



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Minutes – Wednesday, August 4, 2021 – 6:30 p.m.**

Members of the public may have participated in this meeting electronically due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

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 Kimble; Vice Chair Michell Pribyl, and Commissioners Michelle Kruzel, Tammy McGehee, Karen Schaffhausen, Erik Bjorum and Emily Leutgeb.

Members Absent: None.

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

3. Approve Agenda

MOTION

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

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Review of Minutes

a. July 7, 2021 Planning Commission Regular Meeting

MOTION

Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Kruzel, to approve the July 7, 2021 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.*

None.

6. Public Hearing

- a. **Request for Preliminary Approval of a Major Plat to Subdivide the Development Site into Nine Lots for Single-Family, Detached Homes (PF21-003)**
Chair Kimble opened the public hearing for PF21-003 at approximately 6:35 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing. He advised this item will be before the City Council on August 23, 2021.

Senior Planner Lloyd summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated August 4, 2021.

Member Pribyl indicated her concerns specifically about lots 2, 3 and 4, their orientation to the public right-of-way. She understood that this is a difficult site to develop because of the limitations of street access and the wetland and park but looking at Roseville in general and standard development in general, typically home space of public right-of-way in the front yard is towards the street and given the constraints with the shared driveway, it seems to be a very awkward relationship between those homes and the street. Looking at this without a home on there, she would not know which is meant to be the front yard and which is meant to be the backyard. The placement of the driveway also fabricates those lots and leaves a portion of those lots of sort of in no man's land. She asked Mr. Lloyd to speak to why those lots are not oriented towards the public right-of-way. She understood neighbors still have concerns about the shared driveway and lights shining in their yards. If those homes could be oriented toward the cul-de-sac, for example, she thought that even if there were still a shared driveway, that would potentially help with some of those concerns.

Mr. Lloyd reviewed the plat and indicated the street is not public, it is a private street. There are several lots being proposed, not directly addressing a public street. There is sort of an atypical arrangement here because the northern end of these lots do not directly address or reach that cul-de-sac. He indicated he did not have a lot to say about that. He gathered because of the presence of the wetlands and the scale of the setback requirements for structures from it, there is not an opportunity to shift these lots in such a way that they do all address it. He thought if the wetland was not there the homes could all come off of the cul-de-sac. There is not anything within the

Zoning or Subdivision Codes that directly says homes must be facing a street frontage of some kind.

Member Pribyl explained even if other Commissioners felt that the arrangement is acceptable as staff does, she thought that just functionally the placement of the lot line between lot 1 and those three other lots, for the people that live there, this piece of land would be better suited to be a part of lot 1 than of lots 2, 3 and 4 because that other side of the driveway does not seem like it belongs to those three lots. She noted if this moves forward it is something she would like the developer to consider.

Member McGehee indicated that as interesting as this is, whether they agree or not, the plat before them ought to be considered because this is not a design process. This is what is being presented and she did not think the Commission should be correcting it and altering it. She really appreciated Commissioner Pribyl's comments, but she thought the Commission should discuss what was presented which design is not a part of it.

Member Bjorum asked what still needed to be worked through on the stormwater plan to be finalized.

Mr. Lloyd indicated he was not sure, but all of the plans are considered preliminary at this point, and it is not unusual to continue to be working through them at this stage in the process.

Member McGehee indicated she talked to Rice Creek Watershed District and also to Mark Culver, Director of Public Works for the City, and he said that they are not close on the storm water management program and what the applicant has now is not satisfactory and incomplete and there is no application of completed material before Rice Creek Watershed District at this time.

Member Leutgeb indicated with these conditions, a concern the Commission had when this proposal was before them in June was that the proposal that was presented did not seem integral in its odd shape lot outlines and the finding of loopholes in the Code and with all of these conditions attached, her concern is who follows up on that because there is a time crunch between now and the City Council meeting. She wondered what the next steps will be.

Mr. Lloyd explained the shapes and sizes of the lots is entirely a function of this review, conditions of approval and the City Council's action on that. His understanding from the development review committee, meetings at which this has been a topic of conversation several times, there is not much to doubt that a satisfactory stormwater management plan can be engineered and is a very solvable problem for a subdivision like this. If a suitable, manageable plan is not produced then there will not be any development of these lots until such time that there is an approved stormwater management plan. These plans are required elements of a plat application so that the City can see that work is being done on that front.

Member McGehee thought the problem she is having since being on the Commission is that the Commission is constantly being asked to approve things before the permits are in and before it is considered whether things are going to work or not and she thought it would be nice to have a process in place at some point.

Member Schaffhausen asked if the Commission chooses to go forward with the motion, what happens if there is a point where the builder and the City cannot come to an agreement and all of sudden there is this weird chunk of land that might actually fit a house, what would the City do then.

Mr. Lloyd explained how the City would deal with a possible problem.

Chair Kimble agreed with Commissioner McGehee and thought it would be nice to see things further along.

Mr. Paschke indicated it is also uncommon that a developer would get a Watershed permit before a final plat or a preliminary plat because the developer is going through the process of determining whether the City is going to allow them to draw the lines that are lots on a plat which is the sole purpose of a preliminary plat. The other information is very helpful to understand how a lot is going to be graded, whether utilities can be brought to it, how stormwater management will be handled, as well as what trees are going to stay and go as a part of that to help look at things in a more holistic way.

Mr. Todd Ganz, Integrity Land Development, addressed the Commission.

Chair Kimble asked what Mr. Ganz meant by stating that the lots will be ok if the City does not purchase the additional park land.

Mr. Ganz reviewed the plan that showed the smaller park and explained lots three and four get bigger.

Member McGehee asked if Mr. Ganz would be interested in negotiating with the City for more land than that.

Mr. Ganz did not think they could meet code for the driveways and the houses being built if more land were sold.

Member McGehee indicated she understood that, but she presumed the developer would ask for some compensation.

Public Comment

Mr. Cal Ross, 2189 St. Croix, reviewed the history of the area by his house. He noted there is virtually no one who is in favor of this plat in his neighborhood. He explained this does not make a lot of sense to him and is not the standard development seen in Roseville. He indicated he talked to Rice Creek Watershed

District about the drainage plan, and they did not know if the drainage would be going to east because nothing has been done on the permit since April 2020. He explained that is a big concern to him because of the wildlife that resides in the area. He did not think it would be allowed to drain any of the lots to the wetland area. He noted he has never seen a development like this with a shared driveway.

Mr. Kevin Prettyman, 2194 St. Croix Street, asked that the Planning Commission deny this request. His objections to the proposed plan are similar to all of the rest of the neighbors which is the three properties with the shared driveway. There is no other development like this in the area. He was worried what will happen to all the trees that the developer said he would preserve.

Ms. & Mrs. Macalby. Mr. Macalby indicated the woods mean a lot to them and are opposed to the development.

Ms. Nancy Nelson, 2151 Fulham Street, indicated she had a couple of concerns with the added lots to the development since the City Council meeting as well as the ones with the shared driveways. She thought the two homes further from the street would need to have sprinkler systems installed because she did not know if a fire truck would be able to access them if there was a fire. Her other concern was if the developer takes out the turn around where all of the semi's turn around from County Road B. There would not be enough room there for the trucks to turn around. She also thought the development traffic would be a lot for a long period of time. There will be more litter flying around with the construction. She indicated she was not against building on the property, but she did not think this was the correct plan.

Mr. Tim Lundin, 2151 Fairways Lane, explained where he lives, he sees a lot of the traffic that comes and goes, and he does understand that the developer has purchased the land and it seems that it will be developed. He thought the neighborhood will have to accept some things with that, but they were concerned about the turn around and how the semi's, school buses, trash vehicles as well as cars will be able to get out of the neighborhood. He was not sure how that became a part of the development property. He did not think it made sense to take that turn around out.

Chair Kimble closed the public hearing at 7:30 p.m.

Commission Deliberation

Chair Kimble recapped some of the questions made by the residents.

Mr. Lloyd reviewed the shape of the existing parcel and indicated it will become a rectangle by including more land. He reviewed how the turn around has become a part of the development due to a current right-of-way and how vehicles will be able to turn around in the future. He noted the City can determine if a right-of-way should be turned back to the owner if the City deems the property is not being used anymore as a right-of-way.

Member Schaffhausen asked how the City takes in the anecdotal data. She thought this was a fair concern and wondered if the City could possibly divert all of the traffic that is led to this area elsewhere, so the residents did not need to worry about it.

Mr. Lloyd explained that just because someone asks for the land back from the City, it does not mean that the City has to conclude that it is not needed and has to be given back but if someone asks and the City concludes the land is not needed than the City is obligated to return the land and remove the right-of-way. He indicated there has never been any uncertainty that he has seen from the Public Works staff about whether that is a workable idea to remove the cul-de-sac and realign the roadway. He did not know how the anecdotal data might be compared to the traffic data from the counting apparatus the Department has. He indicated County Road B going east to Cleveland Avenue is scheduled to be reconstructed in the next two to three years and seems entirely likely, at that time, even though it is presently signed as a dead end that there may be design improvements that could further communicate to drivers that this is not a way to go to get somewhere and is not a through street when there are other roadways around. He did not think that this was a traffic volume issue.

Ms. Gundlach explained a public hearing is required for vacation of a roadway. This plat is dependent on that vacation going through. The neighbors will likely be invited to a public hearing regarding the roadway vacation.

Member McGehee indicated if the City left the roadway alone, using what is right before them and leaving the road where it is but allowing the two lots that are on the Eustis side, put the cul-de-sac in to the north and give the developer three lots to the north side of the upper cul-de-sac that would open onto the street. She reviewed her thought on the drawing with Mr. Lloyd. She thought as the development stands right now, she would move to deny.

MOTION

Member McGehee moved to recommend to the City Council denial of the proposed Midland Legacy Estate 3rd Addition Preliminary Plat, based on the content of the RPCA, Public Input, and Planning Commission Deliberation, with the conditions listed in the RPCA. (PF21-003).

Motion failed for lack of second.

Member McGehee thought the Commission should deny this based on the irregularity of the lots and to establish a precedence of lots shaped like this when talking about shoreland is very dangerous because the shoreland ordinances do not want to have lots that are narrow at one end and wider at the other. She did not think that this was reasonable access, and she did not think they should be allowing homes that are built in such a way that the City must require sprinkling systems inside the homes so that they can get adequate protection. She agreed with all of the residents who said that not having a turn around where it is, is not ok. There is not other place for a semi to turn around and Eustis Street is not adequate for a turn around of a vehicle that big. She thought that the problem with the lot layout is really serious, and she thought the

other serious thing is that it is not just these people, but the City asked residents to pay nineteen million dollars in a bonding request with one million of which was specifically designated for southwest Roseville parkland. What many people have asked for is natural areas of which this wetland is the only natural area left. The City is not being good stewards of its natural areas. She thought the City should actually pay attention to that. The proposal she made actually preserves what the people want and gives the developer eight potential lots which she thought would be highly valued and highly profitable. She supposed she could move to table this item to take it to the Council, but tabling does not take it to the Council. She thought the major decision that has to be made here is one by the Council. She thought if the Commission were to deny this, it would go to the Council, and they would have the opportunity to negotiate some different plan.

Chair Kimble asked if staff had any comment on the statement from Commissioner McGehee regarding the Shoreland Ordinance.

Ms. Gundlach recapped the reason for the Shoreland Ordinance.

Ms. Gundlach explained the DNR's request for the narrow at the bottom, wide at the top or vice versa relates to riparian lots where the lot width requirement also has to be at the lakeshore. These are not lakeshore lots, these are in the shoreland because they have a wetland and there is a certain distance from the wetland that places them in the shoreland which makes them subject to stricter impervious surface requirements but the narrow at the top, wide at the bottom, vice versa does not apply to these.

Chair Kimble indicated the whole idea of promising nineteen million in the budget, neighborhoods promised a million, she would like staff to respond on.

Mr. Paschke was not sure there were specific promises made per say. There is a Park Masterplan that does advocate for having park land in the southwest area of Roseville and when certain areas come up, the City will perhaps consider them. The City had an opportunity to consider this property when it was for sale and chose not to for whatever reason. Someone else now controls the property and wants to develop it and the Parks Commission recommended that park dedication take place to get what they felt was appropriate and necessary for their park in the southwest area. He indicated it is not the Commission's job to craft a development plan.

Member Schaffhausen asked if the Commission wanted to approve this with a condition that the City Council review the placement of the driveway, which could potentially alter the shape, which is a potential condition the Commission could add into the motion.

Mr. Paschke indicated he believed that to be correct.

Member Kruzel moved, seconded by Member Schaffhausen, to recommend to the City Council approval of the proposed Midland Legacy Estate 3rd Addition Preliminary Plat, based on the content of the RPCA, Public Input, and Planning

Commission Deliberation, with the conditions listed in the RPCA as well as including:

Additional Condition 5. The applicant shall reconfigure Lots 1-4 (and the location of the shared driveway easement, if necessary) such that the land area northeast of the shared driveway is allocated to Lot 1 and not divided among the lots on the opposite side of the shared driveway.

Additional Condition 6. The City Council shall consider preserving a turn-around near the current cul-de-sac in the southern portion of the site along County Road B in accordance with the future right-of-way vacation request. (PF21-003).

Councilmember McGehee asked Commissioner Kruzel and Commissioner Schaffhausen if they would accept a friendly amendment for the City to consider the purchase of additional parkland as possibly some of the wetland to preserve.

Member Kruzel indicated she would be open to that amendment.

Ms. Gundlach suggested that be a separate motion because it does not affect the plat.

**Ayes: 5
Nays: 2 (McGehee, Leutgeb)
Motion carried.**

Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Pribyl, to recommend to the City Council to have the City consider additional parkland by purchase from the builder that might include a portion of the wetland but certainly the additional piece shown on the map (she pointed to the map), but in addition, there could be negotiation with the owner for some kind of a pathway around the edge of the wetland that would be natural.

**Ayes: 7
Nays: 0
Motion carried.**

Recess

Chair Kimble recessed the meeting at approximately 8:04 p.m., and reconvened at approximately 8:10 p.m.

- b. Consider a Request by Genisys Credit Union for a Conditional Use to Allow a Drive-Through for a Proposed New Bank Branch at 2501 Fairview Avenue (PF21-009)**

Chair Kimble opened the public hearing for PF21-009 at approximately 8:11 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing. He advised this item will be before the City Council on August 23, 2021

City Planner Paschke summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated August 4, 2021.

Ms. Megan Huber, Welsh Construction, addressed the Commission.

Public Comment

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

Chair Kimble closed the public hearing at 8:20 p.m.

Commission Deliberation

None.

MOTION

Member Pribyl moved, seconded by Member Schaffhausen, to recommend to the City Council approval of Conditional Use to allow Genisys Credit Union a drive-through at 2501 Fairview Avenue, based on the submitted site and developments plans and subject to the conditions in the RPCA. (PF21-009).

Member McGehee indicated she had a conversation with Mr. Culver about this particular site, wondering why the City could not get into the party central site and that might be something coming later. She wanted to point out that although this was not listed as something that is a problem, Mr. Culver did acknowledge that the City does have a congestion of access along that road at the crest of the hill and may need to have some left turn and right turn only access and something that the City might want to think about in the future because it could become something that is more of a safety hazard with this. She agreed with what the Commission is doing.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

c. Consider Approval of Zoning Map and Zoning Code Text Amendments to Align with the City's 2040 Comprehensive Plan

Chair Kimble opened the public hearing for PF17-020 at approximately 8:22 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing. He advised this item will be before the City Council August 23, 2021.

Community Development Director Gundlach summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated August 4, 2021.

Mr. Jeff Miller, HKGi, and Ms. Rita Trapp reviewed the proposed changes to the Zoning Map and Zoning Code Text Amendments with the Commission.

Member McGehee asked for clarification because this is the Comprehensive Plan, and it can be changed so to tell the people that this is the Comprehensive Plan, and that plan has been decided is to deny the opportunity for people to really participate in a meaningful way in the hearing. She would really give kudos to the staff and this team for their outreach on this. She indicated the group that did the outreach for the Comprehensive Plan was not as thorough as this team, so she did believe that there are elements in the Comprehensive Plan that this is designed to meet, and the Comprehensive Plan did not have a proper hearing when the materials came to the Planning Commission in the previous iteration.

Chair Kimble noted for a point of clarification, what the Planning Commission has before them is the rezoning. The Comprehensive Plan has, in fact, been approved by the City Council and by the Met Council and can be changed but the City has to go through a process with numerous compliance issues embedded in the requirement of the Met Council, so it is not always an easy thing to change. She explained she was on the Planning Commission during the Comprehensive Plan process and attended many of the meetings. She thought there was considerable attempt for outreach and public engagement. There is a responsibility on the citizens to show up for those meetings as well.

Public Comment

Ms. Annie Seefeldt, 1700 Hamline Avenue N., explained the place they just purchased, the existing zoning is listed as Low Density Residential, and the proposed zoning is Neighborhood Mixed Use. She indicated this site has been a commercial property for the last two owners and she thought this is one of those clean up things that is happening as a part of the Comprehensive Plan. She noted having just purchased a commercial property and seeing that it is under a rezoning consideration made them a little nervous, so they decided to show up and indicate their desire to have the rezoning of this particular address to happen as proposed, Neighborhood Mixed Use.

Mr. Mark Armchide, Midland Grove Condominium Board Member, explained he was representing Midland Grove Condominium Association. He indicated he wanted to express the concerns of the owners of the 174 units to the proposed rezoning of 2025 County Road B West from Low Density to Medium Density Housing. He noted this zoning change appears in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. He reviewed the 2025 County Road B West property history with the Commission and explained there is historical significance associated with it.

Mr. Armchide explained 2025 County Road B West is nestled between the south side of Midland Grove Condominiums, the west side of a private house at the top of a hill and bordered on the south side by County Road B. The entrance to the property is in the middle of a downhill slope on County Road B which ends at the Cleveland

Avenue intersection. The property has the same slope as County Road B and the lowest southwest portion of that property appears to be a wetland although he did not think it was designated as such. The Midland Grover property is also a low area and they have been affected by water in wet years. If there is development on the neighboring property the residents would have a concern that the water would be sent in their direction due to the lowness of their land. He stated their entrance to County Road B is very close to the intersection of County Road B and Cleveland, which has a significant amount of traffic at the intersection and being at the bottom of the hill, it is somewhat hazardous to cross the eastbound lane, even to take a simple right turn toward Cleveland. It is also somewhat hazardous for pedestrians to cross County Road B to get to the new Midland Gardens Park across the street. On the other side, approaching County Road B southbound on Cleveland, someone exiting from Highway 36 needs to cross three lanes to get to the County Road B turn lane to get into the Midland Grove development. Midland Grove Condominiums is mostly owned by older residents. He indicated in the past few years Roseville has received a number of proposals to develop the property to higher density housing, which would be dependent upon changing the zoning of this parcel.

Mr. Armchide explained when the City of Roseville conducted the meetings in 2017, Midland Grove residents came out publicly against the zoning change and their dissenting comments are documented in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. He noted they are not aware of any community engagement that occurred after that, so he was surprised to hear the earlier comment that there were a lot of meetings that took place during COVID. He stated they were completely unaware of those meetings, but they have participated in 2017. The 2040 Comprehensive Plan does not document any reasoning or justification for a zoning change to this specific parcel and there does not appear to be any reasoning why this parcel would have a change in zoning. After the meetings were held in 2017, the property was sold to a holding company in 2018 and rented back to the previous owner. As mentioned earlier the City approved the 2040 Comprehensive Plan in April 2020, which included the zoning plan change over the objections of the residents who would be affected by it. The intention of the plan and the zoning change is that the densification of housing allowed by the zoning change would actually take place. If the Commission and the City Council move ahead with the zoning change, the residents of Midland Grove will continue to express concern. He stated this small parcel of land in this specific location is a poor target for increased housing density. It should be easy enough to find another 2.27 acres in Roseville that would be a better candidate for increasing housing density, if that kind of substitution is required to satisfy changes in the plan. He explained the residents urge the Commission to update the 2040 Comprehensive Plan to maintain the current zoning of this parcel to prevent the increase in population of this area, which would only increase the driver and pedestrian hazards that already exist.

Ms. Pat Kelly, Midland Grove Condominiums, asked if the higher density zoning is approved, the residents will still have an opportunity to review any proposal from the developer.

Mr. Paschke explained it would depend on how big that project is and whether it triggers Planning Commission consideration of it.

Mr. Endler explained he was the single resident next to Midland Grove Condominiums on the hill. When the City made the move from single residence to medium density, the old standards were still in place. What has changed is what the standard for low density is. He explained with the new low density he thought it would be 8 to 10 units. When the zoning happened, the current zoning rules were in place. He thought the City figured it should be reconsidered in light of the changes that are currently in front of them or what Low Density Residential means. That aside, they support the goal and what the City is doing. He explained when the Comp. Plan is changed, the time between approval of the Comp. Plan and changing the zoning is entirely too long. He would like the City to try to figure out how to solve that problem. Once a Comp. Plan is changed, he would like the City to have the urgency to notify people immediately and possibly create an ordinance that states if the resident is in one of the residences and someone sells it, they would be required to let the new buyer know there is that difference because no one should be surprised when they purchase a property.

Mr. Carl Albing, 2020 West County Road B, explained he lived across the street from this parcel. He stated there have been several attempts to change the parcel of land and it has been voted down every time. It is frustrating to see this come up once again and this time as a part of a larger plan that feels like it has more momentum against them, after it had been defeated two or three times in the past. He really appreciated the concern from Midland Grove residents. He wondered why the City could not do something different with this little piece of property. He would ask the Commission to deny the zoning change on 2025 West County Road B.

Ms. Lucy Botzek, Ferriswood Homeowners Association president, explained this is a pretty contentious parcel for a variety of reasons and a lot of history. She indicated they are not necessarily opposed to redevelopment or development, but she urged the Commission to reconsider the zoning change to this parcel.

Mr. Dave Polson, Midland Grove Condominium resident, asked the Commission to drive by 2025 County Road B west and take a look at the property. Summary of City Zoning District's as it is today, "The District is established to stabilize and protect the essential characteristics of existing residential areas and to protect, maintain and enhance wooded areas, wetlands, wildlife and plant resources and other sensitive natural resources.", if that property does not describe that in perfect detail, he did not know what does.

Mr. Steven Ring, 1455 Rose Place, indicated he sent out some comments to questions earlier in the day to the Planning Commission. Since then, he talked briefly with one of the Commissioners who clarified some stuff and he also talked to Mr. Paschke who was very helpful in answering some questions. He stated they are in favor of the proposed changes for Medium Density Residential to Low Density Residential along the west side of Snelling Curve. The entrances and exists to this neighborhood

severely constrain the amount of traffic that can be handled. Regarding the lots on the south side of County Road C, between Snelling and Hamline, south of the railroad tracks on County Road C, many of the lots are adjacent to the backyards of the properties on the north side of Rose Place. His lot is one of them. From their perspective, change from High Density Residential to Employment One would likely be a good thing but they have a history of many issues with the businesses on the north side of their property and are concerned about exactly what this would mean. He indicated he still had some questions about noise requirements and some of the businesses, even now, inflict noise on their properties at 6:00 am and other times. He would like to know if there are any decibel limits or actual noise or hours of operation that would be in place for E1-Employment Zoning. He wondered how high the buildings could be, from the table it looked like the buildings could be sixty feet high, which would be a dramatic change from what they are seeing with the businesses right now. He explained they are also concerned about the lights from the businesses shining on their property.

Ms. Gundlach directed Mr. Ring to contact staff regarding current business concerns. She also explained there are some buffer and screening requirements for those E1, Employment District, uses when adjacent to residential. The rezoning of these parcels is to reflect what is actually there today.

Mr. John Garrigues, 2520 Simpson Street, explained he has lived on the property for thirteen years and was excited the City is going to consider developing that row where the greenhouses are. His concern is that when he read it moved to lower density, which he thought was great, it looks like there could be between 1.5 and 8 units per acre, which worried him because every developer that comes in wants to maximize everything and his concern is that a developer will try to put in 8 units per acre and that is a lot of acreage there which will result in many homes and a lot of traffic. When he looked at some of the old residential, there was actually a time when lower density residential was single family homes. His concern is that on one side of the street there will be single family homes and on the other side it will be totally developed out. He wondered if this is something he should be worried about. He appreciated the fact that the City wants to add more housing, but his concern is that it seems like an opportunity for a developer to come in and really turn that side of the street into one large development.

Ms. Christine Soma, 3076 Shorewood Lane, indicated she was in support of this plan. She was thankful for all of the work the Commission has done. She liked the direction and a good step forward for the City with great diversity for people.

Mr. Lee Sarin, 1880 Lexington, explained his property is going to change from High Density Residential to Low Density Residential and will have an adverse effect on him. He indicated he has an acre of land as well as an adjacent lot and all of it will change to low density. He stated he was frustrated because he did not know when he purchased the properties that the zoning was going to change from High Density to Low Density.

Mr. Brian Ash and Mrs. Jill Ash, 2550 Snelling Curve, explained he came to the meeting because they wondered what might happen with the land across the street.

Chair Kimble closed the public hearing at 9:52 p.m.

Commission Deliberation

Member Pribyl indicated she felt a little out of her element because she was not involved in the Comp. Plan process and hearing that there are at least a couple of lots where the community is saying they did not want the change and do not support the change. She thought at the time there clearly was support of the change in order for the City to have made the change to the Comprehensive Plan.

Member McGehee agreed. She indicated she was involved but thought the City needed to make a point of at the Council level and in the newsletter is this change to LDR, the change in the density to LDR because that is really significant. Each of these density and zoning things have been increased. The intensity has been increased so what was something previously now is denser, and she did not think that was widely understood in the community. She did not know what the City can do about the places in front of Midland Grove because they have gone to the City several times and have been repeatedly supported by the Council and Planning Commission not to increase the density or zoning of that lot and she was surprised and shocked to find that it had been changed. She did not know how that changed and did not know about Snelling Curve either.

Chair Kimble thought as it related to the County Road B development, they saw a couple different things come through and she thought one was for high density and she believed there were some specifics to these development proposals that the Planning Commission recommended approval, but the City Council denied them. She did know that these were high density, and the site is surrounded by medium and high density. This is not an illogical rezoning to consider. She recapped the different zoning changes.

MOTION

Member McGehee moved, to recommend to the City Council approval of the Zoning Map and Zoning Code Text Amendments as Outlined in Attachments A Thru E of the RPCA to Align with the City's 2040 Comprehensive Plan and have the City Council reconsider the rezoning the Midland Grove parcel to LDR.

Member Bjorum wondered if there should be two motions.

Mr. Paschke thought the best would be to adopt the document and then to have an additional motion for consideration of the Comp. Plan change.

Member Bjorum indicated he did not necessarily see the Midland Grove parcel as a single-family, low-density lot. He thought the lot is beautiful, but it sounds like the

bad vibes from everything came from a developer who tried to do a pretty bad plan. If zoned as medium density he actually could see this as a buffer to the business intersection to the west and he also saw it as a continuation of the community that is on that corner.

Chair Kimble noted the meeting is past the 10:00 p.m. end time and asked for a motion to extend the meeting.

MOTION

Member McGehee moved, seconded by Pribyl, to extend the meeting until this item is done or until 11:00 p.m.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

Chair Kimble explained she was a part of the Comp Plan process for the entire time and she felt the same way as Commission Bjorum and thought the parcel on Midland Grove make sense to be a medium density zoned parcel.

There was not a second for the motion made by Commission McGehee, so motion failed for lack of second.

Member Schaffhausen moved, seconded by Member Bjorum, to recommend to the City Council approval of the Zoning Map and Zoning Code Text Amendments as Outlined in Attachments A Thru E of the RPCA to Align with the City's 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

Member Schaffhausen thought staff did an excellent job on this with all of their hard work and long hours. She also thanked all of the residents for showing up and expressing their thoughts and being engaged.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Abstain: 1 (McGehee)

Motion carried.

MOTION

Member McGehee moved, seconded by Pribyl, to have the City Council reconsider the Comp. Plan Designation from Medium Density to Low Density of the 2025 Midland Grove parcel.

Member Pribyl agreed to second the motion on the caveat that she agreed with Chair Kimble and Commissioner Bjorum that it does make sense the way it is guided but hearing from the community, she thought the City Council needed to hear from the community as well.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

Mr. Lloyd noted because it was similar in nature to the 2025 parcel, he wanted to remind the Commission about the 1880 Lexington Avenue parcel and was not sure if the Commission wanted to consider that one as well.

Member Schaffhausen thought there were a couple of individual parcels that have some history to them and wondered if that is the way the motion should be worded.

Chair Kimble indicated it is the same. It is because it is already in the Comp Plan that has been approved and would be the same thing to ask.

MOTION

Member Schaffhausen moved, seconded by Leutgeb, to have the City Council reconsider the Comp. Plan Designation of the 1880 Lexington parcel.

The Commission debated the designation consideration.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

7. Adjourn

MOTION

Member Kruzel, seconded by Member Schaffhausen, to adjourn the meeting at 10:21 p.m.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.