

REQUEST FOR CITY COUNCIL ACTION

Agenda Date: **11/10/2014**

Agenda Item: 13.f

Department Approval



City Manager Approval



Item Description: Adopt an Ordinance Approving Zoning Text Amendment to §1009.07
Developer Open House Meetings (**PROJ0017, Amdt. 22**)

There is no mandated deadline due to City Staff initiated request.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Applicant: Roseville Community Development Department

Type of Request: Zoning Ordinance text amendments

LEVEL OF CITY DISCRETION IN DECISION-MAKING

Action taken on a text amendment to the Zoning Ordinance is **legislative**; the City has broad discretion in making land use decisions based on advancing the health, safety, and general welfare of the community.

BACKGROUND

In August 2013, the City Council approved open house requirements for all land divisions (plats/minor subdivisions) of 4 or more lots/parcels. These requirements were added to §1102.01 of Title 11, Subdivision. During that approval process, the City Council directed the Planning staff to incorporate a number of the approved requirements into §1009.07 Developer Open House Meetings.

Planning staff will note that under the timing section there is a difference between the existing Zoning Code version and the Subdivision Code version that will be corrected by the proposed text amendment, as well as clarification on a couple of other items.

Below are the current requirements for a developer open house in §1009.07:

1009.07 Developer Open House Meetings

A. Purpose: Certain proposals or applications for development may constitute significant departures from the present or historical use and/or zoning of a property. Prior to submitting an application for approval of an interim use or zoning map change, therefore, an applicant shall hold an open house meeting with property owners in the vicinity of the potential development location in order to provide a convenient forum for engaging community members in the development process, to describe the proposal in detail, and to answer questions and solicit feedback.

B. Timing: The open house shall be held not more than 30 days prior to the submission of an application for approval of a proposal requiring a developer open house meeting and shall be

held on a weekday evening beginning between 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. and ending by 10:00 p.m.

C. Location: The open house shall be held at a location in or near the neighborhood affected by the proposal, and (in the case of a parcel situated near Roseville's boundaries) preferably in Roseville. In the event that such a meeting space is not available the applicant shall arrange for the meeting to be held at the City Hall Campus.

D. Invitations: The applicant shall prepare a printed invitation identifying the date, time, place, and purpose of the open house and shall mail the invitation to the recipients in a list prepared and provided in electronic format by Community Development Department staff . The recipients will include property owners within the public hearing notification area established in Chapter 108 of the City Code, members of the Planning Commission and City Council, and other community members that have registered to receive the invitations. The invitation shall clearly identify the name, phone number, and email address of the host of the open house to be contacted by invitees who have questions but are unable to attend the open house. The invitations shall also include a sentence that is substantially the same as the following:

This open house meeting is an important source of feedback from nearby property owners and is a required step in the process of seeking City approval for the proposed [zoning map change/interim use], and a summary of the comments and questions raised at the open house meeting will be submitted to the City as part of the formal application.

E. Summary: A written summary of the open house shall be submitted as a necessary component of an application for approval of a proposal requiring a developer open house meeting.

Proposed Amendment

Based on City Council direction, the following amendments have been proposed by the Planning staff:

B. Timing: The open house shall be held ~~not more than 30 days~~ **not less than 15 days and not more than 45 days** prior to the submission of an application for approval of a proposal requiring a developer open house meeting and shall be held on a weekday evening beginning between 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. and ending by 10:00 p.m.

C. Location: The open house shall be held at a ~~location~~ **public location (not a private residence)** in or near the neighborhood affected by the proposal, and (in the case of a parcel situated near Roseville's boundaries) preferably in Roseville. In the event that such a meeting space is not available the applicant shall arrange for the meeting to be held at the City Hall Campus.

E. Summary: A written summary of the open house shall be submitted as a necessary component of an application for approval of a proposal requiring a developer open house meeting. **The summary shall include a list of potential issues/concerns and any possible mitigations or resolutions for resolving the issue(s) and/or concern(s). Citizens are also encouraged to submit their own summary of the meeting highlighting concerns/issues and any mitigations and resolutions. It is encouraged that a list (name and address) of attendees be kept and submitted with the open house summary.**

Additionally the Community Development Department would propose the following paragraph:

The applicant/developer is responsible for mailing a copy of the meeting summary to all attendees who provided their names and addresses on the sign-in sheet.

PUBLIC HEARING & PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

At the duly noticed public hearing of October 8, 2014, Commissioners had a few questions of the Planning staff and two citizens addressed the Commission regarding this item (Attachment A).

Specifically, Commissioner Stellmach sought, via email, Planning Staff's response as to whether the language only "encouraging" the developer to provide a list of attendees was too loose versus "requiring" such a list be kept and submitted. City Planner responded that he recollection of the discussions with the City Council on the initial creation of the developer open house requirement was not to require such a list because there would be individuals most likely in attendance that would not sign-in and/or desire to be noticed.

Commissioners Boguszewski, Daire, and Cunningham discussed the merits of the proposal and whether "encouraging" was suitable versus "requiring" and thus holding the developer more accountable.

Mr. Gary Grefenberg, representing the Community Engagement Commission (CEC), indicated his general support of the proposed text amendments as they were similar to those discussed by the CEC. However, Mr. Grefenberg sought a change to "requiring" the sign-in sheet and summary versus "encouraging", providing more creditability to the process.

Ms. Lisa McCormack also supported a "required" sign-in sheet acknowledging that some would refuse to sign the sheet. She also sought a provision to add in the number of total attendees and suggested more specificity in the staff report when summarizing the open house for the Planning Commission and City Council.

Based on public comments and Planning Commissioner input, the Roseville Planning Commission voted 5-0 to revise item E of the proposed amendment to §1009.07, Developer Open House Meetings; the Commission's changes to the proposed amendment are highlighted in blue below:

B. Timing: The open house shall be held ~~not more than 30 days~~ **not less than 15 days and not more than 45 days** prior to the submission of an application for approval of a proposal requiring a developer open house meeting and shall be held on a weekday evening beginning between 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. and ending by 10:00 p.m.

C. Location: The open house shall be held at a ~~location~~ **public location (not a private residence)** in or near the neighborhood affected by the proposal, and (in the case of a parcel situated near Roseville's boundaries) preferably in Roseville. In the event that such a meeting space is not available the applicant shall arrange for the meeting to be held at the City Hall Campus.

E. Summary: A written summary of the open house shall be submitted as a necessary component of an application for approval of a proposal requiring a developer open house meeting. **The summary shall include a list of potential issues/concerns and any possible mitigations or resolutions for resolving the issue(s) and/or concern(s). Citizens are also encouraged to submit their own summary of the meeting highlighting concerns/issues and any mitigations and resolutions. It is encouraged that a list (name and address) of**

~~attendees be kept and submitted with the open house summary.~~ A sign-in sheet shall be provided on which citizens may, but are not required, to enter their name and address. The sign-in sheet shall be submitted by the developer with the open house summary.
No later than the date of submission of the application the applicant/developer is shall be responsible for mailing a copy of the meeting summary to all attendees who provided their names and addresses on the sign-in sheet.

SUGGESTED CITY COUNCIL ACTION

Adopt an Ordinance amending §1009.07, Developer Open House Meetings consistent with the Planning Commission's recommendation of October 8, 2014 (Attachment B).

Prepared by: City Planner Thomas Paschke - 651-792-7074 | thomas.paschke@ci.roseville.mn.us

Attachments: A: Draft PC Minutes

B: Draft ordinance

**EXTRACT OF THE MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 8, 2014,
ROSEVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION**

- c. **Project File 0017-Amendment 22**
Request by the Community Development Department to amend certain requirements contained in Roseville Zoning Code, Section 1009.07 (Developer Open House Meetings) to be consistent with similar requirements contained within Title 11, Subdivision Code

Chair Gisselquist opened the Public Hearing at 7:15 p.m.

Based on City Council direction, City Planner Thomas Paschke reviewed the proposed amendments as detailed in lines 41 – 62 of the staff report dated October 8, 2014, in an effort to provide consistency and for an additional requirement for a developer to provide a written summary of the open house and a list of those attending, as detailed in lines 55 – 60 of the staff report.

Mr. Paschke summarized the comments received by staff from Member Stellmach earlier today; and his question as to whether current language in only “encouraging” the developer to provide a list of names/addresses of attendees was too loose versus “requiring” that a summary be sent out. Mr. Paschke advised that he had responded to Member Stellmach that it was implied that a sheet was put out at the open house and attendees could sign in and be included in that list as well as what was copied to the City with a meeting summary, along with a request from those attending receive a copy of the summary in case their perception of what transpired or the information contained in the summary was not interpreted the same. Mr. Paschke advised that this would then allow those attending to provide the City Council with their own summary in addition to that provided by the developer. Mr. Paschke opined that he didn’t find a conflict with the current zoning ordinance and language as proposed.

At the request of Member Boguszewski, Mr. Paschke advised that the proposed text amendments in Items B, C, and E were mimicking other areas of code specific to developer open houses; and confirmed that if the Planning Commission preferred to change the “encouraged” phraseology, it would need to be changed in other areas of City Code to bring everything into compliance and consistency.

Member Boguszewski agreed that if the new phrase about mailing a copy, it lent heat to the “encouragement” part; however, since the new phraseology didn’t occur in other code language as adopted to-date, it may imply an intent if adopted that it be added to other areas of code upon future text amendments.

Mr. Lloyd noted, as referenced with the new Subdivision Code, consistent language would be written into that revision versus a separate text amendment.

Member Boguszewski expressed his concern that if text amendments to the new Subdivision code included this new phrase (E. Summary), “encouraging” a list of attendees be kept and submitted with the open house summary, and agreed with Member Stellmach that language would be looser than intended.

Mr. Paschke reviewed his recollection of City Council discussions where they indicated they did not want to require a sign in sheet; and if you attended an open house, everyone and anyone had the ability to send the City your review encapsulating the meeting, but the developer would be required to provide a summary as part of their open house requirements, with the City Council then able to discuss the merits of what actually occurred at the open house. From his perspective, Mr. Paschke advised that the

“encourage” language would not eliminate or require a sign-up sheet, as he interpreted the intent of the City Council discussion to avoid requiring a list of attendees to retain the anonymity of those attending and separating that community or neighborhood event from becoming a city-sponsored or mandated meeting that would be accommodated at the public hearing level before the Planning Commission or City Council.

Member Boguszewski recognized the interest of some attending to simply attend and not provide a record of their names/addresses; however, in an effort not to weaken the process, he opined it was incumbent upon the holder of the open house to provide a sign-up sheet, while allowing those attending to choose to sign-in or not to do so depending on their preference.

Under that scenario, Mr. Paschke advised that he would then include language that a sign-in sheet was “required” to be provided by the developer.

Member Boguszewski opined that would be fine as long as an attendee was not required to sign up, but that a sign-up sheet be provided.

Member Daire advised that he had no issues with the wording of Items B, C, or E, opining that they made the process more explicit. However, Member Daire advised that he agreed with Member Boguszewski that the developer should be “required” to have a sign-in sheet available, but not “requiring” those attending to sign in. Specific to the additional language requested by the Community Development Department (lines 60-62), Member Daire opined that from his perspective it represented an extraordinary requirement, noting that the Planning Commission didn’t provide a summary of the public hearing to each one attending the meeting; and questioned why it should be mandated for a developer. Member Daire moved to strike that last provision as proposed.

Member Cunningham disagreed with Member Daire, opining that the burden of proof should be the greatest for the developer or applicant, including any extra hoops deemed necessary or desired by the City and thus required as part of their approval process. Member Cunningham stated that as long as she had served on the Planning Commission, the biggest concern heard from citizens is that more citizen involvement be provided for and that advocacy for those voices be provided. Member Cunningham opined that she found this to be a minimum request of a developer; and respectfully disagreed with Member Daire.

Mr. Lloyd noted that anyone attending any meetings of any kind always had the liberty to summarize those meetings; and suggested that Item E (Summary) could be relocated to Item D (Invitations) as a separate paragraph as noted by including the language of lines 34-37 of the invitation, alerting those invited and/or attending that a written summary will be sent to those requesting it as long as they provided their name and address; as well as opening up that opportunity to those attending to provide their own summary to staff if they found that the developer’s summary didn’t capture the meeting, along with options for how they could follow-up and provide their comments to staff.

Public Comment

Gary Grefenberg, 91 Mid Oaks Lane

Mr. Grefenberg advised that he was speaking as a representative of the newly-created City Council advisory Community Engagement Commission that had been reviewing ways to involve residents in decisions impacting them. Mr. Grefenberg opined that the report referenced in the staff recommendation provided a step forward. However, in his past attendance at open houses, Mr. Grefenberg opined that the summary report didn’t always fairly represent those residents attending, but on occasion reflected developer

prejudices and had the potential for significant conflicts of interest if that summary report was the sole responsibility of the developer. Mr. Grefenberg further opined that the proposed mailing to all attending and clarifying that any resident attending could submit their own report was based on recommendations of the Community Engagement Commission to ensure resident involvement in decision-making.

Mr. Grefenberg provided as a bench handout, ***attached hereto and made a part hereof***, a comparison of the Community Engagement Commission draft proposal, and the Planning Commission staff's proposal, expressing his appreciation that there was some similarity in the two. Mr. Grefenberg noted the distinction that the Community Engagement Commission was recommending including all those participating, while recognizing that no one would be forced to sign in.

However, with staff's recommendation (line 61), indicating that the applicant was responsible for mailing a copy to attendees, and that the sign-in list would be available, Mr. Grefenberg opined that in order to enforce it there needed to be a "required" mailing of the summary to those attending; and that the sign-in list be kept and submitted with the open house summary based on the intent of the Community Engagement Commission. Therefore, Mr. Grefenberg opined that it seemed appropriate to strike the staff language "It is encouraged..." Mr. Grefenberg opined that he was especially pleased to see (on line 61) that the applicant was responsible for mailing a copy of the meeting summary, since in the complicated zoning process where everyone didn't necessarily understand the elements, it provided more credibility and provide everyone with the opportunity to have their comments and/or concerns recorded.

Even though it may no longer be necessary with the addition of line 61 language as proposed, Mr. Grefenberg stated that the Community Engagement Commission strongly suggested planning staff prepare a summary of the of the open house, as a neutral third party. Mr. Grefenberg opined that this would avoid any potential conflict of interest and respect the accuracy and record of the comments of attendees. Mr. Grefenberg further opined that it was critical that residents be allowed to review what is purported to be a summary of the meeting in case there were areas of disagreement.

Member Boguszewski suggested that, if that portion of the language was passed, perhaps an additional clause be added to ensure all summaries of the open house be submitted "...no later than submission of the application itself" to provide sufficient review time for accuracy and to allow residents to attend subsequent formal public hearings to express their differing opinions.

Mr. Paschke advised that the developer was already required to hold the open house and submit a written summary prior to their formal submission of the application.

Member Boguszewski clarified that he was speaking specifically to the mailing of the summary (as noted on line 61), note the open house itself, which was not clearly identified in the proposed language.

Mr. Grefenberg brought to the Commission's attention the recommendation of the Community Engagement Commission that a joint task force of their members and those of the Planning Commission, plus at-large members, should be formed to assess notification recommendations and prepare a joint plan by both commissions for City Council approval, with staff assistance from the Planning Department. Mr. Grefenberg clarified that the intent was ensure transparent zoning recommendations.

Chair Gisselquist opined that such an initiative made sense; with the consensus of those present in agreement.

Member Boguszewski suggested that Mr. Grefenberg advised that Community Engagement Commission of the willingness of the Planning Commission to serve on such a joint task force.

Mr. Grefenberg noted the interest being expressed by the community (on NextDoor.com) with respect to the need for clarity and cogency of thought, and recognized with respect the experience and integrity of the Planning Commissioners as resident volunteers.

Member Boguszewski further suggested that Mr. Grefenberg express to the Community Engagement Commission his recommendation that the Planning Commission be eliminated as a third party provider, expressing concern in placing any additional burden on staff, as well as how they could serve as a neutral party, especially when the perception of some residents is that Planning Department staff are not neutral.

Mr. Grefenberg admitted that he at times had agreed with that perception of staff, and agreed that with more mutual respect and collaboration in the future, that perception would be dismissed in time. Mr. Grefenberg stated that he would take the Planning Commission's comments and interest back to the Community Engagement Commission, and their recommendation that the specific language, "... prepared by a third party such as staff" be eliminated.

Specific to the Community Engagement Commission's draft proposal and language (9.1.b), Member Murphy stated that he was unsure that the City needed to incur the cost for a staff person, but that it should be a cost borne by the developer. Member Murphy opined that "neutral" was a very objective term; and further expressed concern in "requiring" attendees to sign in. Member Murphy opined that the existing proposed wording from staff currently before the Planning Commission was that citizens were "encouraged" to submit their own summary of the meeting and provide their own unbiased perspective.

Mr. Grefenberg clarified that his remarks weren't intended to mean that attendees be "required" to sign in, but that the developer was "required" to provide a sign-in sheet.

City Planner Paschke

Regarding the entire purpose of an open house, Mr. Paschke clarified that it was to eliminate some of the concerns and issues initially raised by Mr. Grefenberg and the Community Engagement Commission and the perception that staff was currently too involved in projects prior to the public being made aware of and the Commission holding a public hearing. Therefore, Mr. Paschke noted that theoretically the creation of the open house was intended to be prior to staff's review of the application and decision-making for detailed projects, thereby removing staff's perspective from the equation, and enhancing the developer to resident relationship and interaction directly. Mr. Paschke stated that, as a result of that initial process, the developer would formulate their formal plan to staff, and incorporating or in response to citizen comment, and getting the public more involved during the front end through the open house rather than only at the formal public hearing. Mr. Paschke noted that this removed staff from attending or getting caught in the middle of those citizen concerns, property owners, and developer rights; allowing them to focus on the merits of the application on a case by case basis and in accordance with city code.

Lisa McCormack

From her personal perspective, Mr. McCormack expressed interest in a "required" sign in sheet, while realizing people could still refuse to provide their name or address. However, if they were taking time to attend, Ms. McCormack opined that they would be willing to sign in. Ms. McCormack further opined that as part of that documentation

requirement, a number be provided of how many and who attended (e.g. citizens or representatives of the developer), as she was aware of one recent instance that of the eight attending the open house, a significant neighborhood only had 8 attending the open house, with one being a Planning Commissioner and another listed attendee a representative of the developer. Regarding the notification process, Ms. McCormack opined that often the summary addressed in the staff report was more quantitative versus qualitative; further opining that if behooved the City to evaluate the process and have that information available. Ms. McCormack agreed with Mr. Lloyd's suggestion to move the additional language of Item E (Summary) to that of Item D (Invitation) so residents realize they have the opportunity to provide input and counter anything in the developer's summary that they are in disagreement with. Ms. McCormack further opined that it was not necessary to have staff serve as a neutral third party but allow residents that opportunity.

Chair Gisselquist closed the Public Hearing at 7:48 p.m.

MOTION

Murphy moved, seconded by Member Boguszewski to recommend to the City Council approval of amendments to Roseville City Code, Section 1009.07 (Developer Open House Meetings) as recommended by staff in the project report dated October 8, 2014, lines 41 - 62; amended as follows:

- **Item E (Summary), lines 53 – 59:**
“A written summary of the open house shall be submitted as a necessary component of an application for approval of a proposal requiring a developer open house meeting. The summary shall include a list of potential issues/concerns and any possible mitigations or resolutions for resolving the issue(s) and/or concern(s). Citizens are also encouraged to submit their own summary of the meeting highlighting concerns/issues and any mitigations and resolutions. ~~[It is encouraged that a list (name and address) of attendees be kept and submitted with the open house summary].~~”
“A sign-in sheet SHALL be provided on which citizens may, but are not required, to enter their name and address. The sign-in sheet SHALL be submitted by the developer with the open house summary (Member Murphy)
- ***Correct typographical error in Line 62 (Member Daire)***
“addressed” to “addresses”
- ***Item E (Summary), lines 61-62, correct to read:***
“No later than the date of submission of the application, the applicant/developer SHALL be responsible for mailing a copy of the meeting summary to all attendees who provided their names and addresses on the sign-in sheet.” (Members Boguszewski/Daire)

Since the person controlling the meeting summary set the stage for how it was presented, Member Boguszewski spoke in support of retaining the language as proposed in the above-referenced language.

Specific to lines 61-61 and as he'd raised earlier, Member Daire opined that it added an extraordinary requirement for the developer to mail a summary to those attending the open house, and preliminary to the formal public hearing, when the City was already requiring the extra burden of the developer to hold the open house; and served to be a higher requirement than the City held itself to. Member Daire opined that he found that to be an imbalance, in effect creating a third public hearing; and noted that anyone attending the formal public hearing before the Planning Commission had the ability to

make a statement there and have it become part of the public record, typically followed by the City Council holding yet another quasi-public hearing before them when hearing the case. Member Daire recognized the comments of City Planner Paschke in stating the purpose of the open house and additional benefits for it to flag any difficulties before reaching the formal public hearing, allowing the developer and those attending to address and negotiate those issues and subsequently adjust their development plan. Member Daire also recognized that it may be true that a developer determines to proceed as they initially intended regardless of public input; however, he opined that at that point during the public hearing, that attitude would obviously surface. With the formal public hearing established, and now officially requiring an open house, Member Daire opined that in some senses it purports to mimic the intent of the public hearing without the public body there to listen. As noted by Ms. McCormack, Member Daire referenced the minimal resident attendance at one open house; and opined that he agreed with Mr. Grefenberg that summaries be objective when coming forward. Member Daire stated that his chief problem was the proposed requirement was not undesirable, but that it placed an extraordinary burden on the developer, beyond what the City held itself to; and in some cases, if “required” of the developer to send meeting notices and summaries to those attending open houses, and then “required” staff to do the same for the formal public hearing, he was unsure how this ended.

Member Cunningham stated that she saw it differently; since on behalf of the Planning Commission, staff already made the meeting record via minutes, available to the public as requested and online, having the option or requirement for a developer to also mail a meeting summary was appropriate, since those were not available to the public on the City’s website. Member Cunningham opined that therefore, the City already met that step in the process, similar to that being proposed for the developer to follow in turn.

Member Boguszewski agreed with Member Cunningham, that the requirement was not an extraordinary burden, but was in parallel to the Planning Commission meeting minutes, and since the open house didn’t have minutes, it made everything fairly and accurately represented. If there was an undue burden, Member Boguszewski opined that it was on citizens to attend a formal public hearing as well as the initial open house; however, he further opined that it provided them with a mechanism to achieve transparency. Further, Member Boguszewski stated that he didn’t necessarily assume objectivity on the part of the developers for their open houses, having seen on occasion things characterized or spun for their advantage during the process, with how things were actually discussed at the open house or the nuances of those discussions now solely in the hands of the developer and one degree further away from that desired objectivity. Member Boguszewski opined that the opportunity for residents to summarize the meetings from their perspective served to enhance the City’s desired role in helping protect Roseville citizens to make sure they have sufficient transparency.

Member Murphy questioned the pleasure of the body on lines 56-57 to encourage citizens to submit their own summary, and asked staff how the Planning Commission would receive them – as unedited as an attachment or incorporated into the staff report.

Mr. Paschke advised that addresses and other private information would be redacted to ensure the document was suitable for public viewing versus private correspondence with staff; and could be provided as an attachment to the particular report for the review process and consideration by the body as well as staff’s response as part of their analysis.

Member Murphy stated that if a citizen had the opportunity to submit their summary directly to the City and it became part of the review file, they could in turn feel comfortable that they were being unedited.

Since staff proposed this revised language as an addition to the open house requirement, Member Daire questioned if he understood that staff would attach all meeting summaries to the project proposal, including citizen comments, as a part of the material reviewed by the Commission going into the public hearing.

Mr. Paschke confirmed that would be the intent, as currently provided for review of cases.

Chair Gisselquist noted such attachments were typically seen as part of the agenda packet materials.

Mr. Paschke noted that staff includes them when they're received in time to be published with the packet; otherwise provided as a bench handout or included as part of the meeting discussion information or in the body of the report. In most cases, Mr. Paschke advised that they were attached with e-mails and other information as part of the public record and report.

Mr. Paschke clarified that staff was not immune from these requirements either, and in instances where it was in the role of developer (e.g. comprehensive plan or zoning text amendments), City staff would be required to follow these same procedures under code. In his review of potential amendments, particularly this one, Mr. Paschke noted that it was a way to ensure accountability for the developer or applicant holding the open house by providing appropriate content of the meeting to their beset ability. In dealing with transparency issues over the years, Mr. Paschke advised that staff had found the need for more clarify on what actually transpired at the open house level, and not requiring the public to restate their case at the Planning Commission level.

Chair Gisselquist opined that, given the size of some of the developments coming forward, he did not find it onerous to require the developer to send out open house summaries to those attending the meeting.

Member Boguszewski stated that, and subsequent to tonight's action, encouraging attendees to submit their own summaries as part of the process, especially as addressed by Mr. Lloyd, in altering that language to the invitation letters drafted for developers (page 2, lines 34-37).

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

City of Roseville

ORDINANCE NO. ____

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SELECTED TEXT OF TITLE 10 ZONING ORDINANCE
OF THE ROSEVILLE CITY CODE

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ORDAINS:

SECTION 1. Purpose: The Roseville City Code is hereby amended to revise the requirements for parking developer open house meetings.

SECTION 2. § 1009.07 Developer Open House Meetings, is hereby amended as follows:

B. Timing: The open house shall be held ~~not more than 30 days~~ **not less than 15 days and not more than 45 days** prior to the submission of an application for approval of a proposal requiring a developer open house meeting and shall be held on a weekday evening beginning between 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. and ending by 10:00 p.m.

C. Location: The open house shall be held at a ~~location~~ **public location (not a private residence)** in or near the neighborhood affected by the proposal, and (in the case of a parcel situated near Roseville's boundaries) preferably in Roseville. In the event that such a meeting space is not available the applicant shall arrange for the meeting to be held at the City Hall Campus.

E. Summary: A written summary of the open house shall be submitted as a necessary component of an application for approval of a proposal requiring a developer open house meeting. **The summary shall include a list of potential issues/concerns and any possible mitigations or resolutions for resolving the issue(s) and/or concern(s). Citizens are also encouraged to submit their own summary of the meeting highlighting concerns/issues and any mitigations and resolutions. It is encouraged that a list (name and address) of attendees be kept and submitted with the open house summary. A sign-in sheet shall be provided on which citizens may, but are not required, to enter their name and address. The sign-in sheet shall be submitted by the developer with the open house summary.**

No later than the date of submission of the application the applicant/developer is shall be responsible for mailing a copy of the meeting summary to all attendees who provided their names and addresses on the sign-in sheet.

SECTION 3. Effective Date. This ordinance amendment to the Roseville City Code shall take effect upon passage and publication.

Passed this 10th day of November, 2014