



**Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Minutes – Wednesday, July 26, 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, Community Development Director Collins called the Roll.

Members Present: Chair Robert Murphy; Vice Chair James Bull; and Commissioners Sharon Brown, Chuck Gitzen, Julie Kimble, Peter Sparby, and Jim Daire.

Staff/Consultants Present: Community Development Director Kari Collins, Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd, Consultant Erin Perdu, WSB, and Lydia Major, LHB

Chair Murphy requested Agenda Approval be added to this and future agendas.

Member Bull requested an addition to the agenda regarding Discussion on Items from Previous Meetings be added to this and future agendas.

MOTION

Member Bull moved, seconded by Member Gitzen to add Discussion on Items from Previous Meetings to this and future agendas to allow for follow up discussion specific to the Comprehensive Plan.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

MOTION

Member Bull moved, seconded by Member Daire to approve the agenda as amended.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

3. Review of Minutes

a. June 28, 2017, Special Planning Commission Meeting – Comprehensive Plan Update

Corrections

▪ Page 9, Line 376 (Gitzen)

Change wording to, “Member Gitzen commented when and if the Ford business is no longer there, the retail mix will be changing.”

▪ **Page 11, Line 446 (Bull)**

Change wording to, “Member Bull stated he recalled the projected number...”

MOTION

Member Gitzen moved, seconded by Member Bull to approve the June 28, 2017 meeting minutes as amended.

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*

Gary Grefenberg, 91 Mid Oaks Lane, Roseville

Mr. Grefenberg commented he has worked in southwest Roseville as a neighborhood organizer, was part of the last Comprehensive Plan Review Committee, and served as Chair of the Human Rights Commission and the Community Engagement Commission. He stated the City’s community participation efforts have been inadequate and the important issue of traffic congestion and speeding were left out of the notes. He suggested they provide the notes for the walkabouts to those who participated before they are finalized and provide the consultants with an overview of issues that have been present in Roseville. There are some significant land use changes they have previously fought against and got the Council to reject that the consultants may have no knowledge of.

Mr. Grefenberg referred to the 2040 Future Land Use map. He commented there was a good turnout for the east HarMar walkabout, but only three people showed up for the west HarMar walkabout. When they did the last review, they did not want to have the same zoning for HarMar that they had for Rosedale. They allowed Target to go through, but HarMar received a less intensive development designation. He suggested they consider redeveloping the HarMar Mall into a Community Center instead of developing a new one.

Mr. Grefenberg suggested they present the proposed Future Land Use plan to various neighborhoods. He believes there is strong opposition to the proposal for the northwest corner of Cleveland and County Road B. The townhouses and Midland Grove Condos have fought against losing the greenspace and it is now proposed as an area of development/redevelopment. Southwest Roseville has fought for more open space, but it appears it is being taken away. He urged City staff to use Nextdoor and other neighborhood networks to communicate with Roseville residents.

At the request of Member Kimble, Mr. Grefenberg pointed out the boundaries he considers to be part of southwest Roseville. These include Highway 36 to the north, Highway 280 to the west, the southern Roseville City limit boundary, and includes HarMar to the east.

Mr. Grefenberg stated he has not seen a Parks Department plan and he suggested they allow community input regarding the removal of mature trees in the proposed development area. He questioned the proposed zoning change for Evergreen Park to Institutional, wants to keep it as open space, and does not support the expansion of the parking lot. He then referred to the Pathway Master Plan and stated it did not include the 2030 Comprehensive Plan proposed pathways.

He requested they allow the residents in southwest Roseville to provide input on the proposed land use changes either through a focus group or neighborhood meeting.

Member Daire stated he is very interested in defining neighborhood groups and requested to meet with Mr. Grefenberg after the meeting to define neighborhood groups in southwest Roseville so that they can be involved in future discussion.

Mr. Grefenberg clarified there is no neighborhood association, but there are various interest groups and a variety of contacts who need to be involved.

Member Bull commented they need to involve all neighborhoods Roseville in this process. He explained that redevelopment does not necessarily mean new, and that was recently clarified in their joint meeting with the City Council. Regarding the area around Byerlys, redevelopment could include the restructuring of the existing buildings, and the parking areas around them. He also made a recommendation they use Nextdoor as a resource to gather the important issues from the community. The Pathways Master Plan is part of the Transportation Plan and the consultant is from the same company as Ms. Perdu. Items discussed are all being streamlined into the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. The Parks Department recently went through a Master Plan Update, and that is why it is not part of the current Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Murphy suggested Mr. Grefenberg attend the Planning Commission/PWETC Joint Meeting on August 22 to further discuss the Pathways plan.

Member Kimble commented if they reach out to the area described by Mr. Grefenberg, they should also include the area east of HarMar since they abut up to the area.

Member Gitzen stated the City Council directed them to revisit the neighborhoods after they come up with an initial plan.

Chair Murphy stated the technical update of the Comprehensive Plan does include a land use update. There are Planning Commission meetings that take place twice a month where people can be present to make comments on items that are not on the agenda. This Public Comment time is also available at every City Council meeting as well.

At the request of Chair Murphy, Mr. Grefenberg explained his area of concern regarding open space has to do with the proposed future land use for the park that is to be zoned Institutional. The Mid Oaks development and condos also want a certain area to be a park.

Chair Murphy responded the area where the park is wanted requires a land acquisition that has not taken place. The parcel across the street has been acquired, but not yet designated for park use.

- 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*

Member Kimble commented as a compliment to the City Council, she has observed they are good at having a focus on the issues at hand, sticking to them, and bringing closure to them.

Community Development Director Collins reported there were about 40 people who attended last week's walkabout at the HarMar location and she was very pleased. It was an active discussion and they received a lot of feedback.

Chair Murphy inquired how attendees of the walkabouts and Commission members receive the feedback from the event.

Ms. Perdu responded they do not require anyone to sign in at the event so they do not have their contact information. However, a summary of the discussion can be found on the website after each event.

Ms. Collins stated people understand they are there to make comments and provide feedback. At the walkabouts, they encourage them to stay connected to see how their comments are incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan.

5. Project File 0037: 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update

- a. Future Land Use Districts**

Review of suggested amendments for the Future Land Use Map based on comments from the July 18, 2017, meeting of the Roseville Economic Development Authority

Erin Perdu, WSB Consultant, reported after meeting with the City Council, there were a few areas they commented on. In the area around Byerlys and the restaurant area adjacent to Roseville, they expressed concern if those were appropriate areas to designate as redevelopment. She believes these concerns to be due to a misunderstanding of redevelopment. Based on previous comments in this meeting, it appears the definition of redevelopment has been clarified. She stated these areas do not necessarily have to be redeveloped, but they are areas that are underused and could use some intensification and redevelopment.

Chair Murphy confirmed the Byerlys site was discussed with the City Council at their joint meeting.

Member Kimble explained redevelopment is guidance and it encourages types of uses that create vibrancy that are attractive to residences and businesses. It does not mean they need to knock it down and build something new. If something is not working, they look at it and see if it could benefit from a broader use.

Member Daire suggested instead of using the term "redevelopment areas", they use the "term redevelopment opportunities" or "redevelopment potential." It

would then give the impression that shows there is opportunity for improvements in the land use and its potential. Retail and marketing are changing due to online purchasing, and there is community desire for small, family owned stores.

Member Gitzen inquired if there are any ramifications regarding affordable housing by using the word “opportunities” instead of “areas”.

Ms. Perdu responded she does not foresee any ramifications by changing the name of what it is called.

Member Daire commented it is an inventory of various kinds of uses and opportunities.

Member Bull explained the Comprehensive Plan expresses land use guidance. In the past, the HarMar area was guided for mall development and retail. Now they want to expand to a more modern use to make it available for business and residential opportunities.

Member Kimble commented one of the challenges is the way they may redevelop over time. It is more challenging when there are a lot of different owners and it develops over a long period of time. She inquired if it is enforced even though they refer to it as guidance.

Ms. Collins responded they are required to make sure the zoning code matches the goals of the land use designations. Moving forward, a property will need to redevelop within the zoning codes identified in the Comprehensive Plan. If it does not fit with what the developer is proposing, they will need to apply for a land use amendment. These designations should reflect what they want to do and attract in the future.

Senior Planner Lloyd explained the Comprehensive Plan is very much supported by the zoning to the land use area. The Twin Lakes area is the only Community Mixed Use area in the Comprehensive Plan, but it has 4 different zoning districts to support it. There can be some variation in how the zoning code reinforces the general guidance.

Member Bull advised a land use amendment needs super majority support from the Council and the Metropolitan Council needs to approve it.

Member Daire inquired if developers know what the Council will consider after the Future Land Use plan is approved by the Council, and the zoning regulations are applied.

Mr. Lloyd responded yes, and they would further say to developers it must be in line with the Comprehensive Plan and zoning code.

Ms. Collins commented when they refer to mixed use district, it does not necessarily mean vertical mixed uses. It also refers to a variety of mixed uses in certain areas. It may look like the definitions are being reinvented, but they are not radical changes as they are taking from what they already had in their existing definitions and trying to make the titles more reflective of what was already there.

Member Kimble stated some of it is the intention of how the mixed uses relate to each other. She suggested they have some visuals of examples on what some of these mixed uses mean.

Member Bull expressed a concern in changing the land use pattern and zoning code along with it is it becomes an existing nonconforming property. If property owners want to make modifications, they have to conform to new standards.

Member Kimble inquired how they govern allowable percentages for a mixed use area. She commented she likes the proposed change to the corridor mixed use.

Ms. Perdu explained Community Mixed Use requires a master plan for an entire area before development begins. It can be developed in phases, but percentages are determined up front.

Mr. Lloyd commented in Twin Lakes, there is land capacity to meet the 25 percent minimum residential requirement. They do not have a plan yet on how to make the transition if 75 percent of the land is developed and the last 25 percent needs to be residential.

Ms. Perdu stated they need to discuss HarMar and whether it should be Community Mixed Use, Corridor Mixed Use, or a split designation. She opined there should be some requirement for residential because the adjacent neighborhood wraps around it. She could also see a frontage along Snelling with a Corridor Mixed Use designation similar to the area across the street. She clarified Corridor Mixed Use allows residential, but does not require it. However, Community Mixed Use does require residential.

Member Kimble inquired what the impact on greenspace and gathering space would be if they were to align Corridor Mixed Use with Snelling.

Ms. Perdu explained Community Mixed Use references the inclusion of open space and Corridor Mixed Use does not require it. Having a split use on the parcel can be tricky for future development. If the parcel is divided, it will reduce the amount of area where residential is required.

Member Kimble inquired if they could have a Corridor Mixed Use with a minimum residential requirement. There is a lot of potential at that site for mixed income housing with its proximity to City transit.

Ms. Perdu responded the Council was looking at Corridor Mixed Use, thought it fit better with the property along Snelling, but did not want to see residential right along Snelling.

Chair Murphy commented a challenge in that area is foot crossing at Snelling and County Road B.

Ms. Perdu stated pedestrian crossing in this area has come up multiple times at the walkabouts.

Commissioner Gitzen commented he sees the HarMar area as one site and does not see the advantage of changing it to Corridor Mixed Use.

Mr. Lloyd explained there are areas around the community that have dual zoning characteristics. However, more recently the Council has expressed interest in not trying to do that intentionally. If the HarMar area is designated Community Mixed Use and it has a zoning district that requires a regulating plan, they could include text in the Comprehensive Plan that allows for commercial use along Snelling, limit commercial uses in the south and east portions of the site, and require minimum residential.

Member Kimble pointed out under uses, for Community Mixed Use it shows medium-high density residential, and for Corridor Mixed Use it says high density residential.

Chair Murphy explained it is confusing to have the upper bound of density at 36 dwelling units per acre for both Community Mixed Use and Corridor Mixed Use.

Ms. Perdu responded the upper bound is high density for both of those uses, and the lower bound is different for both.

Member Sparby commented Corridor Mixed Use eliminates the positive elements of Community Mixed Use, like parks and open spaces, and the inclusion of residential. The parcel is large and it should not be hard to meet the 25 percent residential requirement. He supports keeping it at Community Mixed Use.

Member Kimble agreed with Member Sparby.

Chair Murphy inquired if the Commission was interested in changing the definition for Corridor Mixed Use to have a residential requirement. No Members responded.

Member Gitzen commented he supports Community Mixed Use, but the wording in the Comprehensive Plan should clarify what they discussed for that area.

MOTION

Member Sparby moved, Member Kimble seconded to keep the HarMar site designated as Community Mixed Use with clarifying verbiage.

Member Gitzen requested a friendly amendment to the motion to include wording that explains their intent in that area. Members Sparby and Kimble accepted the amendment.

Mr. Lloyd stated they can add the nuance to the text instead of the graphic itself.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

Member Kimble clarified it does not mean everything gets torn down and there are a lot of options.

b. Future Land Use Map

Review suggested amendments to the Future Land Use Districts based on comments from the July 18, 2017, meeting of the Roseville Economic Development Authority

Ms. Perdu reported another item brought up by the Council for potential revision was to the Neighborhood Mixed Use category because they are only including corner parcels (with existing small businesses) in that category. The emphasis of that area is on small business that can serve as a “node” for that neighborhood and is compatible in scale with surrounding residences. She proposed removing the residential requirement and renaming the district to Neighborhood Node.

Member Gitzen commented when it says they are incorporating commercial and residential, it sounds like they are requiring residential.

Ms. Perdu stated she will revise the description to say, “These areas may incorporate a mixture of corporate and residential uses...”

Member Kimble suggested they state in the summary the places that require residential versus allow for it. She likes the title Neighborhood Node.

Member Daire stated it would be helpful for the density ranges for Low Density Residential and Medium Density Residential to be mutually exclusive densities. Low Density Residential could be 1.5 to 5 du/acre and Medium Density Residential could be 6 to 12 du/acre.

Ms. Perdu commented it is a typographical error and should read 1.5 to 4 du/acre, as stated in the description text.

Mr. Lloyd pointed out the description text for Low Density Residential actually shows a density of no more than eight to allow for duplexes.

Member Gitzen inquired if Medium Density Residential should say greater than four instead of five.

Ms. Perdu responded the standard is to use round numbers.

Mr. Lloyd commented regarding mutual exclusivity, there may not be a need for it to be that clean. There may be a residential pattern, like an apartment building, that fits into Medium Density Residential, but the developer wants a lower density that falls under Low Density Residential. This development type would be allowed at the lower density in the Medium Density Residential district.

Member Sparby commented it now seems there could be a mixture of commercial and residential in the Neighborhood Node district with a high percentage of commercial. He prefers having some residential guidelines and a requirement as a transitional zoning designation going from residential to commercial.

Ms. Perdu agreed and stated on the map, the neighborhoods are already there and they do not need to require residential development.

Mr. Lloyd pointed out the areas designated in the Neighborhood Node and commented the EDA preferred to keep the commercial allowance tighter to the corner. If they do that and require 50 to 75 percent residential, there is not a lot of room for commercial uses and it becomes more of a residential corner. In this area, there is not enough room to require the residential percentages.

Member Sparby stated he preferred the Neighborhood Mixed Use title because it was provided uniformity to the other mixed use designations.

Ms. Perdu stated she changed it because there is no requirement for residential, but it works either way.

MOTION

Member Bull moved, seconded by Member Gitzen to remove the residential requirement from the Neighborhood Node designation, and to rename it to be Neighborhood Mixed Use.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

The Commission recessed at 8:12 p.m. and reconvened at 8:21 p.m.

Member Gitzen inquired what multi-modal facilities refers to under Community Mixed Use and suggested it be defined.

Ms. Perdu responded they wanted to make sure pedestrians, bikes, transit, and anything else is incorporated into the designs for redevelopment.

c. Housing

Introduction to the topic of housing as the next major content area to address in the comprehensive plan update

Ms. Perdu advised she will present on the topic of housing, but suggested Members respond to the questions provided in the memo dated July 19, 2017 in the meeting packet via email to be reviewed at the next meeting. The Commission agreed.

Ms. Perdu reported based on the Land Use Map, the City will not have an issue with having enough density to meet the affordable housing requirements. She provided a rendering of the Market Value of Owner Occupied Housing and Housing Types for Roseville. A \$238,500 or less home is considered an affordable level designated by the Metropolitan Council based on 30 percent of a person's median income.

Chair Murphy inquired if Cooperative Housing was included in the Housing Types graph for Roseville.

Ms. Perdu responded it is included in the multi-family category.

She continued her report by showing a rendering of New Housing Units by Type and Cost-Burdened Households in Roseville. It showed there is a demand that current owners need more affordable options in a range of housing types, including lower-cost rental options. There have not been any affordable rental units constructed since 2011 or any owner-occupied units since 2006.

In response to Member Kimble, Mr. Lloyd stated the only multi-family developments that have taken place in recent years is Applewood Points and Cherrywood Points, which are both senior housing.

Member Kimble referred to the Cost-Burdened Household graph, and commented the graph could also reflect people buying homes they cannot afford.

Member Gitzen requested an electronic copy of the slides in the presentation. Mr. Lloyd stated he will email them out.

Ms. Perdu went over the questions she provided on page 16 in the meeting packet. She stated there are some creative things they can do with zoning and planning to make affordable housing more available and requested Members provide any other tools or examples that would be helpful for future discussion.

Member Kimble requested additional information from staff on what Roseville has used in the past and is presently using regarding affordable housing.

Mr. Lloyd suggested Members provide the answers to the questions to him by August 11 in order to get it into the meeting packet before the next meeting on August 23.

Member Daire inquired if the majority of Affordable Housing Tools on listed on page 20 in the meeting packet are government interventions or contributions for privately developed housing. He also requested to know what is available to them from Ramsey County that would be comparable to what Hennepin County provides so that they can make choices on what would apply to their housing goals.

Ms. Perdu agreed with Member Daire's descriptions of the Affordable housing tools.

Member Gitzen stated there was a recent *MinnPost* article by Peter Callaghan that talked about affordable housing and how cities are trying to enact ordinances to encourage naturally occurring affordable housing. He inquired if this has been looked at for Roseville.

Mr. Lloyd commented he was not familiar with it.

Member Kimble commented they have a huge stock of 1950s and 1960s ramblers that are coming into the affordable range and are considered starter homes, but she is unsure if they count with the Metropolitan Council.

Ms. Perdu advised they do not count with the Metropolitan Council, but they are considered naturally occurring affordable housing.

Ms. Collins commented Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing (NOAH) talks about reinvesting in the City's affordable housing stock and that is something they should take a look at. She would like to invite Jeanne Kelsey to their next meeting to talk about how some of the City's financing tools were developed and how they have or have not historically incentivized housing.

Member Kimble requested Ms. Kelsey also explain how challenging it is to build affordable housing.

d. Community Engagement Summary

Review the engagement activities to-date, as well as the main themes in the feedback that was offered, as "Phase 1" of the engagement plan is wrapped up

Lydia Major, LHB, provided an update on the Community Engagement Process. She reported it was helpful to have Mr. Grefenberg present at the beginning of the meeting and to hear his suggestions about how to improve the process.

Ms. Major referred to the memo dated July 17, 2017 in the meeting packet. They are finishing the final stages of the Phase 1 (Visioning) engagement process. They will take all the information gathered to fill in any gaps and adjust how they proceed with Phase 2. She explained Phase 2 is where they take all the gathered information and show more concrete ideas to the community for additional feedback.

Member Kimble inquired if the 527 responses to the survey is typical based on the amount that could have responded.

Ms. Major stated it represents just under a 1.5 percent response, it is not a statistically valid survey, and is getting close to what would be acceptable for a City this size. She encouraged Members to take all the feedback as a whole and not focus on just the survey results.

Ms. Major reported they met with staff to figure out how to fill in gaps and they will be meeting with specific community contacts for more information. They plan to proceed with one on one stakeholder interviews to get additional feedback. She encouraged Members to offer feedback on how to fill in gaps and will be flexible with suggestions for Phase 2.

Chair Murphy inquired what form the input will take and when they will be able to see it.

Ms. Collins responded they have a meeting tomorrow to talk about next steps for the visioning effort. They have not seen any draft language at this point. The Healthy Corridors Initiative is also taking place and the consultant will be part of that discussion in order to integrate it into the visioning effort. The goal is still to have a draft by the end of 2018.

Ms. Major responded they are developing some directions and will have another community meeting in September. There is quite a bit of idea generation going on right now, that should come in time to inform a lot of Ms. Perdu's thinking about the Land Use Map; however, with ULI and some of the refinements that will be made, that information will be following later.

Ms. Major requested feedback from Members on what they would like to see done to fill in the gaps from Phase 1 and if they had any suggestions about revising the plan and moving forward into Phase 2.

Member Bull inquired if Roseville's Communications staff have been utilized.

Mr. Lloyd explained the Communications staff are the ones that push information out on Nextdoor and Facebook as well as the quarterly newsletter and electronic communications. They provide them with the basic message and they will select the appropriate channels for those messages.

Ms. Collins added they publish the news updates, Roseville's Facebook page, Twitter account, and Nextdoor communications.

Member Kimble inquired if they have received any other notes from other focus groups.

Ms. Major referred to page 27 of the meeting packet, and pointed out the focus group meetings that have taken place. All the event summaries are up on the website, except for the most recent HarMar walkabout.

Member Kimble inquired what the thoughts were around the HarMar group and if there will be additional discussion.

Ms. Collins responded when they have a more defined plan that the community can react to and a more finalized Future Land Use Map, they plan to have various open houses to allow the community to respond to future land use changes.

Member Sparby thanked Mr. Grefenberg for his passion for southwest Roseville and inquired if a walkabout has happened in that area.

Ms. Perdu commented the closest walkabout was in the Evergreen Park area, but there was not one done in the far south.

Ms. Major explained walkabouts have a limitation in the amount of geographic area they can cover. They do not think of them as serving an entire district and are used more to cover a neighborhood. A community open house is more useful to a larger area. She cautioned that a good meeting turns out a few dozen people and it is not an active participation. The kick off meeting turned out 70 people, but the demographic was mostly white, middle-aged people and was not representative of Roseville's population. That is why they need to think creatively to find ways to meet a more diverse group of residents.

Member Sparby suggested they recruit captains or leaders in the area to try to get more people involved by word of mouth. He suggested Mr. Grefenberg as a stakeholder for an interview and stated they should be as transparent as possible with the stakeholder interview process.

Ms. Major stated they are still working on the stakeholder interview list and making sure it represents the gaps they need to fill.

Mr. Lloyd commented in addition to advertising the walkabouts on social media, they also sent out a direct mailing to every household that lived within 1,000 feet.

Member Sparby stated one way to attend an event is receiving a mailing and choosing to go. Another way is being recruited by City leaders in your area.

Chair Murphy inquired if the City Council meeting with the EDA offered any additional suggestions on how to proceed.

Ms. Collins stated that meeting was very focused and did not talk about engagement.

Ms. Major advised she will get back to them on the questions that were asked and present an outline on what is going to happen this fall.

e. Follow Up on Items from Previous Meetings (added agenda item at the request of Member Bull)

Member Bull inquired of Ms. Perdu if she had clarified with the Metropolitan

Council the number of new housing units required. At the previous meeting, it was reported that the Metropolitan Council stated the City needed 1,477, but he thought it was around 600.

Ms. Perdu responded she did not have any new information pertaining to this request, but will provide an electronic response before the next meeting.

Member Bull stated it will be good to keep track of what the action items are to review at the next meeting. He inquired what the Phase 2 activities will include.

Ms. Major stated they are planning another community meeting, revisiting targeted groups, taking another round at intercept boards, providing a limited survey asking for feedback on directions given, and having a community open house that Ms. Collins previously described.

6. Adjourn

MOTION

Member Bull moved, seconded by Member Daire adjournment of the meeting at approximately 9:08 p.m.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.