



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting  
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive  
Minutes – Wednesday, June 3, 2020 – 6:30 p.m.**

**1. Call to Order**

Chair Gitzen called to order the regular meeting of the Planning Commission meeting at approximately 7:23 p.m. and reviewed the role and purpose of the Planning Commission.

**2. Roll Call**

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

**Members Present:** Chair Chuck Gitzen; Vice Chair Peter Sparby, and Commissioners Julie Kimble, Michelle Kruzel, Tammy McGehee, Michelle Pribyl and Karen Schaffhausen.

**Members Absent:** None.

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

**3. Approve Agenda**

**MOTION**

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

**Ayes: 7**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

**4. Review of Minutes**

**a. May 6, 2020 Planning Commission Regular Meeting**

Commissioner McGehee indicated she had two corrections to the minutes but was unable to get to her minutes at this time. Line 232 there are two sentences there that need to be divided. Line 281 there needed to be a correction. She indicated she would send the corrections to Ms. Gundlach to change.

**MOTION**

**Member Schaffhausen moved, seconded by Member McGehee, to approve the May 6, 2020 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 Gitzen indicated the city has received a number of comments regarding 2395 County Road B but it is not on the agenda tonight.

Chair Gitzen wondered where the 2040 Comprehensive Plan is and has the city adopted that yet.

Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd indicated he was the lead staff person working on this and the city Council did adopt the Comprehensive Plan update on May 4th at the city Council meeting. A couple of weeks ago the city submitted the final adopted version of the plan to Metropolitan Council.

**6. Public Hearing**

- a. **Consideration of the Planned Unit Development (PUD) Final Plan to Amend PUD 1177 (Centre Point Business Park) Revising the Veritas Master Site Plan (PF20-005)**

Chair Gitzen opened the public hearing for PF20-005 at approximately 7:33 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing. He advised this item will be before the city Council on June 22, 2020.

City Planner Paschke summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated June 3, 2020.

Mr. Patrick Giordano, project architect, 32 South 6th Street, addressed the Planning Commission.

**Public Comment**

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

Chair Gitzen closed the public hearing at 7:43 p.m.

**MOTION**

**Member Schaffhausen moved, seconded by Member McGehee, to recommend to the City Council approval of the requested Final Plan Planned Unit Development amendment for 2815 Centre Pointe Drive, modifying the Veritas master site plan to eliminate two office buildings, four stories in height and encompassing 122,000 square feet and replacing the master site plan with a single office building on a separate lot, three stories in height and 55,000 square feet in size. The proposed development will be required to achieve compliance with the standards outlined in PUD #1177, as amended in 2019, and subject to the three noted conditions in the staff report dated June 3, 2020 (PF20-005).**

**Ayes: 7**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

**b. Request for Approval of a Proposal to Subdivide Existing Lot into Two Lots at 2501 Fairview Avenue (PF20-006)**

Chair Gitzen opened the public hearing for PF20-006 at approximately 7:45 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing.

Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated June 3, 2020.

Member Kimble asked what the reason was behind looking at this parcel. She also asked what the size of the lot is for redevelopment.

Mr. Lloyd explained he did not know all of the details, but he knew it was tied into the city's purchase a few years ago of the strip mall just north of City Hall. There is some kind of financial arrangement that allowed the sale of this property to contribute to the purchase of the other one if that happened within a certain amount of time. He indicated lot 2 is approximately and acre.

Member Kimble explained the reason she asked is just the feasibility of redevelopment and also the water tower is right there, and she wondered what the implications of that was for any type of development.

Mr. Lloyd indicated he did not have a lot of insight about exactly what people might consider doing with this property.

Member Pribyl indicated the parcel is about an acre in size but there are access and utility easements on the northwest and south sides, and it looks like a potential easement on the east side as well. She wondered what the limitations are on use of those areas if redeveloped. She wondered if all of those areas could be used for parking, trash, other landscaping or is it all basically for water tower and electrical substation access.

Mr. Lloyd believed the easements would be available for the drive isle, parking area and landscaping but not for structures.

Community Development Director Janice Gundlach indicated the Planning Commission may or may not realize that the city Council had an option with a developer to purchase this property and that option expired in early April but during that option period that developer advanced a multi-family housing proposal to the EDA as a request for public finance assistance and the EDA opted not to support that type of use for funding on that property at that time. After that option expired the city Council does wish to list this property on the market for sale. Once it gets to that point the city will know what type of interest might be out there for it and obviously what might happen it could be before the Planning Commission for a rezoning request. She also noted a forty-foot access easement that runs along the south boundary of this site. That easement is to provide access to the water tower, not only for city staff but also for the telecommunication carriers that are represented on that back site. There are a lot of moving pieces that are going to have to be resolved so there will be more details later on.

Member McGehee explained she was on the Council at the time this was done, and it was a part of a trade with the owners of the strip mall near City Hall. Those owners were given two years to consider this and chose to let it lapse. She noted she was very familiar with the building and so to speak to Commissioner Kimble and Commissioner Pribyl, one of the things the Planning Commission and city might want to think about is that what a portion of that is used for now. There is an area in the building that is currently used by police as a break area. This is used quite regularly, and Park and Recreation also used most of the building for storage area for maintenance vehicles and all of the instruments for the orchestra and band that plays in the summer. There is also a basement that the historical society used for additional storage space. The building had previously housed the Roseville Historical Society offices. The building is quite small but substantial and was built as a fire station. She believes that as the city has changed and it has become abundantly clear, she thinks, as the city looks ahead at some of the massive changes that are taking place with retail and housing in this area of the city and with more of a desire for entertainment venues opening up in this area, it might be appropriate to look for a small public safety “substation” in this area. Given all of the restrictions and large electrical installation on the property she did not really support separating it or changing the zoning because the city should look seriously at where it is in development and the possibility of a need for an emergency vehicle of some type housed there again.

Chair Gitzen asked if the city does subdivide this into two lots could someone buy the existing lot with the building on it and leave the building there for repurpose of it.

Mr. Lloyd indicated that was correct.

Chair Gitzen asked if the building could be torn down until either someone had a new development or could use the existing building.

Mr. Lloyd agreed. There is no need to tear down the building at this time and can be reused.

**Public Comment**

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

Chair Gitzen closed the public hearing at 8:12 p.m.

**MOTION**

**Member Kimble moved, seconded by Member Pribyl, to recommend to the City Council approval of the proposed Fairview Fire Station Plat of 2501 Fairview Avenue, based on the content of the RPCA, public input, and city Council deliberation (PF20-006).**

Member Kimble explained she did not have the history that Commissioner McGehee does but did not see any reason for not moving forward with approving the plat. She questioned what is feasible and what will work there but did not see any reason not to support the request.

Member Pribyl echoed what Commissioner Kimble stated. Separating the parcels in a plat does not necessarily make anything else possible or impossible and thought it made sense.

Member McGehee indicated she would probably not support doing this. She could make several findings as to why this should not be done. She thought until there is a clear decision that the city really wants to sell, she thought this really came about through the trade and she was not sure given what has happened in the past three or four months that the decision to do that might be different than what it was. She really questioned after laying out all of the easements for such a small piece of land and in terms of public safety and people living in the community she thought that denial of a division could be supported in the Comprehensive Plan, not to change the plat and not to divest of this particular piece of property. .

**Ayes: 6**

**Nays: 1 (McGehee)**

**Motion carried.**

**MOTION**

**Member Gitzen moved, seconded by Member Kimble, to indicate the Commission's determination that the proposed disposal of Lot 2 of the proposed Fairview Fire Station plat is in compliance with the 2040 Comprehensive Plan, based on the comments, findings, and recommendation of the June 3, 2020 staff report. (PF20-006).**

Chair Gitzen believed that putting the plan out there and subdividing it will help the city see what type of interest there is and if no one is interested or the city finds it not

to be economically sound the city can then make that determination. If the building is not removed the city can use it how it is, and the plat only gives the city the opportunity to sell and does not mandate the sale of the property.

Member Kimble explained as she thinks about it, the city is coming to the Planning Commission like any other landowner that comes to the Planning Commission and the Commission does not typically question another landowner as to why that landowner wants to do something in particular with their land. She did not think this property was being utilized to its potential and thought this can be subdivided and put on the market and it will stay as it is until it is purchased.

Member Sparby noted there certainly can be some challenges but agreed with Commissioner Kimble that the Commission is not trying to get to that depth with every person that comes before them and the Commission has to let the market dictate what comes to bear for that property. He indicated he would support the motion.

Member McGehee explained she agreed in principal and agreed that the Commission does not ask people who come to the Commission that want to do something on the property but this is actually property in which everyone in the city is an owner and she felt strongly about public safety and felt that on this side of the town, where she is also a resident, the city should be cautious on putting this parcel on the market. Precluding putting it on the market she would have to agree is not the Commission's job to recommend alternatives to applicants. However, it certainly is the Commission's job to consider if, for example, since Roseville's many retail and entertainment establishments in the area have never been forthcoming giving the city a substation or financial contributions to assist in public safety costs as has been done in many other cities, she thought this may be a unique opportunity for the city to have a substation of public safety in this corridor which is so heavily used by visitors to the city and may soon become a very large and dense residential area as well.

Member Kimble wondered if that review would have already happened within the city staff and departments and would not someone have spoken up if it was wanted.

Member McGehee thought previously this parcel was tied into part of this other sale and there was, in her opinion, an unrealistic price tag on it and she thought it was determined by the City not to be suitable for what that particular developer was looking for in the trade. She thought that between that time and the present there has been enough change in the zoning code and change in the development of the areas around Rosedale, Rosedale itself, and within the economy in general that she thought it warranted another look.

Ms. Gundlach indicated she was not around when the City Council gave a developer an option on this property and regardless, the option expired, and the City Council wishes to test the market and that is what the action would amount to. If the property gets on the market and there is not any interest that will produce the economic development that the Council thinks is important for that trade that Commissioner

McGehee talked about then the city does not need to sell the property and nothing has to change.

Member Kruzel agreed to support doing this but she thought this was a bigger issue then just keeping the fire station for use for safety, she thought the city needed to look at a more systemic issue in Roseville and where it may be a spot if that is what is needed in that area of retail space. She thought it has been more than that with more retail spaces coming in and changes to the area.

**Ayes: 6**

**Nays: 1 (McGehee)**

**Motion carried.**

**c. Consideration a Request by Roseville Leased Housing Associates I, LLP (Dominium, Inc.) for a Conditional Use for Two Multi-Family Residential Buildings (PF20-008)**

Chair Gitzen opened the public hearing for PF20-008 at approximately 8:23 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing.

City Planner Paschke summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated June 3, 2020.

Member Pribyl asked if there is any plan to address the traffic issues at the intersection of County Road C and Snelling.

Mr. Paschke indicated staff is dealing with three different jurisdictions there, the city, Ramsey County and MnDOT. There have been conversations about how to try to take care of some of the changes with time delays, but he did not know specifically if there is anything currently being looked at or plans to change it. He did know the city is working on it.

Member Kimble echoed Commissioner Pribyl's concern with County Road C and Snelling. She indicated it looks like a beautiful project but hard to believe that the EAW did not point to some issues with build up of traffic on County Road C. She wondered about the greenspace. When looking at the two projects there is a green oval that is in the middle, is there any public greenspace in that area or is that entirely for the use of the occupants.

Mr. Paschke indicated this is all private to be utilized by the two apartment complexes.

Member Kimble assumed there would be park dedication fees paid.

Mr. Paschke indicated there would not be park dedication fees taken because this project based on the subdivision requirements does not require park dedication fees. There are only three lots on the site so the three lots will be recombined, changing the plot lines to accommodate this project which then would not trigger park dedication.

Member Kimble thought this project would put a fair amount of people into the parks, which is a good thing but also is a lot of activity in the parks. She wondered if in the retail area is there outdoor seating for restaurants that would be planned into the development.

Mr. Paschke believed that is correct but with COVID-19 some of those plans might be put off for awhile for some of those uses.

Member Kimble asked if there will be walkways up to Byerly's from the development.

Mr. Paschke indicated there would be. He reviewed the concept development plan with the Commission.

Member Kimble asked if the developer would start with the multi-family housing with senior housing coming later.

Mr. Paschke indicated that was correct.

Member McGehee knew there was a pathway on both sides and she thought certainly in the family unit the most accessible park and the one most used and closest would be Rosebrook and if there was a stoplight at Herschel the pedestrian would end up on the pathway along County Road C under the powerline but there is no way all along County Road C through there, crossing the railroad tracks so the pedestrian would have to go to the corner of Snelling and County Road C and there is nothing that wraps around the corner that makes a nice convenient either bike or pedestrian walkway in there.

Mr. Paschke thought Commissioner McGehee was correct. There is not a trail system or connection into the park or up that Snelling Avenue area. He knew this was discussed at the staff level, but he was not certain if staff got to the point of what to do about it, but it was discussed.

Chair Gitzen noted he takes his bike there all of the time and there is a path that goes south at the corner of County Road C and Snelling and veers over to the park.

Member McGehee indicated she had a number of questions about the comments that came through from other agencies in the packet related to the EAW and tying those to the city's 2040 Comprehensive Plan. The city had comments about trying to meet some of the requirements in the Comprehensive Plan. There were other comments regarding CO2 and solar panels, particularly in the parking area and green roof on the buildings to avoid the heat island effects. There were questions about the native plantings and trying to make habitats for the Rusty Patch Bumble Bee. She noted that looking at the requirements for the Rusty Patch Bumble Bee, the bee seemed unlikely to flourish in the greenspace in the parking lot.



Member McGehee thought some of these sorts of things that are environmental things that are inside the Comprehensive Plan and somethings that are unique to the climate and resilience and sustainability goals. To follow up on, Commissioner Kimble's thought, park dedication for this project could be used to enhance pathways for trails from this area to the surrounding parks or to apply for some of these other things that the City could use for incentives to assist the developer in including changes to benefit sustainability. Instead the city does not end up with anything. She opined the city should look into its subdivision plan and see why it is that when the city adds 425 new families there is no park dedication fee or anything that can be used to either incentivize desired enhancements that might be a little more costly for the developer or to encourage more greenspace or ties with the city's park land.

Member McGehee explained even beautifying the ditch is a financial issue. When she talked to staff about beautifying the ditch into something perhaps more open as a potential amenity, staff explained that the issue is that such a thing would be hard to maintain and the city does not have the resources to do this kind of thing. She noted that she looked at all of the things from the Pollution Control Agency, the Met Council and the Department of Natural Resources, as well as community members who weighed in on the EAW and made suggestions. They all spoke to goals from our 2040 Comprehensive Plan, many involving the use of solar and reducing the city's CO2 emissions. At this point, however we have few policies or resources to incentivize these recommendations.

Mr. Logan Schmidt and Mr. Michael Krych, representatives of Dominion, gave a presentation to the Commission on the proposed site plan.

Chair Gitzen asked the representatives to speak briefly about the trade off between affordable housing and providing green roofs and solar. He indicated all of these things are great but at some point it is no longer affordable housing he assumed.

Mr. Schmidt explained being in affordable housing his company has rent limits that are capped and determined by HUD every year. He explained Dominion is going above and beyond what is typically required for a housing development and that is a part of MFHA requirements in the green communities. He believed Dominion is going above and beyond offering these sustainable features and to the extent possible with other funding and stuff like that Dominion could potentially do more sustainable features but Dominion believes it is exceeding what would typically be included in an affordable housing project.

Member McGehee thanked the developers for the presentation which was extremely helpful and also answered a variety of the questions she had which were not clear in the packet. She thought it was very useful and appreciated their efforts in creating a very nice-looking plan. She would like to know how long Dominion has committed to keeping the building affordable.

Mr. Schmidt indicated under MFHA guidelines the building would be affordable for a period of twenty years and then there is an extended use agreement that will make it affordable for thirty years.

Member McGehee asked if the thirty-year extended use agreement already been signed or is that something that comes later.

Mr. Schmidt indicated when Dominion finishes construction on the project they have to go through a process called an 8609 application and MFHA will require a LURA that will layout those requirements for the affordability at that point.

Member McGehee asked if Dominion is agreeing or planning to agree to a thirty-year affordability. She asked that because this is a Condition Use issue and she thought duration of affordability is important.

Mr. Schmidt agreed and explained Dominion will be meeting these requirements with the LURA that will be in place for this project.

Member Kimble echoed what Commissioner McGehee said and thought this is an exciting project for Roseville. She appreciated all of the green space and it looked like there will be another place to shop and complimented the team on the project.

Chair Gitzen commended Mr. Schmidt and Mr. Krych for their great presentation and he thought that did help the Commission get a clearer picture of what the development looks like and the thought behind it.

Member Kruzel indicated she liked the multi-generational aspect of this. Bringing family and senior together and thought that was a great concept.

### **Public Comment**

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

Chair Gitzen closed the public hearing at 9:17 p.m.

### **MOTION**

**Member Kimble moved, seconded by Member Kruzel, to recommend to the city Council approval of the proposed apartment complex as a conditional use at 1755, 1743 and 1717 County Road C West, based on the content of the June 3, 2020 staff report, public input and Planning Commission deliberation, with the following condition:**

- a. The property is developed consistent with the plans provided as attachments to this RPCA dated June 3, 2020 unless otherwise amended to comply with city Code requirements, except that unit counts shall not be increased. (PF20-008).**

Member Kimble thought this was a great project and a vast improvement to what is there now and increases the tax base and loves the comment about the inter-generational that Commissioner Kruzel made and thought there was a lot of possibility there. There were lots of reasons to support it.

Member Kruzel agreed and thought it would be nice to see the area change and bring in more families and seniors to the area.

**Ayes: 7**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

**7. Adjourn**

**MOTION**

**Member Schaffhausen, seconded by Member Pribyl, to adjourn the meeting at 9:22 p.m.**

**Ayes: 7**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**