



**Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Minutes – Wednesday, November 29, 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 James Daire, Chuck Gitzen, Julie Kimble and Peter Sparby

Members Absent: Sharon Brown

Staff/Consultants Present: Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd, Community Development Director Kari Collins, City Planner Thomas Paschke; Environmental Specialist Ryan Johnson, Parks and Rec Director Lonnie Brokke; Erin Perdu, WSB Consultant, and Lydia Major, LBH Consultant

3. Approval of Agenda

MOTION

Vice Chair Bull moved, seconded by Member Kimble to approve the Agenda as presented.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Review of Minutes

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 in to the draft minutes.

a. October 19, 2017, Comprehensive Plan Update Meeting

Member Sparby requested a correction on line 118. He asked that "voices" be replaced with "resident input" to better reflect his comments during the discussion.

Vice Chair Bull noted that he was absent during the October 19th meeting, and according to the minutes, several items required follow-up. He asked when updates regarding follow-up will be shared.

Chair Murphy suggested those updates can be shared during Communications.

MOTION

Member Sparby moved, seconded by Chair Murphy, to approve the October 19, 2017 minutes as amended, and the October 25, 2017 minutes as presented.

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*

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*

Vice Chair Bull asked staff about providing updates on any of the follow-up items from the October 19th meeting.

Senior Planner Lloyd responded that several items were added to the October 25th agenda as a result of discussion on the 19th. He does not recall any items that were not followed up on at the October 25th meeting, but he will review the minutes again to be sure nothing was overlooked and needs to be brought back before the Planning Commission again.

Member Kimble inquired how the staff handles inquiries from the public.

City Planner Paschke responded that staff does follow up with those inquiries, though sometimes an email communication can also be sent to both City Council and Planning Commission if input is required.

6. Project File 0037: 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update

a. Follow up on Items from Previous Meetings

Senior Planner Lloyd stated he does not have anything in his notes needing follow-up from previous meetings.

b. Community Workshop

Senior Planner Lloyd invited Lydia Major, LBH Consultant, to report on the community workshops from November 8 and 9, 2017.

Ms. Major provided an overview of the community workshops conducted on November 8th and 9th, noting she gathered the information second-hand, as she missed the workshops due to a family funeral. She reported that a number of residents attended both the evening workshop on November 8th and the daytime workshop on November 9th. Presentations

were made at the beginning of the meeting, followed by an open house where residents were invited to review the plans and provide feedback.

Ms. Major explained that one feedback mechanism staff utilized was “Roseville bucks,” a tool for residents to spend bucks towards the highest priorities of this project. In terms of categories, resilience, housing, and economic development received the most “bucks.”

Results of the resident feedback included prioritization of:

- Focus on preserving water quality and open space.
- Incorporate solar energy and other renewable energy sources into City facilities and policies.
- Provide diverse housing options to serve the needs of all Roseville citizens.
- Invest in transit, trails, and other alternatives to cars to reduce congestion and improve community access and health.
- Proactively seek companies that provide higher paying jobs inside Roseville.

Ms. Major commented these findings and themes are very consistent with the feedback gathered to date. She pointed out the more detailed notes on individual resident feedback in the Commissioners’ packets.

Member Kimble asked about total meeting participation.

Ms. Major indicated that a total of 26 residents attended both meetings.

Vice Chair Bull commented on the number of comments received about water quality. He inquired whether there is any follow-up with Public Works to determine if there is an issue with water quality.

Ms. Major noted Public Works is responsible for writing the sections on infrastructure, and they are to write a surface water management plan, which she does not have tonight, but will likely provide all the information desired.

Vice Chair Bull noted the comments suggesting the creation of different housing that is appropriate for different cultures. Some cultures incorporate multi-generational families into housing situations, and that stood out to him as something to be aware of.

Ms. Major noted she has had some follow-up stakeholder conversations with some folks in the minority populations. Housing of larger families has arisen in those conversations, so staff is learning what that might look like.

Vice Chair Bull noted that only 60 percent of the Roseville bucks were spent, noting that it cost them nothing, and yet the people did still not spend all the money.

Vice Chair Bull asked about the most recent market rate apartment complex in Roseville.

Mr. Lloyd responded that the most recent was Lexington apartments just north of City Hall in the 1980s. He noted several affordable/subsidized housing complexes have been

rehabbed in the last 10 to 20 years, but Lexington was the last market rate complex constructed.

Chair Murphy asked if a market rate apartment complex is under construction SE of the corner of C and Dale.

Mr. Lloyd responded that is an assisted living complex, operated by Acumen.

Member Kimble asked about the Roseville circulator bus system and whether it is running at all and who provides its funding.

Mr. Lloyd responded he does not know the details of that, though he was in a meeting today with Metro Transit, and it was mentioned there are several different layers of transit service. Some of it is provided by Metro Transit and some of it is not. There may not be the same transportation system that used to be around, but there certainly are options and services cobbled together that may approximate what was once in place.

Member Kimble noted it is a valid comment, given the amount of senior housing in Roseville. Perhaps there could be encouragement for the senior housing ownership groups to work together to create a bus that would work for all of the housing centers.

Mr. Lloyd noted that some of the senior housing centers do have their own shuttle systems for resident appointments and so forth, but some collaboration between them could save some resources in the long run.

Member Kimble asked whether there will be additional formal public input to the Comp Plan.

Mr. Lloyd responded this was the last stop before the bulk of the drafting gets done, but there will be additional opportunities to see what is shaping up as the final draft, in addition to the formal public hearing and Council action. This will be the last time people have a chance to see it in pieces before it comes together, but not the last time overall.

Ms. Major added there are open houses specifically for any changes in land use and parcels.

Member Gitzen commented that he attended the November 8th meeting, when 2 Council members and 2 Commissioners were present.

Chair Murphy noted he was disappointed at the turnout for the public meeting.

Ms. Major agreed everyone is disappointed by the turnout.

- c. Parks and Recreation Chapter:** *Packet included a summary of the 2010 Parks and Recreation System Master plan, and the meeting presentation will address proposed updates.*

Lydia Major, LBH Consultant, commented she has been working with Parks and Rec Director Brokke, who has been working with the Parks Commission on the Parks and Recreation Chapter.

Ms. Major presented the ways in which Parks have been included in the data gathering so far, including surveys, public meetings, meetings in a box, and other ways. Additionally, the Park Commission has gone through an extensive exercise in order to review the goals and policies of the previous master plan. They have verified their continued validity, though there have been minor revisions.

Ms. Major continued that the public has shared that they love Roseville parks. It is a major reason people cite for living and working here. People are supportive of continuing the Master Plan vision. She noted this plan can be included in the Comp Plan as an attachment, without having to rewrite it into the Comp Plan.

Ms. Major highlighted some changes in the system since 2010, including added parcels throughout the city. Currently, construction is underway of the Cedar Home Community Building. The Parks and Rec renewal program has completed numerous projects city-wide, with additional ongoing natural resource work.

Ms. Major continued that the 2010 Master Plan included a priority on focusing on southwest Roseville, an area deemed to be not as thoroughly served by parks as other parts of the City. The priority was on smaller land parcel and land connections throughout the area and create a network of trails and parks in that area. She presented a map highlighting some of the vacant parcels that staff has been keeping an eye on.

Ms. Major highlighted some other potential acquisition opportunities, including those near Langton Lake or Acorn. Creating a trail loop around Langton Lake is a priority. There are some changing land use possibilities around Rosedale, where mixed-use residential may be a possibility.

Ms. Major noted that the Parks department is always considering opportunities on behalf of the community, but the priority is not on existing parks-rich areas. Also, the goal is for reasonable buyer/seller situations at reasonable prices.

Ms. Major continued that there is a high commitment to community process. Both the Cleveland site and Marion site are great example of how committed the Parks Department has been to that community process.

Ms. Major highlighted the priority of ADA compliance. The policy is to create completely ADA-compliant projects as updates are completed throughout the parks system.

Ms. Major described coordination is happening with the Pathways planning. The Master Plan had a constellation concept, which is an idea about connecting parks with small pathways and trails in order to maximize the system. The Met Council requires there to be coordination with regional parks such as McCarrons Lake County Park, Josephine County

Park, and The Oval. She also commented on the importance of the recent joint meeting between the Roseville Parks Commission and Ramsey County Parks.

Member Kimble asked whether this would be adopted into the Comp Plan.

Ms. Major responded the Commission received a short version of the Master Plan. The full version would be attached to the Comp Plan.

Member Kimble asked whether the maps like the constellation and sectors will be included in an updated Master Plan.

Ms. Major noted those kinds of updates will be described in the Comp Plan itself.

Member Kimble asked about the cultural diversity of community planning of the parks. She asked whether that comes up at all in conversations about open space in parks.

Ms. Major responded there have been a number of conversations about cultural diversity. She described 1716 Marion Site, wherein the Parks Department went way outside the normal bounds to gather citizen input. This included a popsicle at the parks, a fire truck on the street, and cookies. The kids brought their parents, and great feedback was provided. It was a great chance for the community to experience what it is like to participate in a community planning process. The City followed it up by a walk-about for the Comp Plan as well. The community prioritized a park for children to play after school, accessible playgrounds, and a place for elders in the neighborhood to sit in both shade and sun and have quiet, safe spaces.

Vice Chair Bull commented he would like wi-fi in the community, but until that happens, he would like wi-fi at every park. This would enhance opportunities for fitness programs, kids' activities, and meeting capabilities. He would also some type of a solar-powered charging station for electronic devices at these parks.

Member Sparby noted the summary includes some narrative and quotes from the Planning Commission in the 1960s. He would like the documents to be personalized and to include quotes from Planning Commission members and the community. That would be a great way to see the way the community members are thinking, and would also make the documents more relatable and digestible, both for present readers and readers in the future.

Chair Murphy asked about the Cleveland site.

Parks and Rec Director Brokke noted the preferred master plan is complete. It is a relatively small space, but generally the concept is a nature/art theme, with a pollinator garden, a trail coming through it. There will be benches placed throughout the space. The idea is it will hopefully calm traffic and will create a totally different setting for people in that area. He noted there was excellent public turnout and staff received great feedback.

Chair Murphy asked about the plans for Langton Lake.

Mr. Brokke noted the trail does not extend completely around the lake at this time. The long-term effort has been to eventually extend the trail all the way around.

Member Gitzen commented the Parks Department for all their excellent work, particularly in rehabbing the old buildings and renting them out. The park system is an important way to get involved in the city.

Member Daire commented that as an “adoptee” of a park, the support of the parks in the community is terrific, as well as the support the City provides to the park. He commended the Parks Department both in planning and in execution.

Mr. Brokke noted that the master plan is value-based and prioritizes building a sense of community.

Member Sparby asked about Cleveland Park and the traffic issue.

Mr. Brokke noted it did come up a lot in the meetings. There are often non-park issues that come up in the public meetings that can be addressed by other departments. The State, County and City are all involved in that particular intersection. The lights are being discussed as a possible project. As far as the parks specifically, some landscaping and berming of the terrain can be done to help with the traffic.

Member Sparby noted that families are walking to the park, and that increased pedestrian traffic should be taken into consideration, particularly as there are accidents at that intersection and safety is a priority.

Mr. Brokke noted that the trail will help provide alternatives, but it does not fully mitigate the traffic.

d. Resilience and Environmental Protection Chapter: *Presentation on achievements, on-going work, and next steps pertaining to sustainability goals.*

Environmental Specialist Johnson introduced himself to the Commission, noting he usually reports to the Public Works Commission. He generally works under 3 large topics: water resources, recycling coordinator, and sustainability.

Mr. Johnson recalled what Roseville has done for resiliency and environmental protection in the recent past. He recalled the 2030 Comp Plan process, which was approved in 2009, with a focus on climate protection, emissions inventory, and implementation of the geothermal system.

Mr. Johnson continued that 2012 included Green Steps Cities initiatives, along with University of Minnesota sustainability studies, and the Clean Energy Resource Team. In 2013, the formal resolution was passed to become part of Green Steps Cities. Since joining the City staff in 2013, Mr. Johnson has spent a significant amount of time on solar.

Chair Murphy inquired about a prior presentation about water usage among Metro cities, which indicated that Roseville's per capita consumption was rather high. He asked who gathers that information.

Mr. Johnson responded that the finance department provides a lot of usage data. Additionally, the Public Works department just prepared a report on Roseville's water usage rates.

In 2015, B3 Benchmarking was accomplished. In 2016, solar investigation and campus energy audits occurred. This year has included coordination with U of Minnesota capstone projects, including Green Step Cities and Complete Streets. Additionally, a grant was received to do a vulnerability assessment.

Chair Murphy what type of data a vulnerability assessment will include.

Mr. Johnson responded the assessment will look at population throughout the city, the proximity of shelters, access to pathways, and heat maps are included.

Mr. Johnson then described the Green Steps Cities program, which Roseville began participating in in 2012. He noted that Roseville is currently a level 2 in the Green Steps program.

Member Kimble asked if staff can look at "Reli," which Doug Pierce (in Minneapolis) has worked on with regards to a next-generation framework/scorecard system for neighborhoods.

Vice Chair Bull asked whether the Green Steps program is publicly communicated, in order to facilitate public involvement.

Mr. Johnson noted all the actions and best practices for Roseville are public on the Green Steps Cities website.

Vice Chair Bull encouraged staff to include an update on the Green Steps program in the newsletter and explain how to participate.

Member Kimble asked whether the #5 in the report indicates that the new construction or remodeling of the Roseville public facilities has met the SB 2030 policy.

Mr. Johnson responded he did not look to see if all the public buildings have met the SB 2030 policy. Only a certain number of actions under best practices have to be met.

Member Kimble inquired whether there are policies around private development.

Mr. Johnson responded in the negative.

Mr. Johnson highlighted the U of Minnesota 2012 sustainability studies, which indicated what Roseville has already accomplished, what is in progress, and what it could potentially do in the future.

The Commission recalled a discussion surrounding permitting chickens in residential areas.

Member Kimble asked whether the Green Steps program addresses topics like shared storm water.

Mr. Johnson noted there is a best practice for water resources, and that is one area where Roseville is pretty strong. That is just one of the best practices under the 29 to address.

Member Gitzen asked whether the City has looked into encouraging private rain gardens that would decrease storm water runoff.

Mr. Johnson explained the City's storm water management standards currently are in place. Right now, the City shies away from retention ponds; rain gardens are promoted, as property values are high enough that people do not want to lose that square footage. If a business contacts the City, then options like porous pavements or rain gardens that will slow down some of the water are suggested.

Vice Chair Bull suggested a great educational opportunity for the City surrounding the ideas of chickens, bee-keeping, rain gardens, and the like.

Member Sparby asked whether the City does anything to promote local foods, which was a goal stated in 2012.

Mr. Lloyd mentioned the farmer's market.

Community Development Director Collins noted the community gardens as well. The City also used to sponsor the Living Smarter Fair. The City provided workshops to homeowners about landscaping and gardening education.

Mr. Lloyd there is a private community garden at a church, and there is another community garden on the east side of Rice Street.

Chair Murphy noted there are 120 plots at Oasis Park.

Mr. Lloyd commented there is a large and growing body of local foods systems planning that is happening.

Member Kimble noted a food co-op would be a nice addition to Roseville.

Member Sparby asked about The Good Acre in Falcon Heights.

Mr. Lloyd stated it helps match area growers with buyers.

Mr. Johnson continued with his presentation about the B3 benchmarking program.

Member Kimble asked if the City does well because of the geo-thermal. Mr. Johnson agreed it is a component of the entire heating and cooling system of the City.

Mr. Johnson noted that solar has been the biggest push since 2013. He noted a large solar sustainability study is still being worked on by U of Minnesota graduate students. He presented a map that shows where solar panels have the most potential.

Chair Murphy asked about possible tornado damage to rooftop solar panels.

Mr. Johnson explained they do everything on aluminum frames, on ballasts, to reduce the amount of wind damage.

Chair Murphy noted it would be a risk to install solar panels, due to the weather patterns of the upper Midwest.

Mr. Johnson noted there are insurance policies to protect the solar panel systems.

Mr. Johnson continued with his presentation, noting staff has looked at installing solar panels on the City hall. Due to building codes, the solar panels could not be installed due to the weight of the panels. Going forward, a structural component would have to be added in to make it a possibility. The hope is that the City can do a solar project in the near future. Staff will begin meeting with solar contractors to look at potential grant money and low-interest rate loans for municipalities. The goal is to do a lot of planning in 2018 and set something up for 2019 or 2020 for a solar project. In addition to rooftops, parking lots will also be considered.

Member Daire asked about a cost-effectiveness component in the planning.

Mr. Johnson noted staff does look at the rate of return. Previously, the research showed a 7- to 10-year payoff on the capital cost. The amount of savings in solar panels would be \$200,000 to \$1 million, as compared to what the City would pay to Xcel Energy. The cost of solar panels is coming down, as it is a competitive market.

Mr. Johnson highlighted some of the U of Minnesota capstone projects, which includes organics recycling, pollinator-friendly plantings, and Green Steps priorities, as well as and expanding educational and outreach opportunities. He noted staff is also working on the Comp Plan as well as the surface water management plan.

Mr. Johnson reported that an intern will be working in the department from January to May and will be greatly assisting with information on the Green Cities program, trying to increase from a level 3 to a 4. Staff will continue to collect data and receive feedback from the Council and the City's Commissions.

Member Kimble asked about collaboration with the Watershed Districts.

Mr. Johnson responded they are a great resource that the City likes to utilize as much as possible.

Member Daire asked about greenhouses gases. He suggested some work needs to be done on the sources of the greenhouses gases. He noted there are aggressive goals of reducing greenhouse gases by 80 percent in coming years, but he does not understand the scope of the problem, how it compares to the rest of the country, and the cost of such a reduction.

Mr. Johnson agreed it is overwhelming to consider all the factors. Reducing a carbon footprint is a complex subject and it is difficult to know where to begin.

Member Daire stated the City is being called on to reduce something by 80 percent about which there is little information available. Research on greenhouse gases shows up to 86 percent of it is water vapor. He confirmed this is a huge problem, that would require a lot of money to possibly have negligible results. He loves living in a clean community and a clean nation, but developing nations have been exempted from reducing carbon footprints. It is a global problem that is difficult to understand.

Chair Murphy thanked Mr. Johnson and urged him to keep the City's profile high with the various Watershed Districts.

e. Implementation Chapter Framework

Erin Perdu, WSB Consultant, noted the implementation chapter is the final chapter of the Comp Plan. Ms. Perdu recalled what was in chapter 2 of the draft Comp Plan, which is the decision-making rubric of how to measure goals of the Comp Plan.

Ms. Perdu shared an overview of the matrices gathered from other cities inside and outside the Metro. Some cities will designate tasks as short-term, medium-term, or long-term, which is a proxy for the community's prioritization.

Member Kimble noted that prioritization can sometimes be an indication of complexity.

Ms. Perdu highlighted the implementation chapters from Minnetrista, Grand Forks, ND, and St. Anthony.

The Commission discussed the different approaches presented by Ms. Perdu.

Member Kimble expressed support for St. Anthony's implementation chapter.

Member Daire concurred.

Vice Chair Bull liked the last report the best, and would like it even better if the goals could be included.

Member Gitzen expressed support for the third example as well.

Member Sparby expressed support for both the second and third examples. The third example is too specific for a Comp Plan, especially deciding on specific years. He expressed support for designating who is accomplishing what, but does not know how specific it can be other than “City staff.” He suggested a hybrid between examples 2 and 3.

Vice Chair Bull stated a range of dates would be preferable and would provide more flexibility.

Community Development Director noted there is a policy priority plan created by the Council to help guide the work staff does. They have identified 5 to 7 priorities, and that is in place for 2017 and 2018 and has been helpful. Those are the short-term goals and priorities set for staff by the Council.

Vice Chair Bull noted this is a 2040 Comp Plan, and the City may not know the funding options available in 2040.

Mr. Lloyd noted the funding sources could be presented as a suggestion.

Ms. Perdu suggested the implementation chapter be a bit more general in order to accommodate and complement the policy priority plan format.

Member Gitzen encouraged some thought about which staff will accomplish the various tasks.

Ms. Perdu stated she has received enough feedback to draft the chapter and present it to the Commission in January or February.

Mr. Lloyd noted there is no Variance Board next meeting, but there might be a discussion of the next stage of the Resilience chapter and a follow-up discussion from tonight.

7. Adjourn

MOTION

Member Daire moved, seconded by Vice Chair Bull adjournment of the meeting at approximately 8:18 p.m.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.