



**Planning Commission – Comprehensive Plan Update Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Minutes – Wednesday, February 28, 2018– 6:30 p.m.**

1. Call to Order

Chair Murphy called to order the Comprehensive Plan Update meeting of the Planning Commission 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 Bull, James Daire, Chuck Gitzen, Julie Kimble and Peter Sparby

Staff/Consultants Present: Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd, City Planner Thomas Paschke, and Community Development Director Kari Collins; Erin Perdu, WSB Consultant and Lydia Major, LHB Consultant

3. Approval of Agenda

Chair Murphy noted before they adjourn the meeting, they need to determine if another meeting is needed before March 19, 2018.

MOTION

Member Bull moved, seconded by Member Gitzen to adopt the agenda as presented.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Review of Minutes

a. February 7, 2018 Comprehensive Plan Update meeting minutes

MOTION

Member Kimble moved, seconded by Member Sparby to adopt the February 7, 2018 Comprehensive Plan Update 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, including the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update*

Chair Murphy reminded the public that comments will be limited to three minutes.

Tom Kuhfeld, 1021 Larpenteur Avenue West, thanked the Commission for getting through the Comprehensive Plan. He referred to the Lexington/Larpenteur Roseville Center graphic located in Chapter 4 and Chapter 6, and commented he expected to see a minimum requirement of 10 percent high-density.

Chair Murphy responded the Commission will be reviewing the draft Comprehensive Plan document and he believes the requirement is still included in it.

Mr. Kuhfeld referred to the Lexington/Larpenteur Opportunity Area graphic in Chapter 6. He stated it appears the area has changed, and the description does not say anything about the high-density, which was their main concern. They still prefer the area to have an optional density requirement.

Chair Murphy commented the next public comment time will be at the public hearing on April 4.

Member Sparby stated the 10 percent high-density requirement pertains to all corridor mixed-use throughout the City. At the February 15 meeting, they had a follow-up question for staff regarding mixed-use in that corridor and how it affects Green House Village. This has not been adequately addressed and Mr. Kuhfeld deserves an answer before the meeting on April 4.

- 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*

Chair Murphy noted Member Brown will be done serving on the Commission in March. There are 10 applications for the Planning Commission and he will provide recommendations to the Council.

Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd commented the opportunity areas on the graphic in Chapter 6 are separate from the broader corridor mixed-use area. This area recognizes that the City is putting a focus on revitalization and continued investment in that area. The corridor mixed-use applies to several properties around the City. The 10 percent high-density requirement remains in the draft Land Use Plan in Chapter 4 and they may consider including it in Chapter 6 as well.

City Planner Thomas Paschke stated the 10 percent designation is a very broad statement and they will not determine which sites are most appropriate for this designation until they address the zoning update in mid-2019.

Mr. Lloyd explained the 10 percent high-density requirement was added into corridor mixed-use, community mixed-use, and core mixed-use districts in order to make the math work in the Comprehensive Plan process. This requirement will be 10 percent of all of that land area, not on specific parcels. The Comprehensive Plan document contains a table that shows how much land is in those areas, pro-rates it by 10 percent, and calculates the number of residential dwellings they can count for the Metropolitan Council requirement.

Member Kimble commented the market will drive where housing makes sense. She inquired what opportunity there is for the market to influence it.

Erin Perdu, WSB Consultant, noted the idea was to purposely leave it very broad in order to accommodate the market. That is why it is a 10 percent requirement across the district as a whole and not specifically designated on the map. It will not be 10 percent per parcel. It will be market-based and based on the zoning analysis. When they get into the next step of writing the zoning districts, they can get more specific.

Member Daire referred to the graphic in Chapter 6 that contains the Lexington and Larpenteur Opportunity Area and inquired how the 10 percent determination will be made.

Ms. Perdu responded the Opportunity Areas in Chapter 6 are smaller and narrower than the overall corridor mixed-use district that is in the Future Land Use Map. She referred to the map on page 23 of Chapter 4 and explained that the 10 percent requirement would apply to anywhere that is shaded for corridor mixed-use.

Community Development Director Kari Collins stated this requirement is included in the current Comprehensive Plan for the community mixed-use districts. The City Council suggested it be spread it out so that one area is not burdened by it. The districts are spread throughout the City, but the same concept applies.

Ms. Perdu explained there might be one area of the corridor mixed-use that is all residential and another area that is all commercial, and some that are half of each. The market will determine what goes where, as well as what the zoning revisions dictate.

Member Daire inquired if they would take all the land area in core mixed-use and corridor mixed-use, multiply it by .1, and allocate the results within those districts.

Ms. Perdu agreed.

Mr. Paschke stated there are some parcels that are more favorably configured to support high-density residential, but not all properties are going to see redevelopment over the next 10+ years. That is why it has been left open for staff to work with developers on projects to see what fits best in these areas.

Member Kimble inquired if the goal was to encourage mixed-use developments for vibrant communities.

Ms. Perdu agreed.

Member Sparby stated his concern was if the corridor mixed-use currently has residential in it. If it does not, it places a bigger burden on that district to include it. He requested a rundown on what is included in the corridor mixed-use and what it would take to meet the 10 percent threshold, so that Mr. Kuhfeld can communicate it to his neighbors.

Mr. Paschke noted the 10 percent threshold is there because it still needs to be met.

Mr. Lloyd stated there are no multifamily dwellings currently in the mixed-use districts.

Member Sparby stated Mr. Kuhfeld does have something to be concerned about.

Ms. Perdu explained a high-density development will need to happen somewhere in the corridor mixed-use district citywide.

Member Kimble commented each project that comes in will be reviewed by staff and there is still work to be done on the zoning. There is not an open gate for anything to happen.

Mr. Lloyd stated Greenhouse Village is categorized as a medium-density development, which goes up to 18 units per acre. However, it contains 23 units per acre, which puts it in the high end of the City's standard high-density range. They are not talking about the possibility of something dramatically different than what is already there.

Member Sparby inquired if Greenhouse Village would meet the criteria for the 10 percent.

Mr. Lloyd stated the high-density range goes from 12 to 24 units per acre and Greenhouse Village is at 23.4 units per acre.

Mr. Paschke explained Greenhouse Village is not counted toward the 10 percent because it already exists. Multifamily residential is currently allowed through the zoning code in commercial districts. Depending on what type of project would come forward in the future on one of the properties at Larpenteur and Lexington, as long as it achieves compliance with the zoning, it could go in. Most of the City's residential multifamily buildings are under four stories, and he does not anticipate that to change in these areas.

6. Project File 0037: 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update

a. Follow-Up on Items from Previous Meetings

None.

b. Review Community Engagement Summary

Lydia Major, LHB consultant, reported they had a second round of meetings in November, open houses to review Future Land Use changes in December, and outreach targeted to stakeholders. They are planning a few final events to review the draft Comprehensive Plan and will collect final comments.

Ms. Major reported comments from the public have been about resilience, housing, economic development, environmental issues, density, high-paying jobs, and commercial development. They have 403 subscribers to the email list and have 2,366 unique page views of the Comprehensive Plan Update webpage. They continue to communicate with the public on Nextdoor, Facebook, and Twitter.

Ms. Major reported they have reached out to underserved communities in the City. They met with Mr. Lee from the Hmong Community Center and discussed how his community uses the parks in Roseville and are looking for more indoor gathering spaces. They also met with Mr. Jimenez from the Minnesota Council on Latino Affairs, and Ms. Fuentes on how best to reach out to their community.

She reported they held community meetings and received good feedback. A lot of people indicated they support the City's investment in resilience and economic development. They also held a series of five open houses to discuss future land use and two themes emerged: 1) try to spread multifamily and residential uses throughout the community to avoid concentrating density on certain areas; and 2) be mindful of impacts from density, such as height and traffic.

Member Bull inquired how Ms. Major thinks they did, considering the population base and diversity in Roseville.

Ms. Major agreed it has been a struggle. She stated Ms. Fuentes' comments were brief, but she did suggest a number of non-meeting tools, most of which were used throughout the engagement process. These include pop-up events, meetings in locations where people lived, meetings in a box, and others. Unfortunately, it does take a lot of relationship building time, not just consultants holding more meetings. It is an effort that should continue over many years, and over time, hopefully the conversations can take place. She would like to see more and better, but it is a complicated conversation that needs to keep happening.

Member Bull agreed with Ms. Major. He stated it is tough and it needs to be an effort that the City takes on forever because the community and population are changing.

Member Daire commented when people are concerned about something happening near them, they show up. When they feel it does not affect them, they choose to not

participate. They may be concerned about the Comprehensive Plan, but other people may not be. The community engagement effort has been extremely thorough and deep. He inquired how much further they should take it, or if they say enough is enough. For the update effort, he is grateful for the creativity they have exercised in reaching out to people and they should not beat themselves up for a small turnout.

Chair Murphy stated they included information in the City's newsletter, and every home and business has received it.

Ms. Major noted they also sent a direct postcard to everyone in the City. Comprehensive Planning is very academic and is a tough business to sell to the public. When they do engage with the public and build capacity with them, she hopes over time they will be interested in engaging in the future.

Member Sparby inquired if there were any meeting minutes from the meetings with Mr. Lee and Mr. Jimenez. He noted he had requested detailed minutes of these types of meetings. The information included in the summary is brief and they may want to have more transparency of the stakeholder interview process. He suggested they include what was discussed and who was present.

Ms. Major responded she has notes from those conversations that she can provide and is unsure if they are on the website. The people they contacted made it very clear they did not want to be seen as the voice for their community. Member Daire suggested this be included in her notes.

Member Bull inquired if it should be distributed to Commissioners instead of posted on the website.

Member Kimble inquired if those interviewed were advised that the one-on-one conversation was going to be a public document.

Mr. Major stated they were advised she was a consultant working for the City of Roseville and that her questions were related to gathering feedback for the Comprehensive Plan process. She did not state that the information would be public, but no one said anything that would be controversial.

Chair Murphy suggested she provide the feedback from the conversations to Commission members.

Ms. Major agreed.

c. Review Complete Draft of Comprehensive Plan

Chair Murphy suggested they begin with the Economic Development chapter since they had not seen it yet.

Ms. Perdu requested they keep the discussion of the Comprehensive Plan focused on the big stuff. The small stuff can be sent the Mr. Lloyd. She noted they have started a comprehensive database to collect comments so that they can continually edit the Comprehensive Plan. She thanked the Commission for their feedback during this process.

Member Gitzen inquired about the process.

Mr. Lloyd responded the Commission has a clean draft. As corrections are made, they will show up as redlines. They will provide a final version of the plan with all of the redlines to show the changes made between the draft and final review.

Ms. Perdu noted there is a PDF that is a clean version that can be printed and copied as preferred.

Mr. Lloyd noted the PDF is also posted on the website and the public hearing will be on April 4.

Chapter 6: Economic Development.

Ms. Perdu stated this is the only chapter the Commission has not seen before. The overall business profile is built around the Grow Roseville website. This chapter includes a section that recaps the public engagement as it relates to economic development. There is a section on redevelopment that discusses the redevelopment opportunities and challenges of Roseville. It includes financial tools available for redevelopment and highlights the priority and opportunity areas in the City.

Ms. Perdu reported on the five goals and strategies for economic development:

- 1) Create a development process and/or possible acquisition plan for identified redevelopment areas that is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan.
- 2) Develop a comprehensive marketing and messaging strategy that promotes the business-friendly nature of the City.
- 3) Utilize land use planning to enhance job growth and continued economic health throughout all areas of the City.
- 4) Identify workforce needs of City businesses and facilitate partnerships between the Chamber of Commerce, educational institutions, housing developers, and the business community to satisfy market demands.
- 5) Create infrastructure necessary to retain and attract desirable businesses and promote an innovative business environment.

Member Gitzen noted he already sent a lot of comments to City staff. He inquired if they are using the proper way to site the figures in this chapter. If it is, an explanation should be included on what it means.

Ms. Perdu responded she understands it is a compilation of data from other sources and she will look further into it to make sure it is correct. She agreed they could include a footnote explaining where the data comes from.

Member Gitzen referred to the chart on page 5, and stated it seems like they are jumping around and using different figures. The number in this graphic are different than the numbers used in Chapter 3. It may be information from a different year, but they may want to be more consistent. He also referred to Figure 6-5 on page 11. He noted they ask for the top five businesses in the question, but then only include the top three. He also questioned if Eminent Domain should be included as a financial assistance program, as shown in the chart on page 14.

Regarding the chart on page 14, Ms. Perdu suggested they either change the description of the table or remove Eminent Domain from the chart.

Member Gitzen referred to page 18, and suggested they include a few introductory sentences before the Goals and Strategies section. He also suggested this for the Priority and Opportunity areas or include a reference when they are talked about in the chapter. These should all also have page numbers on them.

Member Kimble commented this chapter was very well written. She referred to page 18, Goal 1, and stated it seems that Strategy 2 should be qualified that it is for projects with extraordinary or qualified costs. She explained the City does not just fund development projects unless there is a reason for it. She referred to page 13, and suggested the same comment be included.

Member Sparby referred to page 18, Goal 1, and inquired what was meant by "...and/or possible acquisition plan..."

Ms. Perdu stated the idea is that the City could acquire property to enable development or redevelopment of high priority areas.

Member Sparby stated it seemed odd to call it out. He suggested they leave it at development process with the understanding that it is incorporated in the assistance tools that are laid out. This makes it sound like the City is going to acquire it and figure it all out instead of incorporating the tools and private development.

Member Kimble inquired about the land bank and if it is part of the concept.

Ms. Collins responded the EDA did adopt an acquisition framework; however, it does not get to some of the strategies identified under this goal. This could compliment what the EDA already adopted and that is why she likes the acquisition language.

Member Gitzen referred to page 19, Goal 3, Strategy 5. He stated they refer to the place-making principles here and in other areas of the plan, but he is unsure what it means.

Ms. Perdu stated they will include an explanation.

Chapter 1: Introduction.

Ms. Perdu reported changes to this chapter includes additional language in the Comprehensive Planning Lenses section. They have added the Public Safety Lens, an explanation of the Thrive MSP 2040 Outcomes, and a definition of Equity.

Member Kimble referred to page 1, third paragraph. She stated a couple of sentences about market should be included. Also, under How to Use the Plan, she referred to the second sentence, “It is meant to be revisited often and revised as conditions change.” She inquired what the intent was and knows it is a big deal the change the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Lloyd stated it most commonly refers to land use applications that require a rezoning. A rezoning frequently comes with a change to the land use map, which is tied to the Comprehensive Plan. He also noted recently they have worked to amend the regional business district to allow for residential uses.

Ms. Perdu commented the intent of including that sentence was to try and get the City to not be afraid to revisit it if there is something that needs to be changed.

Member Daire referred to page 4, the first and second paragraph. He read, “treating people equally has not eliminated the disparities created by the actions of government at the local, regional, state and federal level.” He inquired if they had any examples of this at the local level and noted these are things the City Council should address immediately.

Mr. Lloyd responded he did not have any examples of actions of ordinances that Roseville has implemented over the years that have caused injustice. Other communities have, such as zoning laws that are biased against nonwhite racial groups. This has been outlawed, but their impacts still remain. He does not know of anything specific to Roseville. He did find a restrictive covenant from the 1940s in Roseville that applied to most of a particular plat, but it was outlawed by the State in the 1960s.

Member Daire inquired if it applies to this or if it is just a matter of historical interest.

Mr. Lloyd responded if people of color were not allowed to own property in whole neighborhoods of the City, it would have slowed down any potential integration of those neighborhoods and limit choices for people of color in those neighborhoods. A lot of people have owned their homes since the 1960s.

Member Daire inquired if they know how common restrictive neighborhoods were.

Mr. Lloyd stated he does not know specifically in Roseville, but it was not uncommon.

Member Daire stated the implication in this statement indicates it is a widespread practice.

Mr. Lloyd stated he believes it is, but he does not have the numbers on how common it is. He knows they exist, but they are no longer enforceable.

Ms. Collins commented the use of restrictive covenants for housing and land use patterns is something that has been woven into American history. It is not unique to Minnesota and would not be unique to Roseville.

Member Daire further explained that the assertion is made that government at the local, regional, state, and federal level have done things that have created disparities. In order to validate this statement and take action on it, they need to have examples and indicate how frequently it was done. He wants to know where it exists in Roseville and where they need to take action, and not just state they know it happens. He commented he felt insulted by this statement because he is part of a Commission that is part of a governmental structure, and he has not seen any evidence of this type of discrimination.

Mr. Lloyd stated he previously sent an excerpt that forbade people who were not of the Caucasian race from owning property in Roseville.

Member Daire inquired if it was still in effect.

Mr. Lloyd confirmed it was not.

Member Kimble suggested they revise the statement to say that equity is important because in the past there has been history of this type of disparity in Roseville.

Ms. Perdu commented the statement is just saying that disparities have been created in the past over time by government at all levels and treating people equally has not fixed the problem. That is why they are trying to look at this differently through the equity lens.

Ms. Collins commented the emphasis on disparities refers to outcomes of past actions. They cannot eliminate the disparities because of the history.

Member Brown pointed out it references Chapter 3, page 7, which provides the whole historical context of what came before.

Chair Murphy referred to page 3 and commented he is not comfortable with the definition of equity. He would like it to include the distinction between equity and equality. He suggested it be changed to, “a term referring to the qualities of justice, fairness, impartiality and evenhandedness. Distinct from equality, which is a term denoting equal sharing and exact division.”

Member Kimble inquired if the definition comes from the Metropolitan Council because this section references the Thrive MSP 2040 Outcomes.

Mr. Lloyd stated they are using the outcomes generally and describing them.

Member Kimble suggested they use a diagram to visually give people a better understanding of equity.

Member Sparby inquired if they are required to have the paragraph on the Thrive MSP 2040 Outcomes on page 3.

Mr. Lloyd stated it is not required.

Member Sparby explained it is not the Planning Commission's role to define these broad terms. They speak for themselves and the community has ideas on what those terms mean to them. It is a disservice for them to try and tell the citizens what those terms mean. He suggested they remove it because it is contentious and takes away creativity from the citizens.

Mr. Lloyd commented these are terms that can be broadly define. People may look at the stewardship section of the Comprehensive Plan and see that they do not at all match their definition of stewardship. The purpose of the descriptions is not to define them in an absolute way. It is to give context on how the Comprehensive Plan addresses these topics.

Member Bull stated there are foundational concepts that are carried throughout the Comprehensive Plan. People need to understand what the foundation is to understand the Comprehensive Plan. They do not need to agree with it, but they need to understand the context by which the Comprehensive Plan was developed.

Member Kimble agreed with Member Bull.

Member Sparby stated he trusts the citizens to read the plan and understand it. They do not need to lay out every single detail, especially when they are talking about broad terms.

Member Gitzen agreed with Member Bull and sees the importance of including the descriptions. He is fine with either changing the equity wording or keeping it as is. He referred to page 2, and noted the titles are out of order and not the same as the chapters.

Chair Murphy suggested they include a Table of Contents.

Ms. Perdu noted there will be a Table of Contents included.

Member Daire inquired if the word marginalized is roughly equivalent to discriminated against.

Mr. Lloyd agreed, and commented it can also refer to people who are left out.

Member Kimble stated the definition is treating people as insignificant or peripheral.

Chair Murphy referred to page 4, second paragraph. This paragraph indicates that the focus is going to be advancing racial equity. He supports this for a Comprehensive Plan but is not sure if it is enough. He suggested they add gender equity in addition to racial equity.

Member Daire noted he support Member Sparby's suggestion to delete the entire section titled, Thrive MSP 2040 Outcomes.

Member Sparby moved, seconded by Member Daire, to delete the section titled, Thrive MSP 2040 Outcomes.

Member Kimble commented she supports it staying in the Comprehensive Plan. She heard Member Sparby state that people are smart enough to know what it means, but comments were also made that people can have different viewpoints of the words. It is important to have everyone understand what these terms mean in the context of the Comprehensive Plan.

Member Sparby responded the residents are smart enough to know what the definition means to them.

Member Bull stated based on the amount of discussion they have had about equity as seven members of the Planning Commission, it is not fair to assume that residents are going to assume what equity means. They need guidelines on these principles and he supports leaving it in the Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Murphy agreed with Members Bull and Kimble. There needs to be a common set of definitions for both those reading and composing the Comprehensive Plan.

Member Sparby stated the issue is that they do not really understand what these terms mean, and they take away creativity from the residents by including definitions. They are imposing their views of what they mean onto the residents.

Ms. Collins commented these are not definitions, but they are merely providing context for the purposes of the Comprehensive Plan. The City Council has invested a lot into Government Alliance on Race and Equity (GARE) and it is a priority to them. Including these terms is staff's attempt to address the priorities and tone the City Council would like in the Comprehensive Plan.

Ayes: 2

Nays: 5

Motion fails.

Chair Murphy referred to his previous statement about a wider focus on gender equity and inquired of staff how the City Council sees this.

Ms. Collins noted GARE is not racially focused.

Mr. Lloyd commented the ultimate goal is to reduce disparities and inequities. If they change the scope to include gender equity as well, other items in the paragraph would have to be adjusted.

Member Sparby inquired if there will be any citations in the paragraph.

Mr. Lloyd stated he does not believe citations are necessary with the amount of information available. Finding the research to include citations would be time consuming and not a priority.

Members Gitzen and Kimble noted they support the paragraph as it is written.

Member Sparby stated he sees a lot of broad statements without any backing. These concepts should have references to articles if this is going to serve as the basis for the Comprehensive Plan.

Member Bull noted Thrive MSP 2040 is the reference.

Member Kimble referred to a document Mr. Lloyd had at a previous meeting regarding racial disparity.

Mr. Lloyd noted it was the executive summary from the Metropolitan Council on a larger document called Choice, Place, and Opportunity. That document also cites a lot of research and it would be difficult to include specific citations.

Member Gitzen suggested they cite the Choice, Place and Opportunity document as a reference. It would give people something to refer to for additional research.

Member Daire stated they want what they do to be actionable. In order for this to happen, it has to have an example and be remedied. This is a topic he is passionately involved in. He wants the spotlight shown on things such as institutionalized discrimination and he wants action taken immediately to address it. If it means redistributive justice, he has difficulty with it. Opportunities should be made available to everyone and this deserves a spotlight with examples.

Mr. Lloyd noted this chapter is the introduction to the entire Comprehensive Plan. More specific and actionable information is included in the Community Profile and Economic Development Chapters.

Member Daire commented income disparity has to do with people's ability to earn and this has to do with their qualifications for a specific job that would provide living wages. If they are not prepared to take on a job that pays higher, they must work two or three jobs that do not pay as much. He wants them to be able to identify the problem and provide a solution. They are dealing with substantive questions, things that are missing and disagreements on the way it is presented.

Ms. Collins commented both she and the City Council feel Member Daire's passion and that is why \$50,000 went towards GARE to do an organizational audit on equity to address and fix things right now. The community is getting more diverse and the demographics are changing. They want to identify and address any inequities and figure out how they can be fixed.

Member Gitzen stated this is an introductory chapter and the rest of the plan is actionable. This serves as a reminder that they need to constantly be aware of equity within the community.

Member Sparby moved, seconded by Member Daire, to add citations to the Thrive MSP 2040 Outcomes paragraph in Chapter 1 of the Comprehensive Plan.

Member Gitzen agreed and stated they should be added where appropriate.

Mr. Lloyd inquired if referencing the Choice, Place, and Opportunity research done by the Metropolitan Council would be sufficient.

Member Sparby stated it is sufficient if there is underlying data to support their statements.

Chair Murphy commented referencing the said document would be necessary. He inquired if they have a Thrive MSP 2040 Outcome reference or link.

Mr. Lloyd stated there are links included in a table on the Comprehensive Plan webpage where.

Ms. Perdu commented they could also include a reference to that document within this chapter.

Chair Murphy commented he is satisfied with the chapter as is. It is an introductory chapter and the reference to the Thrive MSP 2040 Outcomes is sufficient.

Member Bull agreed with Chair Murphy and stated they are getting to deep into the introductory chapter.

Member Sparby stated it is not verbatim from the Thrive MSP 2040 Outcomes plan.

Ayes: 3
Nays: 4
Motion fails.

Chapter 2: Vision, Goals and Decisions.

Mr. Lloyd noted there is nothing new in this chapter.

Member Gitzen stated he would like the chapter to be titled, Vision, Goals, and Objective Decision Making. He also referred to page 3 and inquired if all the information on the graph could be shown. On page 4, second paragraph, he suggested they remove the negative reference to Cedarholm Golf Course. The City is spending a lot of money there, and it does not make sense to do so if people do not like going there.

Member Sparby referred to page 8, and suggested they removed the term “world-renowned parks.”

Ms. Perdu noted it was updated in the Parks Chapter but was missed here.

Member Gitzen commented the last three goals were not included in the rubric.

The Commission recessed at 8:37 p.m. and reconvened at 8:45 p.m.

Chapter 3: Community Profile.

Ms. Perdu reported some new narrative was added to the development history and history of the population, along with several maps consistent with the equity lens. The tables and charts were also cleaned up.

Member Gitzen suggested the first section of the chapter include information about the history of the community. He referred to page 2, and suggested they remove the entire paragraph above Existing Land Use. It does not add anything and is too generalized and inaccurate.

Member Daire referred to page 1 and noted the section on Geographic and Development History does not rise to its full promise. It stops with the occupation of Minnesota and does not include any history about who migrated in, which might provide objectivity to the paragraph Member Gitzen was referring to. If they are going to leave it in, they should talk about who settled in the area and how it has changed over the years in order to live up to the promise of the section heading.

Mr. Lloyd stated the first paragraph references the 2002 comprehensive plan as a way show a more complete version of Roseville’s history.

Member Gitzen noted Figure 3-1 does not match Figures 4-1 and 4-4. They also say ACS on some of their Figures and it should be referenced somewhere as the American Community Survey. He also provided staff with other comments and clarifications.

Member Bull inquired if they will remove the paragraph on page 2.

Member Daire referred to page 2, second paragraph. He noted the referenced 1969 Comprehensive Municipal Development Plan does not talk about ethnicity, but it should if they are bringing ethnicity up in this context.

Mr. Lloyd stated the referenced 2002 Comprehensive Plan does have that information in it, but it is not replicated here.

Member Daire suggested they include a sentence stating, “if you are interested in other ethnicities in the area, please see...”

Member Kimble noted the first paragraph points to the 2002 Comprehensive Plan as a full document for history.

The Commission agreed to remove the first full paragraph on page 2.

Member Daire stated he is looking for parallelism and the whole paragraph screams injustice.

Chapter 4: Land Use.

Ms. Perdu noted there were no changes made to this chapter.

Member Gitzen referred to page 3 and stated they are quoting objectives to a goal. They need to clarify these are objectives under the goals.

Chapter 5: Housing.

Member Gitzen noted he submitted his comments to staff.

Chapter 7: Transportation.

Ms. Perdu noted this chapter has been reformatted since last seen by the Commission.

Chair Murphy inquired if the final plan will have the pull-out documents included and if there was a way to number them.

Ms. Perdu stated a lot of the transportation maps will include pull-outs because they are difficult to read on a regular sized sheet of paper. Page numbers will be included in the final version.

Member Daire referred to Chapter 3, page 3, and Figure 4-1 on Chapter 4, and commented the total land areas in acres do not match.

Ms. Perdu stated this was also brought up by Member Gitzen. She believes the difference is either the year or a category has been left out, but it will be updated.

Mr. Lloyd inquired if the total difference equals 1,759. Figure 3-1 includes land in Roseville which is right of way, but right of way is not a land use category for land use planning purposes.

Chapter 8: Parks and Recreation.

Member Gitzen referred to page 2 and noted the objectives are listed, but they are referred to as goals.

Chapter 9: Resilience.

Ms. Perdu noted addition sourcing has been added as well as more narrative on solar, wind and solid waste.

Member Daire inquired if street runoff into ponds and lakes is addressed in this chapter.

Mr. Lloyd commented Chapter 10 is the Surface Water Management Plan, and it may be addressed there.

Ms. Perdu stated she will ask the Public Works Department if this issue is addressed in the Surface Water Management Plan.

Member Kimble, referred to page 8, first paragraph. She inquired if they should include the link to the Regional Indicators Initiative website.

Mr. Lloyd stated he did not include the link in the document because links can go bad over time. However, a link is included on the City's website. He inquired if they should include an actual link reference on this page or refer to the City's website for directions to get there.

Ms. Perdu stated she could include a citation to the organization in the footnotes.

Chair Murphy suggested they include an online page with helpful links related to things in the Comprehensive Plan.

Member Daire referred to page 8, first paragraph. He inquired if they are going to require residents to upgrade their furnaces to reduce total emissions.

Mr. Lloyd stated the City does assist with participation with home energy audits and helping people make the best with what they currently have for heating and cooling. Other County or State grants or low-interest loans may be available for home modifications.

Member Bull commented almost every energy company offers significant rebates on efficiency appliances.

Member Daire inquired if the City should volunteer for this, or if enough is made available in the private sector.

Member Bull stated there may be other opportunities that the City can do to make it available. Solar roof and shingles may be options.

Chapter 10: Surface Water Management.

Ms. Perdu reported Chapters 10, 11 and 12 were all written by the Public Works staff. They are highly technical and are generally executive summaries of larger documents that will be attached to the Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Murphy referred to bullet points pages 1 and 2 and noted these may address Member Daire's previous comment regarding street runoff into lakes and ponds.

Ms. Perdu stated she will follow up to see if there are specific strategies included in the Surface Water Management Plan.

Member Daire referred to page 1, bullet point 2: "Minimize public capital expenditure needed to correct flooding and water quality problems." He noted it is not an insignificant figure if they are going to be separating street runoff. The stated objective is that they do not want to spend a lot of money on water quality.

Mr. Lloyd stated it also gets to exploring water quality independently of capital improvements.

Member Gitzen referred to Table 10-1 and noted it should be titled "Impaired Lakes in Roseville." He also inquired about a reference to an appendix on page 1.

Ms. Perdu responded there will be several appendices included.

Mr. Lloyd stated they are also linked on the website.

Chapter 11: Water Supply System.

There were no comments.

Chapter 12: Sanitary Sewer.

Member Gitzen inquired if they could title this chapter Sanitary Sewer System for consistency with the previous chapter. He also noted the numbers of the figures in the chapter are incorrect.

Chapter 13: Implementation.

Ms. Perdu reported on the changes made to this chapter: the matrix has been filled in, each topic has been separated into tables, edits have been made to the implementation table, and a table has been added to link the City Council to departments and Commissions.

There were no comments from the Commission.

Chair Murphy urged the Commission to email their comments to staff by March 9. He also inquired if they needed to schedule another meeting to review the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Lloyd stated the public review period will be open until Friday, March 16.

The Commission agreed they did not need to schedule another meeting.

Member Gitzen commented he would like to see how these changes are incorporated.

Mr. Lloyd stated if people are looking at the plan at home, he does not want to change what they are looking at until they have something comprehensive to replace it with. He will distribute updated chapters to the Commission Members for further review.

Ms. Perdu suggested they distribute a new draft to the Commission when they send out the work session draft to the City Council.

The Commission agreed.

Member Sparby inquired if they can get more information on the Greenhouse Village issue that was previously discussed. He would like a summary that highlights the concern, the zoning, and the 10 percent requirement that applies to the Citywide sites.

Mr. Paschke stated the key question is whether they feel the requirement needs to be changed. The residents are concerned about high-density at that corner and they do not want a 10 percent requirement in that area.

Member Sparby stated this would show the Commission has considered that area and presented them with a rundown on what it means.

Chair Murphy commented it does not appear that Commissioners see that this area should be changed.

Member Kimble stated they have heard the same facts, but the conclusion is missing. It is a difficult conversation to argue against something they already are. That area is already zoned high-density and she is comfortable leaving the 10 percent requirement in.

Member Gitzen stated he is comfortable with it as is.

Member Sparby noted Mr. Kuhfeld stated he was still confused and that is why he thought a summary would be helpful.

Mr. Paschke stated they can look into how to provide something in writing as it relates to Mr. Kuhfeld's concerns.

Mr. Lloyd suggested they include a map that only shows corridor mixed-use properties and the statement that 10 percent of that entire area would be required for high-density residential development.

Member Gitzen thanked Mr. Lloyd for all his work on the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Collins suggested they express their gratitude in an email to the City Council or City Manager. These emails go into personnel files and are critical.

Chair Murphy noted the next Planning Commission meeting will take place on Wednesday, March 7 at 6:30 p.m.

7. Adjourn

MOTION

Member Sparby moved, seconded by Member Gitzen adjournment of the meeting at approximately 9:35 p.m.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.