



**Planning Commission– Comprehensive Plan Update Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Minutes – Thursday, October 19, 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 and Commissioners Sharon Brown, James Daire, Chuck Gitzen, and Peter Sparby

Members Absent: Vice Chair James Bull and Commissioner Julie Kimble

Staff Consultants Present: Community Development Director Kari Collins, Senior Planner Brian Lloyd, City Planner Thomas Paschke; Public Works Director Marc Culver; and Erin Perdu, WSB & Associates

3. Approval of Agenda

MOTION

Member Sparby moved, seconded by Member Gitzen to approve the Agenda as presented.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Review of Minutes

a. October 4, Comprehensive Plan Update Meeting

Commissioners had an opportunity to review draft minutes and submit their comments and corrections to staff prior to tonight's meeting, for incorporation of those revisions into the draft minutes.

MOTION

Member Gitzen moved, seconded by Member Sparby to approve the October 4, 2017 minutes as presented.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

5. Communications and Recognitions:

- a. **From the Public:** *Public comment pertaining to 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*
Senior Planner Lloyd provided the members with an update on the 2040 Comprehensive Plan noting staff has been working on the future Land Use Plan. He commented on Site 2 and requested feedback from the members on the proposed guidance for this triangle parcel.

Member Sparby recalled just the smaller area in blue (the properties directly abutting C2) was to be zoned Neighborhood Mixed Use.

Chair Murphy concurred with this statement.

Mr. Lloyd commented on a postcard for the upcoming Community Workshops that would be held on Wednesday, November 8th from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. and Thursday, November 9th from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m. at City Hall. He explained Commission Members and City Council Members would be asked to hand out these postcards to members of the community.

Community Development Director Collins reported the last Rice-Larpenteur Avenue Workshop would be held on Thursday, October 26th from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. She reported the workshop meeting would be held at the Community School of Excellence in the cafeteria. She noted this would be a family friendly event in order to gain feedback from the entire community.

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

a. **Follow up on Items from Previous Meetings**

- *Upcoming Comprehensive Plan Update Meeting Dates*

Mr. Lloyd explained staff was waiting to see how the Council meeting went on Monday, October 23rd before setting the remainder of the 2017 meeting dates for the Comprehensive Plan. He reported the Planning Commission would be meeting next to address the Comprehensive plan on October 25th and again on November 29th. He explained the meeting for late December has been canceled due to the holidays. He anticipated that Comprehensive Plan meetings would push into early 2018.

Member Daire asked if the feedback received from the Rice-Larpenteur Avenue Workshop would be channeled into upcoming Comprehensive Planning meetings.

Ms. Collins explained staff planned to draft an appendix to the plan from the feedback received at the workshop.

Erin Perdu, WSB & Associates, reported this was a special area of study that would be referenced within the Comprehensive Plan and be included as an appendix.

- *Stakeholder Interview progress report*
Mr. Lloyd provided the members with a progress report on Stakeholder Interviews. He reported a number of community engagement events were held by the City this spring and summer and noted the list of stakeholders that had been contacted to date.

Ms. Perdu explained she had spoken with Lydia Major and received an update on the recent interviews that had been completed on behalf of the City. She indicated all information gathered from the stakeholder interviews would be included in the planning document. She noted she contacted the ECFE folks and was hoping to attend three sessions with these parents. In addition, the Alliance for Sustainability would be interviewed.

Member Sparby commented the underserved communities have been a major focus within this summary. He asked if a larger swath or more broad view would be taken over the coming months.

Ms. Perdu stated this list was developed after the first round of initial engagements had been completed. She explained the purpose was to fill in the gaps for those that had not been represented at the original open houses. She commented that special efforts had been made by staff to reach out to these organizations or groups to ensure their voice was included through the stakeholder interviews.

Member Sparby questioned if a comprehensive summary of all resident input would be included in the final summary.

Ms. Perdu reported this was the plan.

b. Transportation and Pathways Master Plan

Mr. Lloyd reported Public Works Director Culver would be presenting the members with information on the Transportation and Pathways Master Plan.

Public Works Director Culver discussed the Transportation Master Plan with the members and noted traffic and safety numbers were being updated within this plan, along with changes in traffic patterns. He explained crash statistics were being analyzed and with the capacity of the City's transportation system. He stated the focus was on the volume for main corridors while noting certain choke points. He reviewed a map showing the areas of concern within the system. He indicated the Transportation Commission would be reviewing strategies to address these areas of concern while also reviewing policies and goals at their meeting next week. He

hoped to return to the Planning Commission with a final draft of the Transportation Master Plan by the end of November.

Mr. Culver commented on the Pathway Master Plan with the members. He explained this document would be viewed as a planning document and would assist with securing local and federal funding for trail connections and bike paths.

Mr. Culver reviewed the forecasted traffic numbers for 2040 in further detail and explained these numbers were not anticipated to grow too much. The intersections of concern within the City were noted as an area of focus for future project planning. The City's bus stops and transit routes were discussed. He understood there was a need to improve bus services to St. Paul and this information would be passed along to Metro Transit. The existing pathways within the City were reviewed. He stated he was proud of how this amenity within the City has expanded over the past few years.

Member Daire asked how the City funded its trails and pathways.

Mr. Culver commented the City did not have a dedicated funding source but rather relied on State and Federal grants. He noted MSA dollars could be used, but these were also for City roadways. He reported the County has been a fantastic partner for trails and bike lanes along County roadways. He explained Park Renewal Funds were another source of funding for trails and pathways.

Member Gitzen questioned the difference between a trail and a sidewalk.

Mr. Culver stated generally speaking a sidewalk was generally a five to six foot concrete facility, while a trail could be eight to twelve feet wide, is bituminous in nature and is multi-use for bikes and pedestrians.

Member Daire commented on Section 3-1 and understood the City was working towards better connectivity. He asked if the City was trying to increase the number of lanes or more efficiently use the lanes it already has. He discussed how he used local roadways to avoid regional traffic.

Mr. Culver stated this was a good point and indicated this Section of the plan could be word-smithed a bit better. He reported the Roseville was fully developed and all of its roadways were in place. He indicated it would be difficult to add lanes. He commented further on the managed lanes being planned for Highway 36 and I35W. He described how County roads or minor arterials were supposed to be used to relieve traffic.

Member Daire believed the City needed to focus on peak hour capacities while establishing how traffic was being diverted away from regional

infrastructure onto minor arterials. He wanted to better understand how this impacted traffic crashes during peak hours. He wanted to see the City taking care of its drivers.

Mr. Culver explained the County was completing their own transportation and safety plan in order to identify their priorities. The City could work with the County to bring to light any concerns we may have.

Member Gitzen questioned how much input the City had with the County.

Mr. Culver stated staff had a pretty good relationship with the County and there was an opportunity to critique their CIP, while offering suggestions. He described how the City and County were working together on the Rice-Larpenteur corridor.

Member Gitzen asked how the expense for sidewalks and trails was split between the City and County.

Mr. Culver described how costs were split for these types of projects and was pleased to report the County participated at a reasonable level.

Member Gitzen expressed frustration with the high level of traffic and wait times along Snelling Avenue.

Mr. Culver commented this was a MnDOT intersection and staff recognized this area was a concern.

Chair Murphy discussed how Snelling Avenue was impacted by emergency vehicles and trains throughout the day and noted these vehicles created additional delays for local traffic. He requested clarification from staff on Goal 5-6.

Mr. Culver explained how staff defined “goods” within this portion of the Transportation Master Plan and noted this could be further reviewed.

Member Daire commented on Section 4-5 and described how park and rides were taking vehicles off the regional roadways downstream. He asked if this policy could focus specifically on pull outs that would facilitate movement of the buses through an acceleration lane.

Mr. Culver stated this item, regarding the park and ride was included in the original Transportation Plan. He was of the opinion the Twin Lakes area park and ride was originally under designed and Met Council would have to consider if Roseville was a good candidate for another park and ride. He explained staff could speak to Metro Transit to see if there was a growing need for park and ride services in Roseville.

Member Daire believed that park and rides were a great idea as they allowed for consolidated traffic. He wanted to learn if the City needed more park and rides.

Mr. Culver went on to review a strategies document with the members.

Chair Murphy commented on the traffic concerns at the intersection of Cleveland Avenue and County Road D.

Mr. Culver stated this was a phasing issue and noted staff had spoken to MnDOT regarding this concern.

Member Gitzen asked if the County would be adding any roundabouts in Roseville to assist with easing congestion.

Mr. Culver commented on the roundabouts currently located in the City and noted staff was discussing potential four-way stop intersections that would benefit from having roundabouts. He explained the challenge would be to find the funding to install these roundabouts. He indicated the only concern with additional roundabouts was how to move pedestrians through the area.

Member Daire stated he has heard great things about roundabouts and how they are moving traffic through intersections in a more timely and efficient manner. He understood the City was working to divert cut through traffic along Pascal and Burke and asked how this would be addressed by the City.

Mr. Culver explained this concern was brought to the City by Roseville residents. He commented that traffic was driving along Pascal and Burke in order to avoid the intersection at Hamline Avenue near Har Mar Mall.

Member Brown questioned how the City was working to create a more sustainable and affordable transportation network for seniors.

Mr. Culver indicated this was a challenging situation for the City. He understood the City of Maplewood had partnerships with some private organizations in order to improve transportation, which was something Roseville could look into. He explained the City was interested in learning more from Maplewood on how to fill the gaps in our City.

Member Brown encouraged staff to investigate this further as the number of seniors in the community was on the rise.

Mr. Culver provided the members with final comments on the Transportation Master Plan and the City's strategies.

Chair Murphy asked if the visioning for TCAAP was far enough along for the City of Roseville to understand how it would be impacted by additional traffic.

Mr. Culver stated staff does have questions about this along with forecasted traffic models. Staff commented on the assumptions that were made by Met Council and how traffic would flow from TCAAP to surrounding

communities. He believed the models were properly forecasted. He explained that the regional plan was to direct more traffic back to the freeways through the additional managed lanes and away from the local arterials.

Chair Murphy asked if there were any comments or questions from the public. There were none.

c. Draft Housing Chapter

Ms. Perdu reviewed the draft Housing Chapter with the members and noted this had been addressed by the Planning Commission at several previous meetings. She appreciated the feedback the members had provided regarding housing goals. The goals within the Housing Chapter were as follows:

- Develop a coordinated housing strategy for the City.
- Provide mechanisms that encourage the development of a wide range of housing that meets regional, state and national standards for affordability.
- Implement programs that result in safe and well-maintained properties.
- Establish public-private partnerships to ensure life-cycle housing throughout the City to attract and retain a diverse mix of people, family types, economic statuses, ages and so on.
- Employ flexible zoning for property redevelopment to meet broader housing goals such as density, open space, and lot size.
- Develop design guidelines to support new or renovated housing that contributes to the physical character of the neighborhood, healthy living, and environmental and economic sustainability.

Ms. Perdu explained these goals were written into the framework for the Housing Chapter. She described how household sizes were declining in Roseville. She reported the City needed to explore opportunities to encourage smaller and more “non-traditional” housing development, including opportunities to address the lack of housing in the “missing middle” styles.

Chair Murphy asked how the City was defining “family”.

Ms. Perdu stated she was uncertain how the Comprehensive Plan defined family. She commented that for her purposes, she defined “family” as one or two parents with minor children.

Chair Murphy questioned if the Commission should be moving forward with this item given the fact two members were missing this evening.

Mr. Lloyd commented he had received feedback from the missing members.

Ms. Perdu explained she could bring this item back to the Planning Commission on October 25th for additional comment.

Chair Murphy requested this item be placed on the October 25th agenda.

Member Daire commented on the AFI's within the Housing Chapter along the levels of affordability. He understood the trend was moving towards smaller and smaller households. He stated he wanted to be ensured that this document was comparing affordability factors and household incomes in an apples to apples manner and not apples to oranges. He explained he wanted to be able to put a proper face on the low-income people within the community. He wanted to be able to help these individuals as a City.

Member Gitzen asked if staff was comparing a Roseville family of four to the AMI.

Ms. Perdu reported she would review this comparison further and would report back to the members on October 25th. She explained that she could work to more closely compare the housing and income numbers within the document.

Member Gitzen questioned if market demand would drive the housing needs in the community or if policies had to be in place.

Ms. Perdu stated there were opportunities to have zoning available to assist with driving or creating new housing options. She reported these were long-term conversations that could assist with housing redevelopments.

Chair Murphy commented on a discrepancy in the housing numbers on Page 7 and 8 of the Housing Chapter and requested staff clarify the numbers within the charts.

Ms. Perdu indicated the numbers on Page 7 were incorrect and would be corrected.

Member Daire discussed the bar chart on Page 2 and commented on the number of 1950's homes available in the City.

Chair Murphy stated there have been a large number of building permits pulled in recent years to upgrade and improve the 1950's style homes in Roseville. He indicated it would benefit the City to better understand what percentage of this housing stock has been improved.

Member Daire agreed this would be valuable information for the City to better understand.

Ms. Perdu explained she would further investigate this data and would report back to the Commission.

Member Gitzen reported the smaller homes on his block have been purchased, renovated and flipped, which was reducing the number of affordable homes in the City. He indicated this was happening all over Roseville given the number of smaller single-family homes on the market.

Chair Murphy asked what was meant by ACS.

Ms. Perdu stated ACS referred to American Community Survey and noted this was part of the census data.

Chair Murphy requested the legends on Page 7 be updated to show the proper number of colors. He commented on Page 16 there was a typo regarding the West. St. Paul data.

Ms. Perdu apologized and indicated she would correct this typo. She referred to the next housing goal for the City reporting a quarter of Roseville's households are cost-burdened, spread evenly through the AMI bands. The City's goal would be to reduce the overall community housing cost burden, particularly by supporting those projects that provide affordability for households in the lowest income categories.

Member Gitzen inquired if housing burdens could be adjusted for families that have great transportation options and are moving away from cars.

Ms. Perdu reported this was being investigated. She was uncertain how to quantify this option, but would be looking into this further. She explained the third housing goal was to address the City's aging housing stock and the fact that residents will have increasing maintenance and upkeep requirements in the coming decades. The desired outcome would be to maintain some level of affordability for these homes. This would require the City to support housing maintenance assistance programs, particularly for lower-income households.

Chair Murphy understood the City had housing assistance programs already in place. He asked how much the City was spending on these programs per year.

Ms. Collins commented on the neighborhood enhancement program and stated she would have to investigate the amount of dollars being spent on this and other programs in place.

Member Daire asked if the City had any idea what proportion of the cost burdened households were seniors.

Ms. Perdu was uncertain but indicated she could investigate this further.

Chair Murphy stated employment may more of a determining factor than age.

Member Daire agreed this should also be taken into consideration.

Ms. Perdu indicated the fourth housing goal for Roseville, along with many urban communities, was to better understand the risk of losing its naturally occurring affordable housing to redevelopment. She indicated the City would have to anticipate the need for creative strategies to manage naturally-occurring affordable housing within all affordability bands.

Ms. Perdu commented the fifth goal was for the City to take a look at how strategic development of housing can offer access to services and amenities to provide populations without a personal vehicle a method of transportation. She reported Roseville would have to explore opportunities to increase transit-oriented development in strategic areas connected to major transit routes.

Member Daire discussed transit-oriented housing and questioned if staff had a profile for those that were attracted to these developments.

Ms. Perdu stated she could create a profile for this.

Ms. Perdu explained the sixth goal would be to monitor and update City ordinances that can help to produce flexibility and diversity in housing opportunities. This could be done by updating ordinances as necessary to maintain optimal housing functionality and livability and to address new technologies, market trends and resident needs.

Chair Murphy asked if staff missed a goal within her presentation.

Ms. Perdu noted on Page 19 of her written report there is a needs goal to support the increased demand for senior housing opportunities allowing residents to age in place.

Member Gitzen questioned how the seven housing needs were tied into the Chapter on Page 7.

Ms. Perdu explained these items were the framework for the City's housing goals and assisted staff in creating the matrix.

Member Gitzen stated he would like to see the goals more closely tied together.

Member Sparby agreed.

Member Gitzen commented on how transportation was a regional issue and inquired how this could be addressed by a City.

Ms. Perdu stated there were a lot of strategies in place and referred the Commission to the tool matrix on Pages 22 and 23. In addition, she noted public and private partnerships could be pursued. She explained that in some cases, counties were called upon to assist with transportation concerns.

Ms. Perdu commented further on the matrix located on Pages 22 and 23.

Chair Murphy requested a grammatical change to the document in the TIF paragraph noting there was a run-on sentence that needed correction.

Member Daire asked if a tax abatement program could be used for residents willing to make improvements to their house.

Ms. Perdu indicated she would investigate the potential of such a program.

Chair Murphy reported this type of program could only abate local Roseville taxes.

Member Daire stated the City could work with the County to try and have their portion abated as well.

Ms. Collins indicated tax abatement was not typically used. She recalled the only time the County had offered tax abatement was to keep Lino Lakes from moving.

Member Sparby suggested the word “tabs” be changed to “maintain compliance” when referring to rental housing within the summary table.

Chair Murphy asked why there were references to Hennepin County within the document.

Ms. Perdu stated there were references to Hennepin and Ramsey Counties. She explained she could remove the references to Hennepin County.

Chair Murphy questioned if the members wanted to review the matrix goals tonight or hold off until the October 25th meeting.

Member Daire was in favor of waiting until October 25th in order for the other members of the Planning Commission to be in attendance.

Chair Murphy requested staff place this item on the October 25th meeting agenda for further discussion.

Ms. Perdu provided the members with an update on the other items that will be presented on October 25th.

Mr. Lloyd commented on the upcoming Community Workshops and encouraged the public to consider attending. He stated the first would be held on Wednesday, November 8th from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. at City Hall. The second workshop meeting would be held on Thursday, November 9th from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m. at City Hall. He reported additional feedback could be provided to staff via City’s webpage.

7. Adjourn

MOTION

Chair Murphy adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:47 p.m.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0

Motion carried.