



**Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update Meeting  
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive  
Draft Minutes – Wednesday, August 23, 2017 – 6:30 p.m.**

- 1 **1. Call to Order**  
2 Chair Murphy called to order a Special meeting of the Planning Commission meeting at  
3 approximately 6:30 p.m. for the purpose of updating the City’s comprehensive plan for  
4 2040.  
5
- 6 **2. Roll Call**  
7 At the request of Chair Murphy, Community Development Director Collins called the  
8 Roll.  
9
- 10 **Members Present:** Chair Robert Murphy; Vice Chair James Bull; and Commissioners  
11 Sharon Brown, Chuck Gitzen, Peter Sparby, and Jim Daire.  
12
- 13 **Members Absent:** Commissioner Julie Kimble  
14
- 15 **Staff/Consultants**  
16 **Present:** Community Development Director Kari Collins, Senior Planner  
17 Bryan Lloyd, Housing and Economic Development Manager  
18 Jeanne Kelsey  
19
- 20 **3. Approval of Agenda**  
21
- 22 **MOTION**  
23 **Member Bull moved, seconded by Member Daire to approve the agenda as**  
24 **presented.**  
25
- 26 **Ayes: 6**  
27 **Nays: 0**  
28 **Motion carried.**  
29
- 30 **4. Review of Minutes**  
31
- 32 **a. July 26, 2017, Special Planning Commission Meeting – Comprehensive Plan**  
33 **Update**  
34 *Commissioners had an opportunity to review draft minutes and submit their*  
35 *comments and corrections to staff prior to tonight’s meeting, for incorporation of*  
36 *those revisions into the draft minutes.*  
37
- 38 **MOTION**  
39 **Member Sparby moved, seconded by Member Bull to approve the July 26,**  
40 **2017 meeting minutes as presented.**  
41

42                   **Ayes: 6**

43                   **Nays: 0**

44                   **Motion carried.**

45  
46 **5.       Communications and Recognitions:**

47  
48       **a.       From the Public:** *Public comment pertaining to general land use issues not on*  
49       *this agenda*

50  
51       **b.       From the Commission or Staff:** *Information about assorted business not already*  
52       *on this agenda, including a brief update on the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update*  
53       *process*

54  
55                   Member Bull commented the joint meeting they had with the PWET Commission  
56                   was not what he had anticipated. He was expecting an open forum, but the  
57                   consultant reported for a majority of the meeting. While some questions were  
58                   answered, he was disappointed with effort of the consultant and lack of time  
59                   allowed for the joint meeting.

60  
61                   Chair Murphy advised there may be another opportunity to meet jointly regarding  
62                   the Comprehensive Plan, and they will continue to meet periodically after that.

63  
64                   Member Bull suggested at future joint meetings, the consultant only comment if  
65                   clarity is needed. There needs to be dialogue between the two Commissions. The  
66                   PWET Commission plans to have the Transportation Plan done at the end of  
67                   September.

68  
69                   Ms. Collins commented the consultant present at the joint meeting was the  
70                   engineer that was leading the Transportation Plan effort. If they do meet jointly  
71                   again, Lydia will probably lead it and it would have more of a discussion format.

72  
73                   Member Sparby agreed with Member Bull regarding the joint meeting. The  
74                   objective of the meeting was not clearly defined, a lot of the meeting time was  
75                   filled with a report from the consultant, and a discussion between the two  
76                   Commissions would have been more helpful. If they decided to have another joint  
77                   meeting, they need to have a clear objective to accomplish.

78  
79                   Member Bull stated they were given a packet prior to the meeting that he had  
80                   questions on, but they did not even go through it.

81  
82                   Chair Murphy inquired if the PWET Commission is on track for a final draft of  
83                   the Transportation Plan at the end of September. He suggested they invite the  
84                   PWET Commission to one of the Planning Commission meetings in October.

85  
86                   Senior Planner Lloyd responded he believes that to be accurate.  
87

88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132

Member Gitzen agreed that the joint meeting was not what he had expected, but the material they received was informative.

Member Bull commented he did not agree with the consultant’s comment that the open house was well attended. He attended it, and there were only 15-20 people present, which is not representative of the population of Roseville.

Ms. Collins suggested they invited the PWET Commission to an upcoming Comprehensive Plan Update meeting.

Member Daire stated he found it interesting that the PWET Commission used the forecasted land use model provided by the Metropolitan Council for their trip generation and allocation. However, the Planning Commission is working on is an updated land use map that is not part of the transportation forecast. They should have benchmarks for the amount of retail, housing, and institutional development they would allow that would trigger additional trips. He was dismayed that the models they are responding to were generated downtown St. Paul, and not in Roseville. If Highway 35W and Highway 36 are seen as channels for through-traffic, it means they will be channeling through-traffic through Roseville on the collector streets. He expressed concern with how the Transportation Plan and Land Use Plan will be integrated.

Member Bull commented Roseville is not an isolated entity. If development happens in areas outside of the City, it will affect traffic, and he does not think this has been taken into consideration.

Chair Murphy agreed and commented he believes Rice Creek Commons is going to have an impact on traffic that has not been considered. The addition of more busses on the A line is not a sufficient solution.

Member Daire recalled the PWET Commission Chair commented they were relying on the transit system as the bailout for the congestion and accident data.

Member Bull stated it is commendable the PWET Commission is requesting expansion of the A line from the Metropolitan Council.

Member Sparby commented even though areas like Highway 36, Highway 35W, and Fairview are not in their jurisdiction, they should be recording problem areas so that in 10 years they can see if there is still a problem.

Member Brown commented she looked at the 2030 Plan, and Highway 36 and Highway 35W was identified as a problem there. With the addition of housing and infrastructure, she inquired how far out will it get pushed out if they move ahead with the same problem in the 2040 Plan.

133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179

Member Bull commented the conversation they are having is representative of the concern they have had with the Transportation Plan being separate from the Comprehensive Plan effort.

Ms. Collins stated staff will meet with Erin Perdue and Scott Mareck from WSB to discuss the concerns of the Planning Commission and how the plans are going to integrate.

Mr. Lloyd highlighted the upcoming meetings regarding the Comprehensive Plan provided in the meeting packet.

Chair Murphy inquired about the focus of open house scheduled in October.

Mr. Lloyd responded it is related to the changing of names and land uses within the Land Use Plan. It gives people the opportunity to share their thoughts before they make a final recommendation to the City Council.

Chair Murphy recalled the City Council wanted the final draft of the Comprehensive Plan available for public comment, but it is not on the timeline. It should also be presented in different forums, not just at one meeting.

Mr. Lloyd pointed out the timeline only goes through November, and it probably will not be completed before then. The deadline for the final plan is the end of 2018. They plan to have their work done by the end of 2017 so that the reviews by the Metropolitan Council and adjacent communities can take place in 2018.

Ms. Collins commented there is a mandatory six-month review period for adjacent communities. After City Council approval, it will be sent out to neighboring communities.

Mr. Lloyd explained the City Council will receive feedback from adjacent communities and determine if it should be incorporated into the final plan.

Member Bull commented there will also be several cycles with the Metropolitan Council as well.

Member Gitzen inquired about the review process regarding comments from adjacent communities.

Mr. Lloyd explained it is typically done by staff. They are public documents and could be available on the website so others can look at them as well.

Member Bull stated they have included defined goals and metrics, and inquired who is responsible for measuring them. It is important to define this up front because it could affect budgets and he does not want to over burden current and future staff.

180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226

Mr. Lloyd commented they should prepare for what it might take to accomplish all of it, or cut it down to what can reasonably be accomplished.

Ms. Collins reported they plan to have another open house for the Rice/Larpenteur area in October that will allow response to the draft language in the plan. Due to the involvement of the Urban Land Institute (ULI), the process was pushed back one month. The ULI is looking at a healthy corridors initiative, which is different than the Rice/Larpenteur visioning effort of redevelopment and infrastructure improvement. They met with the Gateway Planning Committee regarding infrastructure improvements in the corridor and a Rice Street traffic study will also be integrated.

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

**a. Follow-Up on Items from Previous Meetings**

*A question was raised at the July 26 meeting about why the Metropolitan Council's expectation of Roseville's capacity for additional residents by 2040 is smaller than the capacity for additional dwelling units. In brief, the expected number of new dwelling units is greater than the expected number of new residents because household size is expected to decrease. More detail on this is included in the packet.*

Mr. Lloyd explained the average household size is expected to decrease in the coming years. Even though population numbers going down, the number of dwelling units will increase to house the people that are expected to be here.

Member Bull inquired if there was any record from the 2030 Plan with regards to how accurate the Metropolitan Council was with family size and population predictions.

Mr. Lloyd commented he has not looked into it, but could look into previous iterations of the plan.

Member Gitzen inquired if the Metropolitan Council considers trends. Millennials are not moving out, which may increase household size.

Mr. Lloyd stated with the aging community of Roseville, more people may be moving out of their homes into assisted living or dying at a greater rate than in past decades.

Ms. Collins commented another trend may be two-parent households going to one-parent households.

**b. Housing**

*Detailed discussion about goals and policies related to housing development as well as housing maintenance and redevelopment.*

227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272

Mr. Lloyd directed the Commission to the meeting packet, and introduced Housing and Economic Development Manager Jeanne Kelsey.

Chair Murphy referred to a report in the packet done by Maxfield Research, and inquired when it was completed.

Ms. Kelsey responded it was completed in May 2013.

Ms. Kelsey commented it will be beneficial to review the 2030 Plan. She reported the roles and statutes of the Housing and Redevelopment Authority (HRA) has been rolled into the Economic Development Authority (EDA). The City can utilize both for funding and levies, and they are currently looking at one levy for the EDA.

Ms. Kelsey suggested they discuss the goals and policies of the 2030 Plan to provide feedback to the consultant for incorporation into the 2040 Plan.

**Goal 1: Provide a wide variety of housing options in order to retain and attract a diverse mix of people and family types with varying economic statuses, ages, and abilities.**

Policy 1.1: Promote the development of housing stock that is appealing to persons of varying economic means.

Ms. Kelsey reported they do have programs that have supported this type of housing in the past. They have used funds to address aging apartment buildings as well as age-restrictive housing. They have surpassed the five-year projections for cooperative and assisted living housing. There are funds available promoting the development of housing stock and can utilized Tax Increment Financing (TIF).

Policy 1.2: Regularly review official controls to ensure the opportunities for development of new housing stock, enhancement of existing housing stock, and ability to provide diversity of housing choices.

Ms. Kelsey reported the community has also supported a variety of housing choices. A nonprofit purchased an aging apartment development in the southwest corner of Roseville and invested money into renovating all the units. On excess land, another 50 units were built on that site.

Policy 1.3: Encourage the development of market-rate, intergenerational rental housing.

Ms. Kelsey reported it is still a goal to encourage the development of market-rate, intergenerational rental housing. When a market rate development comes forward, they often need an affordable component in order to make them work, and intergenerational housing often naturally occurs. When some people want to

273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319

downsize their homes, they want to rent for a few years before they move to an age-restricted community.

In response to Chair Murphy, Ms. Kelsey advised the HRA and EDA are now referred to as the EDA.

Policy 1.4: Partner with the HRA to provide programs to encourage a range of housing choices for all residents in Roseville.

Ms. Kelsey reported the HRA did get involved in a variety of new construction and took over the Housing Replacement Program, which considers properties that have aged out of their usefulness. As an example, the EDA acquired an estate, tore the house down, and then made the lot available for a house to be built on. They also have a loan program targeting money towards median value homes and below, in order to sustain tax value on properties. The maximum amount that can be borrowed is \$40,000 at a four percent interest rate for 10 years.

Policy 1.5: Partner with regional, state, and federal agencies, other cities/HRAs, nonprofit groups, and private-sector developers to provide high-quality, affordable housing to accommodate the City's share of regional affordable-housing needs.

Ms. Kelsey reported with larger developments, a partnership occurs. It may not be financial, but might include completion of a trail, connectivity, or meeting zoning requirements. In an effort to support affordable housing, the City has worked with developers who are willing to incorporate it. In the Applewood Pointe development, they offered five first-time home buyer homes of new construction and partnered with Habitat for Humanity to build two additional homes.

Policy 1.6: Integrate housing plans and policies with other City planning initiatives.

Ms. Kelsey reported the Development Review Committee (DRC) makes sure they are integrating housing plans with other Cities policies and initiatives.

Member Gitzen commented these policies are still relevant and inquired if they should somehow include Mixed-Use Residential and encourage housing near mass transit.

Member Sparby commented it may be more cost effective if they include incentives for private sector development versus using City resources.

Mr. Lloyd stated there can be financial incentives and regulatory incentives. For example, multi-family developments could receive a density bonus if they incorporated structured parking versus surface parking.

320 Member Sparby commented he wants to include language about incentivizing  
321 private sector development to make clear the City supports it.  
322

323 Member Gitzen inquired how the EDA gages success when a house is torn down  
324 and a developer rebuilds on it.  
325

326 Ms. Kelsey responded the HRA wanted to put in controls around investors who  
327 buy homes and turn them into rentals. They require a development agreement and  
328 process that requests financial information, escrows, and plans for construction.  
329

330 Member Gitzen inquired if they looked for other grants.  
331

332 Ms. Kelsey responded in order to get those grants, you had to be a hard-hit  
333 community, and Roseville never met the criteria. The money comes back to the  
334 City through the tax base increase and the increase in value from the previous  
335 home.  
336

337 Member Daire inquired about the cost of surface parking versus structured  
338 parking.  
339

340 Mr. Lloyd commented he is unsure. It may be \$20,000 per stall for structured  
341 parking.  
342

343 Member Daire commented when he was working, surface parking was valued at  
344 \$2,500 per space and structured parking was \$10,000 per space. It is a significant  
345 cost especially if there are two vehicles per multi-family unit.  
346

347 Mr. Lloyd stated they would not expect a developer to get all the surface stalls  
348 into structured parking in order to receive a density bonus. They might require at  
349 least half of the surface stalls be accommodated by structured parking. He  
350 recalled three parking stalls would be enough to get one more dwelling unit.  
351

352 Member Daire stated Rosedale has both surface and structured parking and may  
353 have current figures.  
354

355 Chair Murphy commented they are more interested in the housing component  
356 versus commercial.  
357

358 **Goal 2: Maintain and enhance Roseville as a community with strong,**  
359 **desirable, and livable neighborhoods.**  
360

361 Policy 2.1: Promote and maintain neighborhoods through official controls  
362 supporting design elements that create safer streets, facilitate social interaction  
363 between neighbors, and enhance neighborhood connectivity, such as sidewalks or  
364 pathways, streetscaping, traffic-calming strategies, and open or green space.  
365



366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412

Mr. Lloyd reported these items have been incorporated into the zoning code. The minimum house setback from the right of way is 30 feet, but they allow front porches to extend into that area. It provides a social connection for neighbors. The regulations on garages enhances the designs of homes. It is perceived as more of a residential property versus a line of garages and driveways. These regulations could be changed, and other regulations could be added.

Policy 2.2: Provide Programs for rehabilitating and upgrading existing housing stock.

Ms. Kelsey reported the City, State, and County all have programs to support this.

Policy 2.3: Support housing renovation, redevelopment, and/or infill projects that complement existing neighborhood character and improve neighborhood desirability and longevity.

Ms. Kelsey reported they previously had a program that would pay up to half the architectural fees as well as a program that looked for people to submit their home for an architect to provide a design. This was to discourage a two-story home from popping up on a street lined with ramblers.

Chair Murphy inquired what neighborhood longevity refers to.

Mr. Lloyd responded it has to do with the stability of a neighborhood and its ability to keep up with the maintenance and quality of homes over time.

Policy 2.4: Maintain and encourage a mix of housing types in each neighborhood based on available amenities, transportation resources, and adjacent land uses.

Mr. Lloyd reported an example of this is a 2007 lot split study which reviewed subdividing in Roseville. The outcome of the study determined that the City should still allow it, and the zoning code was updated to allow for subdividing in the standard single-family district.

Member Daire stated this policy assumes that Roseville has defined neighborhoods. However, there are only one or two defined neighborhoods in Roseville. Unless a neighborhood is defined verbally or geographically, it is difficult to know what this policy is being matched to.

Mr. Lloyd stated there are other goals and policies that encourage and support the creation of neighborhood identities and it is most successful when it comes from the community. The planning districts he has looked at are remarkably close to the Nextdoor neighborhood boundaries.

Member Daire commented he would be interested to see how those two boundaries compare on a graphic and it is a good place to start a discussion.

413 Mr. Lloyd agreed to send out the information via email.

414  
415 Ms. Collins stressed sensitivity to any language in the Comprehensive Plan that  
416 might try to identify neighborhoods. Everyone’s definition of their neighborhood  
417 may be different. When they launch Nextdoor, they received a lot of feedback  
418 from residents regarding how they identified what was in their neighborhood.

419  
420 Member Daire stated a discussion needs to start someplace and they could request  
421 feedback from residents on what neighborhood they identify with.

422  
423 Member Bull inquired what they are trying to achieve with this policy by  
424 encouraging a mix of housing types in each neighborhood. Owasso Hills is a more  
425 expensive housing development and it does not seem very fitting to put a mix of  
426 housing types in that subdivision.

427  
428 Ms. Kelsey explained Owasso Hills has townhomes and detached homes to  
429 support the variety of housing types. A mix of housing types does not mean the  
430 inclusion of a small home next to a large one, or multi-family housing.

431  
432 Member Gitzen commented it is a good policy, but suggested they remove the  
433 word “neighborhood.”

434  
435 Chair Murphy stated they may need to reword Goal 2, which uses the words  
436 “livable neighborhoods.”

437  
438 Mr. Lloyd referred to the armory site as an example, and commented there could  
439 be higher density townhouse lots on one end of the site, lower density single-  
440 family homes on the other end of the site, with a variety of densities on the  
441 middle. Instead of giving a general statement about requiring a variety of housing  
442 types, this policy directs it in specific areas.

443  
444 Chair Murphy pointed out Garden Station has single family homes to the north  
445 and east, then townhouses and apartment building to the south and it seems to fit  
446 well in that area.

447  
448 Member Bull commented he does not think it should say “in each neighborhood,”  
449 but rather “as appropriate.”

450  
451 Member Gitzen pointed out if they are talking about a policy under the goal of a  
452 neighborhood, they do not say “in each neighborhood.”

453  
454 Policy 2.5: Encourage the integration of affordable housing in new and existing  
455 neighborhoods.

456  
457 Ms. Kelsey reported the Council has given direction to developers that they want  
458 to see integrated affordable housing, not segregated affordable housing. She  
459 provided an example where they were encouraged to work with Habitat for

460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506

Humanity or Journey Homes, to build an affordable home in an existing neighborhood.

Policy 2.6: Prevent neighborhood decline by supporting ongoing code-compliance inspections and neighborhood reinvestment strategies.

Ms. Kelsey commented the Neighborhood Enhancement Program looks at both residential and commercial development. They send out notice and then actively go out and look for code compliance. There is \$105,000 in a revolving abatement program for properties that are not in compliance. This means they take the cost that was associated with correcting the non-compliance, put it back on the owner's property taxes, and pay the program back.

Member Gitzen inquired if rental licensing and regulations should be included in the policy.

Ms. Kelsey explained it would fit under this policy. They could use a proactive approach and state they are preventing neighborhood decline by supporting ongoing compliance.

Policy 2.7: Encourage communication channels between residential and commercial property owners/managers, to resolve potential neighborhood issues.

Ms. Kelsey reported there are areas with homes next to a commercial element, and they would encourage businesses and neighborhoods to work out issues. An example might be when a garbage trucks arrives before a certain allowed time, and the noise disturbs neighborhood.

Mr. Lloyd stated in a lot of instances, the commercial property manager wants to be a good neighbor and when they are made aware of issues, they make changes.

Member Daire inquired if the City acts as a facilitator when connecting residential and commercial property owners.

Ms. Collins responded sometimes the City has been the mediator between property owners. Other times, residential owners will call the City because they do not have the contact information for the commercial owner. This policy encourages owners to resolve issues so the City does not have to deal with constant complaints.

Mr. Lloyd stated there have been times where property owners cannot find any satisfaction or resolution and it may do the City well to contract with a professional mediator to deal with it more efficiently.

Member Sparby suggested they change to wording in the policy "...attempt to resolve potential neighborhood issues."

507 Member Daire commented he has never seen this as a role of the City.

508  
509 Ms. Collins stated it is advantageous to the City to get both parties together when  
510 they are willing to discuss the issue versus taking constant complaint calls about  
511 it.

512  
513 Member Bull suggested the word “potential” be removed. If there is a need to  
514 communicate, there is already an issue.

515  
516 Policy 2.8: Identify and encourage the preservation of historic homes and  
517 neighborhoods.

518  
519 Ms. Kelsey reported the Historical Society has identified historical homes in the  
520 City. This does not prevent them from being torn down, but does provide an outlet  
521 for them to be notified so they can historically take record of those homes. The  
522 Roseville Historical Trail still exists and encourages history in the community.

523  
524 Chair Murphy inquired if there are historic neighborhoods in Roseville.

525  
526 Mr. Lloyd there are not any yet, but there are places that were developed in a  
527 certain time frame and have consistent architecture that could be of historic  
528 interest in the future.

529  
530 Mr. Lloyd inquired if there were any further comments on Goal 2.

531  
532 Member Daire commented since they are focusing neighborhoods as entities, they  
533 should be defined geographically if this is to have any meaning.

534  
535 Ms. Kelsey suggested they move on to Goal 3 where this is further addressed.

536  
537 Mr. Lloyd stated it might just be an issue of word choice. He inquired if  
538 “neighborhood” under Goal 2 are small areas as opposed to cohesive  
539 neighborhoods.

540  
541 Chair Murphy commented it would resolve his discomfort with historic  
542 neighborhoods. The term historic “areas” would be more appropriate.

543  
544 **Goal 3: Encourage the development of neighborhood identity that build a**  
545 **sense of community and foster neighborhood interaction, as appropriate.**

546  
547 Chair Murphy inquired if it should read, “...and foster neighbor interaction...”

548  
549 Member Bull commented it could be interaction between neighborhoods and  
550 neighbors.

551

552 Member Daire stated if they are talking about individuals, they have put  
553 themselves into the community organization mode. If they are talking about  
554 neighborhoods, they are trying to foster groups to communicate.

555  
556 Member Gitzen suggested they come back to it after they look at the policies  
557 associated with it.

558  
559 Policy 3.1: Foster the creation of individual neighborhood identities through the  
560 promotion of each neighborhood’s unique attributes and amenities.

561  
562 Ms. Kelsey reported some neighborhoods have decided to define their uniqueness,  
563 both formally and informally. Nextdoor allows people to define their own  
564 neighborhood. For example, there is a group that is part of a lake association  
565 because they live on the lake, and they have created their own group.

566  
567 Member Daire commented they use social media to an advantage.

568  
569 Member Bull inquired what has been done towards this goal to identify the  
570 neighborhoods and their own unique attributes and amenities.

571  
572 Ms. Kelsey commented it has been very sensitive to allow neighborhoods to  
573 identify themselves, other than what is City-facilitated. The park constellation  
574 plan is what was used for the neighborhood definition for Nextdoor, and then  
575 people can create a subgroup within that. The unique attributes and amenities are  
576 not defined anywhere.

577  
578 Ms. Collins commented the former Community Engagement Commission (CEC)  
579 was asked to explore the creation of neighborhood associations. This report was  
580 brought to the City Council, but they did not direct staff to create them. The  
581 intent of Nextdoor was not an attempt to identify neighborhoods, but was useful  
582 to push out communications to small pockets of areas.

583  
584 Member Bull stated it is good to have the neighborhood identities, but might be  
585 counterproductive to assign them attributes. He suggested the remove the words,  
586 “...promotion of each neighborhood’s unique attributes and amenities.”

587  
588 Member Sparby recalled when the report was proposed to the Council it was not  
589 received kindly. When lines are drawn and defined, there are a lot of opinions on  
590 who is in what neighborhood and how they are identified. It is a challenging topic  
591 and may not be worthwhile. He supports the current language, leaving it more  
592 ambiguous, and allowing people to define their own neighborhood.

593  
594 Mr. Lloyd inquired if the word “foster” should be changed to “support.”

595  
596 Member Bull suggested it also be accepting of a group identifying as a  
597 neighborhood.

598

599 No Member offered suggestions to wording changes to Policy 3.1 at Chair  
600 Murphy’s request.

601  
602 Policy 3.2: Assist residents in developing and maintaining neighborhood  
603 organization and forums.

604  
605 Ms. Kelsey commented this was created as a way to communicate with  
606 neighborhoods. Before Nextdoor or other types of social media, information was  
607 sent via email to Block Club Captains, and they then sent it out to their  
608 neighborhood.

609  
610 Chair Murphy commented this policy is still appropriate today.

611  
612 Policy 3.3: Create two-way paths of communication between the City and  
613 neighborhood organizations regarding overall citywide information and specific  
614 issues of concern and interest to individual neighborhoods.

615  
616 Ms. Kelsey commented they use social media, Nextdoor, and Block Club  
617 Captains to push information out.

618  
619 Policy 3.4: Encourage neighborhood based planning processes that rely heavily  
620 on resident participation.

621  
622 Mr. Lloyd provided an example of when they engaged the community around the  
623 Twin Lakes area, which led to the creation of four CMU districts. The corridor  
624 study around Rice/Larpenteur is another example of attempting to engage the  
625 community in a meaningful way. There have also been small area design efforts  
626 that have been talked about relating to the Land Use Plan, as well as the Garden  
627 Station process.

628  
629 Ms. Kelsey commented whenever a property is rezoned, they are required to  
630 engage the surrounding community in that process.

631  
632 Policy 3.5: Consider involvement of neighborhood residents in further  
633 development of area plans for 16 planning districts (Land Use Chapter 4) within  
634 the framework of the Roseville 2025 Vision and the Comprehensive Plan.

635  
636 Mr. Lloyd commented a significant part of the 2030 Plan looks at the 16 planning  
637 districts in focus. Some provide thought for future change and growth, while other  
638 land use patterns are stable. They will engage the surrounding communities where  
639 land areas are being guided for a different land use.

640  
641 Chair Murphy inquired why the word “Consider” was used versus the word  
642 “Encourage.” It does not apply too much commitment for change or involvement.

643  
644 Mr. Lloyd responded he does not have any rationale as to why “Consider” was  
645 used.

646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690

The Commission agreed to change the word “Consider” to “Encourage.”

Policy 3.6: Partner with neighborhood organizations to provide forums for residents to participate in the achievement of the housing and neighborhood goals.

Ms. Kelsey reported in working on the old fire station site, they had three different zonings. They had to work with the neighborhood to achieve the housing goals of the neighborhood and they did this through neighborhood meetings. They ended up developing goals and outcomes they wanted to see through the redevelopment of that site.

Member Gitzen commented Goal 3 covers both neighbors and neighborhoods throughout its six policies. He suggested the goal state, “Encourage the development of neighborhood identity that build a sense of community and foster interaction between neighbors and neighborhoods, as appropriate.”

Chair Murphy agreed it was an improvement to what was previously stated.

**Goal 4: Integrate environmental stewardship practices in the housing stock and neighborhoods.**

Policy 4.1: Support official controls and programs that incorporate state-of-the-art technology for new construction or rehabilitation of existing homes that promotes innovative and sustainable building methods.

Ms. Kelsey commented they have been a leader in this area. They require an energy audit when they do work with a rehab loan. They also provide 200 free energy audits annually for people in Roseville and it is one of the best resources to educate people. People generally request energy audits because they are new to the home and want to see how it operates or they plan to make enhancements to a home but do not know where to start. They have also created energy codes related to new construction.

Policy 4.2: Encourage the use of high-quality, durable, and energy-efficient building material and home products in renovations of existing and construction of new housing to promote decreased energy and land consumption, resource efficiency, indoor environmental quality, and water conservation, and to lessen site, neighborhood, and community impacts.

Ms. Kelsey reported they worked with other communities to provide a Green Remodeling Plan book in PDF form. It is updated every three to four years and is very educational. They also reward residents for green projects through the Green Award Program.

691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737

Policy 4.3: Encourage third-party certification, such as Leaders in Energy, Environmental Design (LEED), MNGreenstar, and EnergyStar, of “green” building practices for new and renovated housing units and developments.

Ms. Kelsey commented some things are outside of their control with changing laws and regulations, and they are required to include certain elements for efficiency on new construction. However, with the Housing Replacement Plan, if a person receives a certification on their home or an Energy Star or above, they provide them with a \$5,000 rebate upon complete of their home.

Policy 4.4: Create ongoing resources to educate the community about “green” renovation and healthy building techniques.

Ms. Kelsey reported this is done through the Green Remodeling Plan book, and they are always updating it with current information.

Policy 4.5: Encourage the use of low-impact landscaping, such as no-mow yards, native landscaping, and rain gardens, to reduce the consumption of natural resources in yard maintenance.

Ms. Kelsey commented they had a program that provided grants for incorporation of raingardens, but due to funding constraints, she is not sure if they still exist. They also provided workshops to show what can be done to yards.

Policy 4.6: Encourage housing development on sites that have access to multiple modes of transportation, including transit, biking, walking, and to sites that efficiently utilize land in a sustainable manner.

Member Gitzen inquired if they should consider partnering with outside organizations to provide education on some of these things, since they are providing it anyway.

Ms. Kelsey stated the library originally requested to partner with the EDA on these educational items, and have since continued them on their own.

Ms. Collins commented they are considering doing a one-day open house at City Hall and are discussing how to get all the entities to come and set up here for the event. In addition to governmental agencies, they might consider including the workshops from the Library.

Member Brown suggested they remove the word “and.”

Mr. Lloyd stated it is the word “to” that does not make sense.

**Goal 5: Continue support of housing and neighborhood programming provided by the HRA that address community needs.**



738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784

Policy 5.1: Work in partnership with the HRA to identify housing issues, provide resources for housing programs, and educate Roseville residents on housing-related topics.

Ms. Kelsey commented they will change HRA to EDA. However, the EDA is the City Council, so it makes it sound like they should work with themselves. She suggested they work with the consultant further on this policy.

Policy 5.2: Coordinate with the HRA on implementation of housing-related activities identified within the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Kelsey explained they need money in order to implement. The HRA had a levy, but the Council had to approve all levy money.

Mr. Lloyd suggested the wording include “making a commitment to working on housing issues, etc.,” instead of “work or coordinate with the HRA.”

The Commission agreed they would like to see these goals and policies after the consultant makes a recommendation on how to word them.

Mr. Lloyd inquired if they should consider including accessory dwelling units.

Ms. Kelsey stated it may fit under Goal 1, Policy 1.2.

Member Gitzen stated he would feel comfortable going with the general policies and seeing how it develops.

Chair Murphy commented it does fit under Goal 1, so it does not need to be emphasized.

Member Daire commented the auxiliary dwelling unit option has allowed them to keep their property in Roseville and be closer to his daughter and her husband. It has been an astounding experience and enhanced their living arrangements and quality of family life. He supports the program, and sees it as being a distinct advantage to being able to stay in reasonable proximity to his home for a longer period of time. He is grateful that Roseville allows this option, and that they were given advice on how to make it work.

Chair Murphy referred to page 2 of the memo in the meeting packet, dated August 17, 2017 and provided by Erin Perdu, and inquired about housing tools.

Mr. Lloyd commented the tools were provided in the packet that was emailed.

Ms. Collins explained the two questions on page 2 of the memo refer to the matrix. They have received feedback from a couple of Commissioners on this, and they want to start by identifying the goal’s policies, take the feedback, and determine what the tools are.

785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823

Mr. Lloyd commented after going through the goals and policies they now they have a fuller understanding of what tools are available. Ms. Perdu can consolidate this information into the matrix in greater detail that they can discuss at the next meeting.

Ms. Collins explained the tools are more implementation based to see how they will move towards the goals and policies identified.

Member Brown inquired how often the First Time Home Buyer Program is utilized.

Ms. Kelsey responded it is a County program and the biggest issue they run into is the house needs to be less than \$200,000. A lot of first time homebuyers purchasing homes in Roseville are purchasing homes over \$200,000. Depending on the market, they have gone from having a couple people a year qualify for it to no one qualifying for it.

Member Brown inquired if the pricing needs to be reassessed or if they are encouraging first time homebuyers in Roseville in other ways.

Ms. Kelsey responded because it is a County program and is federally regulated, so they are not able to tamper with those regulations. However, the City could come up with their own program to encourage first time home buyers so the EDA can change and modify their regulations.

Mr. Lloyd commented it was good to get feedback so they can begin to revise the goals and policies and see how the tools can be used towards them.

The Commission thanked Ms. Kelsey for the information she provided.

- 7. Adjourn**
- MOTION**
- Member Gitzen moved, seconded by Member Sparby adjournment of the meeting at approximately 8:42 p.m.**
- Ayes: 6**
- Nays: 0**
- Motion carried.**