

38 coming from different perspectives with differing, but all well-respected opinions,
39 which in politics was a great thing.

40 “Future City” Report

41 Member Daire reported on his attendance, as a Planning Commission
42 representative, of a supplemental meeting with the comprehensive plan
43 consultant, Ms. Perdu, and Roseville Area Middle School students having
44 participated in that essay program. Member Daire reported that the exercise
45 consisted of Ms. Perdu leading a listening session consisting of four questions of
46 the twenty-seven 7th grade students and their technical advisor; with those
47 questions specific to their interpretation of life in Roseville now and in the future,
48 and their participation in the community now and then. From the perspective of
49 his planning career, Member Daire noted how impressed he was with the insight
50 and mature comments of the students, commending their staff/teacher for her
51 guidance.

52 Among the comments provided by the students, Member Daire noted their
53 recommendation for green space in the community, especially large, canopy trees
54 in neighborhoods; improvement of the appearance of commercial areas, especially
55 clustering of smaller commercial areas. Member Daire noted how the students’
56 comments and identified themes mirrored those of the recent Urban Land Institute
57 (ULI) workshop for complete streets and walking paths connecting parks. Other
58 student comments included avoiding residential clusters around non-residential
59 uses; creating neighborhood meeting spaces, such as “hang out” spots and
60 restaurants; and their recognition that since most large commercial development
61 opportunities in Roseville have been taken, with only small commercial spaces
62 remaining, there needed to be more diverse redevelopment in smaller commercial
63 spaces still remaining, including ethnic food stores and restaurants; and putting
64 parking out of sight (e.g. underground). Member Daire noted that the students
65 were not tasked with dealing with any economic implications of their comments
66 and observations. Among those areas recognized by students as needing
67 redevelopment, Member Daire reported that Har Mar Mall came up, with the need
68 for an anchor business and mini mega-towers in their words; along with smaller
69 stores, and more cultural and art opportunities in the community.

70 Member Daire reported that he was uncomfortable with only one of the comments
71 of the students, that being that they perceived that “nothing’s happening.”
72 Member Daire reported that students appeared to hold a negative feeling toward
73 chain businesses and franchise operations, suggesting smaller, local business
74 options.

75 Member Daire advised that he had inquired of the students their feelings about
76 aging-in-place and auxiliary dwelling units; with their responses being that they
77 considered their current homes as starting points, but didn’t necessarily see
78 themselves living in Roseville, especially with their parents.

79 As an aside, Member Daire reported on his discussion with the student’s technical
80 advisor, who emigrated from India before 2000 via TX and then to MN for a job;
81 currently living in Roseville with his family (two children). Asking him what
82 informed his decision to relocate in Roseville and remain, Member Daire advised

83 that the technical advisor had subsequently sent him a three-page response to that
84 question, which had proven very wrenching in some aspects as it was
85 extraordinarily personal and revealed a lot of his family life, with the technical
86 advisor giving him permission to share the letter with the Commission and city
87 staff as another perspective on life in Roseville.

88 In conclusion, Member Daire stated that he was so glad he had attended and been
89 involved in the process; opining that this meeting with students had been one of
90 the highlights of his service on the Roseville Planning Commission.

91 Thanking Member Daire for attending the meeting on behalf of the Planning
92 Commission, and given the intelligent and mature responses of the students, Chair
93 Boguszewski questioned the minimum age for commissioners.

94 Member Daire noted that it would certainly support the city's diversity efforts.

95 Community Development Director Collins advised that, with the Planning
96 Commission serving in a statutory role, the commission could ask the City
97 Council to consider appointment in the future of several youth commissioners
98 serving as non-voting members, similar to that done on several other city advisory
99 commissions at this time.

100 Member Bull thanked Member Daire for attending this meeting, given the short
101 notice provided; reiterating his concern that any interactive events and activities
102 related to the 2040 comprehensive plan update process be brought to the Planning
103 Commission's attention at staff and the consultant's earliest convenience to allow
104 one of the three representatives to attend.

105 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update

106 For the benefit of the Commission and public, Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd
107 displayed an updated timeline of the process to-date since the last iteration in
108 January.

109 Mr. Lloyd reported that the public kick-off meeting for the 2040 process was
110 scheduled for March 7, 2017 at 6:00 p.m. at the Roseville Skating Center-Rose
111 Room. Mr. Lloyd advised that this would allow the public to provide input on
112 their visioning goals since the last update ten years ago; and to hear their feedback
113 on whether those goals, as well as those of the Imagine Roseville 2025
114 community visioning process remained relevant. Subsequent to that public
115 feedback, Mr. Lloyd advised that the Planning Commission would then review
116 the community visioning goals, including feedback from the kick-off event; along
117 with staff's assessment in more detail of what goals/policies from the existing
118 comprehensive plan had been achieved to-date, or those yet needing to be
119 addressed, or already in process.

120 Mr. Lloyd encouraged commissioners, as well as the public, to visit the
121 comprehensive plan web page on the city's website, as displayed and showing
122 main page links, and downloads of presentation slides guiding discussions
123 throughout the process; with several online surveys forthcoming. Mr. Lloyd noted
124 that the web page would be updated periodically throughout the process as it
125 developed. Mr. Lloyd noted that a related page would also be available, consisting
126 of a repository of what had been accomplished to-date and review of meeting

127 packets, minutes and materials would be available as foundational documents for
128 benefit of the public.

129 At the request of Member Kimble, Mr. Lloyd reviewed how the public could
130 access contact information on the website to provide their comments; including
131 the current track for directing specific questions to the Community Development
132 Department and future access options.

133 At the request of Chair Boguszewski, Mr. Lloyd reviewed the intended content,
134 including new posts, ongoing information, alerts to distribution groups noting
135 changes during the process; and parallel information provided on the City’s
136 Facebook and other social media platforms. Mr. Lloyd advised that the intent
137 would be to drive interested people to this site to avoid duplicating the process.

138 At the request of Chair Boguszewski, Mr. Lloyd reported on the efforts currently
139 being undertaken by the city’s Communication Department in coordinating and
140 broadly promoting the kick-off event as outlined in the community engagement
141 plan as previously approved by the Planning Commission and City Council.

142 **5. Public Hearing**

143 **a. Project File 0017, Amendment 31: Request by City of Roseville to amend**
144 **City Code, Chapters 1009.07 and 1102.01 pertaining to developer open house**
145 **meetings**

146 Chair Boguszewski opened the public hearing at approximately 6:47 p.m.

147 Two bench handouts were provided, consisting of an updated “Open House
148 Application” and a revised draft ordinance for future City Council consideration
149 entitled, “An Ordinance Amending Chapter 1009.07, Title 10 of the City of
150 Roseville Zoning Ordinance and Chapter 1102.01, Title 11, Subdivision
151 Ordinance”

152 As detailed in the staff report of today’s date, City Planner Paschke reviewed the
153 proposed continuation of this pilot expanded open house notification program as
154 recently updated with the City Council, and related fee and code changes. At that
155 January 30, 2017 meeting, Mr. Paschke advised that staff was directed to move
156 forward with code amendments to address any conflicts between current code and
157 expanded notification procedures.

158 At the request of Member Murphy, Mr. Paschke reviewed the process by staff
159 rather than the developer or applicant in mailing the notices, with the developer
160 providing funding to do so via fees. Mr. Paschke advised that staff prepared a
161 welcoming invitation with maps of the project site providing as much detail as
162 possible for the public. Mr. Paschke noted that, when the applicant had done the
163 mailings in the past, often there was insufficient detail, maps or information for
164 the public to understand the actual purpose of the open house. With the city’s
165 Planning Division staff now having undertaken the process, Mr. Paschke reported
166 improved implementation. As an example, Mr. Paschke reviewed the recent
167 Minnesota State Fair application for renewal of their Interim Use for park and ride
168 locations throughout the community; with staff providing detailed information

169 with the invitation to the open house, showing drop off sites and routing
170 information for Fair buses.

171 Member Cunningham asked if staff had received any pushback by the business
172 community or developers with concerns that they had no control over the open
173 house process.

174 Mr. Paschke clarified that the applicant/developer retained ownership and control
175 of the open house themselves as far as presentation, information provided and the
176 question/answer time with attendees. Therefore, Mr. Paschke noted there had
177 been no concerns expressed about staff undertaking the other components of the
178 process. In the past, Mr. Paschke noted that staff had provided examples of the
179 invitation to the applicant, even though staff retained final editing rights of the
180 invitations when completed before mailing. However, Mr. Paschke advised that,
181 as per City Council findings a few years ago when staff had been asked to
182 intervene with the notice process, the ordinance stayed in place but staff
183 determined what triggered expanded notification depending on the complexities
184 and/or location of a project, with staff also then taking over the mailing of open
185 house notices to make sure they were done and provided sufficient information.

186 Using the State Fair mailing as an example, Member Daire questioned the fee,
187 and if it was dependent on the number of open houses held.

188 Mr. Paschke clarified that applicants were required to provide one fee and escrow
189 to cover administration time, material costs, and postage in processing the open
190 house notices, using the Fair as an example without knowing the actual cost at
191 that time; it was used as a test case. Mr. Paschke reported that staff had ended up
192 sending notices to 2,200 addresses in Roseville, with costs exceeding the initial
193 fee paid by the Fair, and subsequent additional funds submitted to cover the costs.
194 With funds held in escrow, depending on the actual cost realized in processing the
195 mailed notices, Mr. Paschke advised that if not all funds were used, they would be
196 returned, and if additional funds required, the applicant would submit those
197 monies to the city. Mr. Paschke noted that the city was not interested in making
198 money on the process, only in ensuring city costs were covered by the developer
199 through fees for administrative costs. Once the State Fair mailings were
200 completed, Mr. Paschke advised that staff was then aware of general costs for this
201 type of mailing for future reference; and would be proposing to the City Council
202 fee changes that would be based on that information and reviewed annually as
203 part of the City Council's review and approval of all city fees. At this point, Mr.
204 Paschke clarified that the actual fee amount for this process remains silent in city
205 code, and is addressed in the fee schedule.

206 As noted by Member Gitzen, Mr. Paschke reviewed the intended striking of
207 Chapter 1102.01 in code to remove that more detailed open house information,
208 which would now be covered on the application form and checklist provided to
209 the applicant/developer; and tied to the fee schedule and open house meeting
210 process itself. With code only providing a general statement, Mr. Paschke noted
211 that the process could be revised periodically as needed and based on actual usage
212 and experiences.

213 Member Kimble noted staff’s intent to provide the details as embedded in the
214 open house meeting policy, as provided in the draft provided tonight (Attachment
215 B); with Mr. Paschke concurring, noting that the City Council had yet to approve
216 the policy, clarifying that this was only a draft at this point, provided in resolution
217 format.

218 Chair Boguszewski recognized the intent with outlining the process via policy
219 versus needing to change those details via ordinance and requiring a longer
220 process to do so.

221 Member Bull noted that today’s code stipulated the start/stop times for an open
222 house; and as discussed during the comprehensive plan process, it was noted that
223 more residents worked outside Roseville and with the proposed language change
224 for start time from 6:00 to 5:30 p.m., how that would not preclude those residents
225 from attending and participating in an open house.

226 Mr. Paschke clarified that the intent was simply to provide a broader time range
227 for conducting the two-hour open house, whether it started earlier or not. As an
228 example, Mr. Paschke noted the recent McCarron’s neighborhood open house
229 with one open house held in the afternoon and another later in the evening. Mr.
230 Paschke opined that no matter the start time, the intent was to work with
231 individuals throughout the process, and depending on which one of the five
232 different applications were being processes, as to how flexible and open that
233 broader timing range could be.

234 Community Development Director Collins concurred; and noted the variables
235 available in the open house format; with the developer available for dialogue and
236 to respond to questions; while the actual time for the formal presentation could be
237 adjusted according to the project and timing. Ms. Collins reminded all that the
238 meeting format itself was “open house” that typically provided for coming and
239 going and not an actual sit-down meeting format. Ms. Collins noted that the intent
240 was for the developer and staff to be available to answer questions of those
241 attending.

242 Member Bull opined that the Planning Commission might understand that intent;
243 however, he stated that he got a lot of comments from the public regarding timing
244 and a general lack of understanding that they could come at any time, apparently
245 creating some confusion on the presentation time.

246 Mr. Paschke noted that most open houses involve a presentation or information
247 provided on a proposal; with the developer/applicant available over a two-hour
248 time span and available for questions. However, Mr. Paschke advised that staff
249 would clarify what the open house was, and that it was not simply a presentation.

250 If staff was responsible for the text of the invitations, Chair Boguszewski
251 suggested that they provide a statement clarifying the meeting format, followed
252 by a Q and A period; and if applicable, the presentation could be started later in
253 the meeting for those unable to attend when it immediately started.

254 Ms. Collins duly noted that suggestion, advising that staff would work with each
255 developer and build that language into their notice accordingly.

256 Member Bull noted the needed clarification of the codification process, as
257 detailed in the staff report, line 68 and following.

258 Mr. Paschke noted that, with staff undertaking the process, and not delineated
259 directly in city code, it allows more flexibility for the open house depending on
260 the location of an actual project itself. Similarly with the timing of the open house
261 not before 15 days or after 45 days, Mr. Paschke noted the difficulty with some
262 applications (e.g. Planned Unit Developments – PUD’s) relative to when staff
263 accepts applications (deadline the first Friday of each month) to facilitate staff
264 review and processing, publish Public Hearing Notices, and Planning
265 Commission meeting schedules and subsequent approvals by the City Council
266 when applicable, all part of the rationale for timing of open houses in the process
267 as well. Mr. Paschke stated that, it was staff’s findings that, it was difficult to
268 work with that timing and variables, while meeting the 60-day statutory approval
269 and land-use provisions when determined by code that may preclude sufficient
270 timing for open houses and public hearings as required. Therefore, Mr. Paschke
271 clarified that need to anticipate and adjust timing by staff as needed (e.g. PUD
272 application process).

273 Member Bull questioned how a policy versus city code enforcement would
274 prevail.

275 Ms. Collins advised that she viewed the administrative portion more effective via
276 a policy versus via ordinance, since it consisted of an administrative task, as with
277 this open house process no longer addressed in city code but via policy to allow
278 some flexibility to ensure it works for a particular project, depending on the scale
279 of that project. Ms. Collins opined that this flexibility allowed for staff to
280 determine if more than one open house was indicated and provided a case by case
281 review of the process.

282 As noted by Chair Boguszewski, in Attachment B, the City Council would
283 support the “general guidelines” that could be amended on a case by case basis
284 and via policy versus having the process hardwired in city code.

285 Mr. Paschke concurred, advising that he saw the process as similar to the
286 application processes in place for Interim uses (IU) or Conditional Uses (CU)
287 where everything may not be by city code upfront, due to the variables with each
288 application and therefore not articulated in code but called out specifically in the
289 applications for general requirements, with supplemental information perhaps
290 required after staff’s initial review. While that initial information required or
291 supplemental is not codified, Mr. Paschke noted the way the process was handled
292 as guided in general by city code proved less cumbersome for all involved.

293 With the language currently addressed in code, Member Bull opined if something
294 fell outside the range of specifications, there was an easy determination to make,
295 allowing for fair treatment of all if something didn’t meet city code. If a flexible
296 policy was instead in its place, Member Bull opined that it would be hard for the
297 Planning Commission to see if an application fell within that or if it may open the
298 city up to risk or reprisal if all land use applications were not handled the same.

299 Mr. Paschke clarified that the open house process was not something coming
300 before the Planning Commission initially anyway, and was no different than the
301 IU or CU processes of today.

302 However, Member Bull noted that the open house was a prerequisite.

303 Ms. Collins responded that the intended policy was to serve as a baseline for the
304 open house process; and at no point would staff make a determination that there
305 was no need for an open house. Ms. Collins advised that the policy remained what
306 it is, and assured the Commission that the City Council took all of its approved
307 policies very seriously; and this simply allowed them to expand or adjust
308 parameters to capture more participation, not to give a developer an “out.” Ms.
309 Collins noted that the applicant still needed to abide by the policy; and also
310 assured the Commission that the city and Community Development staff, as an
311 organization, also took city policies very seriously, similar to the many contracts
312 and professional services agreements in place; all adopted by the City Council and
313 holding all parties accountable.

314 Member Daire suggested that the intent was to reduce the surprise factor of any
315 proposed development and to inform the public through the open house before the
316 project entered the formal approval process. Member Daire further suggested that
317 this allowed the developer to respond to community concerns and subsequently
318 tailor their formal proposal to not only suit the developer’s needs but also those of
319 the community; or in other words an informal process to plumb those immediately
320 affected by a proposed project within the notification area. Then when the formal
321 public hearing and approval process comes forward, Member Daire noted that the
322 community could then see if their concerns had been addressed or the proposal
323 changed accordingly, or to hear rationale accordingly. Member Daire stated that
324 he had been surprised by the \$1,100 application fee; but was agreeable if it
325 sufficiently covered administrative costs and had been approved by the City
326 Council. Member Daire advised that he had attended three of the five open houses
327 held for the State Fair’s IU renewal of their park and ride facilities, and opined
328 that he found the community exceptionally grateful for having an opportunity to
329 review the proposal before it came to the city for review and approval. With the
330 idea being to avoid surprises and have the community review proposals and the
331 developer able to address their concerns before submitting their formal proposal,
332 Member Daire opined that this process was on the right track.

333 Member Cunningham clarified that the Planning Commission didn’t deal with
334 city policy at this level; and on a separate track, the City Council would approve
335 the policy or revise the draft prepared by staff. Therefore, Member Cunningham
336 asked what influence the Commission would or could have on the policy, or what
337 their recourse would be to pressure staff to make any changes they deemed
338 necessary at some point in the future.

339 Ms. Collins advised that to amend a policy, it would only take a recommendation
340 by the Commission to the City Council. At any time the Commission found a
341 policy was not working for any reason, Ms. Collins asked that staff be alerted, and
342 that input would be directed to the City Council accordingly for their
343 consideration of necessary revisions. Ms. Collins noted that this was part of the

344 intent in making amendments through a resolution to policy versus the lengthy
345 process required to make tweaks, whether minor or major, to city code
346 (ordinance).

347 Mr. Paschke concurred that it was much easier to work through policy than
348 language codified in city code.

349 Member Kimble noted a typographical error in Attachment B, line 47, duly noted
350 by staff (Change “determined” to “determine”). Member Kimble asked if
351 developers were aware that part of their submittal requirement was to include the
352 names of those attending on the sign-in sheet or if staff needed to specify that
353 requirement.

354 Mr. Paschke advised that as staff reviews the process and required submittals of
355 materials as part of a developer’s application, that included the sign-in sheet,
356 retention of the names of those attending, and a summary of the meeting itself
357 along with providing a copy of that summary to those requesting one as part of
358 their sign-in. Mr. Paschke advised that this documentation would be provided to
359 staff, and that staff would provide those interested parties with a summary of the
360 meeting. Mr. Paschke noted that considerable information through and about the
361 process would be retained, including emails and phone calls received that were
362 related to the project as well; all would be summarized and sent out to those
363 attending the meeting.

364 Chair Boguszewski noted the four specific things included as part of the written
365 summary, now revised to include requiring names and addresses; asking how
366 applicants or developers were made aware of those expectations.

367 Ms. Collins responded that staff could develop a template.

368 Mr. Paschke responded that staff would see that those expectations were made a
369 part of their application so they clearly understood them. Mr. Paschke noted that
370 many things required by staff in the application process were not necessarily
371 included on the application itself; suggesting that a timeline would probably be
372 added for the open house process and time needed for staff to prepare and process
373 mailed notices, once their form(s) and fees are received, typically three weeks
374 before the scheduled open house. Mr. Paschke assured the commission that staff
375 would include sufficient information with the application to ensure it was clear to
376 the applicant/developer, similar to the checklists of documents or information
377 needed and when they needed to be submitted.

378 In Attachment B, lines 41 -42, Member Murphy sought clarification as to the
379 public location intended versus a private residence, citing several examples of
380 past open house locations, asking if more specificity was needed.

381 Mr. Paschke responded that that statement had been crafted by the City Council,
382 with the goal to get out of the potential of holding an open house in someone’s
383 home, but somewhere in the general vicinity (e.g. community room at a nearby
384 apartment complex; area church; or park building. Mr. Paschke opined that he
385 liked the idea of holding the open house on site if possible, even if in a tent or
386 building on site. However since this may not have been the City Council’s intent,

387 Mr. Paschke suggested broadening those suggested locations; as suggested by
388 Member Murphy to broaden or clarify that statement.

389 Member Murphy advised that if the statement had been crafted by the City
390 Attorney, he wouldn't question it.

391 Ms. Collins suggested using language such as "publicly accessible site."

392 On line 42 of Attachment B, Member Murphy questioned if an escape clause that
393 the open house be held on the City Hall campus if no other public space is
394 available. Member Murphy cited an example of the trailer storage in the triangle
395 without a suitable meeting spot.

396 Mr. Paschke advised that there was a statement elsewhere that if no other suitable
397 location is available, the developer/applicant should use City Hall; but duly noted
398 that request for reiteration of that point as noted by Member Murphy.

399 Referencing the fairness and fee mentioned by Member Bull, Chair Boguszewski
400 encouraged staff to make that clear in the application that the fee is intended to
401 cover actual expenses and would be charged or reimbursed accordingly at actual
402 cost. If the policy is flexible enough to change, Chair Boguszewski suggested the
403 methodology of the final costs allowed people to know it was an estimate rather
404 than the solid fee.

405 Ms. Collins advised that an open house application fee would eventually be
406 codified as a secure amount. Ms. Collins noted that the Interim Use renewal for
407 the State Fair had been a unique situation; opining she wasn't aware of any other
408 situations that might require five open houses, with most requiring only one such
409 meeting. Ms. Collins noted that the State Fair IU renewal resulted in 2,200
410 mailings, again a unique situation, with the \$1,100 fee typically covering staff
411 time for custom-designing notices, including graphics, GIS maps and other
412 information, and processing the mailing itself, all taking time, as well as securing
413 the date of the open house, meaning significant back and forth with the developer.

414 As noted by Member Gitzen, Mr. Paschke confirmed that the State Fair open
415 house process had proven a good experiment to define the time required of staff;
416 noting it was still an evolving process. Since it is to be implemented as a policy,
417 Mr. Paschke noted that as it continues to evolve, practical experience would
418 indicate changes as needed with the policy revised accordingly.

419 Member Bull asked why Conditional Use permits are not required to hold an open
420 house.

421 Mr. Paschke responded that, while a Conditional Uses cover a broad range of
422 residential and commercial options, the City Council had determined as with a
423 variance, no open house would be required for either a Variance or CU
424 application given either could cover a residential and/or commercial application.
425 Mr. Paschke noted the policy for open houses covered comprehensive plan
426 amendments, zoning changes, PUD's and IU's.

427 Member Murphy advised that was one of the considerations that made the \$1,100
428 fee palatable for him, that it only applied to commercial and not residential
429 applications.

430 Member Bull stated that he understood the flexibility of time for an open house;
431 however, he asked staff how they were going to ensure it didn't impede the
432 flexibility of involvement by residents versus accommodating the time for a
433 developer. As a general statement, Member Bull asked how that made things better
434 for citizens.

435 Mr. Paschke assured the commission that staff would take that into consideration
436 on a case by case basis and whether or not a given situation required longer hours
437 for the open house.

438 Ms. Collins responded that, if each developer is required to hold an open house,
439 staff retained flexibility with the policy; and could demand more than one open
440 house (e.g. Minnesota State Fair required to hold five open houses for their IU
441 renewal application) versus how the current ordinance read. As far as timing, Ms.
442 Collins stated that she wasn't too concerned, and if a developer had some reason
443 or expectation to start earlier, the open house could then run longer. Ms. Collins
444 noted that the idea was to capture those coming home from work and those able to
445 come later, at their preference, and to gather a broader audience. Ms. Collins
446 advised that staff was putting considerable time into this process, and crafting
447 invitation notices well to encourage as many as possible to show up. If open
448 houses were held at such times where no one showed up, Ms. Collins noted that it
449 was just a waste of time for all involved.

450 Mr. Paschke opined that the policy in no way took away from the goal to get
451 people engaged in the process; but instead enhanced it and allowed it to be
452 implemented better.

453 Chair Boguszewski opined that the times served as a general guideline or as a
454 default; but if the applicant wanted to change the times in some way, they would
455 be required to work with staff for their judgment for rationale in starting any
456 earlier.

457 Ms. Collins concurred, noting that any deviation from the policy would need
458 resolution and the planning file would show the reason for that deviation and
459 rationale for changing the timing.

460 Chair Boguszewski suggested that, when a summary of the open house was
461 received by the Planning Commission, it would be aware of the time of the open
462 house; and if desired, could open up and examine the record at that time. Chair
463 Boguszewski noted that the process relied inherently on any variances from
464 policy to allow for staff judgment that may be perceived by some as subjective,
465 thus the hesitancy of Member Bull.

466 Member Bull questioned why the process was codified originally and not
467 considered as a policy at that point.

468 Mr. Paschke responded that, as per City Council direction, staff was tasked with
469 establishing a process via city zoning ordinance for certain developments,
470 basically at that time the number of PUD's and Subdivisions of more than four
471 lots coming before in considerable number. Mr. Paschke noted the concern was
472 that residents were only finding out about a project at the formal public hearing at
473 the Planning Commission and/or City Council, at which time an internal policy by

474 staff required developers to conduct open house proceedings depending on a
475 project's size, location and the project itself. While the City Council supported
476 that process, they asked that it be formally codified, and was now evolving into
477 this proposed amendment.

478 Chair Boguszewski closed the public hearing at 7:52 p.m.; none spoke for or
479 against.

480 **MOTION**

481 **Member Gitzen moved, seconded by Member Cunningham to recommend to**
482 **the City Council amendment of Chapters 1009.02 and 1002.01 of Roseville**
483 **City Code, as per Attachment A (as amended via a bench handout and**
484 **attached to the staff report dated today's date) to be replaced with a policy**
485 **statement by resolution (Attachment B), entitled, "A Resolution Creating an**
486 **Open House and Public Hearing Notification Policy for the City of**
487 **Roseville;" as detailed in the staff report of today's date; and further**
488 **amended to correct the typographical error on Attachment B, line 124**
489 **(change "determined" to "determine"); with further modification to the**
490 **policy as discussed tonight taken into consideration prior to presentation to**
491 **the City Council.**

492 Member Bull stated his preference for the previously City Council codified
493 process via ordinance and having that process very specific with rules to follow
494 for these types of applications. Essentially, Member Bull opined that the city was
495 now doing away with that, creating a flexible policy that would be administered
496 by staff and put more of a burden on staff ad their time. Therefore, Member Bull
497 questioned how this benefited citizens in any way.

498 In response, Chair Boguszewski stated that while he agreed there was more of a
499 burden on staff beyond just the mechanics, he was unsure that the flexibility could
500 be used by the applicant to abuse that flexibility, but instead he found that it
501 would provide yet more transparency to benefit citizens by providing a tool to do
502 so, with it being up to staff to make sure it was used accordingly for the city's
503 benefit versus restricting it. Chair Boguszewski opined that this revision was in
504 keeping with the recommendations of the Zoning Code Task Force consisting of
505 Planning and Community Engagement commissioners, with the goal of improving
506 transparency. Chair Boguszewski opined that by improving transparency and
507 putting that burden on staff, it achieved standardization that was desired and did
508 so in an informative way to reach more people. While at some point down the
509 road it may become clear based on experience that more staff was needed, Chair
510 Boguszewski noted that would then be up to the City Council. Chair Boguszewski
511 stated his support for the motion as it moved toward the Task Force's goal; and he
512 expressed confidence that staff would be diligent not to abuse the process versus
513 improving access for citizens.

514 Member Bull thanked Chair Boguszewski for his comments, opining that helped
515 him.

516 **Ayes: 7**
517 **Nays: 0**
518 **Motion carried.**

519 **6. Adjourn**

520 **MOTION**
521 **Member Cunningham moved, seconded by Member Gitzen adjournment of the**
522 **meeting at approximately 7:58 p.m.**

523 **Ayes: 7**
524 **Nays: 0**
525 **Motion carried.**