



**Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update Meeting  
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive  
Minutes – Wednesday, October 4, 2017 – 6:30 p.m.**

**1. Call to Order**

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

**2. Roll Call**

At the request of Chair Murphy, City Planner 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/Consultants Present:** Community Development Director Kari Collins, Senior Planner Brian Lloyd, and City Planner Thomas Paschke; Consultant Erin Perdu, WSB

**3. Approve Agenda**

**MOTION**

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

**Ayes: 7**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

**4. Review of Minutes**

**a. August 23, 2017, Comprehensive Plan Update Meeting**

**MOTION**

**Member Sparby moved, seconded by Member Brown to approve the August 23, 2017 meeting minutes.**

**Ayes: 7**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

**5. Communications and Recognitions:**

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

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.*

City Planner Paschke reported the Council discussed the PUD amendment request by Northwestern College at its meeting on September 25, 2017. The request was denied and staff was directed to put together a discussion report related to the possibility of canceling the Centre Pointe Planned Unit Development. This will be further discussed at the last meeting in October and will be brought before the Planning Commission at a future meeting.

Chair Murphy inquired if Roseville was classified as “urban” by the Metropolitan Council and if staff agrees it is a correct designation for them.

Senior Planner Lloyd confirmed this and stated it reflects a new classification system by the Metropolitan Council. It helps to organize communities by their physical developments and pressures on them from the urban core. The name “urban” is insignificant, but it seems to fit into the Metropolitan Council’s classification scheme. It appears to be a reasonable designation and other cities around them have the same designation.

Erin Perdu, WSB Consultant, responded there used to be a way to discuss a City’s designation, but that is no longer available.

Mr. Paschke stated they did have some of the City’s numbers tweaked when the Metropolitan Council sent out a systems statement for review and approval. He stated the Planning staff does not take a position on the designation, and the name “urban” is much more insignificant than all the details it considers.

Mr. Lloyd commented they are in the process of creating new agendas for meetings, and the topic of questions raised at previous meetings is not on this agenda. At the August meeting, someone inquired about the accuracy of population forecasts. Generally speaking, previous population forecasts were high, but it is hard to know what that means this time around with expected population forecasts. He also reminded the Commission of the upcoming community meetings that will take place on November 8 from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. and November 9 from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m. at City Hall. The meetings will be identical and the goal will be to present where they are at in the Comprehensive Plan process, look the main themes of the feedback heard with Phase One of the Community Engagement, and show how the themes are being worked into the Comprehensive Plan.

Member Daire inquired when the EDA will meet and when the following City Council meeting will take place.

Mr. Lloyd responded the EDA will meet on October 17 at 6:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers. The City Council will receive an update on the Comprehensive Plan process on October 16 at 6:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers.

Member Bull commented there is an open house in December and due to busy schedules and travel, he inquired if it could be moved up to before Thanksgiving.

Mr. Lloyd explained the open houses in December are meant to be smaller and more targeted. They plan to explain why an area's land use designation has changed and receive feedback on it.

Member Bull suggested they provide advanced notice to the communities where these meetings are taking place.

Ms. Perdu stated they are planning to have the open houses as early in December as possible.

Member Daire requested more information about a meeting scheduled on December 27.

Mr. Lloyd responded that meeting is the typical Comprehensive Plan meeting that takes place on the fourth Wednesday of the month. It probably will not take place in either November or December, but is on the calendar if needed.

Chair Murphy expressed concern with the tentative nature since people are trying to plan their holiday schedules. He suggested they decide now if it is to happen on that day, or plan for it to happen in January.

Member Bull stated they should wrap things up at the end of October.

Member Daire commented Parks and implementation is scheduled on November 29.

Mr. Lloyd confirmed the November 29 meeting is another regularly scheduled Wednesday Comprehensive Plan meeting, but is scheduled to take place after Thanksgiving.

Member Daire inquired why they are meeting on the Parks plan if it is a standalone document that will be packaged with the Comprehensive Plan with implementation covered in the plan.

Ms. Perdu explained Parks and Implementations are two chapters of the Comprehensive Plan. The Parks plan will be reviewed at a Planning Commission meeting and an implementation chapter will tie in all the different implementation strategies as it relates to the entire Comprehensive Plan.

In response to Member Daire, Mr. Lloyd explained there is a Parks and Recreation system master plan that exists and it has an implementation plan that goes along with

it. The Comprehensive Plan includes a Parks and Recreation chapter. The implementation chapter of the Comprehensive Plan will look at the Parks and Recreation Chapter included in it and have ways to address the goals and policies that will work through the Parks and Recreation system master plan.

Member Daire inquired if the total financial impact will be evident in the implementation chapter of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Lloyd commented the Comprehensive Plan represents goals and lofty policies the City hopes to achieve over time. It is not a public improvement schedule. The 2030 Comprehensive Plan also has an implementation chapter, but does not include strict budgetary considerations.

Ms. Perdu explained it will not provide financial details and put costs to them, but the implementation plans will need to be prioritized and delegated.

Member Kimble stated much of the cost will be determined by the private sector.

Member Sparby inquired if there was any report regarding the stakeholder interviews that took place in September.

Ms. Perdu stated Lydia [Major (Community Engagement consultant)] has had a hard time to getting a hold of several of the stakeholders. She is also planning to schedule the ECFE sessions in October, which may also be included in an overall summary. As of last week, the interviews were still ongoing, and she will request a written status update from Lydia.

Member Bull inquired if they delay will impact the Comprehensive Plan schedule.

Ms. Perdu responded they are taking longer than they had anticipated, but it is not impacting the development of the chapters. They are incorporating the information as they get it.

Member Bull inquired when they will see information on defining metrics for their goal development, who is going to be responsible for measuring the goals, and what impact it will have on City staff.

Ms. Perdu clarified that Member Bull was referring to measuring their progress towards goals included in the Comprehensive Plan. She explained part of this will be included in the implementation chapter and part will be written into an introductory chapter that includes the matrix goals, questions, and measurables. It will include detail about what City staff is going to do and how it will be measured.

Member Bull stated the goals defined in the Comprehensive Plan are lofty and more than can be measured without significant increase in staff. He inquired how a way to measure the goals will be developed and how they will see it.

Ms. Perdu stated part of it is her job with writing the introductory chapter and developing the implementation chapter where it will show who is going to do what and how it will all be prioritized. It will then come back to the Planning Commission for review before the final draft is presented and before the November meeting. She will also provide samples for review at the October meeting.

Chair Murphy requested discussion regarding the need for a November and December Comprehensive Plan Update meeting be put on the agenda for October 25.

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

**a. Memorandum Re: Comprehensive Plan Work Session – Land Use, Housing**

Ms. Perdu referred to the memo on page 21 of the meeting packet and stated they will be discussing future land use sites, redevelopment area concepts, and the draft housing chapter.

Member Bull referred to the memo, third paragraph from the bottom, and stated a “neighborhood” is not necessarily a residential area and could include a mixed use.

Member Daire inquired if the neighborhood concept is only conceptual and not tied to any specific piece of land.

Ms. Perdu agreed and stated they are not attempting to draw lines on a map to define neighborhoods.

Member Daire stated if they are not going to draw lines, they should not be talking about neighborhoods. Most people understand identification with an area. He has seen that the Nextdoor definition of a neighborhood is beginning to define areas of identification.

Ms. Paschke explained Nextdoor does not have a formal process for identifying neighborhoods. Until the City defines specific areas as neighborhoods, anyone can call an area a neighborhood and identify with it.

Member Daire commented for planning purposes, they are left with the defined planning districts as shown in previous plans.

Mr. Lloyd commented they will be bringing back a discussion about the previous planning districts. They have not been used for any great purpose and any boundary associated with them is completely arbitrary. They may identify the way different land uses come together that need buffering. The planning districts were introduced in the 1960s, have changed very little since then, and have rarely been used. Census tracts and block groups offer more accuracy for analysis and the planning districts they have do not have anything to do with census boundaries. They do not intend to have neighborhoods relate to planning districts, just like they did not with the previous Comprehensive Plan update. A neighborhood would only represent a place

that someone identifies with to allow people to organize and engage with the City. It would describe a generalized area not associated with specific geography.

Member Bull commented it is about self-identity and how people relate to an area.

Member Gitzen stated he believes neighborhood is a general term and agrees they should communicate it does not only refer to residential.

Ms. Perdu commented they are working on scheduling a follow up meeting with the Public Works Commission regarding the transportation chapter.

Mr. Lloyd explained when the Planning Commission met with the Public Works Commission and saw some of the transportation considerations, there were still a lot of unanswered questions. Now that the draft of the transportation chapter has been completed, they would like the Public Works Director to further discuss it with the Planning Commission.

Member Sparby commented it will be important to establish the objective of the meeting.

Ms. Perdu agreed and stated the objective would be to discuss how the transportation plan interacts with the Land Use Plan and answer any questions of the Planning Commission.

**b. Future Land Use Sites for Further Consideration**

Ms. Perdu reported they have largely covered future land use sites, but the City Council and staff requested the following sites be discussed for further consideration.

Site 1: 3040 Old Highway 8

Ms. Perdu highlighted the following information for this site:

- 2040 proposed future land use: High Density Residential
- 2030 future land use: High Density Residential
- Current use: Vacant
- Suggested change: Single-Family

Mr. Lloyd reported this site is adjacent to Highway 88, but there is a prohibition of access along the highway. Unless there is an easement to Old Highway 8, the site is landlocked. The parcel is around three-quarters of an acre and they recommend changing it to a low-density category similar to the surrounding neighbors.

Member Bull inquired if there was any history of how it originally became High Density Residential.

Mr. Lloyd responded he is unsure, and it is probably a left over remnant when the area was originally headed in a high-density direction. He pointed out a strip of land

on the other side of Highway 88 and stated it is a parcel that continues on the other side of Highway 88. It contains a power line or pipeline and is overlaid with a couple of transportation easements.

Ms. Perdu commented they are proposing Site 1 be changed to Low Density Residential or Single-family.

Member Gitzen inquired if the larger high-density property has one owner now.

Mr. Paschke responded it has one owner and is already developed.

Member Bull stated access is still an issue whether it is high density or low density.

Mr. Lloyd commented it is being considered for low density because of its proximity to other single-family homes. It seems to be a more appropriate development than a small apartment or multi-family structure.

Member Daire inquired how many units could be developed on the parcel if access could be provided and it was changed to single-family.

Mr. Lloyd responded only one unit could be built. If there was enough area for it to be subdivided, there would still only be enough room for one unit because of the angles of the parcel.

Member Daire stated if access could be provided, it would also have to satisfy a 24-foot street requirement if more than one unit went on that parcel.

Chair Murphy inquired if a private driveway could be smaller than 24 feet wide.

Mr. Paschke confirmed this.

#### **MOTION**

**Member Gitzen moved, seconded by Member Sparby to change the guidance of 3040 Old Highway 8 to Single-family.**

**Ayes: 7**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

#### Site 2: 2373-2417 County Road C2

Ms. Perdu highlighted the following information for this site:

- 2040 proposed future land use: High Density Residential
- 2030 future land use: High Density Residential
- Current use: Vacant
- Suggested change: Business or Industrial

Ms. Perdu commented the City Council recommended this site be reconsidered and inquired if makes sense to have high density housing across from the tank farm for safety and aesthetic reasons. There is existing High Density Residential north of this site, but the parcel is right long County Road C2.

In response to Member Kimble, Ms. Perdu referred to the map provided on page 23 of the meeting packet and stated the cross-hatched areas are sites that are likely to be developed or redeveloped and are included with these parcels. The yellow area is Medium Density Residential and the red area is Regional Business. The Council suggested this area be reguided as a mixed use district.

Chair Murphy inquired if there was a driveway off C2 to this site.

Mr. Lloyd pointed out on the map where the driveway was located.

Member Kimble commented it would be helpful to know the sizes of the parcels they are discussing. Sometimes they can put a name on it, but it has no relevance to marketability to develop it as such. There is already High Density Residential there and it is not ideal to have it across from a tank farm. However, it is possible the existing development could expand. A light industrial use would work, but then it would be backing up to a residential area.

Member Daire commented a business guidance would create an isolated commercial entity and does not make sense.

Mr. Lloyd stated the parcel being discussed is about six acres in size.

Member Kimble stated she would recommend it stay as it is or be changed to industrial or commercial.

Member Gitzen inquired where the apartment would fit in under the mixed use areas.

Ms. Perdu commented it could fit in any of the mixed use areas because it would accommodate a medium to high density residential.

Member Kimble commented the most likely use of the site with high density would be an expansion of the existing development. It would be unusual for a developer to come in and build high density across from the tank farm.

Mr. Lloyd stated the neighborhood mixed use may have the right kind of mixture of uses and would allow for commercial or multi-family residential.

Member Kimble inquired if neighborhood mixed use would allow for an office warehouse.

Mr. Paschke commented the current code would not allow for it.



Member Sparby stated he does not see any issue with the current zoning. There could be a potential expansion of the high density or someone could purchase it in the future and request the zoning be changed.

Member Bull inquired how it will impact the City's housing unit goals if it is changed from High Density Residential.

Ms. Perdu pointed out they are discussing the future land use designations and not the zoning. If they changed it, they will be removing two high density parcels and it will not significantly impact the number of housing units.

Member Kimble commented it will be very hard for the people to sell their homes since they are across from a tank farm and a guidance that might create jobs and fulfill other goals of the City might make sense. She is supportive of changing it to something that would support an office showroom or guide it toward some type of business commercial.

Member Gitzen suggested they make the entire triangular piece into something mixed use that would provide more options and still accommodate the existing apartment building and an expansion.

Mr. Paschke commented they may not be able to expand right now without buying land and doing something else. They also have to consider density with mixed use districts. If this area is guided mixed use that supports high density and someone wanted to buy this piece of land to expand it with another facility either connected to what is there today or another one, it would be supported in a land use sense with the different categories. It would give them more options overall.

Member Bull made a motion to change the guidance of 2373-2417 County Road C2 to Employment district to provide residential business opportunity in that area.

Mr. Lloyd commented this is already considered Employment by name and includes heavy industrial and warehousing. A mixed use district may be more in line with what has been discussed and would allow for a variety of commercial uses such as offices, retail spaces, and residential uses. He went over the different types of mixed uses and stated they all allow residential.

Member Bull stated he meant to say Neighborhood Mixed Use in this motion, and requested it be changed.

#### **MOTION**

**Member Bull moved, seconded by Member Gitzen to change the guidance of 2373-2417 County Road C2 to Neighborhood Mixed Use to provide residential business opportunity in that area.**

Member Bull stated there needs to be options and flexibility in this area.

Member Gitzen and Chair Murphy agreed.

**Ayes: 6**

**Nays: 1 (Sparby)**

**Motion carried.**

Member Gitzen commented more information would be helpful on the rest of these sites before they consider the changes.

Mr. Paschke commented there are some that may be more straightforward. He suggested they move forward on those and bring back the more complicated ones at a future meeting. He also pointed out the land use map that was previously talked about is included in their books.

Mr. Lloyd agreed it would be helpful to get through what they can and come back with more information on the remaining sites.

Site 3: 3205-3223 Old Highway 8

Ms. Perdu highlighted the following information for this site:

- 2040 proposed future land use: High Density Residential
- 2030 future land use: High Density Residential
- Current use: Townhomes
- Suggested change: Medium Density Residential

Ms. Perdu reported the designation should follow the use and that is why they are recommending it be changed to Medium Density Residential.

**MOTION**

**Member Kimble moved, seconded by Member Daire to change the guidance of 3205-3223 Old Highway 8 to Medium Density Residential.**

Member Sparby stated it appears this does not cover all the townhomes and inquired what is located to the west.

Mr. Lloyd responded the City of St. Anthony and Hennepin County are to the west.

**Ayes: 7**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

Site 4: 2797-2833 Hamline Avenue

Ms. Perdu highlighted the following information for this site:

- 2040 proposed future land use: High Density Residential
- 2030 future land use: Neighborhood Business/High Density Residential
- Current use: Commercial/Strip Center

- Suggested change: Single designation, CMU designation

Ms. Perdu referred to the map provided on page 24 of the meeting packet, and reported in the past, one “leg” of the site had been guided for business use (frontage on Hamline Avenue). It is owned by Presbyterian Homes who has plans to redevelop the site in the future. It was discussed that the entire site have one designation rather than a split designation.

Chair Murphy commented the area being discussed is Hamline Shopping Center.

Member Kimble inquired what the light purple represented.

Mr. Paschke stated under Neighborhood Mixed Use, the light purple is considered Neighborhood Center.

Member Daire inquired if they knew what Presbyterian Homes intended for this site.

Mr. Lloyd responded several years ago, Presbyterian Homes had considered redeveloping apartments in that location. However, they have instead made some investments in the retail property there and he is unaware of any plans to redevelop there.

Member Brown inquired if Presbyterian Homes had office use there.

Mr. Paschke confirmed they have office use on the corner of Centennial Drive and Hamline Avenue.

Mr. Lloyd commented if the rest of the property were guided as Neighborhood Mixed Use, it would allow offices, retail, and apartments.

Member Kimble inquired if anyone has talked with Presbyterian Homes.

Mr. Lloyd responded they have not talked with them about their future plans for the site.

Mr. Paschke commented they have reinvested in the mall and he is unaware if they have any other plans.

Ms. Perdu commented the light purple corner is currently designated Neighborhood Node and is just under two acres. The L-shaped part of the site is a little over six acres. The City Council is suggesting the whole site be changed to Community Mixed Use.

Mr. Lloyd stated he did not think the whole square including the Presbyterian Office was to be considered. Either way, treating that area similarly with a mixed use guidance makes sense.

**MOTION**

**Chair Murphy moved, seconded by Member Kimble to change the guidance of the entire square located at 2797-2833 Hamline Avenue to Community Mixed Use.**

**Ayes: 7**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

Site 5: 1380-1480 County Road C and 2630 Snelling Curve

Ms. Perdu highlighted the following information for this site:

- 2040 proposed future land use: Employment
- 2030 future land use: High Density Residential
- Current use: Industrial
- Suggested change: office-business park designation, similar to businesses on west side of Hamline, or Neighborhood Mixed Use, to make more compatible with residential uses to the south

Ms. Perdu referred to the map provided on page 24 of the meeting packet, and reported the City Council sent this back for additional consideration due to challenges with access and railroad. It was discussed that High Density Residential does not make sense and during the last Comprehensive Plan update, this was thought to be a potential transit corridor, but that is no longer an option.

Chair Murphy stated access to all these parcels is from County Road C.

Member Kimble inquired about the access difficulties and the size of the parcels.

Mr. Lloyd stated there is access, but it is constrained because it crosses the railroad property.

Ms. Perdu stated given the access constraints, they are not marked as potential redevelopment sites and the future land use designation reflects what is there now.

Member Gitzen inquired if staff is then recommending it be changed to be a potential redevelopment site.

Mr. Lloyd responded redevelopment has more to do with how likely someone will invest in it in the near future. They do not know of any imminent future development and that is why it is not marked for redevelopment. He stated the site is about 10 or 11 acres.

Mr. Lloyd commented what led to the original suggested change of Employment is that it would allow staff regulate the industrial uses and facilitate improvements to those properties in exchange for improving the buffer and compatibility with the neighborhood to the south. A designation that allows them to regulate the uses is the

direction that they were headed. A Neighborhood Mixed Use still does not allow for the current uses and it would still be non-conforming. However, it would allow them to be more strict about how they are reoccupied.

Mr. Gitzen stated he would not want to be too strict, the businesses that are there have been there for a while, and it is not a desirable area.

Mr. Lloyd stated the Employment district would be best with the uses that are currently on site.

Member Kimble commented it seems like County Road C is now a gateway to other parts of Roseville. The uses on this parcel are older and as the area has developed, they may want it to be more in line with a mixed use designation. However, the size and shape of the parcels and the railroad make it tough. She inquired why the Employment designation gives more flexibility on buffers.

Mr. Paschke responded it gives more flexibility in working with the businesses on existing use and how they refill it when tenants leave versus taking a hard line on nonconforming use. In 2009, the property went from Industrial to High Density Residential. There was at least one property that went vacant for over a year, because they could not put high density on one spot. The Employment designation gives staff and the neighborhood protections because it is built into the code much better than with the current code of High Density Residential.

In response to Member Sparby, Mr. Paschke confirmed the area is currently nonconforming under High Density Residential. In 2010, they adopted a new zoning code that made many properties nonconforming. It complicated this area and it becomes very difficult to work on getting new tenants that are not going away for high density or other uses.

Member Gitzen stated they originally changed it to Employment to make the buildings a conforming use.

Mr. Paschke stated this is looking at redeveloping in the future and Employment uses in the future. The buildings that are closer to the west side and adjacent to the animal hospital are fairly new and will not go away any time soon. The other ones are smaller and dated and might change. They need to determine what is most appropriate.

Chair Murphy inquired if office showroom is permitted under the Employment district.

Mr. Paschke stated it will be once the district is established and it is similar to Office Business Park.

Member Sparby commented he is worried about shuffling the deck of cards on the current business owners, and they are talking about being stricter on uses. He stated

they need more information on what is there and what makes sense for them so they can continue to operate.

Mr. Paschke pointed out High Density Residential gives the business owners nothing right now.

Member Kimble stated what the businesses have right now is the worst case for them.

Member Sparby commented it is a ways off in the future and they should get it right so they do not suffer the consequences.

Member Daire inquired what the use would be if the designation for this area could follow the use so the use can continue.

Ms. Perdu responded the use would be Employment.

Member Kimball stated if they were going to keep everything exactly as it is now, they would not be talking about a 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

Member Gitzen commented with the constraints and businesses here, it makes sense to use the Employment district.

Member Kimble agreed with Member Gitzen. She does not agree that they should guide areas to what its current use is in all cases.

#### **MOTION**

**Member Gitzen moved, seconded by Member Bull to maintain the guidance of Employment District at 1380-1480 County Road C and 2630 Snelling Curve.**

Member Bull commented maintaining the guidance is the most appropriate way to support the businesses. It is a limited area for development and it provides the potential to keep them conforming.

Member Sparby commented they do not know anything about the businesses or how it is going to affect them and he does not support the motion. They need more information now before they start the flow toward what will eventually become the zoning.

Chair Murphy stated High Density Residential is not appropriate and they owe it to the businesses to fix it. The future Employment district seems to fit the area and he supports the motion.

**Ayes: 6**

**Nays: 1 (Sparby)**

**Motion carried.**

Mr. Lloyd suggest they proceed to the next item on the agenda and return to this later in the meeting. There are people present in the audience to speak on it and Ms. Perdu needs to leave the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

The Commission agreed.

**c. HarMar, Lexington-Larpenteur, Rosedale Image Boards**

Ms. Perdu reported the redevelopment concepts provided on pages 31-33 of the meeting packet will be a supplement to the Land Use chapter in the Comprehensive Plan. Based on the public feedback and previous Planning Commission discussions, the three sites noted as high priority for potential redevelopment are HarMar Mall, Lexington-Larpenteur Roseville Center, and Rosedale Center. She noted the concepts are just ideas and not proposals or specific site plans. They are things that could be included as potential implementation ideas, and could be implemented by private property owners or through City ordinances.

HarMar Mall

Ms. Perdu reported they heard a lot from residences through the walkabouts and community meetings and came up with the following suggestions:

- Active Use Space: This could be used for local community markets. It would consist of pop-up markets in the parking lots around HarMar and Target.
- Visual Connections from Street to Mall: This could include ways to connect people from the streets and transit, and bring them into the mall.
- Parking Lot Cinema/Drive: This could be a temporary drive-in to draw people in an active way to the space and into the mall.
- Renewable Energy
- Trees in Parking Areas: This could be one way to beautify the space.
- Mixed use Buildings: This could be a longer-term redevelopment intensification suggestion.

Cindy Ridge, 1454 West Eldridge Avenue, commented she was part of the walkabout in July. All the neighbors want HarMar to succeed and they like a lot of what is included in this concept. She expressed concern with the parking lot cinema/drive-in concept and potential noise associated with it. A drive-in theater would be open late and on the weekends when they like to have the windows open, and in addition to noise they would be concerned with traffic and garbage as well. She requested the Planning Commission remember there are neighborhoods on three sides of HarMar Mall, and she is supportive of daytime uses, not nighttime uses.

Member Gitzen commented the parking lot drive-in surprised him too, especially when they are discussing driverless cars and less cars on the road.

Member Kimble commented she likes the creativity of it and there is another development in the Twin Cities that is considering something similar.

Ms. Perdu stated it could be something that only happens once or twice, and it could be considered further for some other type of entertainment.

Member Kimble commented they would have to address the neighbor's concerns.

Member Bull stated they need to address year-round businesses to make it worthwhile. The active use space is a good idea, but unpractical six months out of the year in Minnesota. Regarding the parking lot drive-in, they heard a lot of comments that people want to get rid of the expanses of open space parking lots. The active space would be great for a small fancy strip of family run restaurants that could be permanent structures.

Ms. Perdu commented if they have a smaller, temporary pop-up option, it might be good to show a more permanent option as well.

Member Sparby commented he did not see a lot of green space with this plan and there is an issue with too much parking lot space in that area.

Katie Engman, 1413 Eldridge Avenue West, commented she attended the walkabout. She has a young family and they often walk to HarMar for dinner. It is difficult to walk through the parking lot and she suggested there be more green space or a walking path for the surrounding neighbors. They chose to live here and wants to use the businesses that Roseville has.

Chair Murphy inquired what she thought of the Solar Panel/Renewable Energy option.

Ms. Engman commented renewable energy is fascinating, but she is not sure it belongs here. It may work on the roof of HarMar rather than at eye level.

Ms. Perdu commented there are also opportunities to use solar panels on the top of walkways as well.

Member Gitzen stated GMC just announced they will develop an electric car by 2023, and this could also be a way to incorporate the panels into a charging station.

Ms. Engman commented she also likes the idea of planting more trees and maintaining the trees they have.

Member Kimble suggested the concept of connecting the street to the mall include connecting the neighborhood to the mall.

Member Sparby suggested they also include appropriately sizing the parking lot as well.



Mr. Paschke stated the current code would require pedestrian connections with lots of islands, trees and landscaping.

Member Kimble commented the nice thing about this site is the Bus Rapid Transit and other ways to get to it. The parking is changing a lot, but they want to be able to attract certain retailers that may require a certain amount of parking.

Member Gitzen commented snow storage and removal is still an issue.

### Rosedale Mall

Mr. Lloyd referred to page 33 of the meeting packet and provided the following concepts to the Commission:

- Elevated Park
- Mixed Use Buildings: This would be central to the Core Mixed Use guidance that the area is standing to get in the updated Future Land Use plan.
- Solar Panels/Renewable Energy: This could serve for recharging cars and meeting energy needs of the shopping center. They could be installed as canopies over parking stalls and would help the keep cars cooler and sheltered from rain and snow.
- Buildings Crossing the Roadway
- Rooftop Parks/Parking
- Trees in Car Parking Areas: This would also include more pedestrian paths through the parking areas.

Chair Murphy commented the building over a roadway intrigues him, and he inquired who owns the air rights over County Road B2.

Mr. Lloyd stated Ramsey County owns the air rights over County Road B2. He stated there is a circulation road that has parking lots on either side of it and it could be incorporated in that area as well. There is also a long-standing desire to have a connection across Highway 36 as well.

Member Daire commented an elevated park across some of the arterials is exciting and he likes the idea of having mixed use buildings over structured park. They could create a network of paths. The City may need to come up with a demo project on how this would work.

Member Kimble stated Lifetime Fitness is doing fitness and running tracks on top of Southdale.

Member Bull agreed with Member Daire, and stated that the transportation aspect of people walking and biking through the community is important and this presents a lot of possibilities.

Member Kimble commented there has been discussion with having lids over freeways to connect to neighborhoods and it has been done in other communities. The area is then turned into a park. St. Paul is looking at connection the Rondo neighborhood and Minneapolis is also considering this.

Lexington-Larpenteur Roseville Center

Mr. Lloyd referred to page 32 of the meeting packet and presented the following concepts to the Commission:

- Plaza Space
- Active Playground
- Trees in Parking Area
- Overhead lighting

Member Gitzen inquired if redevelopment will happen sooner with the current number of empty storefronts.

Mr. Lloyd responded he does not know the timeline, but is a grocer that has been working with the manager to occupy the west end. The plan has been to relocate the House of Wong to the east end of the shopping center.

Mr. Paschke commented they are attempting to redevelop a portion of this site and improve the rest of it. He does not have information on who the potential tenants could be. There are still vacancies there because they are trying to come up with an acceptable plan. He does not expect any of the vacant tenant spaces to be filled in the near future.

Member Gitzen inquired if they can encourage these concepts to happen if redevelopment takes place.

Mr. Paschke responded some of it will already be required based on current and future zoning. Having better connections to the mall area and more trees and greenspace are things the code already requires. It will all depend if the visions of the Comprehensive Plan have made its way into zoning text as this area is redeveloped.

Member Kimble commented retailers demand some of these amenities and this type of site planning because it is what brings customers in. She commented the signage has not been coordinated and it mismatched, and it would be great to have coordination.

Member Bull commented when they previously discussed this as a west end development, they talked about having underground parking. However, this is not included in the concepts that were provided.

Member Kimble commented underground parking costs about \$50,000 per stall. On average, structured parking is around \$30,000 per stall. It is a great concept, but they need to have the demographics, people, and rents to make it work.

**d. Draft of Housing Chapter** (*This item was postponed until the next meeting*)

Member Kimble inquired if item 6(d) Draft of Housing Chapter can be postponed to the next meeting.

Ms. Perdu confirmed they could have it on the agenda at the next meeting.

**b. Future Land Use Sites for Further Consideration**

Discussion resumed on this agenda item.

Site 6: 2315 Chatsworth Street

Mr. Lloyd highlighted the following information for this site:

- 2040 proposed future land use: High Density Residential
- 2030 future land use: High Density Residential
- Current use: Grandview Townhomes
- Suggested change: Medium Density Residential

Mr. Paschke reported the project is to be reguided Low Density Residential and they should see it back from the Metropolitan Council in about two weeks.

Mr. Lloyd commented it would be the same shade as the single-family homes on the Future Land Use Map, but the zoning would allow for townhouses.

**MOTION**

**Member Kimble moved, seconded by Member Gitzen to change the guidance at 2315 Chatsworth Street to Low Density Residential.**

Member Daire commented the City Council directed staff to change this site to Medium Density Residential

Mr. Lloyd commented the direction was to make it lower than High Density and the Council may be open to Low Density Residential.

Member Kimble inquired if Low Density Residential fits the Grandview Townhomes.

Mr. Paschke confirmed it did. They are set for six new townhomes. Once it is approved by the Metropolitan Council, rezoning of the property and a preliminary plat will be presented to the City Council for approval.

Chair Murphy commented he attended the open house on this and the neighbors were concerned about the dead end. Given the size of the property and the houses back there, they were generally in favor of the townhomes.

**Ayes: 7**  
**Nays: 0**  
**Motion carried.**

Site 7: 2360 Lexington Avenue

Mr. Lloyd highlighted the following information for this site:

- 2040 proposed future land use: High Density Residential
- 2030 future land use: High Density Residential
- Current use: Child Development Center
- Suggested change: Neighborhood Mixed Use

Mr. Lloyd commented the commercial property at the corner of an existing townhouse development could be changed to Neighborhood Mixed Use to reflect the commercial designation to the south. It was most likely guided as high density because of the townhomes and nursing home facility in that area.

**MOTION**

**Member Bull moved, seconded by Member Kimble to change the guidance at 2360 Lexington Avenue to Neighborhood Mixed Use.**

**Ayes: 7**  
**Nays: 0**  
**Motion carried.**

Site 8: 1880 Lexington

Mr. Lloyd highlighted the following information for this site:

- 2040 proposed future land use: High Density Residential
- 2030 future land use: High Density Residential
- Current use: Single-family Residential
- Suggested change: Low Density Residential

Chair Murphy inquired about the light purple area on the southeast corner.

Mr. Paschke responded it is a two-story office building and the hardware store is on the north side.

Mr. Lloyd reported staff is suggesting it be guided as Low Density Residential. It is a large property adjacent to both High Density Residential and Low Density Residential.

Member Kimble referred to previous discussion about a gap in the City regarding medium density. Given proximity to the commercial center at Lexington and Larpenteur, this could be a medium density buffer between single-family and high density.

Mr. Lloyd noted the current medium density zoning district does allow for single family homes.

**MOTION**

**Member Kimble moved, seconded by Member Gitzen to change the guidance at 1880 Lexington Avenue to Medium Density Residential.**

Member Bull inquired if high density would be required if a small apartment building was constructed on this lot.

Mr. Paschke responded medium density currently allow for up to 12 units per acre and this site could handle up to an eight-plex unit.

**Ayes: 7**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

Site 9: SE Corner of Dale/County Road C

Mr. Lloyd highlighted the following information for this site:

- 2040 proposed future land use: High Density Residential
- 2030 future land use: High Density Residential
- Current use: Vacant
- Suggested change: Medium Density Residential

Mr. Lloyd referred to the map provided on page 27 of the meeting packet, and explained this site has wetlands that make development of the site difficult and there are single-family guided properties to the east, with low and medium density to the west, and low and high density to the north. The City Council suggested they consider medium density due to the demand for it in the community. The owner is currently working with a senior housing developer for the site that fits with the high-density guidance.

Chair Murphy inquired about cross-hatched right corner.

Mr. Lloyd responded it currently undeveloped but guided as Low Density Residential.

Member Kimble inquired why it was not included with this site.

Mr. Paschke recalled the owner of that parcel requested it be changed from High Density Residential to Low Density Residential because they wanted to be able to construct a single-family home.

Member Gitzen inquired about the message are they sending the potential developer if they reguided the site to Medium Density Residential.

Mr. Paschke responded the owner was in attendance at the Council meeting when this was discussed.

Member Kimble inquired about the acreage on this site.

Mr. Lloyd responded the site is four and a half acres.

Member Brown inquired about the wetlands on the site.

Mr. Lloyd commented there are in the southwestern corner and also toward the southeast.

Mr. Paschke stated the developer cannot touch the wetlands, they have to put a buffer in, and they can only use 25 percent of the wetland for their land use calculations.

Mr. Lloyd commented there are also heightened storm water management requirements.

Chair Murphy commented if they change this to medium density and the project was approved in the meantime, there would be a high-density project that would become a legal nonconforming site.

Mr. Paschke commented if the developer pulls a permit to do this project soon, it has already been approved as high density. The City Council believes this area should be guided as medium density just in case the project never comes to fruition.

Chair Murphy commented given the nature of the wetland area, it would make sense to also include the cross-hatched area.

Member Kimble agreed.

Member Bull commented this is a great area for high density. They need to make sure they are preserving enough opportunity with high density and affordable housing to meet the goals with housing units. He would also support including the cross-hatched area.

Member Kimble commented she could go either way. It could be a high-density site, but it would be nice if it were planned in a way that was complementary to the area. Visually, it will depend on how the developer plans the site. If it is developed and it got close to the corner, it would be a different corner than the others in that area.

Member Brown pointed the townhomes on the other side of the street are set back, and there will be new townhomes on the opposite corner. It will be an interesting corner and is a tough site.

Member Sparby commented there is a developer looking at the site. It is a vacant parcel and it seems they are pulling the rug out from under the developer. They do not

need to reguide it tonight and they should get more information from the developer before they make a decision. He supports keeping it guided as it stands.

Chair Murphy moved to change the guidance at the SE Corner of Dale/County Road C to Medium Density Residential, and include the cross-hatched area. He explained it is a unique corner, the City Council has made this suggestion, and if they include the cross-hatched area, it gives the developer a little more flexibility. The motion failed for lack of a second.

Chair Murphy commented if they do nothing it will remain High Density Residential and the cross-hatched area will remain Low Density Residential.

Member Bull moved to maintain the guidance at the SE Corner of Dale/County Road C as High Density Residential, and include the cross-hatched area located on the northeast corner. The motion failed for lack of a second.

Member Daire stated he agrees with Member Sparby and they should come back to it at a later date.

Member Sparby inquired why they are considering changing it to Medium Density Residential.

Chair Murphy responded the City Council stated they want it medium density.

Member Bull pointed out the City Council stated there is a demand for medium density in the area, but they are not demanding this are become that. This area is better for high density options and is consistent with what the current landowner is looking into.

Member Daire commented they should not deal with this right now. If it remains high density, it will communicate to the developer to proceed with the proposed project. It will also be good to honor the request of the single-family property. He does not see the need to change the land use designations as they stand.

Mr. Lloyd commented they can make a motion to leave things as they stand.

Chair Murphy stated he will not allow a motion to leave things as they are. They have a status quo and it needs to be changed. If they cannot come to a consensus, then it will remain as is.

Member Kimble inquired if they know if the same owner owns the smaller parcel.

Mr. Lloyd commented he was unsure, but the name looked familiar.

Chair Murphy summarized for Site 9, they were unable to come to any conclusion to recommend a change for the 2040 Future Land Use, and it will remain High Density Residential.

Site 10: 2533-2609 Snelling Curve

Mr. Lloyd highlighted the following information for this site:

- 2040 proposed future land use: Low Density Residential
- 2030 future land use: Medium Density Residential
- Current use: Single-family/Vacant
- Suggested change: Medium Density Residential

Mr. Lloyd referred to the map provided on page 28 of the meeting packet, and explained this is a former greenhouse site and the site of a couple single-family homes on the north end. He explained the light blue includes storm water ponding and has an institutional designation. They could still single-family on smaller lots in Medium Density Residential. The low-density designation is typically associated with 11,000 square foot or one-quarter acre lots, but it could also contain smaller lots.

Member Daire commented the houses east of Snelling Curve are on higher ground and are substantial attractive houses. The cross-hatched area is below Snelling Curve and is currently occupied by green houses. If he lived in that area he would feel violated and like someone had betrayed his trust if this area were to become Medium Density Residential. It should remain Single-family Residential.

Member Kimble commented they are currently fronting a greenhouse.

Member Daire stated the green house is hidden behind a lot of foliage.

Member Gitzen pointed out there are also a couple of single-family houses on the north end as well.

Member Kimble commented she appreciates Member Daire's comments. When they first looked at this, it appeared to be a good medium density area because of the proximity to Snelling.

Member Daire stated if this were to be medium density, it would noticeably increase the traffic on Snelling Curve and the people who live in the single-family homes across the street would see it as a significant rise in traffic on the street in front of their house.

Chair Murphy stated the access is either by Hamline Avenue or County Road B2.

Member Sparby commented this could potentially alter the makeup of the neighborhood by changing it to medium density. They have not done a traffic study or received public input to proceed with medium density.

Mr. Lloyd commented if it remained as medium density, there would be no land use change. If it were changed to low density residential, they would hold a public



meeting in early December to let the surround property owners of the potential change.

No motion was made, and Chair Murphy stated it will remain being proposed for 2040 Comprehensive Plan as Low Density Residential.

Site 11: 2560 Fry Street

Mr. Lloyd highlighted the following information for this site:

- 2040 proposed future land use: High Density Residential
- 2030 future land use: High Density Residential
- Current use: Commercial
- Suggested change: Medium Density Residential

Mr. Lloyd reported this site is across the street from single-family, abuts a park, is adjacent to a high-density use, and is a little over one acre in size.

Member Kimble commented she can see it staying as high density. It is part of a whole site that is already high density.

Member Bull agreed.

Chair Murphy commented he is sympathetic to the need for medium density lots in the City and this seems like a prime spot to do it given what was there previously.

Member Kimble inquired if this neighborhood backs up to retail.

Mr. Lloyd confirmed it does, and pointed on the retail areas highlighted in red on the map provided on page 28 of the meeting packet.

**MOTION**

**Chair Murphy moved, seconded by Member Daire to change the guidance at 2560 Fry Street to Medium Density Residential.**

Members Bull and Kimble stated they would favor high density and will not support the motion.

**Ayes: 3**

**Nays: 4 (Bull, Kimble, Gitzen, and Sparby)**

**Motion failed.**

Chair Murphy advised they recommend no change.

Site 12: 2025 County Road B

Mr. Lloyd highlighted the following information for this site:

- 2040 proposed future land use: Medium Density Residential

- 2030 future land use: Low Density Residential
- Current use: Vacant
- Suggested change: Low Density Residential

Mr. Lloyd referred to the map provided on page 29 of the meeting packet. He reported in previous years there had been applications to change the zoning from low density to high density for various development proposed. They have been denied because high density does not seem to fit there. The Planning Commission is recommending medium density on this site, and the City Council is requesting it be reconsidered for low density.

Member Kimble commented the City recently acquired land across the street for green space.

Member Gitzen commented when they previously discussed this, they agreed medium density was a good buffer between County Road B and the high density to the north. He supports leaving it at medium density.

Member Bull agreed that medium is appropriate and they have heard there is a demand for medium density in the City.

Members Kimble and Chair Murphy agreed. Chair Murphy stated it is in private hands and he has not seen anyone from the Parks department express interest to purchase the land to make it into a park.

Member Daire stated if it were changed to a park, it would be for the high-density condos to the north. Access to the site would be torturous for the medium density and single-family people. He supports leaving as the proposed Medium Density Residential.

The Commission agreed to leave it as the 2040 proposed future land use designation of Medium Density Residential.

#### Site 13: 2112 Dale Street

Mr. Lloyd highlighted the following information for this site:

- 2040 proposed future land use: Low Density Residential
- 2030 future land use: High Density Residential
- Current use: Single-family
- Suggested change: Neighborhood Mixed Use

Mr. Lloyd referred to the map provided on page 30 of the meeting packet. He reported this site has a single-family home that remains there. Looking forward, it might make sense to incorporate it into the Neighborhood Mixed Use due to its surroundings.

**MOTION**

**Member Gitzen moved, seconded by Member Bull to change the guidance at 2112 Dale Street to Neighborhood Mixed Use.**

Member Daire called the question.

**Ayes: 7**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

Member Gitzen referred to page 40 of the meeting packet. He commented under Existing Housing Affordability, it states there are 9,174 total housing units in Roseville. However, in the table on the next page, it shows there are 15,747 housing units. Also, in the same table, the 6,693 housing units under “affordable to 51 percent and 80 percent AMI” is misleading. He stated the columns should be added because if a person can afford the higher one, they can also afford the lower one. He also inquired how the housing stock is determined in Roseville.

Mr. Lloyd responded housing stock information taken from Ramsey County for the year the structure was built.

Mr. Paschke stated unless the site was redeveloped, it will reflect the original date it was built, even if improvements were made.

Chair Murphy inquired if a similar graph that showed the age of housing units without improvements would be helpful.

Mr. Paschke commented Ramsey County does not keep solid record of that and it would be difficult to do.

Mr. Lloyd stated it would be difficult to indicate how much improvement was made over time, but it could be added as a textual comment.

Member Sparby raised a point of order, and inquired if they are discussing the Housing Chapter that they previously agreed to postpone to the next meeting.

Mr. Paschke advised it would be helpful to have Ms. Perdu present for the discussion.

Mr. Lloyd suggested Commissioners email their comments and questions to him and he will direct them to Ms. Perdu.

Member Gitzen stated he emailed an article to Mr. Lloyd about affordable housing that was in *MinnPost*. There is now discussion that it is not just the about 30 percent of income, but is also about housing costs plus transportation. He inquired if there has been any discussion with the Metropolitan Council on this idea.

Mr. Lloyd stated he will forward to article to the rest of the Commissioners. He does not know if the Metropolitan Council has anything formalized about it yet, but they heard discussion of reframing the issue from affordable housing to affordable living. If accessibility is not affordable in the place a person can afford to live, it does not do a lot of good to have that residence in that location.

**e. Comprehensive Plan Schedule: September 17-November 18**

Mr. Lloyd requested Commissioners send him any additional questions or comments.

Chair Murphy advised the Variance Board will be having a joint meeting with the Planning Commission on October 25.

**7. Adjourn**

No motion was given. The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.