



**Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update Meeting  
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive  
Minutes – Wednesday, March 22, 2017 – 6:30 p.m.**

- 1 **1. Call to Order**  
2 Chair Boguszewski called to order a Special meeting of the Planning Commission at  
3 approximately 6:30 p.m. for the purpose of updating the city’s comprehensive plan for  
4 2040.
- 5 **2. Roll Call**  
6 At the request of Chair Boguszewski, City Planner Thomas Paschke called the Roll.  
7 **Members Present:** Chair Michael Boguszewski; and Commissioners James Bull, Chuck  
8 Gitzen, Robert Murphy, James Daire and Julie Kimble  
9 **Others Present:** Planning Commissioner-elect Peter Sparby  
10 **Staff/Consultants Present:** Community Development Director Kari Collins, City  
11 Planner Thomas Paschke, and Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd;  
12 Project Manager Erin Perdu, WSB & Associates, Inc.
- 13 **3. Review of Minutes**  
14 **a. February 22, 2016 Special Planning Commission Meeting - Comprehensive**  
15 **Plan Update**  
16 **MOTION**  
17 **Member Murphy moved, seconded by Member Kimble to approve the**  
18 **February 22, 2017 meeting minutes as presented.**  
19 **Ayes: 6**  
20 **Nays: 0**  
21 **Motion carried**
- 22 **4. Communications and Recognitions:**  
23 **a. From the Public (Public comment pertaining to general land use issues no on**  
24 **this agenda)**  
25 None.  
26 **b. From the Commission or Staff (Information about assorted business not**  
27 **already on this agenda including a brief update on the 2040 Comprehensive**  
28 **Plan Update process)**  
29 Specific to the Rice Street/Larpenteur Avenue Corridor, Community  
30 Development Director Kari Collins provided an update on the multi-jurisdictional  
31 efforts of Ramsey County and the Cities of St. Paul, Maplewood and Roseville  
32 over the last six to eight months, represented by elected and staff representatives  
33 of each entity. Ms. Collins reported that the working group had most recently  
34 hired the consulting firm of Perkins+Will to assist in development of a visioning  
35 plan for the area.

**Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update**

**Minutes – Wednesday, March 22, 2017**

**Page 2**

36 As part of that process, Ms. Collins advised that a community advisory group  
37 would be necessary to advise the larger group on plan direction involving  
38 redevelopment, public safety and revisioning, comprised of eighteen individuals  
39 from the combined groups to meet four or five times over the remainder of 2017,  
40 and including one Planning Commissioner from each jurisdiction. Ms. Collins  
41 asked the Commission to appoint a representative from the Roseville Planning  
42 Commission to serve in that role, with additional spots reserved for  
43 representatives of other stakeholders, including residents and business owners in  
44 that corridor. Ms. Collins advised that applications for those stakeholders were  
45 available on the city’s web page/community advisory group (CAG) for those  
46 interested. Ms. Collins advised that the larger group of elected and staff  
47 representatives would review applications after the April 14, 2017 submission  
48 deadline.

49 Discussion ensued regarding anticipated meeting frequency and timing (every  
50 other month) with the consultant preparing materials for their review/feedback in  
51 determining direction for the CAG; preparation time needed for serving in  
52 addition to regular Planning Commission duties; anticipated first meeting in May  
53 of 2017 set by the consulting group and probably two hours in duration each, and  
54 future meetings and logistics decided by the broader group at that first meeting.

55 With consensus of the body, Member Murphy suggested waiting to appoint a  
56 Planning Commission representative to serve on the CAG until the April meeting  
57 to allow seating of newly-appointed commissioners by then; and asked staff to  
58 include that appointment as part of the April Commission agenda.

59 Members Kimble expressed her preliminary interest in serving on the CAG.

60 At that next meeting, Chair Boguszewski reminded staff and his colleagues that  
61 Variance Board members (three and one alternate) would be selected, with the  
62 Variance Board Chair and Vice Chair elected by that body at their first meeting;  
63 along with a Planning Commissioner to serve on the city’s Ethics Commission.

64 At the request of Member Daire, Ms. Collins advised that document sharing  
65 would be handled by the Perkins+Will consultant and distributed to all involved  
66 before each meeting; and confirmed that any and all of the meetings would be  
67 open to the public for observation.

68 At the request of Member Gitzen, Senior Planner Lloyd confirmed that the  
69 subdivision draft code update was scheduled for the April Planning Commission  
70 meeting as well. Given the extensive review that would require, Member Gitzen  
71 asked that staff provide it to the Commission at their earliest convenience to allow  
72 time to sufficiently review it before the meeting, if possible prior to distribution of  
73 the meeting packets; with staff duly noting that request or pushing review to the  
74 May meeting if necessary.

75 Specific to the Comprehensive Plan Public Kick-off meeting held on March 7,  
76 2017, Mr. Lloyd referenced the summary prepared by Lydia Major of the  
77 consultant team and feedback received from the public at that time.

78 At the request of Chair Boguszewski, Mr. Lloyd confirmed that the online survey  
79 remained active until mid-April of 2017, and encouraged public participation  
80 sooner rather than later.

81 Chair Boguszewski noted attendance by several Commissioners at the Roseville  
82 Sustainability Alliance meeting held last evening.

83 Specific to that, Member Murphy asked that Ms. Collins and Mr. Paschke include  
84 some of the ideas offered during that meeting as part of the contents/goals of the  
85 comprehensive plan update for the environmental aspect, whether in the  
86 framework of the Planning Commission or Public Works, Environment and  
87 Transportation Commission (PWETC). Member Murphy suggested that it may  
88 be interesting to have them come in as a guest speaker during a future Planning  
89 Commission meeting for a brief presentation.

90 Ms. Collins offered to pursue that possibility; but with upcoming community  
91 engagement opportunities including community health, suggested she would work  
92 with WSB Consultants on the best approach to include that information as part of  
93 the process.

94 Chair Boguszewski asked staff and Ms. Perdu to return to the April 5, 2017  
95 Planning Commission meeting with a decision on how to gather that information.

96 Specific to tonight's agenda, Mr. Lloyd noted that the anticipated wrap up of the  
97 visions/goals discussion had been deferred to April to allow further review of the  
98 early engagement feedback received to-date. Instead, Mr. Lloyd advised that  
99 tonight's meeting topic would instead look at vacant/developable land.

100 Ms. Perdu advised that the Commission would receive an updated schedule for  
101 April/May/June at the April 5, 2017 Planning Commission meeting, including  
102 timing for the update to the City Council.

103 Chair Boguszewski reminded his colleagues of the upcoming annual Ethics  
104 Training for city staff, citizen advisory commissions, and while Member Bull  
105 questioned if that was also open to the public, questioned if involving the public  
106 in this intensive training may dilute the focus and aspect intended for elected and  
107 appointed municipal officials.

108 Due to obvious wide-spread issues of quorums involved, Ms. Collins advised that  
109 the training was intended for new commissioner training and distribution of a  
110 commissioner handbook at the beginning, followed by an expanded training as a  
111 refresher for staff, council members, and advisory commissioners. Ms. Collins  
112 suggested staff could provide notes for online publication after the event for any  
113 members of the public interested.

114 **MOTION**

115 **Recognizing that tonight's meeting represents the culmination of Chair**  
116 **Boguszewski's service to the community on the Planning Commission,**  
117 **Member Murphy moved, seconded by Member Kimble thanking Chair**  
118 **Boguszewski for his valuable contributions to and leadership of the Planning**  
119 **Commission.**

120 Chair Boguszewski thanked his colleagues for the fun and rewarding opportunity;  
121 and recognized Commissioner-elect Peter Sparby in tonight’s audience, newly  
122 appointed by the City Council along with Tammi Etheridge. Chair Boguszewski  
123 opined that even though there was lots of activity during his tenure serving on the  
124 Commission, it was now and had been manned in the past by volunteer citizens  
125 with a strong interest in the overall good of the city in balancing the interests of  
126 homeowners, the business community, renters, and developers in donating their  
127 time to ensure that.

128 Prompted by Chair Boguszewski, Commissioner Murphy reiterated the  
129 Commission’s thanks to Chair Boguszewski for his distinguished service to the  
130 Planning Commission; and offered his anticipation in working with all the  
131 commissioners at the start of his term on April 1, 2017.

132 Based on his participation in the City Council’s interview process for candidates,  
133 Chair Boguszewski opined that he considered both Commissioners-elect Sparby  
134 and Etheridge as strong candidates, and looked forward to their service on the  
135 body.

136 **Ayes: 6**

137 **Nays: 0**

138 **Motion carried.**

139 **5. Project File 0037: 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update**

140 Referencing Ms. Major’s written summary of the public kick-off, Ms. Perdu provided a  
141 brief verbal summary, noting approximately seventy attended the event; with good  
142 comments received at that time as well as online before and after the event. As noted by  
143 Mr. Lloyd, tonight’s meeting topic had been switched to allow more time to receive and  
144 collate that community engagement for inclusion in the next discussion by the  
145 Commission.

146 **a. Vacant/Developable Land**

147 Ms. Perdu noted that draft materials prepared for the public kick-off meeting were  
148 provided in tonight’s meeting packet for commission review; and advised that  
149 tonight’s focus would be a walk through of revisions to the value and goal review  
150 portion of the comprehensive plan update based on input from previous meetings.  
151 Depending on available time tonight, Ms. Perdu further advised that next steps  
152 would be addressed at the end of the discussion.

153 *The first step in developing Roseville’s Future Land Use scenario is to look at*  
154 *vacant, developable lands and determine the most appropriate future land use*  
155 *designation. Planning Commissioners will review maps indicating vacant,*  
156 *developable parcels for any changes that should be made to their future land use*  
157 *designation.*

158 As outlined in the WSB memorandum included in tonight’s meeting materials and  
159 attached maps updated in 2016 with the city’s GIS information, Ms. Perdu  
160 reviewed the intent of this discussion. If any errors, omissions or other issues are  
161 found on those maps by commissioners, Ms. Perdu asked that they alert staff for  
162 their updating of the maps. For tonight’s purposes, Ms. Perdu sought feedback

163 from individual commissioners on any changes they considered applicable in  
164 updating comprehensive plan land use designations.

165 Subarea 1

166 Member Murphy asked staff to clarify the proposed access to the southern parcel  
167 on the west end of Walmart, based on his understanding that there wouldn't be  
168 another curb cut allowed on County Road C or Cleveland Avenue.

169 Mr. Lloyd clarified that access would be from within the existing common  
170 Walmart parking area, with Mr. Paschke advising that easements for access were  
171 already in place, providing for cross-parking easements for shared parking as  
172 well.

173 Member Kimble noted that it would be helpful to have streets shown on next  
174 iterations of the maps, duly noted by Ms. Perdu. Member Kimble noted past  
175 general discussions and different proposals for the corner of Cleveland Avenue  
176 and County Road B-2, including a multi-unit building north of County Road B-2  
177 east of Cleveland; but not showing up on the map at this time.

178 Mr. Paschke reported that one of the lots had been purchased by the city for  
179 Park/Open Space on the SE corner, and the other lying in front of the Midland  
180 Grove condominiums had been the subject of a number of redevelopment  
181 proposals over the years, with none coming to fruition at this point. Mr. Lloyd  
182 noted there was an existing single-family home located on that parcel.

183 Member Bull agreed that was a parcel to consider for redevelopment.

184 While identifying that parcel, Member Kimble suggested with high density  
185 residential (HDR) located to the north and medium density residential located to  
186 the east, it seemed that switching designation from low density residential to high  
187 density residential may be more appropriate.

188 For the parcel now owned by the city, Member Kimble asked if a park was to be  
189 located there; with Mr. Paschke advising that it remained in the planning stages  
190 and programming had yet to be determined, but opined that he thought it may  
191 become passive park land.

192 Member Murphy noted the disadvantages with traffic in that area and no way to  
193 safely access the parcel given that busy vehicular traffic.

194 Subarea 2

195 Ms. Perdu noted that most of the vacant land was in single-family designated  
196 areas with few exceptions.

197 Member Murphy pointed out an area to the top of the map near the lake (u-shaped  
198 green area designated on map) and asked staff if those were individual lots, with  
199 Mr. Paschke confirming that, noting that underlying designation was single-  
200 family lots platted many years ago; and Mr. Lloyd concurring and advising that  
201 they remained as independent parcels under single ownership at this time.

202 Chair Boguszewski pointed out the parcel on the bottom of the map (pink color  
203 designation) where the former driving school was located; noting it was an  
204 isolated parcel designated for Neighborhood Business.

**Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update**

**Minutes – Wednesday, March 22, 2017**

**Page 6**

205 Mr. Paschke advised that staff had not heard anything about the future of the lots  
206 in many months, even though there was an approved Conditional Use (CU) still in  
207 play at this point, and from his understanding the property owner was working on  
208 an agreement with Ramsey County for access onto Larpenteur Avenue.

209 Ms. Perdu noted that, while the redevelopment is pending, it would remain shown  
210 as vacant on maps until redevelopment was begun.

211 Noting HDR designation on the parcel north of County Road B, approximately  
212 1.5 blocks east of Snelling Avenue and east of the bank, Member Gitzen asked  
213 staff if that proposed project was still pending.

214 Mr. Lloyd advised that the rezoning request for this parcel had not been finalized,  
215 even though the City Council remains supportive of the proposed project in  
216 general, and from staff's understanding the Good Samaritan development team  
217 continued efforts to make a redevelopment project work.

218 Mr. Paschke advised that the project may come back as a Planned Unit  
219 Development (PUD) if the developer could get the funding worked out.

220 Chair Boguszewski confirmed with staff that pending projects on that parcel and  
221 also at County Road B and Cleveland Avenue were the rationale in not changing  
222 underlying zoning for one project.

223 At the request of Member Murphy , Mr. Lloyd clarified that Lexington Avenue  
224 had been realigned after-the-fact to address access issues and concerns of Ramsey  
225 County with southern lots already creating congestion without having additional  
226 access onto Lexington Avenue, thus halting progress to-date for redevelopment of  
227 that area on Lexington Avenue and County Road C east and south of City Hall.

228 Member Gitzen asked if there was any consideration of eliminating the railroad  
229 tracks running east/west on the south side of County Road C, opining that would  
230 considerably change access for some of those parcels.

231 Mr. Lloyd reported that there were no plans to do away with that rail line or  
232 change the nature of that corridor at this time. In the past, Mr. Lloyd advised that  
233 the City Council had considered that as a possible transit corridor, but advised that  
234 was dependent on agreement with and future plans of the Minnesota Commercial  
235 Railroad.

236 Member Murphy stated that he was surprised to see a small area designated LDR  
237 on the southeast corner of Dale Street and County Road C, noting the unique  
238 terrain features, as well as odors from the compost in that area.

239 Mr. Lloyd agreed with the considerable slope from County Road C into the  
240 compost area; noting interest by several groups over the last few years in that  
241 area, but unsure at this point any resolution on their part. Mr. Lloyd clarified that  
242 the LDR designation had been discussed at the last 2030 comprehensive plan  
243 update and zoning ordinance update; but the parcel still remained under private  
244 ownership and for single-family consideration.

245 Member Murphy stated that he may consider that area in play if additional MDR  
246 was developed across the street or for flexibility to allow development

247 considering the terrain issues; however, stated that it didn't seem applicable for  
248 HDR from his perspective.

249 Subarea 3

250 With this map area involving the eastern edge of the city, Member Kimble asked  
251 staff to identify the armory parcel.

252 With the area identified by Mr. Lloyd, he advised that the former armory site was  
253 a future agenda item for Planning Commission consideration to recommend LDR  
254 for the site, as the preference expressed by the immediate neighborhood.

255 With the SE Roseville project involving the Larpenteur Avenue/Rice Street  
256 corridors, Chair Boguszewski asked staff how far west and north it was poised to  
257 address.

258 Ms. Collins responded that this had come up at the last working group meeting,  
259 with the boundaries, still somewhat flexible, were identified in the Request for  
260 Proposals (RFP) sought for a consultant for the project, and as she was unable to  
261 remember them at this time, advised that she would provide that information to  
262 the Commission at a later time, as well as for the citizen advisory group and the  
263 work group.

264 Chair Boguszewski asked if it was likely that the former armory site was likely to  
265 come under that purview.

266 Ms. Collins confirmed that it was and based on staff's interpretations, advised that  
267 the entire corridor captured the former armory site as the Roseville City Council  
268 considers it involved and part of the broader plan for the entire SE area of the city.

269 Specific to the former corner gas station in this area, Mr. Paschke advised that a  
270 building permit had been issued recently for a retail building of approximately  
271 10,000 square feet.

272 Noting the irregular lot north of the park in the northeast corner of the map near  
273 Lake Owasso that was abutting the lake, Member Bull noted that it was almost  
274 three acres, but owned by the Minnesota State Land Trust, and while shown as a  
275 vacant parcel on the map, was not actually developable under that Trust.

276 Member Gitzen noted that it could have actually ended up as a tax forfeit parcel;  
277 with Mr. Paschke agreeing to further research on that parcel, noting there were  
278 several existing single-family homes in there as well. Member Gitzen opined that  
279 if the property was in Trust, the city should request it for Park/Open Space use.

280 As individual commissioners continue their review, Ms. Perdu asked that they  
281 forward any additional areas of follow-up or map corrections, as well as  
282 additional questions, to staff.

283 **b. Redevelopment Sites**

284 *In addition to considering currently vacant parcels, there is significant potential*  
285 *for redevelopment and infill to accommodate much of the projected growth in*  
286 *Roseville. Planning Commissioners will review some potential redevelopment*  
287 *areas in the city, chosen based on previous planning documents and public input*  
288 *received so far, to consider their redevelopment possibilities.*

**Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update**

**Minutes – Wednesday, March 22, 2017**

**Page 8**

289 Ms. Perdu advised that many of these ideas had been generated at the public kick-  
290 off meeting and related comments, as well as pointed out in other planning  
291 documents and policies. Ms. Perdu sought additional comment from  
292 commissioners for areas for future redevelopment throughout the community or  
293 areas that could retain the same use but with more intensity. For example, while  
294 some areas may already be identified for commercial use, Ms. Perdu suggested  
295 consideration could be given to those with small buildings and large parking lots  
296 that had potential for outbuildings or more commercial use if appropriate as  
297 potential future changes.

298 Har Mar Mall

299 Ms. Perdu identified this as an idea that had come up at the Future Cities student  
300 group and the public kick-off meeting as well. Ms. Perdu clarified that the intent  
301 was not that the future land use map classification could or should necessarily  
302 change for that site. However, with the worksheet designating this site as  
303 Commercial Business (CB), Ms. Perdu asked the commission whether it had any  
304 other thoughts on the future of Har Mar Mall to take into consideration at this  
305 time.

306 Member Murphy asked for a definition of “redevelopment” in this context,  
307 including who would do it, who would pay for it, and if those currently owning  
308 the parcel, or tenants of the existing mall were honored with any future  
309 redevelopment.

310 Ms. Perdu agreed that was a good question and recognized that “redevelopment”  
311 addressed a whole host of things. For the purpose of the comprehensive plan, Ms.  
312 Perdu suggested concentration remain on whether or not there was any room in  
313 any of the areas for tonight’s discussion that could be considered for a more  
314 intense use (e.g. additional stories on existing buildings, outbuildings to  
315 accommodate more of the same type of use) or whether it would be appropriate to  
316 change the current use to something else in the future. Since most of the areas  
317 identified were privately owned land, Ms. Perdu noted that the details of how  
318 those land uses may change depended on the preference of the owner. However,  
319 Ms. Perdu noted that the commission’s exercise was to look at the future land use  
320 map and policies for the 2040 comprehensive plan update involving the city’s  
321 vision for these sites if and when the parcels turned over; and to provide clarity on  
322 the city vision for such a possibility.

323 Chair Boguszewski noted the growing desire among many to increase the level of  
324 affordable housing in Roseville. From his personal perspective, Chair  
325 Boguszewski recognized many in the community who looked at the Har Mar Mall  
326 site and salivated about the potential of that site for affordable housing given area  
327 amenities (e.g. bus routes, area shopping options, etc.) As an example, if the City  
328 Council in their leadership of the city agreed at some point in the future that was a  
329 good location for affordable housing uses, Chair Boguszewski advised that the  
330 site could be designated now for future design for affordable housing, whether  
331 through Eminent Domain or financial incentives as possible avenues for future  
332 consideration. Chair Boguszewski noted the continued interest in the community  
333 and area for potential areas for additional affordable housing, including groups



334 such as the League of Women Voters (LWV) who are adamant about the need to  
335 sole the affordable housing issue; and consideration given that Snelling Avenue  
336 was the only logical place to address it and with a unified lot to facilitate it.

337 Specific to long-term visions, Member Kimble clarified that the intent of this  
338 exercise for the future of Roseville was not for the purpose of ousting any current  
339 land owners and/or tenants, but was to consider possibilities. In addition to Chair  
340 Boguszewski’s affordable housing option, Member Kimble noted the viability of  
341 this area for future mixed-income housing that would also take advantage of the  
342 bus rapid transit (BRT) now available along Snelling Avenue and other areas  
343 providing innovative walkability for mixed density and income housing, not an  
344 easy thing to accomplish. However, Member Kimble agreed that this location was  
345 where it made the most sense.

346 Mr. Paschke agreed that no comprehensive plan served to evict people from their  
347 locations; but noted the reality of the city needing to plan out for 20-30 years and  
348 beyond. In this exercise, as noted by Ms. Perdu, the commission was being asked  
349 to look at sites that may be viewed as “tired,” some that had even been identified  
350 ten years ago with the last plan update; and the possibility of repositioning  
351 themselves in the market place. In the future, Mr. Paschke noted that due to the  
352 market place, Har Mar Mall may no longer be viable for retail, and a mixed use  
353 may allow itself to find sustainability. Therefore, Mr. Paschke asked that this  
354 exercise be used to identify potential redevelopment areas; and agreeing that the  
355 amenities noted by individual commissioners would support a multi-family and/or  
356 HDR use in the future.

357 Member Kimble noted the area could be similar in a smaller sense to the  
358 Excelsior at Grand development involving HRD and mixed retail.

359 From a general overview, and in his personal research of recent news articles,  
360 Member Gitzen noted the death of big stores (e.g. brick and mortar) indicating  
361 that by 2040, the city may be faced with big boxes where retail formerly was  
362 situated, but needing a new use. Member Gitzen opined that should be part of the  
363 commission’s thought process for this exercise; as well as considering ever-  
364 improving technologies, and the potential use of some of the sites for smaller  
365 manufacturing uses (e.g. driverless cars; solar, wind energy). At the public kick-  
366 off meeting, Member Gitzen reported that he had sat in with a group talking about  
367 the huge parking lot on the south end of Har Mar Mall, and their interest in  
368 developing that for another use rather than a sea of asphalt.

369 Similarly, Member Kimble reported that she had sat in with a discussion group  
370 about the Rosedale Center and surrounding parking lot and what could be done to  
371 add walkable HRD to that area, whether through structured parking as an option;  
372 but with many potential options available to make that site more interesting and  
373 user-friendly.

374 Member Bull opined that larger tracts, such as the Har Mar Mall, were more  
375 difficult to address in the comprehensive plan; and while the commission could  
376 come up with multiple types of units, land use and rezoning would be necessary  
377 to get to HDR and Neighborhood Business. Member Bull asked for a clarification  
378 that if the comprehensive plan designation was changed, the zoning would also be

**Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update**

**Minutes – Wednesday, March 22, 2017**

**Page 10**

379 changed for consistency, simply putting restrictions on future use, but not ousting  
380 current uses, and impacting current uses only when they became nonconforming.

381 Mr. Lloyd clarified that, if zoning was changed substantially from its current  
382 status, any legal nonconforming use would remain until an expansion was  
383 considered or other situations where nonconformities would need to be addressed.

384 Therefore, Member Bull noted the need for caution with the comprehensive plan  
385 and what may impact Roseville citizens and businesses.

386 Member Daire noted his interest in the Future Cities student group’s suggestion  
387 that Snelling Avenue at County Road B be emphasized as the city’s Main Street,  
388 including housing and commercial uses. Member Daire questioned if something  
389 along that nature, similar to the Silver Lake Road and 37th Avenue area of New  
390 Brighton (former Apache Plaza) with commercial uses and restaurants was a  
391 future trend that may involve future mall redevelopment.

392 Member Kimble noted a similar use at St. Louis Park’s “The Shops at West End”;  
393 and considered as lifestyle centers, that were semi-popular but basically retail  
394 uses. Member Kimble noted that they still had some difficulties, but that type of  
395 development was proving beneficial to some communities and many larger mall  
396 tracts redeveloped accordingly.

397 With residential uses mixed in, Mr. Paschke opined that they created their own  
398 synergies within the immediate area.

399 Ms. Collins noted other examples (Bayshore Mall in Glendale, WI) with  
400 redevelopment emphasizing connectivity and access to get to the community  
401 regardless of the transit mode, but once there, the ability to do it all (e.g. mixed  
402 housing on top of attractive retail areas); creating walkable malls, and often with a  
403 performance space in the middle, creating a big destination spot.

404 Member Kimble opined that would be highly-dependent on the demographics and  
405 what could be attracted based on that.

406 As the Metropolitan Council pointed out, Member Bull noted the need for more  
407 housing units; with an interest in Roseville for more family-owned  
408 restaurants/businesses, indicating the need for more multi-level buildings than  
409 were currently developed in the past.

410 Ms. Perdu addressed one concept first brought up by the Future Cities students,  
411 but also brought forward in results of the public kick-off meeting, was that  
412 residents would like to see more small businesses, or culturally-reflective  
413 businesses. Ms. Perdu reported that the Har Mar Mall was mentioned repeatedly  
414 for such a hub for that activity, while still remaining programmed for commercial  
415 use, but suggesting that the comprehensive plan show concepts for how that goal  
416 might happen. Ms. Perdu noted that those comments fit into tonight’s commission  
417 discussion with mall redevelopment in to a mixed village concept (e.g. St. Louis  
418 Park Westend on a smaller scale).

419 Member Daire referenced a book written by his daughter reviewing local family  
420 owned business owners and their competition from big box operations and owner  
421 interviews and their business model success built instead on convenience, product

422 knowledge and customer service (friendliness). Member Daire noted comments  
423 he heard at the Future Cities meetings when students were asked what biased  
424 Roseville residents from shopping at locally-owned stores versus big box options.  
425 Member Daire noted his personal bias toward locally-owned family stores and  
426 went out of his way to patronize neighborhood stores. However, from an  
427 economic standpoint, Member Daire noted that big box retailers were the ones  
428 doing the hiring, allowing larger turnover of employees and the economies of  
429 scale in products available for sale. Since most smaller, family-owned businesses  
430 hire few employees, and frequently not outside their immediate family, Member  
431 Daire noted that if one chose to patronize them, they would pay a higher price for  
432 it. On the other hand, with ongoing discussion on living wage issues, Member  
433 Daire noted there may be a need to balance that with big box retailer wages.  
434 While locally-owned, smaller businesses have a lower volume of business and  
435 higher individual prices, Member Daire noted that at the same time, they provided  
436 you with a feeling of belonging that some were willing to pay for. Member Daire  
437 stated that it created a dilemma for him as he considered personal economics and  
438 how smaller family-owned businesses may fit into a lifestyle mall of the future,  
439 providing that hominess while within what could be considered a big box center.

440 In considering the increase in Internet sales, Member Bull noted many people  
441 aren't interested in paying for that personal service, but instead wanted the  
442 convenience of ordering by phone from home. Member Bull suggested  
443 consideration be given to buying patterns in the future and where people wanted  
444 to shop and the types of stores that will attract building a relationship versus the  
445 type of customer and their personal buying patterns.

446 Chair Boguszewski noted this involved two very different market segments; with  
447 wise comments from his colleagues, especially the threat Internet buying poses to  
448 big box stores. While he may choose the big box option based on their huge  
449 selection, Chair Boguszewski noted it provided no connection with the owner, but  
450 was simply based on convenience. For those seeking an option with more  
451 anonymity, Chair Boguszewski noted those were the online shoppers and were  
452 entirely different from the segment that desired the customer/owner interaction.  
453 Therefore, Chair Boguszewski suggested the question should be what future  
454 character or nature of Roseville was being sought: the anonymous big box mall  
455 for convenience serving a bedroom community or to promote and develop smaller  
456 operations that may survive the Internet world. Chair Boguszewski opined that  
457 this would serve to address the nature of the character of the community most  
458 desired: whether Roseville became a replication of anonymous inner-ring suburbs  
459 across the United States, or whether Roseville had the ability to be a real city with  
460 various centers within it where people can relate to as a real place.

461 Member Daire noted talk about diversity and opined to him anonymity seemed to  
462 be the death knell of diversity; and with that emerging diversity concept it needed  
463 a personal relationship and from his perspective provided for serious  
464 consideration.

465 Member Bull noted one example of the future could be seen in the recently-  
466 opened Dunkin' Donut's franchise in Roseville with options for online ordering,

**Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update**

**Minutes – Wednesday, March 22, 2017**

**Page 12**

467 delivery service, drive-through service, or on-site dining. Member Bull opined  
468 that those businesses merging to meet all those desires would be the ones to  
469 flourish in the future.

470 Member Kimble stated that since the public kick-off meeting and discussions  
471 there, she had been thinking a lot about the comments she'd heard there. With the  
472 example of Dunkin' Donuts, Member Kimble suggested considering other similar  
473 options – whether locally-owned or franchise-owned.

474 Member Bull stated his preference for the predictability of chains in his travels,  
475 finding them comfortable; even though he liked the balance of both options.

476 Chair Boguszewski noted the fear of some people that Roseville's environment  
477 and attitude toward business has become too difficult and therefore squelches  
478 business interest in the community.

479 Member Kimble noted the need to look at the comprehensive plan in a regional  
480 context and not ending at the city boundaries, such as seen with the Larpentour  
481 Avenue/Rice Street revitalization efforts underway. Member Kimble suggested  
482 looking beyond those borders to see what was occurring in those areas, and to  
483 take advantage of that synergy. Member Kimble suggested looking at that broader  
484 picture at the next discussion, including what's across the street in Falcon  
485 Heights, Maplewood, Little Canada, St. Paul, etc.

486 At the request of Member Bull, and in the context of "next steps," Ms. Perdu  
487 advised that they would be seeking additional input from the commission at which  
488 time staff would return with suggested scenarios for a future land use map if any  
489 of the current designations needed to be changed. However, if the commission  
490 was interested in other visual concepts, Ms. Perdu offered to bring those concepts  
491 back in more detail – not small area plans – but providing more specifics and  
492 dialogue about what the city might look like and incorporate both those levels of  
493 detail. As a note of caution, Ms. Perdu noted that the future land use map and  
494 math, needed to work with Metropolitan Council projections.

495 Chair Boguszewski asked if there was any underlying rationale as to why only  
496 these three zones were highlighted, since there were other commercial areas in the  
497 community.

498 Ms. Perdu advised that the only rationale was that these five areas were  
499 mentioned at the public kick-off, including SE Roseville and the Twin lakes  
500 Redevelopment Area; and sought additional discussion by the commission if they  
501 felt other areas needed updating for future land use consideration. Also, Ms.  
502 Perdu asked for additional feedback if the commission felt there were other older  
503 commercial areas appropriate for redevelopment that should be added; or if they  
504 had a general feeling for aging commercial strips that could be interpreted in  
505 future land use sections of the comprehensive plan update versus simply  
506 highlighting them on a map.

507 Outlots and infill opportunities between County Roads C and C-2; extensive  
508 parking lots

509 Chair Boguszewski noted Sections 2 through 4 as identified on the map, but also  
510 recognized that some had improved over the last few years. Chair Boguszewski

511 expressed concern that while public comment is great, he wanted to ensure that  
512 there was no perception being put forth of current businesses and their success  
513 and/or failure, opining that wasn't a proper indicator that a site may be ripe for  
514 repurposing, but simply for the addition of some new businesses to complement  
515 current uses.

516 Ms. Perdu clarified that there was no intent to indicate failure of any of those  
517 businesses.

518 Member Murphy noted that the current use of the University of Northwestern  
519 administration building at Lincoln Avenue and Terrace Drive was still designated  
520 as Commercial Business (CB), but asked if a more proper designation would be  
521 Institutional (I).

522 Mr. Paschke clarified that designation remained CB as that was still a use that  
523 could occur in the future outside its current use.

524 Whether or not the building was still on the tax rolls, Member Murphy noted  
525 reasonable diversity in that immediate area (e.g. Grumpy's, Pizza Lucé, etc.) and  
526 questioned what higher use may be desired in that area, such as on the east side of  
527 the Bylerly's site.

528 Member Kimble advised that she had some difficulty figuring that out.

529 Member Gitzen questioned the need to repurpose it.

530 Mr. Paschke suggested an exercise for repurposing the entire Rosedale Square site  
531 (where Byerly's Store is located) if that went away. Mr. Paschke noted the  
532 possible changes over the next 10-20 years, possible relocation of one of the  
533 tenants, or other redevelopment opportunities should that space or other larger  
534 tenant space become vacant, specifically on this vital transit corridor in the  
535 community. As noted along East Snelling Service Drive (Slumberland area), Mr.  
536 Paschke noted difficulties in filling larger buildings originally used for retail and  
537 what future use they could achieve.

538 Member Gitzen stated the need for transit to influence this exercise, using the  
539 example of University Avenue and light rail, and to consider how the community  
540 and comprehensive plan update would take advantage of transit.

541 Member Kimble noted the massive parking lots currently in front of businesses  
542 and whether or not that needed rethinking.

543 Mr. Paschke clarified that new design standards are now in place to prevent that  
544 from happening; but also noted that the comprehensive plan would flesh out some  
545 of those things, including ethnic and diverse uses versus chains.

546 Member Murphy noted extensive parking lots were due to the city's requirement  
547 for businesses to have extensive parking.

548 Mr. Paschke suggested one consideration may be to move to structured parking;  
549 however, he recognized that many older developments had larger lots, even  
550 though city code and design standards had now been changed to address that,  
551 especially in Mixed Use designations.

**Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update**

**Minutes – Wednesday, March 22, 2017**

**Page 14**

552 On the western edge of town (grey block on map), Member Murphy questioned if  
553 any of that would benefit from a different goal than Business Park (e.g. Interim  
554 Uses for trailer parking at Meritex; goal of paying taxes until the building is  
555 demolished, and not much manufacturing going on at this point) with  
556 warehousing on the east side of Walnut Street up to Brooks Avenue, and business  
557 park north of County Road C on the western boundary.

558 Mr. Paschke clarified that this was more Office Business Park use.

559 Member Murphy suggested adding a sixth development area south of the railroad  
560 tracks on Walnut for redevelopment outside industrial uses.

561 Member Kimble suggested reserving at least that area for industrial use in  
562 Roseville, since it was the only area available right now; with concurrence by Mr.  
563 Paschke.

564 Member Murphy questioned other areas for growth of buildings or what the larger  
565 potential was: business park or industrial; and what was desired for the city.

566 Peripheral to this discussion, Member Daire noted the rail corridor running east  
567 and west through the community south of County Road C, especially on the  
568 eastern edge. Member Daire noted his past work with the Metropolitan Council  
569 when they were considering a light rail corridor along that track to connect at  
570 Highway 280 and University Avenue. Member Daire opined that the city could  
571 get a lot of mileage out of that if it was still on the table and as had been proven in  
572 Minneapolis to spur housing connections and commercial uses adjacent to light  
573 rail. Member Daire noted that obviously it involved parking, but also noted that  
574 Rice Street, Snelling Avenue and other places in between would be good station  
575 locations. Member Daire clarified that he was looking at the area north of I-35W  
576 connection with Highway 36 where the rail line crossed, currently an industrial  
577 area but a good candidate for redevelopment if a station was located in the area  
578 and encouraged HDR development around it as well.

579 Ms. Perdu stated that she would look into current status of such a project with the  
580 Metropolitan Council.

581 Specific to development of the former Twin Cities Army Ammunition Plant  
582 (TCAAAP) site in Arden Hills, renamed the Rice Creek Commons, Member  
583 Kimble asked if there were enough plans in place for transportation for their  
584 southern routes touching Roseville. Through coordination with other adjacent  
585 communities, Member Kimble opined that seemed to be the larger impact coming  
586 through Roseville, and potential for considerable traffic to and through Roseville  
587 if businesses develop there.

588 While it may be too early for firm insight on that, Ms. Perdu duly noted that  
589 request for additional information.

590 Rice and Larpenteur revitalization; collaboration with Maplewood and St. Paul  
591 Ms. Perdu deferred to the ongoing study of this area in the near future, currently  
592 shown on the map as a redevelopment area.

593 Lexington Avenue/Larpenteur Avenue – Aging Strip Mall Development  
594 Ms. Perdu noted that retail discussion would apply to this area as well.

595 Member Murphy referenced two areas on the map, duly noted by Ms. Perdu,  
596 where the senior cooperative and apartment complex was located, pointing out the  
597 need to move the eastern boundary of Area 4 to the edge of Community  
598 Development (CB).

599 Chair Boguszewski noted the considerable issues of that strip mall for some time,  
600 even though the Cub Foods Store drew people from the Como area of St. Paul,  
601 other businesses seemed to be struggling.

602 Member Murphy observed that those struggling were those having been there for  
603 a long time.

604 Ms. Perdu clarified that these areas are intended to prompt tonight's discussion,  
605 but may not show up on the final comprehensive plan maps.

606 Twin Lakes Redevelopment Area (TL)

607 In referencing attempted redevelopment of this area by reviewing various meeting  
608 minutes over the last twenty years, Chair Boguszewski stated that the only thing  
609 that struck him was that there didn't appear to be much designated office use or  
610 complexes, but that they instead seemed to be scattered uses, even though  
611 Roseville desired that type of land use. While the city has a business park that  
612 provided a somewhat different flavor, Chair Boguszewski stated his confusion as  
613 to how to remedy this.

614 Mr. Paschke clarified, with confirmation by Chair Boguszewski that he was  
615 thinking along the lines of a standalone office park or district.

616 Member Murphy stated that he was more partial to a business park, if there were  
617 not height restrictions, but some density with walkability too, such as the  
618 Semantic and Marriot complexes on the west side of Cleveland Avenue.

619 Chair Boguszewski questioned if there was a benefit to shifting some of the CB,  
620 RB, or CMU designations for office development use.

621 Discussion ensued on land use designation for hospitals or medical facilities and  
622 how they varied depending on their actual use or differentiated by the medical  
623 uses happening in medical office buildings compared to more intensive hospital  
624 uses.

625 Mr. Paschke noted that one unique thing about Roseville zoning and the current  
626 comprehensive plan was that it allowed for office use in six different districts, and  
627 provide examples for these land uses that were not necessarily specific use  
628 designations but guided in the districts toward Business Park use.

629 Member Kimble referenced trends as addressed by member Daire and what the  
630 Roseville community wanted to see, opining it involved so much more than  
631 simply zoning. Member Kimble noted the need to address what drew people to  
632 Roseville, where the jobs were at and in what uses, creating a much more  
633 complicated situation. While it may be fine to want something and create zoning  
634 to encourage it, Member Kimble noted that there was also a reason for their  
635 location, and questioned what the commission knew or needed to know beyond  
636 zoning (e.g. market trends).

**Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update**

**Minutes – Wednesday, March 22, 2017**

**Page 16**

637 Ms. Perdu duly noted this discussion, advising that they would delve deeper into  
638 the details before the next commission discussion.

639 In context of other places not currently shown on the map, Mr. Lloyd addressed  
640 two small properties for feedback from the commission on the northwest corner of  
641 County Road B and Dale (NE corner of that site). Mr. Lloyd noted that this  
642 involved two small properties marooned by themselves by the highway  
643 interchange, apartments and the school property. Mr. Lloyd asked for some  
644 thought on how to guide those parcels in the future, currently with a single-family  
645 home that is intended to remain for some time; but one of the parcels having a  
646 garage on the lot, and in a regulatory unknown area. Mr. Lloyd asked what  
647 direction made most sense for future use; and anticipated some discussion from  
648 the owner representative of those properties, and asked that the commission also  
649 think about it.

650 Mr. Paschke identified another unique parcel off County Road D east of the BP  
651 gas station off Cleveland Avenue, with the zoning line currently going right  
652 through the building from one designated area to another (one side Residential  
653 and the other side Neighborhood Business). While the property was for sale for a  
654 while, Mr. Paschke noted the difficulty of selling a property with two zoning  
655 designations. Having talked to the property owner recently, Mr. Paschke advised  
656 that a goal for staff, the commission and the property owner was to determine the  
657 best re-use of the property: whether residential or business, but to give clear  
658 direction on the parcel.

659 Mr. Paschke advised that staff may bring forward some other anomalies along the  
660 way.

661 As part of his review, Member Daire suggested the need for streets to separate  
662 bike/pedestrian/vehicular traffic for safety, perhaps through development of a  
663 policy by the city in determining where those roadways are located and expanding  
664 them accordingly. Member Daire suggested criteria that could be considered as  
665 part of a policy, such as identifying which roads, frequency of vehicles as it  
666 relates to safety, peak hours of travel, which have or need sidewalks, etc. Member  
667 Daire suggested a research project, perhaps managed by the Public Works,  
668 Environment and Transportation Commission (PWETC), but one that would  
669 seriously consider public safety as part of the comprehensive plan update process.

670 Ms. Perdu duly noted that suggestion.

671 Member Bull opined that technology would rule in the next twenty years, and  
672 may reduce the need for the current park system and walkways; perhaps with  
673 small buildings that allow bikes to be ridden via video aspects for enjoyment  
674 versus commuting. Therefore, Member Bull questioned if continued expansion or  
675 redevelopment to park land would be as necessary if there were opportunities for  
676 MDR or HDR and applicable access.

677 At the request of Member Kimble, Mr. Paschke clarified that the Hamline  
678 Shopping Center is now owned by Presbyterian Homes, and while their past  
679 vision was to redevelop it, they had repurposed some of it, but other plans  
680 remained static at this time. However, Mr. Paschke noted the potential for future



681 use that keeps it identified on the map for what could occur, based on a master  
682 plan or study developed for a broader area a number of years ago.

683 **6. Adjourn**

684 Outgoing Commissioner and Chair Boguszewski thanked his colleagues and city staff for  
685 their work in keeping the best interests of the city at heart in their decision-making and  
686 recommendations to the City Council.

687 **MOTION**

688 **Member Murphy moved, seconded by Member Gitzen to adjourn the meeting at**  
689 **approximately 8:18 p.m.**

690 **Ayes: 6**

691 **Nays: 0**

692 **Motion carried.**