

**Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Minutes – Wednesday, May 24, 2017 – 6:30 p.m.**

1. Call to Order

Chair Murphy called to order a Special meeting of the Planning Commission at approximately 6:30 p.m. for the purpose of updating the city’s comprehensive plan for 2040.

2. Roll Call

At the request of Chair Murphy, Community Development Director Kari Collins called the Roll.

Members Present: Chair Robert Murphy; Vice Chair James Bull; Commissioners James Daire, Julie Kimble, Chuck Gitzen, Pete Sparby; and newly-appointed Commissioner Sharon Brown

Staff / Consultants

Present: Community Development Director Kari Collins, and Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd, Consultant Erin Perdu, WSB

MOTION

Member Murphy moved, seconded by Member Bull to amend tonight’s agenda to add the swearing in of newly-appointed Commissioner Sharon Brown.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

Chair Murphy welcomed and introduced Commissioner Brown and swore her in as the newest member of the Planning Commission.

3. Review of Minutes

a. April 26, 2017 Special Planning Commission Meeting - Comprehensive Plan Update

Commissioners had an opportunity to review draft minutes and submit their comments and corrections to staff prior to tonight’s meeting, for incorporation of those revisions into the draft minutes.

MOTION

Member Bull moved, seconded by Member Daire to approve the April 26, 2017 meeting minutes as amended.

Corrections

- **Page 5, Line 164 (Bull)**
Typographical correction: Change “Chair Bull” to “Chair Murphy...”
- **Page 5, Line 198 (Collins)**

Correct acronym “SEPTED” to “CPTED – Crime Prevention through Environmental Design...”

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Communications and Recognitions

a. From the Public (Public comment pertaining to general land use issues not on this agenda)

Public comments pertaining to general land use issues not on this agenda.

Dale Howey, 991 Parker Avenue, Roseville

Mr. Howey provided a bench handout, speaking in support of the upcoming “Planning for Resilient Cities” co-sponsored by the Alliance for Sustainability, Anoka, Ramsey and Washington Counties, and others. As a sustainability enthusiast, Mr. Howey encouraged attendance at this meeting, intended for city staff and the community-at-large, with details on the meeting agenda included in the handout. Mr. Howey offered his assistance to the city to implement some of the tools for sustainability (e.g. electric vehicle charging station at City Hall).

b. From the Commission or Staff

Information about assorted business not already on this agenda, including a brief update on the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update process.

Mr. Lloyd provided a brief update of scheduled events and activities for community engagement as part of the comprehensive plan update.

Mr. Lloyd also noted that staff planned to attend the workshop referenced by Mr. Howey, with the daytime sessions geared more toward staff, and the evening sessions intended for advisory commissioners and community volunteers, but all open to the public and more information available on the city’s website, comprehensive plan web page.

Chair Murphy advised that he and Member Daire had attended an earlier session sponsored by the Alliance for Sustainability, and thanked staff for promoting this forum in response to their report on the value of information provided.

Specific to upcoming community engagement walkabouts for the comprehensive plan update, Member Sparby asked staff to elaborate on the meeting locations and logistics for residents wishing to attend.

Mr. Lloyd again alerted commissioners and the public to the city’s web page for detailed information, but reviewed the general intent of the walkabouts that were area-specific, with notices provided in advance to those neighborhoods and allowing residents to walk through and address opportunities and challenges that may not be as obvious to others outside their immediate area.

Ms. Perdu reported that, as addressed at the most recent City Council meeting as well, the walkabouts would start at a gathering point for each location, allowing questions of those not wanting or unable to participate in the entire walk. Ms. Perdu advised that discussion questions and maps would be provided at that start intended as topic started to initiate conversations, and then move forward as dictated by those residents of the neighborhoods in attendance.

5. Project File 0037: 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update

a. Future Land Use (Map and Districts)

Assorted land-use topics including a draft future land use map, and the names and descriptions of certain land use categories.

Ms. Perdu thanked commissioners for providing their homework comments and ideas as a precursor to tonight’s discussion. While several items remained to determine a consensus tonight, Ms. Perdu advised that commission feedback would continue to inform development of the draft land use chapter, with those ideas for redevelopment in target areas further outlined in more detail before the next meeting.

For the different classifications (e.g. planned unit development PUD – storage area use today), Chair Murphy noted his and Member Kimble’s attendance at one of the focus discussion groups where one developer had proposed that the City of Roseville’s definition for “office” had to be in Industrial or Business areas and the envisioned customer was for Residential storage. Chair Murphy questioned staff as to whether people felt safer in more Office Business Park designated areas; and whether those discussions may result in changing the definition of “office” or “storage” and whether that was germane to this discussion of land uses.

Mr. Lloyd clarified that part of the comprehensive plan update should look at future land use as a proxy for the general activities envisioned for those properties in the future. Mr. Lloyd further noted that part of the update should include whether current designations and categories were appropriate or could be improved. Mr. Lloyd advised that he had not yet discussed commission feedback with city staff at this point, but noted that he was aware of some districts having current descriptions difficult to pin down or that were problematic to administer.

Member Daire noted the process at Larpenteur Avenue and Rice Street involving four jurisdictions with little direction available at this point, and questioned how those processes would interface with the comprehensive plan update process.

Community Development Director Collins advised that some progress was being made with redevelopment in that area, as well as consideration of redevelopment opportunities and an overall plan being discussed for SE Roseville as well as the broader multi-jurisdictional area. Ms. Collins advised that this planning effort would run parallel with the comprehensive plan update, with Member Kimble serving as the Planning Commission representative on that community advisory group, and using visioning efforts to inform the process.

Chair Murphy noted previous discussions on these parallel tracks, and asked which planning process would be in place first based on their respective deadlines.

Member Daire noted his rationale in asking was what role that neighborhood planning would have in relationship to the comprehensive plan, and which would inform which; and how the work of the multi-jurisdictional output would be handled and whether that visioning effort would become part of the comprehensive plan update or if it would be subject to modification by the Planning Commission and Roseville City Council; and how to address this and future neighborhood plans in the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Lloyd responded that if and when something came out of the corridor planning effort that would suggest changes to the comprehensive plan and land use and/or zoning in that area, it could be approached at any time as an amendment to the comprehensive plan if the plan update has already been completed before that information is available. If results are known sooner in the process, Mr. Lloyd advised that they could be incorporated in the comprehensive plan update. Mr. Lloyd opined that he suspected many outcomes from that neighborhood process would be more reflective in the zoning code overlay than general guidance in the comprehensive plan, but either way, the results would be determined and addressed subsequently when they became available.

Member Daire stated that it was important from his perspective for those residents and business owners in that area to understand the visioning process and potential implementation. While the Roseville City Council has jurisdiction in the Roseville quadrant of that intersection, Member Daire noted that there was an important role for neighborhoods to drive a vision for their respective neighborhoods, even though it may result in conflicts with adjacent jurisdictions and their respective Planning Commissions and City Councils. As a process-oriented person, Member Daire opined that it made sense to have

an idea of how area plans related to larger plans. Member Daire further opined that he wasn't confident that this was the correct way to view the process, but if so, it seemed like the cart was driving the horse at this point, and therefore, stated that he was looking for specificity in how to deal with small area plans related to the larger responsibilities of the Planning Commission and City Council.

Ms. Perdu stated that, while understanding Member Daire's concerns, there were several ways she envisioned small area plans, for this area of Roseville or others, to be incorporated in the comprehensive plan. As staff mentioned, Ms. Perdu noted that the overall future land use guidance shown on the land use map was only one small piece of the comprehensive plan, and served as a starting point for what was on the ground now. As the Rice Street corridor plans evolve, Ms. Perdu stated that she anticipated recommendations on connections, redevelopment, etc. to become incorporated into the comprehensive plan and referenced as small area plans or studies that would be highlighted in the plan. Ms. Perdu also noted that another step would be to ensure underlying land uses were not contradictory but supportive of each other, and depending on other efforts, that implementation information would be incorporated into the plan update. However, Ms. Perdu noted the importance of allowing that visioning process to evolve further and in its own timing.

Ms. Collins noted that the outcomes of the plan will be very different, with direction intended to apply in a tangible way to short-, middle-, and long-term goals (e.g. streetscaping, redevelopment, revitalization, etc.). Ms. Collins noted that one recommendation may be to work with other jurisdictions to align design standards and zoning to make them more cohesive in the Rice Street/Larpenteur Avenue area, requiring far more visioning efforts and as part of navigating through that process, and eventually as applicable incorporated into respective comprehensive plans for all jurisdictions involved.

Member Kimble agreed, noting that some may be programmatic rather than bricks and mortar.

Future Land Use Map

Ms. Perdu displayed the 2040 future land use map and those areas currently designated for high density residential (HDR) that may be better served as medium density residential (MDR).

Railroad C – County Road C

As noted by Member Kimble, there were several new single-family homes and new development, while all seemed guided for HDR, while she recalled designated some green space included.

Mr. Lloyd clarified that there were remnant parcels currently outright-owned and designated as part of adjacent parks or appearing passive in their appearance.

Dale Street and County Road B

At the request of Member Kimble, Ms. Perdu advised that the designation had been changed to reflect the current land use.

NW Quadrant (Corner of Cleveland Avenue and D)

Chair Murphy noted this was currently designated Community Business (CB), and recalled that City Planner Paschke had made a comment early on that this was an area needing review even though he wasn't aware of any community concerns.

On the next street over (Wheeler Street), Mr. Lloyd noted that Mr. Paschke was working with a property owner with a home and adjacent business, prompting his comment.

Chair Murphy noted that his comments were related to the area to the east, with the gas station, a large house and four driveways.

Ms. Perdu suggested that she had discussed that area with staff, suggesting it should be part of the residential neighborhood rather than current designation as LDR, even though there were questions as to how it was being used at this time.

Ms. Collins clarified that there were two structures on the property, and one commercial with a legitimate parking lot and one home; with the commercial structure making it seem out of place compared to the residential feel.

NE Corner - South to Cleveland Avenue and County Road B

Chair Murphy and Member Kimble concurred that a better designation for this would be MDR. Chair Murphy recalled a previous land use application that had come forward and after further examination had been determined as unsuitable for LDR; even though to the east there were condominiums, and to the east and north, it was designated MDR. Chair Murphy suggested further discussion to designate that corner as MDR; with Member Kimble suggesting MDR be at least considered as a starting point; with consensus by the body.

Member Bull noted that the referenced proposal was for HDR, approved by the Planning Commission even though there wasn't a lot of capacity, but then subsequently not approved by the City Council.

Ms. Collins reported that at a recent City Council meeting, they had expressed their interest in taking a more detailed look into currently HDR designations,

and suggested this was an appropriate time to reconsider those current HDR designations at the Planning Commission as well.

Just across the street, Chair Murphy noted that the city had recently purchased the land on the corner; with Member Gitzen noting that the designation should be changed to Park/Open Space now.

Mr. Lloyd advised that there were several areas in the community recently purchased by the city for Park/Open Space land use, and reported that they had not been updated yet on the displayed land use map.

West of Fairview Avenue/North of Highway 36 (west side)

Chair Murphy noted the need to designate the fire station and water tower parcels as Institutional.

Ms. Collins advised that the City Council would soon be discussing the future guiding of that site (June) and whether to seek requests for proposals (RFP's).

Mr. Lloyd reminded commissioners that this map was to designate future – not current – land use, and suggested guiding that area should be guided Regional Business (RB) to be more cohesive with surrounding properties.

Lexington Avenue and County road C (across from City Hall)

Chair Murphy noted a small lot designated LDR that wasn't sold with the other part of the development, and immediately south of the bike shop; suggesting that it be considered HDR as future use to blend with the remainder of the area.

Mr. Lloyd agreed that HDR would comply with overall trend; but reported that the parcel may have actually recently become city-owned and to be used as an access point for Applewood Point.

Snelling Avenue and County Road B (Har Mar Mall)

From a broader discussion, and in looking at future land use in this area, Chair Murphy wondered if Community Mixed Use (CMU) would be a more appropriate use for that whole area, with feedback received from neighbors for that area, as well as those adjacent to Rosedale Center. In his review of CMU-1 definitions, Chair Murphy opined that he felt that was more a more appropriate designation, seeking input from his colleagues.

Member Gitzen suggested designating it simply as CMU, but not designating CMU-1, 2, 3 or 4 at this point to leave options more open.

Ms. Perdu confirmed that the comprehensive plan didn't designate beyond simply CMU.

Member Kimble stated her support for CMU in that area.

Especially with future land use, Member Sparby opined that it would serve as a good regional hub area for CMU, and offered his support as well.

Member Brown concurred, asking if that area of Roseville is or could be considered the city's "official downtown," and if so it needed a further look.

Member Bull concurred, stating that he saw CMU appropriate in many more areas around the current Har Mar Mall (e.g. Rice Street). In reviewing packet materials provided and other community examples, Member Bull noted the use of a downtown square type of atmosphere, with businesses, transportation hubs, pedestrian and bicycle pathways, and area housing amenities, all of which seemed to be of great interest to the Roseville community. With more family businesses sought where people can live in proximity to business, Member Bull opined that there was a lot of value in that, and increasing housing units, noting the 600 suggested by the Metropolitan Council.

Mr. Lloyd reviewed various land use category descriptions from the current comprehensive plan for business designations and examples of each, suggesting more contemplation of connections rather than parcel by parcel. For the purpose of long-term use, Mr. Lloyd noted CB may serve as more of a district than just a parcel.

Member Kimble noted the ideas that have been discussed around the Rosedale Center as well as Har Mar Mall, and asked if those ideas indicated more of a mixed use, if RB would allow for that.

Mr. Lloyd advised that it did not, since residential use was not included in the current RD description.

Member Kimble suggested that description or definition may need further review to include residential uses.

Ms. Collins noted that this would be part of the City Council discussion in June, whether to expand RB to include housing; with Mr. Lloyd noting that the Planning Commission discussion would then continue from that point.

With RB and CB designations, Member Kimble asked if they would also include elements of CMU (e.g. green space); with Mr. Lloyd advising that it would be a richer variation for CMU than the other designations didn't have, and in that case be more parcel by parcel. Member Kimble opined that it was important, as a development became larger, that more connective green space was available.

Ms. Perdu expressed appreciation for how this discussion has developed; and asked the commission where on the land use map they envisioned that mixed use. Ms. Perdu noted that it was embedded in some business districts, but not

currently a primary purpose; but as districts were further clarified, it would help to have an idea of where commissioners saw that mixed use so the map and district language could be updated accordingly, with her preference to make that distinction more clear. Ms. Perdu noted that the only CMU designation at this time was the Twin Lakes area, requiring a small area plan or master plan before mixed use is developed. However, in other categories, Ms. Perdu noted that those were intended to be more informal or ad hoc; and that was a question she had in what the thinking had been behind the land use map, and whether there was a preference to encourage mixed use in certain areas of the city (e.g. Har Mar Mall and along Rice Street) or if it would be a deterrent to mixed use if a small plan or master plan was required in CMU-designated areas.

Member Kimble asked if part of the complexity was in the land control.

Ms. Perdu asked if the commission wanted to encourage height mixed use or broader footage without a master plan or small plan.

Member Gitzen stated that the city could envision a 2040 use, but couldn't actually control what happened in the process.

Ms. Perdu admitted that it was complicated, in that it did and didn't, but if official controls are required (e.g. zoning and land use map) they needed to agree with the comprehensive plan guidance; and while future land use may not reflect current land uses, the comprehensive plan served as a guide land use goals where the city ultimately wanted them to be. Therefore, Ms. Perdu noted that rezoning requests must be consistent with the comprehensive plan.

Member Bull stated that he considered the comprehensive plan as a guiding document for future land use, subject to change.

Member Gitzen stated that his question was if zoning followed the comprehensive plan, did the Har Mar Mall fit into CMU designation now.

Mr. Lloyd advised that further review would be required to see if the footprint fit into CMU parameters.

Ms. Collins advised that to leave the structure as it, and if ownership and/or tenants turned over, Har Mar Mall would become a non-conforming use in that sense if it didn't fit into the CMU designation, but it could continue to operate as a mall, but when it redeveloped, it would trigger the CMU designation unless a developer requested a zoning change at that time.

Member Sparby stated that he understood it was still zoned CMU until rezoned, but may not conform to the comprehensive plan even though zoned CMU; and while not de facto zoning, it would guide it.

Member Kimble noted that the trigger was redevelopment.

Mr. Lloyd clarified that legal advice to-date had been that the zoning map and its parameters were the official control, and therefore, has to be made to support the guiding document (comprehensive plan). Mr. Lloyd noted that the next step after adoption of the comprehensive plan update would be to make necessary zoning changes soon after. While this didn't compel property owners to change anything at that time, Mr. Lloyd noted that if the size or scope of a development triggered that the property was no longer a conforming use due to a zoning change, they would need to seek special approval or begin redevelopment in a way that did conform. At this point, those parcels would be considered as grandfathered as legal, nonconforming sites and activities could continue as such, and can be rebuilt, improved and maintained as long as the property owner desires, with redevelopment serving as the trigger to the new zoning designation.

Ms. Collins noted that it was clear that a comprehensive plan map would follow through this process and changes would be made consistent with the zoning map and then rezoned no matter their current status. As an example, if Har Mar Mall redeveloped in the future for mixed use, Ms. Collins advised that the CMU designation would equip and guide the land use appropriately for that vision, provided the goal was to not continue the current use as is. With the goal to closely align the comprehensive plan and zoning maps, Ms. Collins noted that, as Mr. Lloyd indicated, a bulk zoning change would be done post-comprehensive plan update as applicable, similar to that done in 2010.

With that said, Ms. Perdu encouraged commissioners to look at the future land use map for their vision for the community in the future, not necessarily reflecting the current land use, but to consider rezoning those areas to support the comprehensive plan. Ms. Perdu advised that the idea was to equip property owners to redevelop in the way the city and its residents wanted in the future. When writing that land use and other comprehensive plan sections, Ms. Perdu advised that it may suggest updates to zoning ordinance language and description of districts, without necessarily using existing zoning districts.

Member Bull noted that if the Har Mar Mall was designated CMU and identified as CMU-1, 2, 3 or 4, redevelopment may actually split the parcels into different sections with different densities; therefore making him question if it was feasible.

Mr. Lloyd opined that it was appropriate to consider and approach such designation as if it was a hypothetical change for the parcel to CMU and four different zoning designations from low to high density. As an example, Mr. Lloyd referenced the former National Guard Armory site that the comprehensive plan previously discussed and ultimately resulted in recent

approval for LDR (single-family residential). While MDR was discussed on a part of the site, Mr. Lloyd advised that any developer wishing to exceed that MDR density could request to do so; and similarly additional density could be proposed for the Har Mar Mall site as well.

Specific to Har Mar Mall, Member Bull opined that redevelopment may include using some of the current structure, and may or may not conform to other designations or be appropriate at the same time.

Considering what could happen at Har Mar Mall, Member Daire noted the Target Superstore located in the same area, and designation of the Rosedale Center as RB, with the highway interchange located between. Therefore, Member Daire noted that the proposed center of the city was actually an interchange, and while that may or may not be a bad thing, opined that in some respects he viewed that as an obstruction, considering Snelling Avenue and Highway 36.

Member Daire noted discussions with the Future Cities students talking about a Main Street for Roseville, and they suggested Snelling Avenue, while he opined that County Road B-2 may be more in line with that goal and communication threads at Snelling Avenue and Highway 36 being more extraneous to the current use with the exception that it served as a feeder. If consideration was given to those land uses with the idea that they must be fed, since Roseville is part of a constellation of communities in the metropolitan area, Member Daire opined that there was a need to consider the City of Roseville as a “neighborhood” to the broader region. Member Daire noted that the land use map involved only the city, but not any land uses or designations outside the city limit boundaries, even though they connected across those jurisdictional boundaries. Member Daire opined that in considering this interchange as the center of Roseville, from a transportation plan, it seemed necessary to consider that broader area in context and as micro changes versus their context within Roseville that may seem major. Member Daire suggested the need to lay out the public transportation network, with one of the dominant attractions of Roseville being its proximity to both Downtown St. Paul and Minneapolis, therefore needing to fit into that larger overall context. Even though Roseville has RB (commercial) nodes, Member Daire opined that there was a need to consider how they’re connected from Roseville and to the regional context and how to address both.

Member Bull agreed with the comments of Member Daire, noting five municipalities that bordered Roseville; and the need to know what land uses were adjacent to Roseville and how we wanted to areas to develop. However, Member Bull noted that the way property and land uses were classified may be different, and possibly not consistent with that broader picture.

Member Daire clarified that he wasn't an advocate for the Metropolitan Council's appointed body making decisions on how much housing each community should have; but on the other hand, he noted that their viewpoint was significant and one that he'd personally like to explore.

Chair Murphy noted that part of tonight's discussion was specific, while part was leaning toward the philosophical.

Specific to Rosedale Center and Har Mar Mall, Member Kimble referenced her off-line notes to Ms. Perdu suggesting her interest in considering mixed use in both of those areas and applicable densities. Member Kimble asked Ms. Perdu to provide approaches taken by the City of Edina for the Southdale Center, and recent changes for outlots for housing or through small area plans as it started to redevelop, including their infrastructure changes.

Ms. Perdu referenced research in the packet from the City of Edina's mixed use guidance; but agreed to take a closer look at their approach as requested.

As part of this mixed use discussion, Ms. Perdu stated that she would like to vet ideas to rework future mixed use descriptions; and expressed her interest in hearing from commissioners other areas in Roseville they considered appropriate for mixed use.

Chair Murphy asked that staff include that discussion – individual parcels – for commission comment at a future meeting.

In consideration of timing, Member Sparby sought confirmation from his colleagues that there was a consensus for CMU for Har Mar Mall; allowing feedback from the public and City Council accordingly.

Chair Murphy clarified that the process was still in the early stages as far as recommendations went, with land uses being addressed again during this process. While seeking consensus of the body, Chair Murphy stated that his goal was that all commissioners be heard and achieved some form of agreement where possible, while recognizing that they may or may not be final at this point.

Ms. Collins stated that any unanimous feedback from the commission would be helpful in the context of providing the City Council with that information on specific parcels and discussion around those peripheries.

Chair Murphy confirmed that in concept, the commission's consensus for CMU or a similar designation for future land use at Har Mar Mall.

With confirmation by Ms. Perdu, Member Kimble clarified that the commission was interested in mixed uses, whether through CMU designation

or some adapted community business description yet to be developed beyond the current CMU description.

Personally, Member Daire stated his awareness over the last few months of dramatic changes in the commercial environment, mostly due to online purchases and the need for bricks and mortar buildings to be adapted accordingly. Member Daire stated his interest in having better direction on what could or could not succeed at Har Mar Mall.

With concurrence by Mr. Lloyd, Member Kimble clarified that CMU allowed mixed uses without defining a percentage of what was involved until a specific development comes forward.

Member Daire specifically noted the current interest in thrift or recycling shops and asked if that would be a permitted use in CMU districts; and if so, if there was likelihood that such a use may find its way into the Har Mar Mall area.

Chair Murphy noted that the commission didn't have the ability to answer that within the 2040 comprehensive plan.

Member Bull referenced many recent articles about the changing face of business, and what future bricks and mortar stores may look like, and what may or may not succeed in the short- and long-term. Member Bull noted there were some products that did better on site versus online purchases (e.g. fitness stores) depending on the contact type needed for that business (e.g. showroom businesses). Member Bull opined that the changing world of transportation and what people and/or product movement looked like was also part of the equation.

Ms. Perdu stated that she would make sure the mix of uses for CB would be viable into the future as the retail environment continued to change; and therefore would revise text for districts accordingly.

Dale Street and County Road C (SE Corner)

Chair Murphy noted that there was nothing there now and it was proposed HDR, but in looking to the east, there was single-family residential, to the south was the compost site, and to the west was MDR; and kitty corner was LDR and HDR. Chair Murphy questioned if HDR was the best use for that corner.

Mr. Lloyd clarified that the designation was not something that had been considered much yet this time around, but it did receive quite a bit of focus at the last update ten years ago, but agreed that HDR may not remain the best idea.

Chair Murphy and Member Kimble stated their preference for MDR.

Member Bull noted that, if it remained HDR, it was a good area to do so given the County Road C thoroughfare and HDR right across the street.

Chair Murphy noted that traffic congestion was already difficult at County Road C and Dale Street.

With no consensus, Chair Murphy suggested leaving the designation as is at this time.

Snelling Avenue at Byerly's location (CB area)

Member Sparby opined that he saw this as another potential CMU designation; noting the future potential for affordable housing, mixed use and green space, similar to the discussion about the Har Mar Mall; with Member Kimble concurring,

At the request of Chair Murphy as to a caution from staff about current descriptions, Mr. Lloyd agreed that allowing mixed uses and evaluating various districts accordingly to facilitate it was prudent.

Member Gitzen concurred, noting that language needed tweaking to allow other uses, especially right at this busy intersection; opining that modified CMU seemed logical to him; and depending on how the descriptions were revised, at that time it would indicate whether mixed use was appropriate.

Ms. Collins clarified that the current CMU allowed for some residential.

Ms. Kimble stated that she envisioned mixed use at a lower density than the Har Mar Mall or on a smaller scale; noting the need to look at infrastructure including how traffic issues are addressed, as part of any mixed use area and density consideration.

Ms. Perdu asked for a consensus of whether or not it be called "Community Business," "CMU," or a hybrid if there was a desire to allow mixed use if it happens as a community district as written or as revised.

Member Kimble stated that her vision for mixed use was to intentionality of zoning as opposed to CMU and then looking hard if housing could be added. If the vision of mixed use, Member Kimble stated her preference for that designation accordingly.

Member Sparby noted additional CMU in that area, creating a CMU corridor, with the addition of green space and conscious ability to mix uses to create parks and specific areas shifting away to guide the process and make better decisions.

Today, Chair Murphy stated that he was more comfortable with the ambiguity for mixed use given that immediately to the north of this area there was a reasonable amount of foot traffic from the University of Northwestern students to Byerly's, Cartridge World, etc. and therefore, he would wait to see the revised wording developed by staff and the consultant team.

Member Bull stated his agreement with mixed use and part of the reasoning to make Snelling Avenue more of a community street rather than just a thoroughfare that it currently was, but creating reasons for people to get be able to access the area more easily than current and somehow address congestion on those area streets.

While tonight's discussion seemed to focus on the Har Mar Mall and Rosedale Center, Member Brown also noted other areas (e.g. Lexington and Larpenteur Avenues) with considerable aging commercial uses, and lots of empty storefronts in that area. Therefore, Member Brown suggested a further look at that area as well, noting the considerable and important area between Garden and Across Hamline.

Member Daire referenced Member Sparby's comments on County Road C and Snelling, and agreed it seemed a logical node for CMU, even those areas not in Roseville's jurisdiction, but including Snelling Avenue at Larpenteur Avenue, County Roads B and B-2 and C. Member Daire opined that north of those nodes seemed appropriate to him, but wondered how to configure it and encourage a node that wasn't just involving one corner of an intersection and supporting infrastructure. Member Daire questioned if the intent was to bring guidance to HDR around commercial nodes, when at this time focus was on quadrants of intersections as opposed to the intersections themselves. Member Daire opined that a vision was needed for what could happen at those nodes and then take appropriate action after that. For instance, Member Daire noted if Har Mar Mall is appropriate on the corner and Target on that northwest quadrant, what about the other two quadrants, that to him seemed appropriate for convenience food stores or similar uses. From his perspective, Member Daire reiterated the need to consider all four quadrants of an intersection and how they related to RB nodes where transportation strategies were to surround those nodes with arterials. However, at the County Road B and Snelling Avenue node, Member Daire opined that it penetrated the commercial; and if the vision was for a sub-regional business concentration, he also wanted to have an idea of what did or did not work.

Member Kimble recognized the good thinking being done by Member Daire and the complexities involved; however, she noted the difficulties in anyone attempting to read future markets and trends. Member Kimble noted that the goal was to do your best, and recognize that all of the visions may not be achieved over time, with market forces coming back that may change the

comprehensive plan and/or rezoning and possibly negating some of those efforts at visioning.

Mr. Lloyd agreed with the challenges in visioning, using examples from the past that guided areas to HDR as a regional commuter line was anticipated through Roseville, making HDR a sensible approach. However, without realizing that goal, Mr. Lloyd noted the trend now to guide some of those areas away from HDR since it was found to constrain zoning changed from historical Industrial designation and what those properties could do as they interfaced with residential properties to the south, that were unlikely to redevelop as HDR in the foreseeable future. To change those parcels into conforming uses once again, Mr. Lloyd noted would allow the city to better regulate them. While attempting overall to address future uses, Mr. Lloyd noted that those zoning decisions could be amended as needed. Therefore, Mr. Lloyd stated that he didn't want to undermine the importance of this update process, but also didn't want to see the commission be paralyzed by it either.

Member Kimble again thanked Member Daire for his thoughts, but given the many unknowns, suggested looking to what was driving Roseville now as a first-tier suburb and its level of densification, with interest both from housing and retail continuing in Roseville. Member Kimble noted future trends that may drive development with generational home ownership that would support the thinking around mixed use at different nodes as opposed to singular use and strip malls as seen in Roseville and in the broader regional area.

Member Daire stated that he was trying to avoid the trap of trying to know what was going to happen, but rather to stand back and recognize that there wasn't a clean slate to work with, and allowing for continuity with the past in relationship with the vision while helping to look at it from a creative process versus from his professional career perspective.

Member Kimble noted Ms. Perdu's leadership in providing good examples to help that visioning process.

Ms. Perdu noted the other part of the land use chapter that looked beyond concepts for redevelopment areas, and as part of the homework packet, noted the key areas to address (e.g. Lexington and Larpenteur Avenues, Har Mar Mall, Rosedale Center) and in addition to the current land use map, the additional work needed in the text for districts to further clarify the commission's feedback tonight and what may occur for mixed use districts. Ms. Perdu assured commissioners that it would differ from the current text; and thanked commissioners for the feedback that would assist her in conveying that revised text for their review before the next meeting and specific for key area development.

Member Brown noted that from a broader scope, it would be interested to see how use and demographics played into it, with millennials coming into the process and what to include in this plan for their future use and shopping trends and how they would live or commute and how that played into this plan update. Member Brown noted the considerably wide demographic the community had to consider.

At the request of Chair Murphy, Member Brown confirmed her interest in mixed use at the Hamline, Larpenteur and Lexington areas; even recognizing that some of the developments were across the street in the City of St. Paul jurisdiction.

With Ms. Collins pointing out that mixed use area south of Larpenteur (St. Paul) as an example, Member Kimble noted the lack of green space and her lack of interest in seeing mixed use at Lexington and Larpenteur, while envisioning it more for MDR or single-family residential in back. However, seeing the street infrastructure at that location and visibility issues, Member Kimble stated her struggle in considering mixed use there.

Member Brown noted the proximity of that urban development area to the Como area.

Member Gitzen, in looking at CB designation and ways to make it more mixed use, stated that his perception of comments from his colleagues, was that in addition to the areas of focus tonight, there were others that could also be considered.

Ms. Perdu concurred, noting that she was also hearing the need for revitalization of existing commercial uses and even if it remained commercial, some overlapping with areas of redevelopment interest.

Member Kimble stated that Ms. Perdu hit on the key, with Roseville's draw as one of the top three retail centers in the metropolitan area, and used other retail developments as an example of having recently undergone a newer, refreshing and more vibrant revitalization. Member Kimble stated that was the vision she saw in allowing that to happen through more mixed use that other communities used as opposed to a strict business use.

Member Brown referenced the examples provided by Ms. Perdu for the Cities of Woodbury and Maple Grove that included gathering spaces in those mixed use areas (e.g. coffee shops or drive-up stores) that were different than a typical strip mall, including considerations given to green space.

Member Bull referenced recent surveys indicating the desire to move away from existing larger retail areas toward neighborhood businesses as redevelopment occurs, such as a neighborhood center with smaller stores,

meeting spaces, and livable units included, as well as providing bicycle and walking paths for transportation and located throughout the community as parcels become available to develop. However, Member Bull stated that he wasn't sure how to communicate to developers the city's willingness to look at those possibilities; but didn't think it was by designating a certain number of parcels but by developing a mechanism to communicate through the comprehensive plan and zoning code areas available for redevelopment.

Ms. Perdu suggested one approach may be to see how districts (e.g. CMU, RB, CB) are currently segregated and how they draw their customers, which may have created some difficulties as developers looked to see what uses were permitted.

Mr. Lloyd agreed, noting how that drew into the comments of Member Bill in a mechanism to indicate the city's encouragement of and desire for small service retail and how it should be regulated. Mr. Lloyd noted that a challenge found in the CB district and current language related to local market areas, were how some defined those districts. For example, Mr. Lloyd noted that some considered Target as a community-scaled facility with residents as well as those passing through Roseville able to stop in to pick something up. However, Mr. Lloyd noted that addressing that broader market area leads some to the conclusion that Target is a regional business versus community business.

Therefore, Mr. Lloyd noted that the challenge was in defining the business category by who was trying to be served as opposed to the current language that may be intended to encourage certain things. Mr. Lloyd advised that staff would like to address that, and noted that there was currently considerable overlap in CMU and CB, while Neighborhood Business (NB) also allowed for residential over retail and at nodes like at Lexington Avenue and County Road B where NB was designated on three of the four corners, that location could be conducive to a local retail provider and limited residential. However, Mr. Lloyd noted that determining how to phrase those things to encourage what was being sought was as important as not preventing someone from having a perfectly sized (e.g. Source Game Store) in a CB district and a specific size, even though that particular business drew from a regional area.

In addition to looking at districts in terms of mixed uses and tonight's discussion, Ms. Perdu advised that she would rewrite the text to try to get at what was being sought in specific categories, rather than where customers were coming from (e.g. size and bulk of buildings, impacts from use, hours of operation, traffic patterns, and parking requirements) to get away from how far the draw is and restricting business accordingly.

With Member Bull noting that most of that would be addressed in the zoning code rather than the comprehensive plan, Ms. Perdu noted that the general impact was what she was seeking, by changing titles of some districts to not be

based on where customers were coming from whether regionally or neighborhood.

Ms. Collins clarified that may be comparable to the CMU-1, 2, 3 and 4 districts.

Member Gitzen suggested it may be more of a general business district and description such as provided in the City of Bloomington description.

In speaking about community and regional districts, Member Daire noted the need to address access patterns as well; arguing for the need to consider where people are coming from to know the type of infrastructure needed to support it.

Member Bull noted that infrastructure and needs could change dramatically over the next twenty years depending on future technologies.

Member Daire agreed, but referenced the comments of Member Kimble, when making investments in infrastructure, it was comparable to the Metropolitan Council's statement that you couldn't build your way out of congestion. Member Daire noted the ever-increasing capacity on Highway 36 as an example of the need to address that infrastructure to not distract from or turn people way form regional destination points.

Member Bull noted the irregularity of traffic patterns on Highway 36; with Member Kimble agreeing that it not only varied, but also noted peak times also varied, sometimes starting earlier in the day, but not with any regularity.

At the request of Chair Murphy, Mr. Lloyd and Ms. Perdu reviewed "next steps" with Chair Murphy requesting that staff provide the commission with City Council meeting minutes as they related to these discussions, particularly the upcoming HDR discussion in June.

b. Goals and Decision-Making Rubric

Review an updated draft of the Decision-Making Rubric, which will become a simple and intuitive tool for elected, appointed, and hired city officials to evaluate their actions in terms of the comprehensive plan goals.

Ms. Perdu referenced the updated decision-making rubric based on previous commission feedback, seeking their input on this draft to achieve a consensus prior to presenting it to the City Council.

Member Bull opined that a lot of items discussed in the notes didn't seem to make it into this update; with Ms. Perdu advising that they should have, and asked for specific examples of any omissions from commissioners outside tonight's meeting.

Member Bull noted his review of meeting minutes and his review of the update and observation of a number of things omitted, one in particular was the goal “desirable place to live/work” and those things unique to Roseville; and also a lack of specifics beyond gathering statistics for age, race, gender, etc. that appeared like an EEOC item.

Ms. Perdu advised that she would go back for another review of meeting minutes.

As another example in the Roseville as a safe community goal, Member Bull noted that discussions indicated that “natural surveillance” needed to move from planning technicality language to a more public-friendly descriptor. Mr. Lloyd agreed that term was a development term rather than a public knowledge term.

Member Bull referenced the measurable on page two with most including numbers, but the Roseville as a safe community goal listing trends. Member Bull stated his preference for numbers from which those trends could be compiled over time.

Ms. Perdu reiterated her intent to spend more time reviewing past meeting minutes and to correct the update accordingly.

In the goal that Roseville had world-renowned parks, Member Brown opined that given the global world, that was a lofty goal.

Chair Murphy noted that he had mentioned this at a previous meeting, and while not intending to be anti-park, referenced an article about great parks, and stated that he didn’t recall the commission accepting that as a goal.

Member Bull concurred, noting last month’s commission discussion on that goal, seeking that the parks didn’t even have to be Minnesota-renowned, but simply met but didn’t need to exceed the level for Roseville residents.

Member Brown concurred that Roseville residents should be pleased and want to move here because of that, but didn’t think the whole world needed to be pleased.

Members Daire and Sparby had no additional feedback at this time.

Chair Murphy pointed out the first goal, fifth measurable asking for clarification, with Ms. Perdu noting the need to reword that to indicate that the measurement was intended that public art would be representative of the community.

Chair Murphy also noted that the Roseville as a safe community goal and its first two bullet points questioned if the number of vacant structures was a measurable, and if that included a unit or building, or tenants in a multi-tenant building (e.g. strip mall) and suggested Police Chief Mathwig may want to provide some input on appropriate measurables for that goal.

Ms. Collins clarified that it was a proven fact that vacancies attracted nuisance behavior, and this was intended to address nuisance activity of long-vacant buildings, not units or multi-unit buildings.

Ms. Perdu stated that language would be revised for more clarify.

Specific to sight lines, Ms. Collins advised that the attempt was to move toward Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED), which the city currently did little of.

Member Gitzen suggested rewording that section as well.

Specific to the parks goal, Member Kimble noted that Roseville was known for quality and a high percentage of green space, and along with the Cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, was known for a great park system. Member Kimble suggested some type of descriptor in that section.

Specific to the measurables, Member Kimble questioned what it meant, with the first draft of this document not having as much, but feedback provided at previous meetings, but a need still there to determine what was going be measured and how.

In the goal that Roseville scores high for quality lifelong learning, Member Gitzen suggested including something about the library and education opportunities, while he remained unsure how to measure them,

In the Roseville transportation goal, Member Gitzen suggested a bike-friendly designation for the community, perhaps from a bike transportation agency, or complete streets initiative to look at the whole right-of way and design for all modes of transportation at least showing up as a goal for consideration.

For the wellness goal, Chair Murphy questioned what the measurable was for “equitable access.”

Ms. Perdu responded that the idea was to look at the goal through transit stops as they relate to healthcare facilities for those without vehicles, as well as access to healthy foods and produce.

Chair Murphy suggested including that in the action column as a sub-goal.

Mr. Lloyd noted that it would be appropriate as a measurable along the lines of healthcare facilities within a certain distance of transportation.

Member Bull stated that the idea about healthcare facilities, as discussed last month, was to address not only the considerable number of goals, but the intent to document who was tasked with performing the goals and at what level they were going to be measured, especially based on available staff resources. Member Bull advised that Ms. Major was going to discuss that with Ms. Perdu and add that to this chart in future drafts.

Ms. Perdu agreed to add that to this chart, noting that it belonged in the implementation element of the comprehensive plan, including the responsible parties and timelines.

At the request of Chair Murphy, Ms. Perdu reviewed “next steps” at the June meeting to wrap up the land use and category discussion and then transition into the housing descriptions.

Chair Murphy noted the commission’s request before that next meeting for City Council meeting minutes in their draft form related to their land use discussion and Member Kimble’s request for additional information on redevelopment of the Southdale Center area.

Mr. Lloyd suggested emailing that information to commissioners; with Chair Murphy requesting the information sooner rather than later.

At the request of Member Bull related to when the online survey would close, Ms. Perdu advised that the City Council at their update earlier this week, had directed another advertising push and extension for the time being to encourage more participation.

Mr. Lloyd reported that approximately 250 responses had been submitted to-date; and advised that staff would be using standard channels to re-communicate the survey. However, Mr. Lloyd encouraged commissioners to personally encourage participation by word of mouth.

At the request of Member Bull, Ms. Perdu and Mr. Lloyd reviewed the plans for upcoming walkabouts to ensure diversity; as well as other focus groups to pull in those hard-to-reach population groups.

Ms. Collins reported on the upcoming media push for the Rice Street/Larpenteur Avenue initiative and large-scale workshops scheduled on June 14th and June 20 and their location, both open to the public.

6. Adjourn

MOTION

Member Sparby moved, seconded by Member Kimble to adjourn the meeting at approximately 8:48 p.m.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.