



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Minutes – Wednesday, November 7, 2018 – 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, and Wayne Groff.

Members Absent: Commissioners James Daire and Peter Sparby

Staff Present: City Planner Thomas Paschke, and Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd

3. Approve Agenda

MOTION

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

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Review of Minutes

a. October 3, 2018 Planning Commission Regular Meeting

Member Groff stated on line 32 the word Statue should be Statute and on line 40 jest should be gist.

Member Bull stated Member Groff's name is referred to as Member Goff in many instances. Line 556 remove "not" after would to read "would want all of these various uses to be not permitted...".

MOTION

Member Kimble moved, seconded by Member Bull to approve the October 3, 2018 meeting minutes as amended.

Ayes: 5

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.*

Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd reviewed the 2019 Planning Commission meetings. He noted January 2, 2019 might be a potential date change along with July 3, 2019.

Chair Murphy asked what the City policy was on holidays.

Mr. Lloyd indicated the City will be closed July 4th, there may be staff out of town on the 5th as well.

Member Groff asked what day the meetings would be moved to if the dates were changed.

Mr. Lloyd stated typically the meetings would be moved to the following week. He stated the second Wednesday of the month are usually open if the Commission needs to move the meetings.

Chair Murphy suggested moving the July meeting to the 10th. Commissioner Kimble thought both meetings should be moved. The rest of the Commission agreed.

Mr. Lloyd noted the 2019 meetings would be held on the first Wednesday of each month except for the January and July meetings, which will be moved to January 9, 2019 and July 10, 2019.

The Commission concurred.

6. **Public Hearing**

- a. **Consideration of a Comprehensive Land Use Plan Map Change, Zoning Map Change and Planned Unit Development Cancellation at 1700 Hamline Avenue (PF18-018)**

Chair Murphy opened the public hearing for PF17-019 at approximately 6:42 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing. He advised this item will be before the City Council at the November 26, 2018 meeting.

City Planner Paschke summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated November 7, 2018.

Chair Murphy asked for clarification of the motions.

Mr. Paschke stated the Commission could do three motions for this item.

Member Gitzen asked in regard to the PUD, at the time was that the only way the owner could get this building in there.

Mr. Paschke stated this item predates his employment with the City, so he did not know a lot about the background. He thought it was determined to be the best course of action at the time or it was a development site that best fit a PUD versus any other possibility. He indicated the minutes were not as detailed as today.

Member Gitzen thought the land use should be designated as LR

Mr. Paschke indicated that was correct.

Member Kimble asked how this relates to the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. She wondered if there needed to be changes in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Paschke stated this would be a 2030 Comprehensive Plan Amendment and would show up on the City maps and would not be a part of the 2040 update.

- **Sandra Vittori, Owner of Sandy and Friends**

Ms. Vittori stated twenty-three years ago she found a vacant piece of property which she believed was zoned residential duplex. She stated it was a perfect place for what she wanted to do, and she went through the process. She stated she has established a great business at the location. She noted she would like to retire and is a great building that could be other businesses.

Member Groff asked the applicant what other types of businesses she could envision on the property.

Ms. Vittori thought almost anything. She stated people that have looked at the building have been a daycare, financial company, there is a buyer but was not sure what she wants to do with the building. She thought the buyer was in the same industry but did not want to put a salon in there. This would broaden the scope of what could be in the building because it is a nice building with a great parking lot and not offensive to the neighborhood.

Public Comment

Chair Murphy closed the public hearing at 6:53 p.m.; none spoke for or against.

Commission Deliberation

Member Groff thought it made sense to approve this and did not think it would change the neighborhood. He thought the building works with what is there, and he thought the owners reasoning was sound in his opinion.

Member Bull expected the Zoning Laws have changed over time where the neighborhood business is now applicable there and provides flexibility for different types of businesses to come in. He thought the PUD cancellation was appropriate.

Chair Murphy thought the packet was pretty straight forward and appears to be the easiest and right path moving forward.

MOTION

Member Bull moved, seconded by Member Kimble to recommend the property be re-guided from a Comprehensive Land Use Map designation of Low Density Residential (LDR) to Neighborhood Business (NB)

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

Chair Murphy noted the Commission had a quorum for the 5/7 vote needed to pass this motion for a Comprehensive Plan recommendation change.

MOTION

Member Gitzen moved, seconded by Member Groff to recommend the property be rezoned from an Official Map classification of Low Density Residential-1 (LDR-1) District to Neighborhood Business (NB) District.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

MOTION

Member Kimble moved, seconded by Member Bull to approve the Planned Unit Development that regulates use of the property as just a hair salon be recommended for cancellation of the PUD.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

7. Project File 0037: 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update

a. Review Suggested Edits to 2040 Comprehensive Plan

Senior Planner Lloyd and Consultant Erin Purdue reviewed the 2040 Comprehensive Plan edits with the Commission.

Chair Murphy stated in Chapter 5, Housing, his understanding is there will be continued edits from what the Commission currently has.

Ms. Purdue indicated that was correct. Some of the information has been incorporated but the policy suggestions need to be integrated into the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Purdue continued to review the Housing changing edits with the Commission. She noted staff has added a “when we would use this” narrative to each tool and the Maxfield study strategies would be added to the Comprehensive Plan as well.

Member Kimball asked on the fifty percent in both sections is it only at fifty percent AMI or at fifty percent AMI or less.

Ms. Purdue stated that was correct and could make the change to make that clearer. It was assumed it would go down.

Ms. Purdue reviewed edits to the Transportation chapter with the Commission. She indicated there were recommendations for the addition of Ramsey Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, recommendation to change reference to street names from CSAH numbers, references to future A-Line BRT extensions and the addition of Metro Transit coordination strategies.

Ms. Purdue reviewed changes to the Surface Water Changes Chapter and the Implementation Chapter with the Commission.

Ms. Purdue stated the City Council reviewed the changes to the Comprehensive Plan on November 5, 2018 and provided some feedback. Staff will take any of the Planning Commissioners comments and incorporate those into the Comprehensive Plan as well and then staff will go before the City Council for approval and then submit the plan to the Met Council on December 3, 2018. She stated after the Comprehensive Plan is submitted the Met Council has up to 120 days (6 months) to review the plan and give the City a final approval or comments the City needs to address. After the Met Council review the plan will come back to the City for final adoption.

Chair Murphy asked if the copy that the City Council sees be on the website in final form.

Mr. Lloyd stated it would be. Whatever edits made will be published on the website as well as the current draft and will remain to be seen online.

Chair Murphy stated it looked like the Housing Chapter (Chapter 5) was going to have some wording changes to it to get the most recent studies recommendations included in the list of eight items enumerated.

Mr. Lloyd indicated that was correct and is possible the policy recommendations might immediately follow some of the data from the report. There also might be later in the

chapter where the goals would be aggregated and would be updated with the more current priorities.

Member Gitzen asked if the Commission could get an update on what the Council recommended.

Ms. Purdue reviewed the Council comments from their November 5, 2018 meeting with the Commission.

Member Gitzen asked if the draft comprehensive housing was going to be finalized before submission.

Mr. Lloyd stated the draft has already been finalized and will be changed in the documentation.

Ms. Purdue continued to review Council comments.

Chair Murphy stated the Maxfield Study that was in the Commission handout, some of the parenthetical comments are sixty percent AMI on there and some of the text seen show fifty percent AMI and he wondered which number will be in the final.

Ms. Purdue thought the final would need to use the Met Council's breakdown, which is 30/50/80 percent, so the City strategies will have to reflect that. In those instances, staff will need to figure out how to integrate that information and explain it. She thought when staff includes some of the information from the Maxfield Study in the section around page six of the Housing Chapter it can be quoted out of the Maxfield Study but then the staff recommendations will have to tailor the Met Council.

Ms. Purdue continued reviewing the City Council comments.

Member Gitzen stated the E with the circle around it indicates the new equity symbol and he wondered if there was anywhere in the documents that explains what that symbol means.

Ms. Purdue stated the symbol was explained in Chapter One, bottom of page 5, the last paragraph explains what the symbol is used for and why it is in the Comprehensive Plan.

Member Gitzen wondered if it would be worth repeating the explanation when the symbol is actually first used in the document.

Ms. Purdue thought the sections that have the goals and strategies labeled with it a footnote could be placed for reference.

Member Gitzen stated in regard to the Maxfield Study in Chapter five, page 7, it talks about between 2018-2030 "demand exists for...", and he came up with 1,606 units all together and he did not know if those were adaptive and how that reflects on the other tables where needs are discussed going forward.

Ms. Purdue stated the housing needs analysis that is referenced elsewhere in the Chapter comes from the Met Council and staff concluded the City needed to stick with the Met Council numbers as far as their affordability assessment, but the Maxfield Study information is being included because it is another piece of information that should be considered. She stated staff is not going to try to reconcile the numbers with the Met Council information but will stick with the Met Council information because that is what the Met Council requires. She indicated this is information that should be noted when thinking about if the City approves a project with a certain number of affordable rental units, is there demand for it, etc.

Member Kimball thought it was another third-party assessment.

Member Gitzen asked if staff will acknowledge there is a difference.

Mr. Lloyd stated in the text of the plan the City can acknowledge the differentiation.

Member Gitzen asked if the Parks and Transportation Commission reviewed the changes to their chapter and updated it with their comments.

Mr. Lloyd was not sure. He stated the City Parks and Recreation staff was a part of the group that reviewed the feedback received to help identify what should go in to the Comprehensive Plan. As it pertains to the Parks and Recreation Chapter, what was added is a recognition that the City has been working with Ramsey Active Living, Ramsey Communities for several years and will continue to do that. He noted there was not a policy change made that staff felt the Commission should see.

Chair Murphy asked the Commission if there were any other comments or suggestions for changes before the Comprehensive Plan goes to the Met Council.

Member Gitzen thought the document looked really good after he reviewed it. He thought it would be nice to receive the changed pages to the document for a complete document.

Member Bull asked where the priorities from the independent study would be incorporated in the document.

Ms. Purdue stated staff needs to think about that a little more. The easiest place to incorporate them would be right after the information from the study on page seven of the Housing Chapter. If there is something that specifically dovetails with another goal or strategy the City already has it would want to be integrated there as well.

Mr. Lloyd thought the priorities could appear in the Goals and Strategies part of the chapter. He thought it was important to mention the housing needs analysis from Maxfield looks out to 2030 which is not the end of the Comprehensive Plan horizon and he thought the City Council intends to have that kind of analysis updated every five

years. This is something staff anticipates updating in the Comprehensive Plan as a normal Comp. Plan Amendment at the appropriate time.

Member Bull asked if the City Council has already seen the recommendations.

Mr. Lloyd indicated the City Council has seen the Maxfield Study.

Member Bull stated he was a little concerned about going out to the public and stating the top concern for Roseville is more affluent housing.

Mr. Lloyd stated that also was a concern of staff and Mary Bujold at Maxfield acknowledged that one of the driving factors of high prices in the housing market is all of the competition for the same homes that some people can easily afford and are affordable to people in the higher ends of the AMI scale and by providing high end market housing choices for the more affluent people to choose that takes pressure off of the rest of the housing market as well. He stated it is not presented in the document as this is the best strategy to take care of the entire housing market problem but certainly one of the strategies to relieve housing prices and the upward pressure of it and start to fill in a part of Roseville's market that hasn't been touched in thirty off years. He thought that was why it was a higher priority in the report.

Member Bull thought it was much easier to add amenities to get to an affluent type property versus take away or cut down amenities to get to an affordable unit. He stated the challenge is how to get to affordable units and still make it economically feasible to be developed.

Ms. Purdue thought the intent in how staff incorporates the recommendations is to add them where the goals and strategies are supplemented that the Planning Commission and City Council has agreed on and then if there is something completely new, those that are new and don't easily match with something the City already has, would be listed separately so it is clear those items were a specific recommendation from the Maxfield Study but was not one of the goals and strategies that has not been vetted for in quite a long time through this process.

Member Bull liked the explanation because he wanted to hear a desire that this is segmented off and is another view from a third party.

Ms. Purdue stated staff is not intending to change any of the goals or strategies that has already been decided on.

Chair Murphy thanked Ms. Purdue and Mr. Lloyd for the update.

Mr. Lloyd explained that the Comprehensive Plan will be posted on the website for review and if there are any questions or comments there will be a link for communication with staff.

Member Bull wondered if the Council meeting could be a joint meeting for representation so if there were any questions, the Commission could help address them.

Mr. Lloyd stated Planning Commission members can attend the City Council meeting, but he was not sure it could be scheduled as a joint discussion but is something staff can inquire about.

Mr. Paschke did not think it would be necessary because it was clear the effort the Commission has put into the plan over the past two years. He thought if the Chair was at the meeting and makes a comment as it relates to this review that might be helpful.

Chair Murphy agreed and encouraged individual attendance at the City Council meeting.

8. Adjourn

MOTION

Member Gitzen, seconded by Member Bull to adjourn the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

Ayes: 5

Nays: 0

Motion carried.