



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Minutes – Wednesday, September 6, 2017 – 6:30 p.m.**

1. Call to Order

Chair Murphy called to order the regular meeting of the Planning Commission meeting at approximately 6:30 p.m. and reviewed the role and purpose of the Planning Commission.

2. Roll Call

At the request of Chair Murphy, City Planner Thomas Paschke called the Roll.

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

Staff Present: Community Development Director Kari Collins and City Planner Thomas Paschke

3. Review of Minutes

a. August 2, 2017, Regular Meeting Minutes

MOTION

Member Bull moved, seconded by Member Brown to approve the August 2, 2017 meeting minutes.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Communications and Recognitions:

a. From the Public: Public comment pertaining to land use issues not on this agenda, including the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update

None.

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 Bull commented they had previously discussed having additional agenda line items added to approve the agenda and provide follow up discussion to questions raised a previous meetings.

Chair Murphy stated they included it in the Comprehensive Plan meeting agenda, but not yet at this meeting.

Community Development Director Collins noted it will be included on future agendas.

MOTION

Member Bull moved, seconded by Member Sparby to approve the agenda as presented.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

5. Public Hearing

- a. Planning File 17-014: Request by Centre Point, LLC (University of Northwestern, St. Paul) to amend Centre Pointe Planned Unit Development (PUD) Agreement 1177 to allow College or post-secondary school, office-based, as a permitted use on 2955 Centre Point Drive**

Due to his interest on this item, Member Daire recused himself and stepped down from the dais. Prior to the meeting, he presented a letter to Chair Murphy outlining his reasons for recusal.

Chair Murphy opened the public hearing for Planning File 17-014 at approximately 6:36 p.m. He advised this item will be on the September 25, 2017 City Council agenda.

City Planner Paschke summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated September 6, 2017. The University of Northwestern owns the property at 2955 Centre Pointe Drive and wishes to expand its engineering and science program. It will include classrooms, laboratories, and research facilities. He highlighted the uses currently permitted in the Centre Pointe Business Park, and stated the University of Northwestern is requesting consideration of an amendment to the Centre Pointe Business Park Planned Unit Development (PUD) to allow college or post-secondary school, office based as a permitted use.

Mr. Paschke reported there are letters of support and one letter of opposition to this proposal included in the meeting packet. The Planning Division recommends the Planning Commission consider the following two options:

- a. Recommend approval of a PUD amendment that would modify the permitted uses on the subject property to include college or post-secondary school, office-based, as defined by Section 1001.10 of the Zoning Code.
- b. Recommend denial of the request as the suggested uses including classroom, laboratories, and research facilities affiliated with a college or post-secondary school are deemed not appropriate for the Centre Pointe Business Park.

Member Kimble referred to line No. 55 of the staff report, and inquired what Exhibit E-2 was.

Mr. Paschke responded Exhibit E-2 includes the chart that is included on page 2 of the staff report. It highlights select uses that were in the previous B-4 district, which no longer exists.

Chair Murphy confirmed he tracked down Exhibit E-2 on the website prior to the meeting, and it included this chart as Mr. Paschke had stated.

Member Kimble commented that many of the uses listed are common to all office projects, are not unique, and could be considered 100% office.

Member Bull inquired about the proposed building.

Mr. Paschke explained it is a two-story building and may have a basement. Northwestern would be the tenant and he is unsure if they were planning to include any additional tenants. It could be parceled off if all of it was not needed by Northwestern since office is a permitted use.

Member Sparby inquired if there is an option to consider a comprehensive review of this PUD.

Mr. Paschke responded there currently in not a plan to consider that, but it may take place in the future. It would help eliminate inconsistencies between the PUD, what the current code allows for, and how the property is guided.

Commissioner Gitzen inquired about parking requirements and future studies needed for approval.

Mr. Paschke responded he believes it would meet the parking requirements. The laboratory space would have different calculations than an office building would have. If this is approved, they will look more closely at it so there are no parking issues. When this office park was first developed, traffic was a concern because it was new to the area. However, it is no longer a concern and he is not aware of any other studies needed for approval.

Member Kimble inquired about the square footage of the building and if the building is exempt from real estate taxes since Northwestern already owns the building.

Mr. Paschke advised the size of the building is not referenced in the staff report and confirmed Northwestern is exempt from real estate taxes.

Chair Murphy inquired about proposed changes to the exterior, how Lydia Avenue and Center Pointe Drive are classified, and if college office use is a permitted use.

Mr. Paschke commented the applicant can speak to the changes on the building. Center Pointe Drive and Lydia Avenue act as interior roads and take the traffic from inside the office park and move it out onto Cleveland Avenue. There is no need for further modifications to these roads. This area shows up as office business park on the zoning map and is guided as such. An office based use is a permitted use within an office business park district.

Member Bull inquired if an impact study has been done on the pathways master plan.

Mr. Paschke stated this type of study has not been done. There are sidewalks and pathways within the Centre Pointe Business Park, but there may not be connections along Cleveland Avenue which is a County road.

Chair Murphy commented it may be a challenge for people to get across Cleveland Avenue at certain times of the day.

Mr. Paschke stated there are plans in place related to the Twin Lakes redevelopment area that a connection be made from Cleveland Avenue toward the park on County Road C2.

Member Sparby inquired what the ratio is between classroom and student activity versus administration, if they plan to see an increase in traffic to the building, and if there is concern with left turns onto Cleveland Avenue out of the office park.

Mr. Paschke responded there would be an increase in traffic within Centre Pointe Business Park because this building has not been used for a while. He is unsure what the increase would be with this being used as a school based use versus an office use because they do not keep tabs on the number of office workers allowed in the building. The Centre Pointe PUD does state that at some time in the future, the properties may be responsible to assist with a signal light at County Road C2 and Cleveland Avenue, if needed. However, it has not been an issue up to this point and is part of long range plans related to a Twin Lakes area buildout on the east side of Cleveland Avenue.

Doug Schroder, University of Northwestern Vice President of Business/Chief Financial Officer, thanked the staff and Commission for their work on this project. Northwestern has deep roots in the Roseville community, it is the largest private employer in the community with over 800 employees, and they share the same sense of commitment and vibrancy in the community with the City.

Mr. Schroder reported the nursing program at Northwestern has 120 students, and there is a need for expansion. They previously also had a partnership with the University of Minnesota in engineering, but that was discontinued in December of 2015. The demand for nursing and engineering majors is going up and with four percent of their enrollment based in engineering, they need to respond. The Board of Trustees decided to begin a four-year engineering program, but there is no space with their current facilities for this option, nor do they want to take on the debt that would allow it. They need to provide for the educational needs of the community, but it must be affordable to them.

Mr. Schroder reported the property at 2955 Centre Pointe Drive fits their needs, it can be purchased at a reasonable price point, it is close to the main campus, and the underlying zoning district of office business park allows for college office space use. The faculty and students are excited for this opportunity because it puts them right in

the middle of the business community for collaboration and partnerships towards producing job-ready business students. He directed the Commissioners to a document in the meeting packet from Dr. Matt Hyre, head of the Engineering Department at Northwestern, that addresses this. Mr. Schroder stated St. Thomas, Hamline University, and College of St. Scholastica also have satellite locations.

Mr. Schroder reported in the 2007 PUD, the City identified traffic as a concern if the campus continued to grow. Relocating to this area will redistribute traffic and not bring it onto the campus. Laboratory use is a permitted use in the B-4 chart, and is part of a broader office definition. He read the college office based definition found in Ordinance No. 1427 and stated this building would be owner-occupied solely by them. The City has wisely demonstrated flexibility over the past 20 years on how to define an office, the result has provided a healthy business climate within the district, and Northwestern seeks that same flexibility with this request. They have looked over the PUD and laboratory is not defined, but the City has defined laboratory in the zoning statute. If flexibility is applied to the PUD's definition of office to include educational laboratories, then Northwestern's proposed use of the building would be 80 percent office, and no PUD would be required.

Mr. Schroder explained they are requesting an amendment to the original 1997 PUD for the property at 2955 Centre Pointe Drive, to conform it to the City's current zoning code. They are seeking equal consideration from the City to what it has already granted three other accredited degree granting institutions within the City. National American University and Minneapolis Business College are both located in office business districts, and the American Academy of Acupuncture is located in a regional business district. They are proposing to invest in an existing vacant building and will maintain the buildings historic use of having highly educated professionals. He provided a rendering of the minimal changes that will be made to the exterior of the building and the proposed interior layout.

Mr. Schroder explained in order to expand the nursing program, they need to expand the biology program, and it will be done in this facility. There is a link between the vibrancy of Northwestern and the health of the Roseville community and he highlighted examples of this. In addition, they will bring professional, permanent jobs to the site, they will own/occupy the building and invest millions of dollars into it, their presence will attract other businesses who seek to locate in proximity to their programs, and they will continue to provide highly educated nursing and engineering students.

Member Kimble inquired about the conceptual develop schedule and when the building will begin its use.

Mr. Schroder responded they have a need for a laboratory in the fall of 2018 and an additional one in the spring of 2019. Phase I allows these two laboratories to be completed, and Phase II will be completed for use in the fall of 2019. There would be minimal use in the fall of 2018 and the remaining use would begin in the fall of 2019.

Member Bull inquired if a typical student using this building would be there full time or traveling to and from the main campus.

Mr. Schroder responded the students are full time, but may only have classes two or three times a week during the day. They will not all arrive and leave at the same time of the day so the traffic will be distributed throughout the day. They will run a shuttle service to and from the main campus based on the class schedule and require students to use it.

Member Bull inquired if the improvements to the building will be done by Roseville companies.

Mr. Schroder responded the general contractor is PCL, and they could suggest they bid out work to local subcontractors.

Member Bull stated this use does not fit into office business park zoning because of the overlying PUD and its special conditions. In a previous proposal with the storage unit facility, they recommended to the City Council to cancel the PUD and look at the appropriate underlying zoning that the City would like for that area. The City Council decided not to move forward with that recommendation because there were two members absent from the meeting. He inquired about the citizen who wrote in opposition to this request stating Northwestern was in violation of the current PUD with exceeding the enrollment maximum.

Mr. Schroder explained the 2007 PUD allows for 2,400 traditional students enrolled on campus. The official enrollment of traditional students in 2017 is 1,625. The entire enrollment of students is 3,500, which includes 1,300 online students and 500 students that take classes at night.

Chair Murphy inquired what uses Northwestern would use the building for if this is not approved.

Mr. Schroder responded they will ask their Board for further direction. They may look at moving other administrative offices or leasing out some of the space.

Member Sparby inquired how they define laboratory as referenced in the PUD language.

Mr. Schroder responded in will include equipment for engineering, traditional laboratories for chemistry and biology, and computer simulation laboratories. It will be both research and classroom style laboratories.

Member Sparby inquired what percentage of the laboratories will be classroom style versus research style.

Mr. Schroder recalled 25 percent of the square footage is classroom and 80 percent of it is office/laboratory. Thirty percent of the square footage in any building is

hallways, stairwells, and bathrooms. They also hope to have public space, which is about 10 percent.

Member Brown inquired if it will be primarily engineering or engineering and nursing.

Mr. Schroder responded the first floor is engineering and the second floor is biology and chemistry. The majority of the students in the biology program are pre-nursing students and they take biology classes during their first two years. During years three and four, they will be considered nursing students and will take classes in the Wilson Center Building on Lincoln Drive, which was formerly Edina Realty.

Member Bull inquired about biohazard management plans within the building, if there will be any outside storage, and about his amendment request being made solely for this property.

Mr. Schroder responded they have an extensive program where they partner with the University of Minnesota to make sure they comply with all the requirements for biohazards and the faculty and students are trained to make sure waste is properly disposed of. There will be no outside storage at this site. Mr. Schroder commented he is interested solely in this site and allowing the college office based definition there.

Public Comment

Dave Erickson, 1251 Josephine Road, on faculty at University of Northwestern, commented he currently works in the Business Department. He supervises 70 interns, half of which are in the Roseville community, and 65 percent of those get employment through their internship. If the Engineering Department is expanded, it will be about the same size as the Business Department and will have the same internship requirement. This will provide people of character and high values as employees within the City.

Kirby Stoll, 1973 Lexington Avenue North, commented his written statement is included in the meeting packet as Appendix H. His son just started at Northwestern and will be studying mechanical engineering, and he is in support of the PUD amendment. Northwestern has been a good neighbor to Roseville. There are vacant office spaces in the City and he likes that Northwestern has the opportunity to own and increase its impact on Roseville and the community.

Micah Stelter, 2818 Virginia Avenue, commented he began as a student at Northwestern in 2005 and has never left. He currently works at the college and many current students, faculty and staff serve in the Roseville community. This is a great opportunity for the community to support this growth and program.

Linda Ashworth, 2583 Dellwood Avenue, commented she used to be the Internship Director at Northwestern and has had conversations with the Engineering Department

on how they can partner with local companies. They need to have a laboratory to equip themselves and she supports approval of this request.

Mark Seignious, 702 Wheaton Avenue, commented he has one child at Northwestern and supports approval of this request. It would be a great gesture in maintaining the good will that Roseville and Northwestern have with one another.

George Palke, 1775 Shorewood Curve, commented he is a close neighbor to Northwestern and had a son graduate from there in 2002. He has seen Northwestern students helping senior citizens with shoveling snow and raking leaves. The Roseville community benefits from services the students provide and he supports anything they can do to enhance Northwestern.

Yu Yi, 1427 Clarmar Avenue, commented her Chinese friends have kids that attend Northwestern. They love the school, respect the faculty, and support the educational opportunities it provides. People are very friendly and the school is a good bridge between China and the United States.

Meagan Struck, 570 Sandhurst Drive, commented she is a former student and currently on staff at Northwestern, and supports approval of this request.

Benjamin Struck, 570 Sandhurst Drive, alumni of the Biochemistry Program at Northwestern, commented he supports the growth of Northwestern and approval of this request.

Mia Madison, 2610 Snelling Curve, Northwestern alumni, commented she is glad Northwestern can support a nursing program, is excited to see it grow, loves Roseville, and supports approval of this request.

Oscar Knudson, 2749 Woodbridge Street, commented he has worked with Northwestern in his former business and supports approval of this request.

Chair Murphy explained the Planning Commission cannot approve or deny the request, but can recommend actions to the City Council. He stated there are some Commission openings with the City and encourage the residents in attendance to consider serving in that way.

With no one further coming forward to speak for or against this request, Chair Murphy closed the public hearing at approximately 8:01 p.m.

Commission Deliberation

MOTION

Chair Murphy moved, seconded by Member Gitzen, to recommend to the City Council approval of a PUD amendment that would modify the permitted uses on the subject property to include college or post-secondary school, office-based, as defined by Section 1001.10 of the Zoning Code.

In response to Member Kimble, Mr. Paschke confirmed the motion is specific to the property at 2955 Centre Pointe Drive and not the PUD as a whole.

Member Bull commented he supports what Northwestern is trying to do and would like to see them succeed with it. However, similar to a previous proposal, he recommends cancelling the PUD and have underlying zoning appropriate for the site. They should not be making individual amendments for a single property and the right method is to have the City Council determine if the PUD is still appropriate.

Member Sparby commented it is up to the Planning Commission to recommend approval or denial of PUD amendments and they are working with a PUD that has no purpose at this point. He is upset the City has forced the applicants to come through this process rather than addressing the PUD itself. They have had multiple requests on this and they have yet to decide if the PUD even makes sense at this time. He supports looking comprehensively at the PUD and opening it up for all types of development.

Member Bull commented they are required to take action within a certain period of time.

Member Gitzen commented the PUD has been amended over time. This use is a good fit for the site and supports this application.

Chair Murphy agreed this PUD has a history and is dated. The history of amendments, underlying zoning, and the 2012 added definition of college/post-secondary school office based use supports this use. It is compatible with the office uses in the district today as permitted uses.

Member Kimble agreed with Chair Murphy and supports the motion.

Member Brown also agreed with Chair Murphy. She added it will bring stability to the area and she supports the motion.

Member Sparby requested a friendly amendment to the motion to recommend cancellation of the PUD with an alternative of approval of the amendment to the PUD. If the Council does not cancel the PUD, the alternative would be to support this application and the approval of the amendment to the PUD. He wants to make it clear their preference is to cancel the PUD to allow for this use and other uses.

Chair Murphy inquired if they could direct staff to come up with appropriate alternatives, but not cancel the PUD.

Mr. Paschke responded no, as it relates to this request. In 2010, they eliminated the PUD process when they adopted a new zoning code. The PUD process never allowed for a cancellation and there are other active PUDs. The process has always allowed for amendments to PUDs where deemed appropriate. It is up to the Council to

determine what to do long term with this PUD and the others. A PUD cancellation will require a lot of work and staff time because of all the nuances and restrictions and how they fit in with the existing code.

Ms. Collins commented the Council is still interested in looking at some of the outdated PUDs and exploring cancellation or amendments to them. They would not be comfortable cancelling a PUD until they look at all the various land use tables and identify what uses they are comfortable with.

Mr. Paschke stated they are also in a Comprehensive Plan update that may make some minor changes to what some of the land use designations are called and update the zoning code. It may be two or three years before they consider how the older PUDs should be amended or cancelled in the future. It is a complicated process.

Chair Murphy inquired if the topic of PUD cancellations is developed enough to have a joint meeting with the City Council.

Ms. Collins suggested when this recommendation comes before the City Council on September 25, 2017, they will see this dialogue and provide direction to the Planning Commission on how they would like to proceed.

Member Sparby commented with the previous application, it was frustrating when they were given an option to recommend cancellation of the PUD. It went forward to the City Council and cancellation was never really a consideration. Now that they know it is not an option, he feels comfortable supporting or denying these applications going forward, and he supports this application.

Member Kimble commented the request is to study this issue and they cannot make a recommendation to cancel this PUD.

Member Bull agreed with Member Sparby, and commented a Councilmember pointed out they were not comfortable moving forward with the application because they did not have enough Councilmembers present. If approving this is the right thing to do, he does not feel it is specific to this one property.

MOTION TO AMEND

Member Bull moved, seconded by Member Sparby, to amend the main motion to include the entire development within PUD #1177.

Member Gitzen commented he does not support the requested amendment. He does not want to jeopardize the application by having the Council look all the properties associated with this PUD.

Member Kimble and Member Brown agreed with Member Gitzen, and do not support the amendment.

Member Sparby commented if they are looking at office/classroom usage in the area, it makes sense to open it up to other potential schools and broaden the PUD as a whole.

Chair Murphy commented he does not support the amendment. When the Council reads the minutes from this meeting, they will see the discussion and have the ability to open it up to include the entire PUD at their discretion.

Ayes: 2
Nays: 4 (Kimble, Gitzen, Murphy, and Brown)
Motion failed.

There was no further discussion and the Council voted on the main motion.

Ayes: 5
Nays: 1 (Bull)
Motion carried.

6. Adjourn

MOTION
Member Kimble moved, seconded by Member Bull adjournment of the meeting at approximately 8:24 p.m.

Ayes: 6
Nays: 0
Motion carried.