



**Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Minutes – Wednesday, June 28, 2017 – 6:30 p.m.**

1. Call to Order

Chair Murphy called to order a Special meeting of the Planning Commission meeting 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, City Planner Paschke called the Roll.

Members Present: Chair Robert Murphy; Vice Chair James Bull; and Commissioners Sharon Brown, Chuck Gitzen, Julie Kimble, and Peter Sparby, with Jim Daire arriving at 6:40 p.m.

Staff/Consultants

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

3. Review of Minutes

a. May 24, 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.

Chair Murphy advised Erin Perdu’s name is misspelled throughout the minutes and requested it be corrected.

MOTION

Member Gitzen moved, seconded by Member Bull to approve the May 24, 2017 meeting minutes as amended.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

Chair Murphy reminded Commission members to state their name the first time they speak for the transcription service.

4. Communications and Recognitions:

- a. **From the Public:** *Public comment pertaining to general land use issues not on this agenda*
- 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 and schedule of upcoming meetings as part of the Comprehensive Plan Update.

Member Bull inquired about the number of people participating in the Walkabouts. He heard from a resident that the questions being asked on the Walkabout were not pertinent to the issues being raised on the neighborhood networks. He encouraged Members to use the neighborhood network Nextdoor often and to talk with some of the leads about issues in neighborhoods.

Erin Perdu, WSB Consultant, responded there has generally been five or six participants. There are questions that are meant to start the discussion, but they make it clear they are there to talk about whatever things come up.

Community Development Director Collins requested Commission Members encourage all residents to contact City staff with any feedback or concerns they may have.

Member Sparby inquired if they knew who will be receiving the stakeholder interviews.

Ms. Perdu responded they need to talk with staff regarding the interviews, and they will be scheduled later this summer. The list will be made available to the public.

Member Bull expressed concern they have not made it out to the diverse areas of the City.

Ms. Perdu agreed there has not been a lot of racial, gender, or economic diversity represented in the Walkabouts. They are hopeful the ECFE events in September will provide some of this, as well as some of the stakeholder interviews.

Ms. Collins commented on June 10, they were at the Brittany Marion apartments for a community safety get together. Although there was a significant language barrier as she tried to talk with the parents about the Comprehensive Plan, it was clear that adequate play space for their children was important to them.

Member Bull suggested a Comprehensive Plan event similar to the public safety event may be the way to reach a more diverse audience.

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

a. Future Land Use Districts

Discussion of possible revisions to the names and descriptions of land use designations

Senior Planner Lloyd introduced himself and Erin Perdu, Planning Consultant with WSB.

Ms. Perdu began by reporting on the future land use text revisions. She referred to page 29 of the meeting packet and stated she hopes the new spectrum of districts highlights the mixed use opportunities the City already had.

In response to Member Bull, Ms. Perdu stated they are looking at the future land use classifications in the Comprehensive Plan that correspond to the districts on the map. After it is adopted, they will make sure the zoning districts correspond with the future land use districts.

Mr. Lloyd commented the zoning district names do correlate with the Comprehensive Plan designations and the content between the two must match up. All the permitted uses are based on the zoning districts.

Member Kimble inquired if the definitions were newly created by the consultants or taken from someone else's definition. Ms. Perdu responded they created the names, but a lot of the description language was taken from the existing district. They have added some things regarding scale and transportation connections and removed references where the traffic and customers were coming from.

Member Gitzen inquired if there are any industry standards for these names.

Ms. Perdu responded the residential terms are generally standard, but there are a variety of names with mixed use and commercial.

Chair Murphy inquired if there is anything to distinguish between land use district when standards overlap.

Ms. Perdu responded they should make distinctions to eliminate overlap.

Ms. Perdu reported they did not make many changes to the residential districts. They did include a minimum density in the low-density category and added some narrative regarding transportation connections and types of uses contemplated. Ms. Perdu stated the density ranges remain the same as what was in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Murphy referred to Low Density Residential, and inquired what a 1.5 dwelling unit per acre would translate to be.

Ms. Perdu stated it translates to about three quarters of an acre.

Mr. Lloyd advised it is an average and is more helpful when the math is expanded.

Ms. Perdu then directed discussion to mixed use districts. She reported this is a replacement of the business districts with a spectrum of mixed use districts and most were already allowed in the 2030 Comprehensive Plan. The major change is with Core Mixed Use where the possibility of residential was added. She explained the Neighborhood Center is considered Medium Density Residential, but would also allow business uses. The title is based on discussion around how these neighborhoods were located at key intersections with small scale commerce opportunities.

Member Bull suggested they remove the word “predominant”, and replace it with an actual percentage. He also inquired what the percentages represent.

Ms. Perdu explained when a percentage is displayed, it is a percentage of the land mass area. For example, with Neighborhood Center, the percentage range of 50 to 75 percent is intended to look at the entire center and it does not need to occur on the same parcel. They can address how compliance is measured when they discuss the zoning code.

City Planner Paschke commented it would be flushed out more in the zoning code when they determine how they are going to achieve compliance in building specific regulations to get to the specific percentage.

Member Kimble explained it is more challenging to do this in a mixed use district because individual parcels may come up for development by different owners and developers.

Mr. Paschke stated there are some things in the code that prescribe how a given area is to develop over the course of time. It is up to the planners on staff to make sure they are achieving all of the specific requirements of the zoning district in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. With regard to multi-level buildings, the zoning ordinance would make it a square footage or floor area ratio versus just a footprint to make sure the goals are achieved.

Ms. Perdu advised at this point, the intent is to be general and save the detail questions for the zoning revisions.

Member Gitzen commented a master plan should be included in all mixed use district requirements.

Member Kimble referred to Neighborhood Center and pointed out the description does not show that it “requires” a predominant mix of use. Also, with the subdivision language changes, she remembers they removed the definition of streets, yet she sees them included in Neighborhood Center, and Corridor Mixed

Use. She inquired if they have any districts that would allow for a walkable stretch of blocks with a mix of residential and commercial, similar to Excelsior and Grand in St. Louis Park or Grand Avenue in St. Paul. She also pointed out in Community Mixed Use, mid-high density should say med-high density, and inquired why Core Mixed Use is so limited with residential. There is a lot of land, they could include residential vertically, and she would support it going up to 50 percent.

Ms. Perdu explained the intent of the Corridor Mixed Use is to allow flexibility in a larger area with both vertical and horizontal mixed use. The Core Mixed Use includes Rosedale and that entire commercial area. They left the density beginning at zero percent and up to 25 percent and would like to hear from other Commissioners if they think it should be increased.

Ms. Collins commented she was at a meeting where they reported Edina is proposing a density of 65 units per acre in an area of development.

Chair Murphy inquired what type of elevation would be required to allow for that amount.

Mr. Paschke responded it would be six stories in height. However, they are on small lots that include commercial on the bottom and residential on top. He inquired if the zero to 25 percent density with the Core Mixed Use would allow for more than that with the zoning code.

Ms. Perdu commented they could allow for more flexibility in these percentages and the code would be more specific.

Mr. Lloyd inquired if this discussion allows them to be less descriptive about the range. He suggested with the Core Mixed Use, they want it to be mostly an intense commercial area. However, a substantial amount of housing is also allowed and that can be defined in the zoning updates.

Member Bull agreed with Mr. Lloyd, and stated if the zoning has the percentages, a person could request a variance.

Ms. Perdu suggested they keep percentages in with the Neighborhood Center and Community Mixed Use where a minimum residential is required.

The Commission agreed with Ms. Perdu and supports removing the use percentages in the remaining summaries.

Member Kimble pointed out parks and open space is mentioned in all the mixed uses except for Core Mixed Use, and she suggested they at least include green connectors with that use.

Member Sparby pointed out except for Neighborhood Center, all the titles include the words “mixed use”. He suggested it be called Neighborhood Mixed Use.

Ms. Perdu moved the discussion to the four types of employment districts. She reported the Low-Intensity Employment district includes single office buildings, the Employment Center includes business parks, and aside for some changes to transportation descriptions, there were no changes to Industrial and Institutional.

Member Kimble commented she struggles with the term Low-Intensity Employment since there can be quite a few employees in a single office.

Ms. Perdu commented they will work on a new name.

Chair Murphy referred to Industrial, inquired what type of laboratory would be included in that use, and questioned the term “freight connections” under transportation considerations. He suggested they use the term “rail connections.”

Ms. Perdu stated that word “laboratory” was carried over from the previous plan and she did not have any specific intent for it. She agreed it could be located in other areas, and will delete it. Regarding freight connections, this description will be linked with the City’s Transportation Plan that includes a freight element. Ms. Perdu requested the Commission give her additional changes in wording after the meeting, or email them to Mr. Lloyd.

Member Gitzen inquired if self-driving cars are incorporated into this plan. It has been reported that in 10 to 20 years, parking lots and garages will be obsolete.

Member Kimble inquired if something should be included acknowledging this possibility.

Mr. Lloyd stated there are petroleum storage facilities are in town that may not be needed, but could still be used for industrial purposes. He inquired if they should consider a policy that if gas stations start to close, the City will step in to help develop that site so there are not gas stations sitting empty on corners.

Member Bull agreed they will see a movement to smaller and self-driving vehicles, but not the obsolescence of gas stations in this timeframe. The roadway structure and infrastructure will begin to change dramatically with these forecasted changes.

b. Future Land Use Map

Discussion of overall future land use map as updated with new land use designations based on previous discussion, how land use designations affect (and are affected by) certain Metropolitan Council requirements, and potential development/redevelopment areas, in general, as well as deeper discussion of select “special study areas”

Ms. Perdu displayed the 2040 Future Land Use map.

Dale Street and the south side of Highway 36 (near the Parkview School site)

Mr. Lloyd highlighted property in the northeastern corner of Parkview School site and the intersection of Dale Street and Highway 36. The properties have traditionally been single family and the Institutional zoning regulation has been limiting efforts to redevelop it. He suggested it be guided Low Density Residential or Medium Density Residential to allow that property to be something more than single family homes.

Mr. Lloyd displayed a sketch from one of the property owners that showed an outline of the southern property and five townhouse units. The property owner has indicated that the neighboring property owner is interested in the same kind of idea. The County has indicated if the properties were both developed in this way, they would prefer a single access to both locations as well as to the ball fields to the south.

Alex McKinney, property owner, commented he purchased the property in 2013 or 2014, and it was previously residential. It is located on the east side of Parkview School with ballfields adjacent to the property. The two properties combined are about one acre and they are both located on the south side of Highway 36. After speaking with the other property owner, they decided to look into having a larger area of townhouses. They are requesting higher density zoning on both properties to allow for this.

Chair Murphy inquired what future tenants would think about being next to the middle school.

Mr. McKinney responded there is a park on the northern third of the site. The school is next door to his property, but it is about a quarter mile walk to it. He is not concerned with Highway 36 being on the other side because on the north side of the highway, townhomes were built and are selling. Mr. McKinney commented he is open to feedback from the City on whether the units should be rented or owned.

Member Kimble stated having a school nearby can be a good selling point and likes the idea of townhouses in this area. She commented it would also be nice to have some green area in front as well.

Member Bull agreed and likes the idea of a medium residential because of the traffic pattern in the area, and drainage will have to be considered.

Member Gitzen suggested they figure out the access with the County and see if their requirements fit with the plan.

Mr. McKinney stated there is already a dual curb cut and water and electricity to the property.

Chair Murphy advised the Commission is generally receptive to this idea.

Mr. Lloyd advised they will update the future versions of the plan.

Ms. Perdu referred back to the 2040 Future Land Use map and stated the districts represent the proposed land use districts and not the titles from before. She then displayed the 2040 Future Land Use map with the Special Study Areas and stated they will include more detail on how those areas can be redeveloped.

Rice/Larpenteur area

Chair Murphy referred to the Rice/Larpenteur area and inquired if the intent was for the Special Study Area to go up further north.

Ms. Perdu advised they will make the map consistent with the scope of the study.

Presbyterian Homes office building – Hamline Avenue

Mr. Lloyd highlighted this area as one that Member Gitzen had suggested. It includes the Presbyterian Homes office building on Hamline Avenue, the Hamline Shopping Center, and the gas station.

Member Gitzen advised this area is owned by Presbyterian Homes and they plan to redevelop it.

Ms. Perdu advised they will highlight it as a redevelopment area.

West side of Snelling – across from HarMar and Target

This area was also highlighted for redevelopment by Member Gitzen. He stated there is a line of fast food restaurants and this whole area seems logical for redevelopment.

Member Sparby agreed this area needs to be targeted for development/redevelopment.

South of County Road C and East of Snelling Avenue

Mr. Lloyd reported this area is guided as medium density and residential.

Chair Murphy stated the usability of this site was always a question because of a marshy area east of Snelling.

Ms. Perdu stated they had discussion on this site and had changed the use to single family.

Member Gitzen commented it is underutilized and fits under development/redevelopment.

Snelling and County Road C – Byerly's Center area

Member Gitzen stated part of this area had already been discussed, but more of it needs to be included in development/redevelopment.

Mr. Paschke pointed out part of the site that is included in the Twin Lakes development area.

Member Gitzen commented when and if the Ford business is no longer there, the retail mix will be changing. The area to the west is prime to be redone.

The Commission agreed they would like to include the areas suggested by Member Gitzen.

As requested by the Commission at a previous meeting, Ms. Perdu provided information on what is going on in Edina with Southdale Center. She reported Edina designated this as their community activity center in their 2008 Comprehensive Plan. The current zoning is mostly a land commercial district, and general objectives include details about mixed use, increased density and intensity of use, life-cycle housing, and a safe pedestrian environment. There is a mixture of zoning districts around the perimeter of Southdale, and there is not one cohesive district for the area. They did have a small area plan where they provided a framework vision with specific uses with an emphasis on human-scale, reducing surface parking, creating a better street grid, and buffering pedestrians.

Member Kimble pointed out this was in the 2008 plan, but it did not materialize until now. She stated the City has made the streets more user friendly and broken down, and they have been doing a really nice job in changing the character of the area.

Ms. Perdu commented they could potentially incorporate these types of ideas into their narrative about Rosedale and the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Perdu continued her report on the calculations associated with the Metropolitan Council requirements.

Affordable Housing

The Metropolitan Council requires there to be enough residential density and available land for development and redevelopment. This creates opportunities for affordable housing and it is important the City guides at least eight units per acre to meet the 120-unit required. They use the minimums of the City's density range to calculate how many units it will get and the City's affordable housing allocation is 142 units. Currently, the City's high density residential meets this minimum at 238 residential units. At this point, Community Mixed Use does not count toward the affordable housing allocation.

In response to Member Kimble, Ms. Perdu explained they take the developable acres (19.8) and multiply it by the minimum density (12 units per acre) to get 238

minimum units. The yield factor shows that it is important to have a minimum residential requirement in districts so that it can be included in the calculations.

Chair Murphy inquired what the current numbers are for affordable housing compared to the Metropolitan Council requirement.

Ms. Collins responded the City is required to identify housing programs and tools they offer to the Metropolitan Council, and they provide a score of how the City is doing with affordable housing opportunities. This has been between 90 and 100 percent for the last couple of years. Roseville has very limited vacant land and that is why they are looking at redevelopment in areas that may accommodate multifamily housing.

Ms. Perdu reported Roseville is classified as Urban. The eight units per acre is the minimum density requirement throughout the metro area.

Member Bull clarified the numbers show they should provide an additional 72 units of affordable housing for people that are making less than \$24,000 in income.

Ms. Perdu responded the portion below 50 percent area median income (AMI) has to be at a higher density than 8 units per acre. It is required to be 12 units per acre, but the City's high-density category already meets the minimum.

Meeting Forecasts

Roseville's population is projected to gain about 840 people and 1,477 households through 2040. The household sizes will be going down, and the new housing that is going to be developed will be multi-family, which means less people per household. This is very common in the urban and inner ring suburbs of the Metropolitan Council.

Member Bull stated he recalled the projected number of households to be around 600. Ms. Perdu stated she will look into it.

Ms. Perdu explained the Plan Yield is how many households and how much population the City could yield from development and redevelopment. It includes the available acres, programmed density, and projected persons per household.

Ms. Perdu reported the City meets the population projection and is slightly under the forecast for the number of households. One way to increase the number of developable households would be to increase the areas designated as redevelopment. The City has more housing projected than people projected, and the Metropolitan Council assumes that new development is going to be for smaller households.

Member Daire commented the 2010 census figures for population and household shows there are 2.3 persons per household. The 2040 plan shows there to be 2.14

persons per household. The ageing section of the population will not be around in 2040, and then the population density per household drops. The Metropolitan Council may have missed this with its recommendations and they should look more closely at it.

Ms. Perdu responded she can talk with their Metropolitan Council representative to get more information about what was behind the recommendation.

Community Designation: Urban

Ms. Perdu read the description of what an urban community is and explained if they can meet the criteria for the Urban designation, the rest of it will fall into place. Urban communities are expected to plan for forecasted population and household growth at average densities of at least 10 units per acre for new development and redevelopment. Roseville has the same designation as Golden Valley, Edina, and Bloomington, among others.

Chair Murphy inquired what Arden Hills was designated as.

Ms. Perdu responded they are designated as suburban which requires a density of five units per acre. There is a total of nine designations for communities in the metro area. The intent is to have more growth towards the center of communities.

Mr. Paschke stated it better utilizes systems already in place, such as public transit and infrastructure, versus stretching the systems and expanding outward.

Ms. Perdu highlighted the table found on page 27 of the meeting packet, and commented to make the calculation, they use any land use category with future residential development programmed, but not low density residential. She explained Roseville's Community Designation Density is 7.04 and it needs to be 10. This is found by dividing the minimum units (367) and dividing it by the guided total (52.07).

Ms. Perdu reported there are several ways the future land use maps can be modified to meet the forecast and Community Designation requirement. These include:

- Increase redevelopment areas
- Increase percentage of residential in mixed use districts
- Increase the minimum density ranges for Medium and High Density Residential and mixed use categories

Member Kimble suggested they add in the new areas to see how the number is impacted.

Ms. Perdu highlighted the different new areas on the map and commented only High Density Residential would help.

Member Kimble referred to the redevelopment site located south of County Road C and east of Snelling, and inquired if that site could be Medium Density instead of Low Density.

Mr. Paschke responded it potentially could, but the wetland area is fairly large and there would be an issue with access.

Ms. Perdu provided a scenario where they could increase the minimum Medium Density to six, the minimum High Density to 18, and the minimum Neighborhood Center and Community Mixed Use minimums to six to achieve the required density of 10 units per acre.

Member Daire suggested they keep Medium Density and Neighborhood at four, High Density at 12, and change the Community Mixed Use to 10.

Ms. Perdu suggested they put Medium Density at five, High Density at 13, Neighborhood Center at four, and Community Mixed Use at 10.

Member Kimble commented she likes this scenario better based on the description of Community Mixed Use.

Member Daire inquired if this meets the 1,477 required households. Ms. Perdu stated that number will also include Low Density Residential, and with the additional area they are close.

Member Kimble and Chair Murphy stated they like Member Daire's suggestion.

Mr. Lloyd pointed out that Low Density Residential could have up to eight dwelling units per acre, as stated in its description, which helps in the calculation.

Chair Murphy requested comments from staff regarding the new numbers they proposed.

Mr. Lloyd responded adjusting the minimum is immaterial because developers generally want to do as much as possible.

Ms. Paschke agreed they are typically at or near maximums, not minimums.

The Commission agreed they were comfortable with the following minimums: Medium Density Residential at five, High Density Residential at 13, Neighborhood Center at five, and Community Mixed Use at 10.

Ms. Perdu advised she will redo the maps and update the numbers based on discussion and provide an update at the next meeting. There will be a HarMar Walkabout on July 20, and an EDA work session on July 18. At their next meeting on July 26, they will have final concepts for land use, ideas for the special study areas, and begin discussion on housing.

Member Bull requested an update on Meeting in a Box and inquired who they have reached out to. He suggested providing a one-hour training session to familiarize people on how Meeting in a Box works. He also inquired about surveys.

Mr. Lloyd reported another Meeting in a Box was done since the last meeting, and a couple more people have indicated interest. It was also brought to the Human Rights, Inclusion, and Engagement Commission meeting last week, but he is unsure if it will produce any more Meeting in a Box events. He will also look at what contact information he has for people who attended the kickoff event and consider how to reach out to them. They hope to have a short video tutorial on how it works and plan to reach out to the Nextdoor community with information. Regarding surveys, he has not heard of recent survey numbers, but will look into it.

Member Bull inquired how they are going to set a baseline and measure goals. They should consider ways they can group the measurement of goals to make it easier to gather results.

Ms. Perdu advised this will be covered in the implementation chapter of the plan, but it can also be discussed along the way.

Mr. Paschke responded there will be some goals, such as code modifications, that are not measurable because they are not associated with a number.

Member Kimble commented she has an article available from the *National Real Estate Investor* publication on the topic of Self Storage.

Member Bull inquired if they should be doing anything to prepare for their joint meeting with the City Council on July 24.

Mr. Paschke suggested they come up with topics for discussion and they can go over them at the next meeting. He will email out the agenda from the previous joint City Council meeting along with the article from Member Kimble.

6. Adjourn

MOTION

Member Kimble moved, seconded by Member Gitzen adjournment of the meeting at approximately 8:50 p.m.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.