes), One Lot for Retention of an Existing One-Family Detached Home, and One Outlot (PF22-005)**

Chair Kimble opened the public hearing for PF22-005 at approximately 6:35 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing. She noted this will be before the City Council at their July 25th meeting.

City Planner Paschke summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated July 6, 2022.

Member Pribyl thanked Mr. Paschke for the presentation and for addressing some of the neighbors' concerns raised in the emails sent. She indicated one email that is not directly related to the plat but one she remembered seeing as a comment was the possibility of lighting from this parcel onto other parcels. She asked Mr. Paschke to review the City policy regarding lighting.

Mr. Paschke did not know if there would be a restriction and did not know of any street lights that would end up going in on a private street. He noted he has not seen any plans for that. As it relates to the units themselves, the owners would be able to light their yard the same as any other owner on their property. Typically the lighting is shielded so it does not shine outside of the property.

Mr. Tom Brama, 3009 Troseth Road, owner, addressed the Commission. He indicated his concern is this is a very desirable area to live and it is hard for people to move into the area. They felt that by offering Twinhomes the cost would be lowered to people of getting into a desirable neighborhood where there is a mix of properties. He explained this is not an out of the ordinary use of the property and is not changing the character of the immediate neighborhood.

Member McGehee wondered what would the size of the home pads be.

Mr. Brama indicated the pads would be approximately twenty-one hundred square feet with an unfinished basement.

Public Comment

Ms. Laurie Stark, 2999 Troseth Road, wanted to reiterate what the other plat maps do not show and that is the block bounded by Old 8, Troseth Road and C2 are all single-family homes. Surrounding that, there are all different kinds of housing. She sees people wanting single family homes and she did not think the water management plan addresses the whole neighborhood, it just addresses Mr. Brama's two plats of land. She did not think there was much green space in that little area of Roseville and green space is very important for the wildlife in the area. She thought that by developing those two plots of land into this type of housing is going to reduce the green space even more and the community already lost so much green space to the Edison Complex. She noted she did not know any neighbors in favor of this project.

Ms. Jane Bates, 2980 Old Highway 8, stated she was overwhelmed when she hears about not changing the character of a neighborhood and proposing to put in where currently two families can live to adding six additional onto those two lots. She indicated since 2003 she has supported a family, paid taxes, and done everything they could to support a single-family home. Apparently the 2040 plan that Roseville approved did incorporate a change from single family home to low density housing in which she did not think the information was adequately provided to the residents that live in a community. She indicated this could happen to anyone and any neighborhood and breaking up single family homes and neighborhoods for somebody's financial gain is unacceptable.

Mr. Roger Pascal, 2999 Troseth Road, indicated he has been in the neighborhood for sixty-eight years and there has been eighteen splits so far and in the southwest corner there are actually three houses where cattail ponds were filled in to provide more splits. He indicated the neighborhood is already getting split up. He explained this is a legacy neighborhood and pretty soon there will not be any nice lots because they will all be broken up.

Mr. Brandon Kowal, 2960 Old Highway 8, added the way the private drainage system was explained for this plat is that it will flow north and based on the report he submitted from 2017, there is still a choke point at County Road D going north so the old infrastructure does not support and has to change for this to work. He noted this will not change overnight and a private system flowing north will not solve drainage issues.

Mr. Michael Cassel, 3002 Troseth Road, explained he is the direct recipient of stormwater runoff from the block that is being considered for new platting. He asked what the current square footage in that area that is currently paved and impervious to stormwater capture and how much of that area is going to be occupied by square footage building, new drive. He noted on page eight of the packet there is material that talks about the bio-filtration basin. Mention has been made tonight of some sort

of water neutral capture of drain on that area. He did not know what it was talking about but when it rains heavy the water comes coursing next to his and his neighbors' homes. This is not an insignificant problem and aside from the fact that there is something to be said about a legacy neighborhood and he understood something in the Comprehensive Plan about a missing middle but he wondered if this development and five hundred-thousand-dollar twinhomes going to make a response of what is needed. They have been under assault and he understood Edison is seeking a third building off County Road D as well. He thought if the City took all factors under consideration this project is not really in character with this neighborhood. He thought there was something to be said for the character that is low density housing. He wondered if this is the place for this type of development. He indicated he likes the character of the neighborhood and is concerned about the character of the neighborhood could be changing over time. He also wanted to understand better what a bio-filtration BMP plan is because he did not have any confidence that the City has adequately addressed the drainage problems that directly impact their home.

Chair Kimble closed the public hearing at 7:11 p.m. with no one else wanting to address the Commission.

Commission Deliberation

Chair Kimble asked if staff had anyone that could explain what the bio-filtration BMP plan was.

Mr. Paschke indicated he cannot speak to this directly but indicated he could answer questions related to the stormwater management plan. He indicated this proposal, site development that is required to create stormwater management is not something that is supposed to assist in resolving the issues that are ongoing in this neighborhood. That is a bigger, broader issue that needs to be addressed by this general area.

Chair Kimble explained this is a preliminary plat and the Commission is looking at the plat against a relatively limited number of requirements.

Mr. Paschke indicated that was correct and there are somethings that are out of the control of the Planning Commission to address or add conditions to.

Member McGehee thought there are rights of the citizens and should be represented and she did not think there was much point to the Commission's activity if all the Commission does is look at what the planning staff has combed through very carefully and manicured so that it matches City Code and then give a rubber stamp to that and send it the City Council. She indicated she was not sure that is the best way the Commission can advise the Council or bring things forward because she feels strongly and is very familiar with this neighborhood and she agreed with the people, they are bounded by what she would call a multi-family effort of both New Brighton and St. Anthony Village, which have put all of their stuff right up against the edge. She noted she was on the City Council at the time the Edison project went through and there was a lot of density and a lot of trees were removed and lost along with

green space in the neighborhood. She thought Sand Castle Park is a very tiny area and is not like the other City parks that grace the area on the other side and she thought this area on the other side of Old Highway 8 is in many ways a legacy neighborhood and is under assault and also undervalued by Roseville because it is on the other side of 35W. She also spoke about the water issues going on in Roseville as a whole.

Ms. Gundlach reviewed her discussion with the City Engineer regarding some of the drainage issues in the area.

Member McGehee indicated she did not particularly have an objection to the subdivision of this lot. She noted she did have an objection regarding the initial split of the lots at the City Council because it was envisioned having twin homes but not six of them and particularly not in the back yards. She considered seven twin homes on the two parcels to raise the bar to multi-family.

Member Bjorum understood Member McGehee's point but he would disagree simply based on the fact that the LDR allows for the lot widths and square footages that the developer is proposing so regardless of how large the existing lots are, what is being set in front of them is clearly within the limits of the Zoning Code and Comprehensive Plan.

Member McGehee agreed and reviewed what the Council envisioned the lots to be at the time the lot was split. She noted she only raised these issues because they are issues the City Council should think about because it was the Council that put these things in place. She thought there was a lack of green space and she thought these water issues are serious and she did not think these twin homes are affordable. She noted these are issues that she would like carried forward to the City Council. She would like, if at all possible, some kind of stipulation that these townhomes would be sold as single, individual homes.

Ms. Gundlach did not think it was within the land use authority to dictate whether or not something is owner occupied or rental. She explained relating housing type and affordability and missing middle, the reason the City opened up the two family or duplex housing type or LDR District was because the Comprehensive Plan calls for a need for missing middle housing and that does not necessarily mean the same thing as affordable housing. Affordability is a function of supply and demand and income and missing middle is two, three, four family dwelling units. Nobody disputes the \$450,000 or \$500,000 that is not affordable, but when comparing that to the Enclave Townhomes that are listed for \$650,000 or the single-family homes at Midland Legacy Estates that are listed for \$850,000, those are one family dwellings that are owner occupied. \$450,000 is a little more in the middle for what people could expect to pay for a single-family home. She explained affordability is a function of supply and demand and the City has a system where of all the City's residentially zoned land for one hundred years, eighty some percent of it has been zoned only for single family homes of lot sizes of eleven thousand square feet. That has caused affordability issues coupled with land price, materials, costs and now interest rates. Owning a single-family home, certainly new construction is unattainable for many so the idea behind

opening up the City's Zoning Code and allowing different housing types, specifically missing middle housing types into their single-family neighborhoods would, over time, to peel back what the City can actually have for affordable ownership units like a duplex. That was the intention behind opening up two family dwelling units in the LDR District and to be honest, it was going to be an even larger challenge to try and take existing LDR District and rezone it to medium density to achieve a similar density type. She explained this is going to happen with infill projects. The City was very upfront with that. Where there are larger lots, that is an infill project and she does understand and sympathizes with the neighbors who live next to these infill projects because that is where it will be felt most.

Member McGehee indicated because the City is always talking about different housing types, there are large lot areas in Roseville and she did not particularly like them referred to as infill projects, that it is the goal to chop up all of the large lots in Roseville because there are people who like large lots and she was one of them and she explained she has one but she thought those areas and large lots should also be available in Roseville unless it is the plan to have Roseville consist entirely of missing middle and affordable rental housing. She thought the City did have to be careful not to chop up all of what the City has because there are some areas in Roseville that are very desirable and carry a lot of the tax weight from the housing standpoint.

Ms. Gundlach explained the City is not the developer and not developing any land or chopping up any parcels. The City is responding to developers, property owners who wish to develop their land in accordance with Zoning Code requirements. The City is just applying the code. If there is a large lot neighborhood that wants to maintain their large lots and nobody wants to sell or subdivide, the City is not going to force that upon anybody.

MOTION

Member Bjorum moved, seconded by Member Pribyl, to recommend to the City Council approval of the Proposed Brama Vistas Preliminary Plat, based on the content of the RPCA, public input, and Planning Commission deliberation with the three conditions listed in the RPCA (PF22-005).

Member Bjorum indicated he was recommending approval because it is based on all of the required criteria as set forth by the City's Zoning Code and Comprehensive Plan. He noted he did not like the plan either but there is no reason to deny it because it meets all of the requirements and the issues that were brought up by Member McGehee are very important and he hoped the City Council does consider those as well.

Member McGehee indicated for the sake of the Council; she will be opposing this. She agreed this meets all of the conditions but she was going to oppose it so that it stands out when it goes to the Council and is not a unanimous vote and is not put on the Consent Agenda and does get the review that the Commission would like it to have.

Member Pribyl agreed and noted she does not necessarily like the layout of this but also do not feel that having twinhomes in the neighborhood with large lots ruins the character of the neighborhood automatically.

Ayes: 4 ayes

Nays: 1 nay (McGehee)

Motion carried.

7. Other Business

a. Discuss Phase Two Zoning Code Update Amendments

Mr. Jeff Miller of HKGi, summarized the information as detailed in the staff report dated July 6, 2022. She asked for feedback regarding the four identified areas for sustainability requirements.

Mr. Miller made a presentation on Phase Two of the Zoning Code Update.

Staff and the Commission discussed EV charging station requirements for different size businesses.

Ms. Gundlach indicated staff is looking for specific feedback from the Commission. Staff is looking to see if the Commission is ok with the EV ready versus the EV charging, the percentage and the overall number of parking that should trigger that requirement.

Chair Kimble indicated given this is new she would err on the conservative side and say minimum of thirty parking stalls versus twenty and include if it is burdensome. The City can always see how it goes and increase this if needed rather than imposing something that is a little stricter.

Member Pribyl agreed. She noted there are more and more electric vehicles out there so there will be more demand from residents living in multi-family or people shopping looking for EV charging stations. Getting something in the Zoning Code is helpful and important and making this intermediate step makes sense.

Member Bjorum thought it was also ok to say there needs to be some on day one but to have additional down the road may be needed. He has found that some developers will go more than EV ready just because they know it is coming down the line and forcing the minimum really tells them to just do the whole setup. He knew that with a lot of these things it demands a much bigger electrical feed to do these projects when done but he thought that was anticipated on the front end and a lot less damaging to anybody doing development work. He thought having the split is probably very important.

Member Pribyl indicated for new construction it is not as much as a cost and easier to get them ready and to have electric service.

Member Bjorum understood there are varying stages of charging and all dependent on the speed in which the vehicle is charged. He wondered if that was something the City would add into that requirement.

Mr. Miller explained if this is of interest his team will look at that further and what the best practice is right now.

Member McGehee thought it might be easier for the older buildings that do not have the service to have the option to provide EV charging at the lower end of service.

Mr. Paschke indicated he was not opposed to that requirement but most of the charging stations that have been approved for the City of Roseville is a separate fee that goes right to the unit that then feeds the charging station. It is not coming directly from the building itself and feeding it out. It is a separate line brought in by Xcel that goes to a transformer tool that brings it to the station so that would not necessarily be a concern or issue. He thought the issue was when reconstructing a parking lot the requirement to install the EV stations which would be an extra expense to the building owner.

Member Schaffhausen indicated she was not opposed to any of this but she knew from a small business perspective, that cash flow their businesses and can barely afford to survive. She thought this is something to consider and what the Commission is talking about is not creating a lot. She wondered if a small business would be forced to put in EV stations if they could not afford to install them.

Member Bjorum thought that is where the five percent kicks in. If the EV station were to cost more than five percent of the entire project than there is an allowance in there that the states the business would not have to do as many or something like that.

Chair Kimble asked what the definition is of reconstructing for a parking lot. She asked if it would just be repaving or something more because that makes a difference as well.

Ms. Gundlach explained maintenance of existing stalls like repaving them would not trigger this in staff's mind of implementing it. If there is an existing business doing an expansion or adding parking and at the thirty stalls then at that point it would.

Chair Kimble thought staff should define what reconstructed means.

Ms. Gundlach reviewed the discussion and what he Commission would like to be changed.

The Commission was in consensus with the changes to the Zoning Code with what was discussed.

Ms. Gundlach noted all of the solar in the City is on a map on the website and she noted the requirement for EV charging stations does not go into effect on residential homes until it hits the apartment building level. The requirement is only for apartment buildings and non-residential buildings and will be up to the owners whether or not to install them.

Mr. Miller continued with his presentation on screening of solar energy systems. He noted it is being recommended not to add a screening requirement.

Staff reviewed with the Commission why screening of solar energy systems is not recommended.

Mr. Miller reviewed the proposed Minimum Tree Requirement for Multi-Family Residential Development.

The Commission discussed the minimum tree requirement proposal with staff.

Ms. Gundlach summarized the Commission was ok with going with the one per thousand of open space for multi-family but staff will go back and look at the model standard, which does not impose differing standards for residential, commercial or industrial.

Mr. Miller continued his presentation on Drought-Tolerant or Native Landscaping recommendations.

Staff reviewed some reasons why having a Drought-tolerant or Native landscaping list makes sense for the City for developers.

The Commission and staff discussed enforcement, rules and regulations and other processes in the City regarding irrigation, lawn mowing and other landscaping and sustainability.

Mr. Miller reviewed next steps with the Commission.

8. Adjourn

MOTION

Member Pribyl, seconded by Member Schaffhausen, to adjourn the meeting at 8:41 p.m.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0

Motion carried.