



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Minutes – Wednesday, March 1, 2017 – 6:30 p.m.**

- 1 **1. Call to Order**
2 Interim Vice Chair Murphy called to order the regular meeting of the Planning
3 Commission meeting at approximately 6:30 p.m. and reviewed the role and purpose of
4 the Planning Commission.
- 5 **2. Roll Call**
6 At the request of Vice Chair Murphy, City Planner Thomas Paschke called the Roll.
- 7 **Members Present:** Interim Vice Chair Robert Murphy; and Commissioners Chuck
8 Gitzen, James Daire, Julie Kimble, and James Bull
- 9 **Members Absent:** Chair Michael Boguszewski
- 10 **Staff Present:** Community Development Director Kari Collins, City Planner
11 Thomas Paschke, and Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd
- 12 **3. Review of Minutes**
- 13 **a. February 1, 2017, Regular Meeting Minutes**
- 14 **MOTION**
15 **Member Gitzen moved, seconded by Member Daire to approve the February 1,**
16 **2017 meeting minutes as presented**
- 17 **Ayes: 5**
18 **Nays: 0**
19 **Motion carried.**
- 20 **4. Communications and Recognitions:**
- 21 **a. From the Public: Public Comment to land use on issues not on this agenda,**
22 **including the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update**
23 None.
- 24 **b. From the Commission or Staff: Information about assorted business not**
25 **already on this agenda, including a brief update on the 2040 Comprehensive**
26 **Plan Update process.**
- 27 For the benefit of the public and Commission, Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd
28 provided a brief update and current plan schedule/timeline as displayed. Mr.
29 Lloyd announced the public kick-off meeting scheduled for March 7, 2017 at 6:00
30 p.m. at the Roseville Skating Center – Rose Room; with mailed and published
31 notice provided citywide and available online on the city’s website. Mr. Lloyd
32 reported that periodic updates would continue to be posted on the website.
- 33 At the request of Member Kimble, Mr. Lloyd clarified that the longer-term
34 timeline was intended to provide a more generalized look as updated; with more
35 detailed views of each month provided at monthly Planning Commission
36 meetings, but as always still available on line as updated.

37 **5. Public Hearing**

- 38 **a. PLANNING FILE 17-002: Request by Grace Church, Roseville Area High**
39 **School, St. Christopher’s Episcopal Church, Church of Corpus Christi, St.**
40 **Rose of Lima, Calvary Church, New Life Presbyterian Church, Centennial**
41 **United Methodist Church, and Roseville Covenant Church in cooperation**
42 **with the MN State Fair for renewed approval of eight park and ride facilities**
43 **and approval of one new (St. Christopher’s Episcopal Church) park and ride**
44 **facilities and approval of one new park and ride facility as an INTERIM**
45 **USE. Addresses of the facilities are as follows: 1310 County Road B-2, 1240**
46 **County Road B-2, 2300 Hamline Avenue, 2131 Fairview Avenue, 2048 Hamline**
47 **Avenue, 2120 Lexington Avenue, 965 Larpenteur Avenue, 1524 County Road C-2**
48 **and 2865 Hamline Avenue**

49 Interim Vice Chair opened the public hearing at approximately 6:38 p.m.

50 City Planner Thomas Paschke summarized this request for renewal of the Interim
51 Use (IU) for eight facilities, and the addition of one new facility as detailed in the
52 staff report of today’s date. Mr. Paschke noted the expiration of the current IU as
53 of September 2016; and five subsequent and separate open houses held by
54 applicant representatives of the State Fair, with 2,200 notices sent to residents and
55 renters in the surrounding areas of these nine facilities. Mr. Paschke reported that
56 only eighteen individuals had collectively shown up at those open houses, along
57 with three Planning Commissioners. Mr. Paschke reported that a summary of the
58 open houses was included in packet materials; and advised that similar notices
59 had been mailed out in advance of tonight’s formal public hearing before the
60 Commission.

61 As part of staff’s review, Mr. Paschke reported that three additional conditions
62 (Conditions J, K, and L) as detailed in the staff report were being recommended
63 since expiration of the last IU in response to higher usage of the facilities by the
64 general public creating some additional concerns, specifically related to overflow
65 parking on public streets nearby those facilities and related issues, with all
66 previous conditions recommended for continuation with any renewals and for the
67 newest location.

68 Since creation and distribution of tonight’s staff report, Mr. Paschke advised that
69 internal conversations between city staff and State Fair staff had led to both
70 parties revising tonight’s requested action, no amended to ask the Commission to
71 receive public comment on this item, then close and TABLE their deliberation
72 and consideration of the request by the body until a future meeting. Mr. Paschke
73 advised that this would allow both parties to work out additional specific details
74 for the three newest conditions from both the city’s and State Fair’s perspectives
75 and to consider their impacts as conditions for approval.

76 Commission Questions/Discussion

77 Given the set hours of operation for the Fair, Member Bull asked why staff felt a
78 condition different from those set hours should apply to the park and ride
79 facilities.

80 Mr. Paschke responded that the condition had been put in place when an Interim
81 Use had initially been sought by the fair as an attempt to control and monitor
82 those sites adjacent to single-family residents, specifically no earlier than 7:00
83 a.m. and no later than midnight regardless of State Fair hours. Mr. Paschke
84 advised that the city had instituted those hours to better address community issues
85 and concerns that had been brought forward by residents in 2002 related to noise
86 and activities in the vicinities of those sites.

87 Member Bull further questioned the purpose of condition d for walking and
88 monitoring of each site by volunteer staff.

89 Mr. Paschke responded that this condition had been in place since the inception to
90 provide monitoring of sites for certain activities that should not be occurring, as
91 well as ensuring garbage and litter are contained in appropriate containers and not
92 ending up in adjacent residential yards or streets. While he frequently monitors
93 each site during the duration of the Fair to observe any obvious issues, Mr.
94 Paschke advised that by having the conditions in place under the IU, their
95 implementation had addressed and reduced many of the concerns over the years
96 as expressed by residential neighbors and within the neighborhoods of the sites.
97 Given the recent increase in customers using these facilities, Mr. Paschke advised
98 that it may result in other issues related to public street parking that had not yet
99 been addressed.

100 Member Bull asked why the IU was to expire at the end of September 2019
101 (condition M - 3 years) and why not for a longer period.

102 Mr. Paschke advised that staff had put included that new condition as a
103 mechanism for review with State Fair personnel to allow periodic check-ins to
104 ensure conditions were working as intended. While the IU could be for a one-year
105 duration, or up to five years, Mr. Paschke stated that staff considered a three-year
106 duration appropriate in this instance given the number of sites involved; but
107 recognizing staff's interest in discussing this further with State Fair personnel, as
108 they would obviously prefer a longer term (e.g. five years) duration.

109 Since the Fair hours of operation are from 7:00 a.m. to midnight, Member Gitzen
110 asked if the City's IU conditions should run accordingly.

111 Mr. Paschke questioned the need to change them, but suggested the Commission
112 ask that question of State Fair personnel present at tonight's meeting. Mr. Paschke
113 opined that he wasn't sure how later fair hours related to the City of Roseville,
114 advising that staff was not aware of any concerns with hours of operation of the
115 sites expressed by adjacent residents.

116 Applicant: Steve Grans, Transportation Manager for the Minnesota State Fair

117 In response to previous Commissioner questions, Mr. Grans advised that the last
118 bus left the State Fairgrounds at 12:00 midnight (Member Gitzen); that Roseville
119 was not the only city or suburb with park and ride facilities used by the State Fair
120 (e.g. St. Paul, Minneapolis, Roseville, Shoreview and Arden Hills) with none
121 located south of the metro area at this time (Member Daire) with outer circle
122 transportation provided by Metro Transit Express buses at \$5 for a roundtrip ride;

123 and those further out handled accordingly depending on the transportation vendor
124 used.

125 At the request of Member Daire, Mr. Grans confirmed that the City of Roseville
126 was the only community requiring the IU process; and further confirmed that
127 State Fair staff had initially reviewed Conditions A through M as listed, inclusive
128 of the three new conditions.

129 With Member Daire noting the State Fair had previously held five-year IU's, Mr.
130 Grans concurred, noting that the only exception had been when a new facility was
131 added mid-term and an IU issued for a shorter term to allow it to catch up with the
132 IU for other facilities and considered for renewal for the same cycle at that point.

133 Interim Vice Chair Murphy asked Mr. Grans to respond to the bus accessibility
134 concerns raised by the email from Ms. Docken; and to advise how the mi of buses
135 is determined to serve the park and ride facilities.

136 Mr. Grans responded that the State Fair had a handicapped accessible site and
137 buses located at the Oscar Johnson Arena on Energy Park Drive exclusively for
138 customers with special accessibility issues; and they encouraged using that facility
139 accordingly. However, Mr. Grans reported that attempts were made to provide
140 one handicapped accessible bus was available for each route, but unfortunately
141 didn't always work out depending on the time of ridership. When someone calls
142 the State Fair, Mr. Grans advised that directions and route information/times were
143 provided. However, if a customer didn't want to go to that site, Mr. Grans advised
144 that State Fair staff would notify the park and ride Superintendent to notify
145 Lorenz Bus Company of the need and approximate timing for the next available
146 accessible but on that route; or if necessary the Bus Company will attempt to send
147 an accessible mini-bus to that facility for that person and their guest to provide
148 transportation to the Fair. Mr. Grans advised that each year, Lorenz was trying to
149 get more accessible buses on their routes.

150 At the request of Interim Vice Chair Murphy, Mr. Grans advised that the Oscar
151 Johnson facility, even though close in proximity to the Fairgrounds, had yet to run
152 out of available parking spaces for its customers.

153 Specific to the State Fair's open houses and transparency for Roseville residents,
154 Member Bull reported that the open houses he had attended were very well run
155 and expressed his appreciation to State Fair personnel for their outreach to the
156 community and operation of their facilities, whether receiving positive or negative
157 comments.

158 Mr. Grans thanked Member Bull for his comments, noting that the State Fair had
159 been providing services for over fifty years, with more than 50% of its customers
160 arriving by bus, whether or not via a park and ride facility.

161 At the request of Member Daire, Mr. Grans confirmed that the State Fair was
162 basically autonomous from the City of St. Paul and/or any other municipality,
163 with its own year-round Police Chief and Security force direction and authority,
164 even though it was augmented by other departments for the duration of the annual
165 State Fair.

166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209

Public Comment

Since preparation of tonight’s meeting materials, and additional emails included in the public record, Mr. Paschke advised that staff had fielded one additional phone call from a neighbor to the Centennial United Methodist Church site, expressing their support for the facility.

Randy Neprash, 1276 Eldridge Avenue

As a resident living behind St. Rose of Lima Church longer than the park and ride had been in operation, Mr. Neprash clarified that he would be speaking to that facility and was generally in support of the site. Mr. Neprash opined that operators of the site and the State Fair organization itself, as well as the city had been very responsive and helpful over the years; and stated his appreciation for the idea of open houses as the IU process came along periodically for review in a more comprehensive and formal way.

With that said, Mr. Neprash stated that he agreed that the overflow parking had become a problem as facilities had grown in popularity, all located in residential neighborhoods, and filling up fast, at which time customers park in the neighborhood.

Mr. Neprash provided several examples he’d experienced in his neighborhood; but recognized the responsibility provided for the St. Lima site by the church’s volunteers in running it. However, Mr. Neprash noted that those volunteers could not be responsible for those overflow customers choosing to park around the neighborhood; or for trash blowing through and ending up in every direction up to 3-4 blocks from the site by those inconsiderate users of the bus transportation by scattering trash on private property. Mr. Neprash admitted he was at a loss as to how to resolve the issue, but noted it would prove to be a huge help to the adjacent neighborhood to have that trash controlled, whether blowing from the site or from overflow parking customers in the neighborhood, especially when the trash ended up on private property and given trespassing concerns by volunteers who may be positively policing the trash. In his personal situation, Mr. Neprash noted this became an ongoing problem during the two-week operation of the State Fair.

Specific to geography and parking access, Mr. Neprash noted safety concerns with traffic and bus loading areas with the entrance located on the back (east) side on Dellwood Street, with Hamline on the west side, and only arterial streets available being Hamline and Fernwood. By having the traffic come in the back way, Mr. Neprash noted it continued to be a safety concern for children, pedestrians and bikers, even though the State Fair had responded favorably in the past by relocating the bus loading to the back, even though it created a safety concern on those residential streets. Mr. Neprash admitted that an access point on Hamline was a result of the city previously recognizing those visual and safety concerns, but even though signed by the city that seemed to work for a short time, bus drivers still didn’t get the message.

In attempting to report the issue to State Fair personnel, Mr. Neprash advised that this was a challenge; and asked that they provide better contact information to the

Regular Planning Commission Meeting

Minutes – Wednesday, March 1, 2017

Page 6

210 residential neighbors of each of the facilities: how to reach a State Fair
211 representative to resolve any bus issues, as well as a contact for the organization
212 running each park and ride facility, which had never been available, as well as a
213 dedicated city staff person to contact during the State Fair as well. Mr. Neprash
214 suggested contact information based on mailings, no matter what format it took,
215 and also available through a web-based page on the city's website to log in
216 messages for all of the neighborhood to see and respond to. While he realized that
217 may be asking a lot, Mr. Neprash asked that at a minimum email addresses and
218 phone numbers for those three contacts as requested above be provided for each
219 facility.

220 Specific to the trash pick-up, Mr. Neprash recognized that it was a challenge, and
221 admitted that he didn't know how best to deal with the private property nuisance
222 issue it created.

223 Specific to parking, Mr. Neprash summarized his two issues, one rare and one
224 more common: people blocking driveways or a portion thereof that may result in
225 being blocked out of your driveway for the entire day and part of the night.

226 Interim Vice Chair Murphy suggested that residents contact the city's Police
227 Department if and when that occurs.

228 In response, Mr. Neprash state that when that had been done, he was not aware of
229 any resolution or observed any action being taken.

230 Mr. Neprash noted that the more common issue was people parking in front of
231 mailboxes (e.g. Belmont immediately east of the middle of the St. Rose of Lima
232 property); even though residents made their own signs annually asking people not
233 to park in front of their mailboxes with no result. If possible, Mr. Neprash asked
234 that the State Fair provide similar weatherized signage, rather than being at the
235 expense of residents, such as political campaign signs; or asked that city staff
236 make that an additional condition of IU approval.

237 In response to comments made by Member Daire, Mr. Neprash stated that he
238 found the park and ride facilities hugely valuable and served as fundraisers for
239 those organizations manning the sites, which he was totally supportive of. While
240 supporting any signage to avoid people blocking driveways or mailboxes, Mr.
241 Neprash stated that the last thing he'd want to do was to have someone return
242 from a day at the fair to find that their car had been towed because of illegal
243 parking.

244 Member Bull suggested neighborhood volunteers consider putting out trash cant
245 to incent people to use them versus throwing things in yards, even though he
246 recognized that it wasn't their responsibility to do so.

247 Mr. Neprash stated that if public trash cans were made available, he was confident
248 residents would be happy to put them out and monitor them.

249 At the request of Member Gitzen, Mr. Neprash clarified that, other than the city-
250 installed "No Parking" signs for two blocks on Dellwood during the State Fair,
251 there are no other "No Parking" signs in the neighborhood now. Mr. Neprash
252 further noted that there were no sidewalks in the neighborhood, so the street was

253 even narrower with parking and people walking on the street. Mr. Neprash stated
254 that the neighbors wanted to be reasonable, but also wanted to be heard about
255 these ongoing inconveniences during the Fair.

256 At the request of Interim Vice Chair Murphy, Mr. Neprash provided his
257 experiences and those of his neighbors in approaching bus drivers on site and
258 radio dispatch feedback immediately to the bus drivers. Mr. Neprash advised that
259 this was the reason for his suggestion for a direct contact with the State Fair to
260 minimize response times and to achieve a firm response.

261 For the benefit of this discussion, Mr. Paschke advised that the city's Public
262 Works staff installed "No Parking" signs in five specific areas – having grown
263 from one area - during the Fair due to past calls and issues with narrow roads
264 creating safety concerns.

265 Peggy Verkuilen, 1123 Sextant Avenue W (Near RAHS)

266 Ms. Verkuilen spoke in support of the park and ride endeavor, but noted her
267 safety concerns, specifically at County Road B-2 at Dunlap when cars are parked
268 right up to the corner. Specific to Dunlap to Sextant, Ms. Verkuilen opined that
269 there was no way emergency vehicles could get through if needed, especially on
270 the lower part of Dunlap where it curved. Ms. Verkuilen stated that she had
271 repeatedly begged the Police Department to sign those corners, whether for the
272 annual State Fair or during sporting or other events at RAHS when parking was at
273 t premium, to no avail. While community service officers put out "No Parking to
274 Corner" signs as appropriate, Ms. Verkuilen suggested standard operating
275 procedure would be sign it rather than having to take the time for an officer to
276 enforce parking near the intersections.

277 Specific to parking in front of mailboxes during the State Fair, Ms. Verkuilen
278 stated that they had to go without mail for two days in a row and asked that "No
279 Parking" on a certain side be enforced to at least allow for mail delivery; and to
280 address access for emergency vehicles at the corners.

281 At the request of Member Daire, Ms. Verkuilen opined that simply restricting
282 parking on one side of Dunlap would not alleviate access for emergency vehicles
283 going east/west along County Road B-2 and turning onto Dunlap. Ms. Verkuilen
284 stated that she wanted people to attend games and activities at RAHS, but
285 reiterated her concern that it was a safety issue. Ms. Verkuilen also stated that she
286 didn't want to discourage people from attending the fair, but also asked for
287 consideration if it was their loved one needing an emergency vehicle's services
288 and unable to access their home.

289 At the further request of Member Daire, Mr. Paschke confirmed that there was a
290 State law and city code requiring that vehicles park no closer than 10' from an
291 intersection; advising that it was simply a matter of enforcement, and offered to
292 look into the Police Department's policy on what that enforcement would entail
293 (e.g. tag and tow or citation).

294 Janice Walsh, 1356 Colonial Drive (across from St. Christopher's Episcopal)

295 Since this is the first year of operation for this site and as a resident of the
296 Williamsburg Townhomes across the street, Ms. Walsh asked if there was any

297 possibility of posting “No Parking” signs for public street parking and access to
298 the townhomes, or if residents would need to make their own.

299 Mr. Paschke stated that staff would take that into consideration during its further
300 review after tonight’s meeting and prior to Planning Commission action.

301 Interim Vice Chair Murphy, in response to how the townhomes could request “No
302 Parking” signage, advised that staff had made a note and these meeting minutes
303 would also reflect her concerns for the record. Member Murphy apologized that
304 the city’s Police Chief was currently out-of-town and unable to respond to citizen
305 concerns before or during tonight’s meeting.

306 Catherine Dorr, 2392 Hamline Avenue (corner of County Road B-2 and Hamline
307 Avenue – directly across from Grace Church)

308 Ms. Dorr spoke in support of the three additional conditions recommended by
309 staff. Ms. Dorr noted that she had used the park and ride facilities to attend the
310 fair for a number of years, and found them not only convenient, but a way to
311 alleviate traffic congestion at the fairgrounds and lower the carbon footprint. In
312 general, Ms. Dorr spoke in support of the facilities that could help allow people to
313 have a good experience at the fair.

314 Among the problems she wished the Commission and staff to address, in addition
315 to the three additional conditions, Ms. Dorr addressed overflow parking on
316 County Road B-2 in the Masonic Lodge parking lot that occurred during certain
317 days of the fair, but not typically on weekends and Labor Day, but when RAHS
318 also closed part of their lot for student use, with the smaller RAHS and Grace
319 Church lots filling up fast, causing vehicles to park near the Willow Pond area
320 and then overflow into the Masonic Lodge lot, with between 10 to 30 vehicles
321 using that lot. Ms. Dorr noted that she hadn’t observed any signage by the
322 Masonic Lodge, and admitted that this was only an occasional problem depending
323 on what was occurring at the RAHS lot. Ms. Dorr asked if the State Fair thought
324 that by adding additional parking at St. Christopher’s Church this would relieve
325 some of that overflow parking along County Road B-2. Ms. Dorr stated that she
326 had yet to have people block her mailbox or driveway, but noted that she had
327 noticed overflow parking along the Masonic Lodge area.

328 Also, Ms. Dorr asked if there was any way the traffic light timing at County Road
329 B-2 and Hamline Avenue, already heavily used during rush hours when school
330 lets out, could be adjusted to avoid additional back-up of vehicles on County
331 Road B-2.

332 Given the pedestrian and vehicular traffic, and typical rush hour traffic volume,
333 Interim Vice Chair Murphy spoke in support of the three new conditions
334 recommended by staff.

335 In response to Ms. Dorr and for the record, Mr. Grans advised that the State Fair
336 did not have any agreement in place with the Masonic Lodge for parking, and
337 therefore did not encourage or authorize parking in that lot by State Fair
338 customers. Also, Mr. Grans advised that State Fair did not support any of its lot
339 volunteers and their organizations to encourage public street parking when lots
340 are full. Mr. Grans noted that when a lot was full, it was full, and volunteers

341 advised customers of other lots with available room and their location. Mr. Grans
342 clarified that any public street parking choices were undertaken by customers of
343 their own volition. Specific to potential issues addressed about parking on County
344 Road B-2 and when the RAHS/Grace Church lots were full, Mr. Grans advised
345 that neither lot was available to the State Fair for the full twelve days of the State
346 Fair; and given that restrictions seem to continue to increase on an annual basis,
347 advised that this was their rationale in adding the St. Christopher's facility to
348 offset restrictions found at RAHS.

349 Ms. Door responded that those are the days she observed problems with on-street
350 parking.

351 At the request of Interim Vice Chair Murphy, Mr. Grans advised that he had no
352 suggestions on the mailbox and/or overflow street parking in residential
353 neighborhoods other than as suggested by residents themselves during tonight's
354 discussion.

355 At approximately 7:36 p.m., and prior to Interim Vice Chair Murphy closing the
356 public hearing, Member Bull made the following motion.

357 **MOTION**

358 **Member Bull moved, seconded by Member Gitzen to TABLE recommended**
359 **action on this item, as requested by staff, to the April 5, 2017 regular**
360 **Planning Commission meeting and allowing staff to work through additional**
361 **issues with State Fair representatives at their earliest convenience.**

362 **Ayes: 4**

363 **Nays: 1 (Daire)**

364 **Motion carried.**

365 **6. Other Business**

366 **a. PROJECT FILE 0042: Subdivision Code Rewrite**
367 **Discuss the annotated outline illustrating how the Subdivision Code is**
368 **presently structured and how a rewritten code might be different and**
369 **provide input to guide the drafting of an updated ordinance.**

370 Mr. Lloyd introduced this first look by the Planning Commission of the intended
371 rewrite of the subdivision ordinance, seeking their initial feedback for staff and
372 the consultant, Kimley-Horn, to guide the updated ordinance. As detailed in the
373 staff report and attachments, Mr. Lloyd reported that the City Council had
374 approved hiring of the consulting firm Kimley-Horn to facilitate this process.

375 Mr. Lloyd noted that tonight's discussion should focus on the broader focus using
376 the annotated outline provided by the consultant with the initial questions they
377 and staff had formulated based on past practice and their recommended
378 amendments for discussion issues (Attachment A); a case studies memorandum
379 prepared by Kimley-Horn based on their research of other subdivision codes
380 (Attachment B); and the city's existing subdivision code (Attachment C). Mr.
381 Lloyd clarified that the minor amendments made to the subdivision ordinance in

382 2016 had not been incorporated at this point into this copy as found on the city's
383 website, but were minor in nature.

384 Mr. Lloyd advised that staff was seeking the Commission's input tonight, and
385 would be holding a similar session with the City Council in a few weeks. Mr.
386 Lloyd advised that subsequent to these opportunities, staff would bring that
387 feedback to the consultants for their response and to inform a revised draft
388 subdivision code to initiate feedback from both bodies again.

389 Member Bull noted that, approximately one year ago, discussion was held on the
390 subdivision ordinance at which time he provided a document with twenty or more
391 questions, but had received no response to-date. Therefore, Member Bull stated
392 that he was at a loss as to where the city was at and where it desired to go as it
393 related to the subdivision ordinance. While he offered to resubmit that document,
394 Member Bull asked that staff provide their feedback to his questions.

395 Mr. Lloyd stated his recollection of that document and while not having reviewed
396 it recently due to the subdivision ordinance having been put on hold due to other
397 workload issues and staff pulled off the project completely for the duration, he
398 noted that typical approaches for code rewrites involved working from current
399 code to amend from within. However, Mr. Lloyd advised that this subdivision
400 code process was instead intended to forget about the current code details with the
401 consultant approaching it from how best to position a new subdivision code. Mr.
402 Lloyd stated that he could reference the list of questions submitted by Member
403 Bull to see how they might interact with those things being suggested or needing
404 addressed in the rewrite.

405 Member Bull stated that he would appreciate that.

406 Member Gitzen suggested that it would be helpful for the full Commission to see
407 the questions submitted by Member Bull; with Mr. Lloyd recognizing that request
408 and advising that staff would in turn provide a response to each in light of this
409 current process.

410 Interim Vice Chair Murphy refocused tonight's discussion on Attachment A to
411 address each of the consultant's suggestions and any additional feedback from the
412 Commission.

413 Member Gitzen agreed that he would like to go through Attachment A in the
414 organized way the consultant had laid out this initial draft while referencing the
415 current Title 11 – Subdivisions of Roseville City Code. Member Gitzen stated that
416 he was not in favor of throwing out the entire document even though it may
417 require a major rewrite to update some of the sections; noting that other
418 communities as noted in the consultant's case studies had similar formats but
419 provided a more modern and up-to-date subdivision code. Member Gitzen noted
420 since Attachment A was still in outline form, he may be reading things into it that
421 were not intended by the consultant; and therefore found it difficult to comment
422 beyond a high overview.

423 Mr. Lloyd advised that the overall structure would remain the same similar to
424 other city code sections (e.g. zoning code), but components within the code would
425 need updating, thus the need for a consultant to guide the process. Mr. Lloyd

426 advised that when the original subdivision code was adopted in 1956, large
427 portions of the city were still farms and large tracts of land able to be subdivided.
428 However, Mr. Lloyd noted that the city faced a much different situation today
429 with few remaining locations for development or large plots, necessitating a
430 subdivision code that would take in to consideration replatting of smaller
431 subdivisions as being of more use today and more appropriate.

432 Member Daire referenced Attachment C and asked if it reflected the current
433 ordinance or if there were recent changes made that do not yet appear.

434 Mr. Lloyd reiterated that the current ordinance (Attachment C) was what was
435 currently posted on the city's website as the subdivision code, but it didn't reflect
436 the most recent changes made in the late summer of 2016 when lot size
437 parameters were revised to eliminate redundancies of other provisions now in the
438 city's zoning code.

439 Member Daire stated that Attachment C then didn't represent what the city's
440 current subdivision ordinance actually said.

441 Mr. Lloyd clarified that it is essentially the same other than as previously
442 mentioned, opining that the substance of the code was current, advising that the
443 new subdivision code would not address lot size parameters that were now
444 handled in the city's zoning code.

445 Member Daire opined that it struck him that the direction reflected in those more
446 recent changes made to reduce redundancies were causing him some concern
447 related to four or fewer lots part of an administrative approval process as well as
448 approving design standards administratively. Member Daire asked if that
449 represented a general trend for staff to increasingly handle more minor
450 considerations that typically came before the Commission.

451 For clarity, Mr. Lloyd responded that four or fewer lots as reflected in Attachment
452 A as a potential suggestion was simply that – a suggestion that minor subdivisions
453 could be approached in that way. Mr. Lloyd reminded the Commission that city
454 code provided a distinction between minor and not minor subdivisions (3 and
455 fewer or 4 or more lots) and stated that he didn't expect that to change. Mr. Lloyd
456 clarified that the case study suggestion provided by the consultant from Plano, TX
457 was simply one possible route beyond Roseville's version included for example
458 and consideration.

459 With Kimley-Horn chosen as consultants, Member Daire stated one thin that had
460 struck him when reviewing the materials, was that those cities cited as having
461 similar subdivision processes to that of Roseville didn't involve first-ring suburbs.
462 Member Daire stated that raised questions in his mind as to where the
463 development status of those cities may be.

464 Having once worked in Plano, TX, Member Bull reported that it was a northern
465 suburb of Dallas, opining it would be comparable to Richfield, MN as a first-ring
466 suburb on an expressway with heavy access through the community.

467 Member Daire noted, therefore, that they may have a feature of interest to
468 incorporate into the Roseville process.

469 Mr. Lloyd cautioned that there may be differing state requirements for Texas and
470 Minnesota.

471 Specific to concerns raised by Member Daire related to trends, Mr. Lloyd advised
472 that when he was reviewing the most recent revisions to the city’s subdivision
473 code, another change made last summer involved not only lot size parameters
474 now addressed in zoning code, but also defining lot shapes acceptable for new
475 lots. Mr. Lloyd reported that those new provisions were less rigid and in his
476 review of neighboring community subdivision codes, he had found an exception
477 in Falcon Heights, but in almost all other communities, he had found verbatim the
478 same provisions now included in Roseville’s subdivision code. Whether or not
479 that meant Roseville was moving in the right direction, Mr. Lloyd noted there
480 weren’t many examples from its immediate neighbors that provided any good
481 new ideas.

482 Interim Vice Chair Murphy noted that those surrounding communities were
483 experiencing similar development trends as that of Rose Township, now the City
484 of Roseville.

485 Members Kimble and Daire both spoke in support of a Commission work session
486 if the intent was to review the subdivision code on a line by line basis; or that the
487 Commission does homework on the process and brings that feedback to the
488 meeting to inform the discussion.

489 Mr. Lloyd reiterated that the purpose of tonight’s discussion was simply for
490 general feedback without much detail at this point to help the consultants
491 understand the concerns of the Commission and those areas needing the most
492 thought going forward in shaping that substance. Mr. Lloyd assured the
493 Commission that the next iterations of the draft document would involve greater
494 detailed scrutiny of areas needing the most work.

495 Commission Discussion – Attachment A

496 For the record, Interim Vice Chair Murphy recognized a written comment via
497 email and dated February 27, 2017 from Carl & Charity Willis, 1885 Gluek Lane,
498 provided as a bench handout, attached hereto and made a part hereof.

499 Page 1

500 With this first page dealing with definitions and purpose statements and the
501 regulatory authority for Roseville as a jurisdiction, Mr. Lloyd referenced the
502 suggestions made by the consultant and references to other documents (e.g.
503 comprehensive and enabling plans)

504 Member Bull stated that he shared the questions of Member Daire in his review
505 and that while consultants were to help with the process, there was no clear
506 concept of the goal from the consultants: where to rewrite it, modernize it or to
507 bring it up to the language of other communities’ subdivision codes. Member Bull
508 asked if there was a stated purpose for what the consultants had been engaged to
509 do.

510 Mr. Lloyd advised that indeed there was a stated purpose as detailed in the City
511 Council-approved Request for Proposals (RFP) issued for engaging a consultant

512 in the first place. Mr. Lloyd clarified that the purpose was geared toward updating
513 the current subdivision code to better reflect that Roseville is fully developed now
514 versus when the current code was essentially written in 1956 and involving large
515 plats. Mr. Lloyd noted that the other part of the rewrite involved minor
516 subdivisions and the City Council's enactment of a moratorium on minor
517 subdivisions for residential parcels and required application information and
518 perceived level needed in certain situations to make decisions on their approval or
519 denial. While this involves some stated focus, Mr. Lloyd noted that generally
520 speaking there isn't any intent to dramatically change Roseville's subdivisions
521 based on findings of the Single-Family Lot Split Study performed approximately
522 seven years ago.

523 Generally speaking, Mr. Lloyd advised that the intent was to continue subdivision
524 processes in the manner allowed historically, but recognizing that a major portion
525 of the current ordinance was outdated and no longer worked well in reality as it
526 had in the past, or had become problematic not only due to code language but due
527 to changes in the institutional culture and what something meant and how the city
528 anticipated facilitating subdivisions within the community. As an example, Mr.
529 Lloyd noted that the existing subdivision code had a list of details required for
530 Preliminary Plat applications, some that were no longer relevant or needed.

531 Member Daire stated that helped his understanding of the process. However,
532 Member Daire asked if requirements for a subdivision application were removed
533 from the ordinance and made part of the application procedure, wouldn't that
534 allow administrative modifications that would no longer inform or involve the
535 Commission or review agency that may not know about those changes. Member
536 Daire stated that, by having those requirements addressed in ordinance, it
537 provided a guideline for those reviewing applications coming forward (e.g. the
538 subdivision of a large lot on the west side of Roseville, originally proposed for
539 seven lots and then reduced to four lots) that could be handled administratively.
540 Member Daire asked how staff intended to be aware of objections from
541 surrounding neighbors and other ramifications that may result by removing those
542 guidelines from ordinance.

543 Mr. Lloyd responded that a balance was needed to ensure that requirements not be
544 overlooked, but also for the applicant to understand and know that requirements
545 will need to be met. Mr. Lloyd advised that, throughout this rewrite process, staff
546 and the consultant would be working in conjunction with the City Attorney to
547 ensure that submission requirements as amended with new technologies and
548 situations are taken into consideration without compromising the process.

549 City Planner Paschke advised that the process being considered is similar to
550 current processes and applications for Interim Uses and Conditional Uses that
551 come before the Planning Commission. While code doesn't spell out all
552 requirements, as part of the application submitted for staff review and creation of
553 their report to the Commission and City Council, Mr. Paschke advised that each
554 may have a unique site and may require as few as five or as many as forty-five
555 requirements as part of that application. However, to be consistent and not have
556 things listed in code, Mr. Paschke noted that during the review process, staff has

557 the flexibility to request additional information for review by staff, the
558 Commission and City Council, while other requirements listed on application
559 forms even for permitted uses may or may not be necessary depending on the site
560 and situation (e.g. traffic studies)

561 Interim Vice Chair Murphy noted that in the definition section, consistency was
562 needed with other chapters of city code (e.g. “streets” and “emergency vehicles”)
563 and to determine where those definitions were needed to avoid confusion but
564 allow use-friendly formatting without excessive cross-referencing.

565 Community Development Director Kari Collins noted that the consultant had
566 found twelve definitions and fifty-one references in current city code related to
567 “streets.” Ms. Collins suggested the rewrite process would involve initial
568 observations needing addressed and then consistency among plans. However, as
569 noted by Mr. Lloyd, Ms. Collins reiterated that the purpose for tonight’s initial
570 review was for the Commission to comment on the direction of the consultant and
571 staff and whether or not that was appropriate from the Commission’s perspective,
572 and without getting into the finer details at this point, which would come at a later
573 time. Ms. Collins asked that the Commission provide their general observations
574 on the staff’s and the consultant’s notes and advise if they were appropriate or
575 not. For example and specific to a suggested administrative review for
576 determining lot lines, Ms. Collins noted that this was simply the consultant
577 exploring options based on other communities from taking each application for a
578 lot split through the entire platting process as the most aggressive option to
579 consider, some level of administrative review as an option, or a combination of
580 those options. Ms. Collins clarified that the consultant had included those notes to
581 obtain a reaction from the Commission during their review tonight and before
582 moving further into the process.

583 Member Daire stated that if definitions were moved to a unique location and only
584 referenced in other sections of code, for tracking purposes, if only a paper copy
585 was available, it would be difficult to track; and cumbersome for online tracking
586 of links for definitions.

587 Ms. Collins noted that staff would explore a variety of options but the intent
588 would be to have definitions included for context and integral in applicable
589 sections of code so someone didn’t need to choose their own adventure path in
590 finding the definitions. Ms. Collins reiterated that the goal of staff and the
591 consultant was to make definitions more consistent across the board.

592 The consensus of the Commission was to have definitions clearly stated if
593 differing in any way from common understandings, and legally and clearly
594 defined as appropriate.

595 While not seeking to railroad this process, Member Bull opined that it seemed out
596 of place in the midst of the comprehensive plan update to shape the community
597 and that being a one-year process. Member Bull opined that it may be
598 inappropriate to look at subdivision code details now that may not fir with that
599 comprehensive plan update in a year, causing him some discomfort.

600 On the contrary, Interim Vice Chair Murphy opined that he saw the
601 comprehensive plan at one level with this subdivision ordinance as a blueprint as
602 part of it. Member Murphy stated that how the city did business would not change
603 its goal; and therefore a review of the subdivision could be done regardless of the
604 end target. Member Murphy stated that he wasn't feeling that same disconnect,
605 but opined that this was simply dealing with another set of issues.

606 Member Kimble agreed with Member Murphy, opining she saw it all as part of
607 the process.

608 Ms. Collins agreed that, especially related to the residential subdivision process,
609 the City Council had expressed their eagerness to get clarity in that area to address
610 procedural language and due to the current moratorium, necessitating the need to
611 move forward with it despite the comprehensive plan process.

612 At the request of the Commission, Mr. Lloyd advised that the original moratorium
613 was for six months ending mid-March 2017, but could be extended for a more
614 realistic finalization in late spring or early summer of 2017. Mr. Lloyd advised
615 that staff would be seeking that extension from the City Council in the near
616 future.

617 Page 2

618 Mr. Lloyd provided a general overview involving a flow chart of existing
619 procedures that was quite cumbersome. Mr. Lloyd advised that, while not yet
620 formulated, the intent would be for staff to develop an extensive list of criteria or
621 conditions applicable for minor subdivision applications in order to qualify for
622 administrative approval. Then, for those applications not able to initially address
623 that list of criteria or being of a more complicated nature, Mr. Lloyd noted those
624 would move beyond administrative approval and applicable to any and all
625 subdivision application.

626 While not yet approved by the City Council after recent recommended approval
627 by the Commission, Mr. Lloyd noted that the open house provision would be
628 replicated in this chapter to follow the same process as in other chapters of code.

629 From her perspective for business and/or residential applicants, and from general
630 feedback from the recent Urban Land Institute (ULI) workshop, Member Kimble
631 noted the need for Roseville to be seen as development and project friendly to
632 attract what was wanted in the community. When considering that perspective and
633 the checklist mentioned by Mr. Paschke, Member Kimble agreed that staff needed
634 to have the ability to ask for some things, but using her current process in seeing a
635 lot-split development project through the City of St. Paul's planning process as an
636 example, she noted her frustrations with a lack of clarity in what is or is not
637 required. Member Kimble opined that her initial reaction was that she was less
638 comfortable having approvals done on an administrative basis even though she
639 had the utmost confidence in staff; but instead based her discomfort on the lack of
640 land available for development in Roseville leading to the need for a more
641 formalized process. Member Kimble stated her continued lack of support for the
642 administrative approval process for four or less lots; but also noted that as a
643 resident in a neighborhood where that subdivision was occurring next door to you,

644 the size and configuration was a big deal and therefore, she felt that needed
645 Planning Commission and City Council consideration and approval.

646 Member Daire concurred with those comments of Member Kimble.

647 While agreeing with administrative approval for smaller lot splits, Member
648 Kimble sought clarification as to whether or not there would be an appeal process
649 available for an applicant if they were in disagreement with staff's findings.

650 Interim Vice Chair Murphy concurred that he would support such a process,
651 similar to that for variances.

652 Mr. Lloyd opined that he was inclined to think the administrative approval
653 process would be implemented for two to three lots, not four.

654 Member Gitzen suggested a maximum of three lots; and at the request of Member
655 Bull, Mr. Lloyd clarified that the intent was for a total of net lots.

656 In her reading of existing subdivision language, Member Kimble asked if the city
657 had considered a one-stop site plan review process to avoid extended delays from
658 one department or commission to another (e.g. Public Works/Engineering and/or
659 Parks & Recreation).

660 Mr. Lloyd noted that at the staff level, the city had a Development Review
661 Committee (DRC) that reviewed all land use applications; and while there was
662 that staff coordination in Roseville, there wasn't a unified development ordinance
663 as some communities had with building code and all other requirements in a
664 single document for an applicant to understand all that would be required. Mr.
665 Lloyd advised that it had been mentioned as an option on the staff level, but given
666 the mammoth review required of city code all at once, there had been no further
667 consideration given to it.

668 Member Gitzen stated his agreement in large with Member Kimble, including not
669 supporting administrative review of four lots. However, Member Gitzen opined
670 that the flow charts or checklist could be made easier and better; and advised that
671 the minimum he'd be comfortable with was a review by planning staff like that
672 used by the City of Eden Prairie, with City Council approval after that initial staff
673 review.

674 Mr. Lloyd recognized the apprehensive expressed by the Commission about
675 Minor Subdivision administrative review, and if constrained to a simple lot split
676 (one lot into two) that would be their comfort level. At the request of Member
677 Gitzen, Mr. Lloyd clarified that the current process was for staff review then to
678 the City Council for their approval for up to three lots; but noted the proposed
679 option would be for total administrative review and approval different form that
680 current process.

681 For minor lot splits from one to two lots, Member Kimble asked if the checklist
682 involved notifying neighbors.

683 Mr. Lloyd advised that at this point the checklist had yet to be developed, with
684 tonight's discussion seeking Commission feedback. Mr. Lloyd suggested a similar
685 comparison might be the current process for accessory dwellings or extra

686 dwelling units and code parameters for occupancy permits through staff review.
687 Mr. Lloyd noted that this was a public process with staff reviewing the application
688 and working through issues, and if all requirements are met, staff then sends a
689 letter to surrounding property owners explaining the application and staff's
690 findings, with their intent to approve the application on a date specific, and
691 seeking comment or questions before that approval. Mr. Lloyd advised that with
692 the few applications processed by staff to-date, he had only heard from one
693 person, even though the process intended to provide neighbors with a heads up to
694 appeal any administrative decision upon receipt of the information. Mr. Lloyd
695 sought feedback on the Commission's interest in pursuing this idea further or
696 other ideas.

697 Member Gitzen stated his interest in seeing what the checklist and public
698 notification process may look like before making a decision.

699 To put things in context and as part of staff's work with the consultant, Ms.
700 Collins advised that the goal was to balance as much public engagement as
701 possible and City Council review with the city being seen as business- and
702 development-friendly. Thus, Ms. Collins noted the direction to the consultant to
703 provide options as outlined in their case studies. Ms. Collins reviewed the
704 checklist for submittal requirements and approval approvals that she was familiar
705 with from her tenure with the City of Milwaukee, WI.

706 Member Bull stated that he was open to reviewing administrative procedures,
707 reserving his concerns with public openness if an appropriate balance could be
708 found.

709 Member Daire stated that he felt strongly that the Planning Commission served as
710 citizen-volunteer representatives to consider what should or should not be done by
711 city staff. Member Daire opined that the more done administratively, the less
712 public involvement, causing him considerable concern.

713 Mr. Lloyd duly noted that concern. Mr. Lloyd recalled previous conversations
714 about the Commission's keen observations about records kept of open houses
715 and/or meetings, and advised that specific to the example of the accessory
716 dwelling process, the process has worked well-to-date.

717 For further consideration, Mr. Lloyd advised that state statute allowed that Minor
718 Subdivisions could be administratively approved and did not need a public
719 hearing. However, whether or not Roseville wants to follow that procedure was
720 another matter, but Mr. Lloyd wanted to bring that to the attention of the
721 Commission that it was allowed in Minnesota that provided pertinent
722 requirements were met, administrative approval was allowed. However, Mr.
723 Lloyd also noted there was still some risk involved with politically or emotionally
724 charged situations or atmospheres of public review even if an application met all
725 requirements, with that part of the consideration as well.

726 Interim Vice Chair Murphy stated his interest in seeing a draft checklist as a
727 starting point, and to possibly serve to allay some concerns.

728 Member Kimble thanked Ms. Collins for her comments about staff's interest in
729 being developer-friendly, noting that there were a lot of ways to do so without

730 circumventing review of something by adjoining property owners. With a one-
731 stop review or other process oriented toward that goal, Member Kimble opined
732 that would allow interested parties to review and comment on developments in
733 their immediate neighborhoods.

734 Recess

735 Interim Vice Chair Murphy recessed the meeting at approximately 8:39 p.m. and
736 reconvened at approximately 8:46 p.m.

737 Page 3

738 Member Kimble sought clarification, confirmed by Mr. Lloyd that current design
739 standards required developers to provide streets.

740 Member Gitzen noted that “public works design standards manual” and similar
741 references were inconsistent; duly noted by Mr. Lloyd. Member Gitzen further
742 stated his preference for keeping things in code for the application form that could
743 change periodically (e.g. comment on 1103.04), suggesting that at that point, the
744 Public Works Design Standards Manual, actually a survey document, created a
745 disconnect. If referencing anything, Member Gitzen suggested it should be the
746 Ramsey County Guidelines for Subdivided Plats,” especially since Ramsey
747 County would actually be doing the review and establishing requirements, with
748 only required city signatures their only involvement.

749 Mr. Lloyd thanked Member Gitzen for that timely mention, noting that the city’s
750 attorney was also the attorney for several other communities in the metropolitan
751 area, and was currently working with the Ramsey County surveyor and had put on
752 an informational program just yesterday that was attended by several of the
753 Community Development Department’s staff, at which he had first encountered
754 the survey standards manual. Mr. Lloyd opined that he anticipated a considerable
755 bit of information gleaned from that meeting would work its way into this rewrite.

756 Member Gitzen suggested that document would be an appropriate one to
757 reference in this code chapter; duly noted by Mr. Lloyd.

758 At the request of Member Bull, Mr. Lloyd advised that the Metropolitan Council
759 did not have a requirement for subdivisions.

760 Member Daire asked staff to summarize the current process for plat approval;
761 advising that based on his personal research on review and approval of final plats,
762 he wasn’t satisfied with the results of that search.

763 Mr. Lloyd reviewed the current process, clarifying that staff was no suggesting
764 considerable changes beyond simple refinement with the main revision being
765 subdivisions of land that triggered park dedication requirements being first
766 determined by the Parks & Recreation Commission for land or cash in lieu of land
767 and their recommendations as part of the approval process when applying for
768 Preliminary Plat approval for staff review. At that point, Mr. Lloyd advised that
769 the approval process then would move to the Commission and City Council for
770 their approval; and applicants then circling back to prepare a final plat application
771 that would essentially meet all the conditions applied to the preliminary plat with
772 that application then reviewed by staff for requirements/conditions and then to the

773 City Council for approval. Mr. Lloyd noted that the key component for final plat
774 approval was to ensure that it was essentially the same as the preliminary plat
775 requirements and not something else entirely or another iteration. Mr. Lloyd
776 advised that this broader review by the City Council verified that what they had
777 approved in the preliminary plat remained intact, at which point the applicant
778 recorded the final plat with Ramsey County.

779 Page 4

780 No comment.

781 Page 5

782 Mr. Lloyd advised that there remained more work to be done with design
783 standards as they related to the subdivision code (e.g. rights-of-way and lot layout
784 and their relationship to each other) as part of center line gradients and curve
785 specifications that were important with respect to rights-of-ways. While some can
786 go in a different section of city code, Mr. Lloyd advised that current 1800'
787 maximum block length standards were extremely long for Roseville; and
788 suggested focusing more on the existing street network rather than simply
789 guessing at how long the longest block may or should be.

790 Interim Vice Chair Murphy noted this page provided one of his examples for
791 “streets” and their definition; duly noted by Mr. Lloyd.

792 In Section 1103.02, Interim Vice Chair Murphy noted Item J referencing “half
793 streets” and their prohibition, asking what they were and whether or not a
794 definition would appear in this document. Member Murphy noted this involved
795 the concept of definitions again, and whether or not they were worthy to appear in
796 the definition section and if so to provide for a concise definition.

797 Page 6

798 While understanding the first suggestion under section 1103.04, Interim Vice
799 Chair Murphy questioned how code would embody that for future change, noting
800 that from his understanding the city was really constrained as to how it could
801 spend park dedication fees.

802 Mr. Lloyd responded that code could require this similar to dedication of park
803 land or strips of land for trails as part dedication land. While the current
804 subdivision code language is very general about cash or land, Mr. Lloyd advised
805 that code could be much more specific requiring dedications of some nature to
806 begin piecing together the city’s pathway plans for example even though it wasn’t
807 specified in any way at this point, but allowing the city to potentially use park
808 dedication fees to acquire that necessary land. Mr. Lloyd agreed that use of those
809 funds were restricted, but could be used for acquisition and some improvements,
810 and may possibly include sidewalks as part of rights-of-way dedication ideas for
811 related plans.

812 Referencing consultant comments for the park dedication section and broader
813 goals of the city, Member Kimble suggested staff push the consultant to provide
814 examples of new and innovative ideas for privately owned public spaces that
815 would comply with restrictions for park dedication fees while providing ideas of

816 benefit to the community. Member Kimble asked that this opportunity be opened
817 up and reviewed, opining that there were some examples available within the
818 metro community.

819 Specific to drainage and utility easements, Member Gitzen stated that he had
820 never understood how Roseville required 12' on a side but nothing on the front,
821 while most communities allotted 10' on the front and center on side and rear lot
822 lines. From his perspective, Member Gitzen spoke in support of 5' on each side
823 versus the current 6' and requiring 10' on front similar to most other metropolitan
824 urban communities.

825 Mr. Lloyd responded that both the City's current Public Works Director/Engineer
826 and City Engineer had been surprised to find no front yard easement requirement
827 in Roseville; and opined that would be included in this rewrite.

828 On the plat, Member Gitzen noted that some counties only allowed public utilities
829 on a dedicated plat, while unsure of Ramsey County's requirements, but
830 suggesting the City be consistent with Ramsey County.

831 Mr. Lloyd noted the current limitations of plat detail, including other easements
832 (e.g. solar access) that could be required and may require a separate document.

833 Member Gitzen noted other communities (e.g. City of Afton, MN) that required a
834 conservation easement on steep slopes, an option that can be done outside the
835 platting process; and duly noted by Mr. Lloyd.

836 At the request of Mr. Lloyd, Members Gitzen, Kimble and Murphy asked for
837 more information before making a decision on whether to only require drainage
838 and utility easements, or to include conservation or solar access easements as
839 well.

840 Page 7

841 Mr. Lloyd provided the current process for park dedications, including the written
842 version and unwritten policy of how they were handled now; with the intent for
843 including them as part of the annual fee schedule reviewed by staff and
844 recommendations brought to the City Council.

845 Mr. Lloyd advised that the procedure section was taken from the Parks &
846 Recreation Department staff's unwritten policy to present to the Parks &
847 Recreation Commission for recommendation to the City Council, done as one of
848 the first steps added to the beginning of the process before receipt of the
849 subdivision application itself. While the current unwritten process seemed to work
850 well, Mr. Lloyd advised that the intent to include it in code was so applicants
851 were not caught off guard or be unaware of this standard city process; and by
852 including it in code it would be more obvious to all parties moving forward.

853 Page 8

854 Regarding the "Other" suggestion, Member Kimble noted her issues with new
855 developments and signage and the impact that signage had on a community.

856 Mr. Lloyd reviewed several administrative items needing revision or restructuring
857 to be in line with current practices and processes (e.g. 1104.05). Compared to

858 current language in a subdivision application and lot shape not supported by
859 subdivision code and variance applications required, Mr. Lloyd advised that the
860 process proceeded directly to the Variance Board for their review for practical
861 difficulties. Mr. Lloyd clarified that the Variance Board strictly addressed the
862 variance issue and not the overall subdivision itself; with the City Council then
863 addressing the subdivision portion of the application, but not determining whether
864 or not the variance is acceptable. Mr. Lloyd opined that it made more sense to
865 have one body ultimately responsible for both decisions, such as City Council
866 review of the subdivision application and variance portion as a package; or as
867 done in the past in Roseville, a subdivision application may just proceed to the
868 City Council, or otherwise to the Planning Commission and ultimately the City
869 Council. Mr. Lloyd opined that the process needed to be tightened up to avoid
870 opening up the process for conflict, thus the reference on page 8.

871 Mr. Lloyd reported that he had only recently learned that the property owner's
872 signature was required on the plat document, including a line for another party's
873 signature if the parcel was sold to another party before being recorded at Ramsey
874 County. Mr. Lloyd noted that currently, there was no place for that second
875 signature, invalidating the plat; opining that the suggestion in section 1104.06 was
876 intended to avoid that situation.

877 Regarding the "other" noted, Mr. Lloyd advised that their references were
878 included as part of consideration of the subdivision ordinance but not necessarily
879 fitting in elsewhere in the current outline.

880 In response to Member Bull, Mr. Lloyd clarified that the current process is
881 working according to code at this time; with the Variance Board responsible for
882 variance applications and the City Council responsible for subdivision
883 applications. Mr. Lloyd recalled the process and long-standing interpretation of
884 code provisions and related variances from approximately 8 – 10 years ago that
885 provided for an alternate process for the Planning Commission to provide a
886 recommendation to the City Council for the entire application. However, Mr.
887 Lloyd noted that at some point, an observation was made that this was not what
888 the code said and the process was changed accordingly.

889 General Comments

890 Mr. Lloyd thanked the Commission for their participation in this difficult starting
891 discussion, and for providing good insight about things still needing to be
892 addressed to move forward and identifying the less-favored directions as well as
893 those having more support from the Commission at this point.

894 Interim Vice Chair Murphy offered an opportunity for public comment,
895 recognizing that this wasn't a formal public hearing, but no one appeared to
896 speak.

897 Member Gitzen noted in the staff report the intent to bring a revised draft back for
898 the April 5, 2017 Planning Commission meeting. However, Member Gitzen
899 suggested it be presented that night without discussion, in light of the two new
900 commissioners coming on and to allow them time to review the document and get
901 up to speed, suggesting discussion ensue in May.

902 Mr. Lloyd suggested staff could mention that to the City Council as an option;
903 and while not having any objections in theory, reiterated the moratorium and need
904 to extend it at their discretion. Mr. Lloyd noted that further delay in this process
905 may represent a further extension of something people may be anxiously
906 awaiting, even though it was a fair observation being made by Member Gitzen
907 about the new commissioners.

908 **7. Adjourn**

909 **MOTION**

910 **Member Daire moved, seconded by Member Murphy adjournment of the meeting**
911 **at approximately 9:17 p.m.**

912 **Ayes: 5**

913 **Nays: 0**

914 **Motion carried.**