



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Minutes – Wednesday, December 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, Chuck Gitzen, Julie Kimble, Sharon Brown, and Peter Sparby

Members Absent: James Daire

Staff Present: City Planner Thomas Paschke and Senior Planner Brian Lloyd

3. Approve Agenda

MOTION

Vice Chair Bull moved, seconded by Member Gitzen to approve the agenda as presented.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Review of Minutes

a. November 1, 2017 Planning Commission Regular Meeting

MOTION

Member Gitzen moved, seconded by Member Sparby to approve the November 1, 2017 meeting minutes.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

5. Communications and Recognitions:

a. From the Public: *Public comment pertaining to general 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 Kimble commented she attended a Minnesota Business Journal annual office update, which provides a market update across the Twin Cities area. Two brokers brought up Rosedale and the possibility of development around Rosedale.

Chief Planner Lloyd presented a revised schedule on the 2040 Comp Plan Update. There will be a check-in with the EDA in the middle of January regarding economic development chapter and housing, followed by one more stop with individual chapters on January 24th at the Planning Commission. In February, the final public engagement will begin, which will be the opportunity to review the entire draft plan. The Planning Commission will also be reviewing the whole draft plan. The Council will review the draft plan in March. Once feedback is incorporated, a public hearing will be held with the Planning Commission on April 4th.

Mr. Lloyd continued that if the Council needs another work session, that will be available to them. Otherwise, staff anticipates final approval by May 7th. There may well become changes to incorporate from that final public hearing and approval process, and staff can make those changes to the document in May, and getting it out to neighboring communities in June. Later in the year, the update will be submitted to the Met Council.

Vice Chair Bull asked about the timing of the land use open houses and the meeting with the EDA.

Mr. Lloyd clarified that nothing in the land use changes open houses should affect the EDA meeting. If there is some discussion to be had regarding significant feedback, counter to the City Council and the Planning Commission for the land use plan, staff can bring that to a regular Planning Commission meeting.

Vice Chair Bull suggested it will be difficult to attend all the land use change meetings, so he suggested staff email summaries to the Commission.

Member Gitzen noted he would appreciate more time to review the draft plans.

Mr. Lloyd noted that is one of the advantages of making the draft plan available for the public review beginning in the middle of the month. That is a time the Planning Commission can begin reviewing it as well. He noted the draft will be available to both the Planning Commission and the City Council at the beginning of the public engagement period.

Chair Murphy noted the Planning Commission is not meeting on the 4th week of December. The Commission has agreed on meeting dates through June 2018.

6. Public Hearing

a. Consideration of a Comprehensive Land Use Plan Map Change and Zoning Map Change at 2030 County Road D (PF17-019)

Chair Murphy opened the public hearing for PF17-019 at approximately 6:40 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing. He advised this item will be before the City Council on the third or fourth meeting in January 2018.

City Planner Paschke summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated December 6, 2017. He pointed out the property under consideration, which is owned by Gunnar Petterson. Part of the zoning is neighborhood business, and the south portion is residential. The request is to change all of the property to Low-Density Residential 2, which will allow for the conversion to another home site on the north side, creating a duplex. The other main purpose of the request is to allow for a lot to be created to build a second duplex.

Mr. Paschke pointed out the staff report, noting this would be considered a downgrading of the current Comp Plan designation as well as a down-zoning. Staff considered the location and surrounding land use in the area and has concluded the requested changes make sense. He noted this is a straight-forward request. He pointed out there is a BP Amoco on the corner.

Mr. Paschke noted the property owner has had the property for sale for years, but it is such an odd situation, with the line going through a building and having two different uses for the property. It makes most sense to make it all Neighborhood Business, Low Density or Medium Density which would improve the marketing of the property.

Vice Chair Bull asks about lines 84 through 86 of the staff recommendation, which indicates the property would be changed from High Density.

Mr. Paschke responded it was a typo and should rather indicate Neighborhood Business.

Chair Murphy noted this is unusual in that two zonings butting up in one structure, and it is a very narrow strip of property between it and the back of the gas station to the west.

Member Gitzen asked if a platting process would also be required.

Mr. Paschke affirmed that a platting would be necessary to subdivide the property, but it makes sense to wait for the Comp Plan update. There are some things that might have to change in this area, including some utilities. Those two should be resolved, so it does not make sense to shift lot lines to accommodate that. The first step is Comp Plan Amendment rezoning.

Member Kimble asked about the email in the packet, Attachment C, the options do not make sense. She asked about selling a portion to the gas station for expansion.

Mr. Paschke recalled that comment described the property owner's choice, as related to what was presented at the Open House.

Member Sparby noted some people are concerned about a possible change to Section 8 housing.

Mr. Paschke responded the City is unable to regulate housing of any sort, as it relates to rental or ownership. From that perspective, the City does not get involved, whether it is Section 8 or any other type of modified housing type. Once the City allows something to move forward and become a guided land for residential housing, that is what it is. There is no ability to determine whether it is owner-occupied or a rental.

Mr. Paschke continued that if the property is rented, if someone meets whatever the rental obligations are, they can have Section 8 vouchers to pay for the rent. The City does not get involved in those types of arrangements. Federal law prohibits the City from discriminating against Section 8.

Public Comment

Barry O'Mara stated he is a friend of Gunnar's, and he is representing the meeting on behalf of Gunnar. The gas station has been brought up. If the zoning is approved, there would be no gas station expansion. Secondly, it would be very unlikely the duplexes would become Section 8 housing.

Mr. O'Mara asked for clarification on the correct map. Mr. Paschke pointed out the updated, accurate map.

Chair Murphy noted the parking lot would be approved, and a duplex would be built.

Mr. O'Mara concurred that a duplex would likely be built on the site. The parking lot would be completely removed. He does not envision any structure that would allow the retaining of the parking lot. It is better off being green grass.

Member Sparby if the applicant has considered two single-family lots.

Mr. O'Mara responded there was some consideration given to other options, including single family. It does not lend itself well to that scenario. The highest and best use of this property is a duplex.

Chair Murphy closed the public hearing at 6:58 p.m., as no one else appeared to speak for or against.

Commission Deliberation

Chair Murphy asked whether the Comp Plan takes a supermajority, while the rezoning does not.

Mr. Paschke concurred.

Chair Murphy suggested two motions be made.

MOTION

Member Kimble moved, seconded by Member Gitzen to recommend to the City Council that the property at 2030 County Road D be reguided from a Comprehensive Land Use Map Designation of Business to Low-Density Residential (PF17-019).

Chair Murphy recalled he attended the open house, and probably a half dozen folks were present. The small piece that is designated Neighborhood Business now – the only thing can be done is expand the gas station. Changing it to Residential looks like to provide a nice blending with the surrounding residential.

Member Sparby noted it would serve as a nice buffer between residential and neighborhood business. This would also put the property to the highest value.

**Ayes: 6
Nays: 0
Motion carried.**

MOTION

Member Sparby moved, seconded by Member Kimble to recommend to the City Council that the property at 2030 County Road D be rezoned from the official map classification of Neighborhood Business to Low-Density Residential 2 (PF17-019).

**Ayes: 6
Nays: 0
Motion carried.**

7. Project File 0037: 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update

a. Continuation of Discussion on Resilience Chapter

Senior Planner Brian Lloyd introduced Becky Alexander with LHP.

Ms. Alexander presented her report entitled Roseville 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update Resilience Discussion, which summarizes her feedback from last appearance before the Planning Commission as well as some public feedback. She recalled that climate mitigation is important to address, but there is uncertainty in terms of needing more information before this body is prepared to recommend a way to do that. One suggestion was to find out what other cities are doing in their resilience chapter, so

that has been included in the report. Also included are other initiatives being worked on outside of the Comp Plan process, like vulnerability assessment and climate adaptation plan which has been released in draft form.

Mr. Lloyd noted staff is trying to figure out how to best distribute that to the Commission.

Member Kimble asked whether the Resilience Chapter has some overlap with the Environmental Chapter.

Mr. Lloyd responded the topics are inter-related. The conversation at the last Planning Commission meeting touched on solar and some water resources. The 2030 Comp Plan has a chapter on environmental protection as well. The Met Council has new requirements on resilience, so staff will try to incorporate all of that in the environmental chapter, which is mostly the work of the Public Works department, to bring those together with the resilience piece.

Ms. Alexander noted the energy efficiency in buildings, solar development, water tracking, all those play a big role in the resilience conversation.

Member Kimble stated it would make sense if there would be a reference between the two chapters.

Ms. Alexander noted the goal is to have one chapter. The different aspects of shore land protection, water management, all of those things addressed in the environmental protection plan, might feed into those goals.

Member Gitzen asked for clarifications on the references to the 2030 Comp Plan vs. 2040 Comp Plan Update.

Ms. Alexander noted the goal is to start with the 2030 Comp Plan as a starting point, and update it.

Member Gitzen asked whether it will carry forward.

Mr. Lloyd noted much of what is in the 2030 environmental chapter is still applicable for the 2040 plans. The goal will be to build from the 2030 Comp Plan.

Member Gitzen asked about greenhouse gas reduction goals.

Ms. Alexander noted that is a good discussion for the Planning Commission. The language in 3B is carefully worded to say “support” the State’s Next Generation Energy Act goal of 80 percent. That is not as strong as saying “commit to” or “achieve.” It specifies the things the City has in its control, in addition to things to encourage actions by residents and businesses. That is how she addressed what she heard last time from the Commission, not wanting to overcommit to an action plan.

Member Gitzen asked about “protect access to direct sunlight.” He asked how that can be enforced or achieved.

Mr. Lloyd responded if that goal is included, it could be accomplished via tree height and location requirements or building mass requirements and setbacks, so as not to allow buildings too close to property lines where it would cast shade on its neighbors. If this continues to be a goal, there are different ways to approach it. He recalled a previous Planning Commission discussion of solar easements on subdivision. That is an option for amending codes in the future.

Ms. Alexander noted section D is a required element in the Resilience Chapter, as per the Met Council guidance.

Member Gitzen asked that the section be developed a bit more.

Member Sparby commented on confusion about City operations and energy use and greenhouse gas emissions of the City as an entity, or the city as a whole, including business, residents, and traffic. He asked for clarification.

Ms. Alexander confirmed both categories are included. The goal of an 80 percent reduction could be community-wide. What other cities are doing is committing to a community-wide goal with an understanding there will need to be a partnership with businesses and residents. It will have to include leadership and education. Many cities are making commitments within their City operations, so Roseville can include that as well.

Chair Murphy stated it is both: lead by example, with more goal-orientation for the City.

Member Sparby stated there is no way the City can hold business or residents accountable; only the City can be held accountable. He suggested going stronger with the City and be less strong and more aspirational with community goals. He commended staff and the consultant for doing such good work.

Chair Murphy asked about item 2B, greenhouse gas emissions. Does that include vehicles passing through the city?

Ms. Alexander responded it can be defined in multiple ways. Traditionally, in Minnesota it accounts for vehicles traveling through the City and does not account for miles Roseville residents drive outside the city limit. There are other ways to calculate those miles, as part of the climate action process, to help determine what is in control of travelers through the city vs. residents.

Ms. Alexander continued that travel needs to be addressed on a regional scale. There are things cities can do in terms of incentivizing electric vehicle and eventually autonomous vehicle adoption.

Chair Murphy noted 35W will be widened in the next several years, and that will have a major impact.

Ms. Alexander noted that energy emissions have decreased much more rapidly than travel emissions can. Emphasis has been placed reducing energy emissions, with the understanding that it is much more difficult to set goals for travel emissions.

Chair Murphy asked if there can be dual goals that distinguish between what the City can control and what the City cannot control.

City Planner Paschke commented on the future expansion of 35W. He noted it is for a managed lane, so it is not necessarily a full-capacity lane. It may correlate into additional cars, but it may not add dramatic capacity to the road to handle more vehicles. The same discussion is on a portion of 36 out of Minneapolis out to Stillwater. There are ways for the City to create things in the Comp Plan that require Roseville to work regionally to try to reduce emissions and those types of things.

Mr. Paschke continued that with technology changing and car companies moving towards full electric, that will change over the course of time, even while this plan might still be in the first three years of its existence. There are things the City can strive for on a broad level, even if there are things out of the City's control. They can be considered lofty goals, because it is desired for the community to head in that direction. It takes more than Roseville to accomplish, but it is desirable to include in the plan.

Member Kimble asked about resiliency as it relates to emergency preparedness.

Ms. Alexander responded that could be primarily under the C goal, and that emergency preparedness is a good thing to address in this section.

Member Kimble suggested including an educational component about the concept of resiliency, since it is a new concept for most residents.

Chair Murphy asked whether partnering on the educational piece is possible, such as a university or high school or library.

Member Kimble concurred. The City does not need to develop its own curriculum but instead direct the public to existing resources.

Mr. Lloyd noted the Public Works staff is working on informational resources related to storm water and protection of environmental resources, as part of this chapter. There is some of that educational effort that has been going on, and it can be made more robust on additional topics.

Vice Chair Bull asked about 1A, "What We Heard," which indicates more information is needed. He asked about the plan to obtain more information.

Ms. Alexander responded the goal is to continue to research what other communities are doing and continuing to have these conversations, that can be beefed up.

Vice Chair Bull inquired about the accuracy and validity of the PaleBlue.org vulnerability assessment/study.

Mr. Lloyd responded he does not know about the funding and the background of the PaleBlue, or what the built-in mechanism is for checking the validity of the assessment. He suggested having staff review it and assess its weaknesses.

Vice Chair Bull suggested we should reserve referencing it, since we do not know the validity of the study.

Ms. Alexander noted that can be fluid, based upon the validation and completion of the final version of that study.

Vice Chair Bull stated he does not want to make decisions based upon a study not yet seen. He also commented on 2B, which references energy. He asked for examples of long-term solar that pays for itself.

Ms. Alexander recalled that Mr. Johnson had mentioned some examples at the last Planning Commission meeting, where there was a payback within approximately ten years.

Vice Chair Bull noted those were based on projections rather than on historical examples of the systems paying off.

Member Kimble noted that was a comment from the public.

Ms. Alexander noted this level of detail would not be in the final chapter itself. If that question needs to be answered before the goals are established, then staff can pursue it.

Vice Chair Bull stated it is important to have empirical study so that the City does not make goals based upon a flawed assumption.

Member Kimble noted that each solar project has a whole set of variables. It depends on the sun, the size of the project, and other things. It is difficult to make a cart blanche statement. It will be different, based upon the size of the project and whatever the solar project was designed to provide.

Vice Chair Bull recalled a news article about a solar farm plan in Blaine and people are questioning the viability of having it near residents' homes. He suggested the City needs to be well-rounded in its thoughts.

Ms. Alexander stated additional research can be done to find out what payback scenario of solar.

Chair Murphy asked whether the Commission should focus on page 3, What We Propose.

Ms. Alexander concurred that would be helpful.

Member Gitzen noted St. Christopher's Church recently installed solar, and he wondered what their experience has been so far.

Member Sparby commented D2, the third page, on solar meeting 10 percent of electricity use within City boundaries. He asked where that solar electricity would be coming from within Roseville.

Ms. Alexander noted the solar resource maps, developed by the Met Council planning handbook. Based upon projected population growth and the City's current electricity use, 16 percent of total available rooftop area would have to be covered with solar. Public Works would have to investigate what partnerships can be established with places like Rosedale.

Chair Murphy asked why the City has to generate solar within the City boundaries as opposed to simply consuming solar energy.

Ms. Alexander responded that is a good discussion to have. The reason to include it within City boundaries is to have it as an economic development resource within the City. The decision to develop it in the city or buy it from somewhere else is up to the City.

Member Sparby stated the solar maps do not tell the whole story. People are not going to be throwing solar panels on their roof if there is no economic incentive. He would support "strive to produce solar electricity" as a goal, but would not be in favor of stating definitively "producing solar electricity."

Ms. Alexander asked whether a target goal is preferable.

Member Sparby noted the target goal should be repeated, just for clarification.

Ms. Alexander noted the incentives available on the federal level are making it feasible. Additionally, the landscape will continue to change as the solar energy becomes cheaper.

Mr. Lloyd noted some people have observed this is more beneficial to wealthier households which can afford to install it and then sell back the electricity to the utilities. The City can not as a practical level provide solar panels below a financial threshold, but the City does have to be aware of equity ramifications.

Ms. Alexander noted there are programs that is 0 down, and it is paid off as the incentives come in, along with a low-interest loan. Many people do not know that

type of program is available and assume a lot of down payment is available. That could vary from company to company.

Member Gitzen asked about 16 percent of viable rooftops.

Chair Murphy expressed support for a language that is focused on consumption rather than where it is generated, since older buildings will not be able to support solar panels. He suggested D2 include a more general term of “renewable sources,” rather than generated within Roseville specifically.

Ms. Alexander noted the State has a solar generation goal of generating 10 percent of statewide electricity within state boundaries. By doing it within the City, Roseville is doing its part to meet that State goal that is specific to solar. Wind is not as good of a resource in Roseville as solar is. She asked for further Commissioners’ comments on D2 and D1.

Member Kimble expressed a preference for including a reference to producing within Roseville, but she could support either way.

Member Gitzen expressed he could support it either way – as a target goal or to be produced within the City.

Member Sparby expressed concern for making the statement consumption-based, since once the electricity enters the grid, the consumer does not know where the electricity is produced – whether it is from solar, wind, or coal.

Ms. Alexander stated that using language like “sourcing” 10 percent of the City-wide electricity is still true. It is not specific to directly consuming solar energy, but sourcing it from solar energy resources.

Member Sparby confirmed he is fine with that language.

Ms. Alexander noted the main gap is to get the vulnerability and climate adaptation framework distributed to see if the Planning Commission wants to be more specific or ambitious with goal C, or if it is a good general goal statement regarding climate-related risks.

Mr. Lloyd noted the next discussion on resiliency will be at the end of January.

8. Adjourn

MOTION

Vice Chair Bull, seconded by Member Sparby to adjourn the meeting at 7:56 p.m.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.