



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Minutes – Wednesday, July 1, 2020 – 6:30 p.m.**

1. Call to Order

Chair Gitzen 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 Gitzen, City Planner Thomas Paschke called the Roll.

Members Present: Chair Chuck Gitzen; Vice Chair Peter Sparby, and Commissioners Julie Kimble, Michelle Kruzel, Tammy McGehee, Michelle Pribyl and Karen Schaffhausen.

Members Absent: None.

Staff Present: City Planner Thomas Paschke, Community Development Director Janice Gundlach, Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd, and Community Development Department Assistant Staci Johnson.

3. Approve Agenda

MOTION

Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Kruzel, to approve the agenda as presented.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Review of Minutes

a. June 3, 2020 Planning Commission Regular Meeting

Chair Gitzen noted changes were given to staff by members of the Commission and the minutes have been amended.

MOTION

Member Schaffhausen moved, seconded by Member McGehee, to approve the June 3, 2020 meeting minutes as amended.

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.*

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.*

None.

6. Public Hearing

- a. **Consideration of a Request by Jones Lang LaSalle for Approval of Two Drive-Through Facilities As A Conditional Use At Rosedale Center (PF19-028)**

Chair Gitzen opened the public hearing for PF19-028 at approximately 6:39 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing.

City Planner Paschke summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated July 1, 2020.

Chair Gitzen thought making the ring road a two-way roadway is important to this project and he wondered if staff anticipated this to happen before the construction.

Mr. Paschke believed the ring road switching over, and/or improvement will concur with some of the site preparation needed to be done for the two lots in order for separate applications to be submitted to the city when those projects move forward.

Member McGehee wondered how far the Caribou Coffee wraps around toward the ramp from Hwy 36. She wondered if there will be any issues with headlights from the drive-through at Caribou and the off ramp from Hwy 36 to Fairview.

Mr. Paschke explained there will not be any issues with the drive-through because it will be on the north side of the building and will wrap the ring road and go along the north side but there might be something staff could look at on the south side where the curve come around and traffic exits the egress onto the two way. Some landscaping might be able to be done in that area. He was not sure what was currently existing there and how it might impact.

Member McGehee indicated she appreciated the trails and lanes that have been made for pedestrians and bikers but she wondered if staff could explain how the intersection from Hwy 36 and Fairview will turn into a D from where it is now and how this will help with current traffic back up on that road and on the ramp from Hwy 36.

Mr. Paschke believed the EAW put forth some proposed modifications. One will be that Ramsey County will do a signalization study with respect to calming with respect to all signals along Rosedale which will probably assist in bettering traffic flow in this area and allowing the traffic to move better during those peak times. He did not know if it would be done initially due to retail not being what it used to be. Another improvement is to modify an island and a four-way in or around where the exit ramp is off of Hwy 36 to Fairview. He noted there are some things proposed that came through on the EAW that are more global to Roseville than the two drive-throughs.

Member Pribyl appreciated the effort to have pedestrian and bike access coming from Rosedale and having access off of Fairview. She thought the sidewalk connection for Raising Canes and Caribou Coffee seemed to be in an odd location and wondered if there was a more convenient area for the sidewalk.

Mr. Paschke indicated he understood and noted he would try to work with the consultant on this.

Mr. Andy Berg, Kimley Horn was at the meeting and addressed the Commission.

Public Comment

No one came forward to speak for or against this request.

Chair Gitzen closed the Public Hearing at 7:15 p.m. for Commission discussion.

MOTION

Member Kimble moved, seconded by Member Kruzel, to recommend to the city Council Approval of a CONDITIONAL USE for Caribou Coffee on Lot 3, Block 1, Rosedale Center Seventh Addition, based on the comments and findings of this report, and the following conditions and the addition of the canopy language:

- 1. Modification of the southern access point from a full access to an egress only. This would require all users to enter the site via the middle access to the southern outlot and cause any queues to back into the parking lot and not the ring-road.**
- 2. Modification of the site plan and moving the coffee 300 shop/bank development north to gain additional queuing storage. This will eliminate the center parking area shown adjacent to the center site access. The center parking area is not ideal from an operations or safety perspective, as parked vehicles are surrounding by circulating traffic.**
- 3. Eliminate the north egress only access and modify the angled parking to 90-degree parking. Additional stalls could be added, and the modification will require constructing a small hammerhead backout area where there proposed north access is located.**
- 4. Remove the bulb striping for the southbound left-turn lane within the center access intersection.**

5. **Stripe a short northbound left-turn lane opposite the southbound left-turn lane at the center access intersection.**
6. **Modify striping on the east approach of the center access intersection to delineate a better entrance for entering vehicles from the proposed development.**
7. **Wayfinding signage shall be added to aid in circulation, and to direct motorists to the drive through entrance and desired customer parking areas. Considerations shall be made for circulation of delivery and garbage trucks.**
8. **Contingent on a city approved vehicle circulation and signage plan, and pedestrian/bicycle access plan. Similar to that depicted on plans provided for consideration on July 1, 2020.**

Member Kimble indicated she was in support of the continued outlot development at Rosedale Center.

Member Kruzell thought staff did a good job and she liked the fact that there was discussion about the pedestrian walkway and the traffic flow. She thought it was stated pretty well.

Member Pribyl appreciated seeing more happening in the outlots and the under-utilized parking areas. She was glad to see some development happen there.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

Member Kimble moved, seconded by Member Pribyl, to recommend to the city Council Approval of a CONDITIONAL USE Approval of a CONDITIONAL USE for Canes on Lot 2, Block 1, Rosedale Center Seventh Addition, based on the comments and findings of this report, and the following conditions and the addition of the canopy language:

1. **Development of a drive-through screening plan to include both the type and style of fence, overall fence location, and landscaping to meet Code, to be approved by the City Planner.**
2. **Replacement of the existing sidewalk to accommodate pedestrian movements into Rosedale and the Canes site.**
3. **Access to the ring-road at the north access point shall be modified to include only one egress lane.**
4. **Wayfinding signage should be added to aid in circulation, and to direct motorists to the drive-through entrance and desired customer parking areas. Considerations shall be made for circulation of delivery and garbage trucks.**
5. **Contingent on a city approved vehicle circulation and signage plan, and pedestrian/bicycle access plan. Similar to that depicted on plans provided for consideration on July 1, 2020.**

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0
Motion carried.

b. Consideration of a Request For Approval Of A Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map Change From Low-Density Residential (LR) To Medium-Density Residential (MR) And A Rezoning From Low-Density Residential 1 (LDR-1) To Medium-Density Residential (MDR), And A Preliminary Approval Of A Major Plat To Subdivide The Property Into 19 Lots For A Single-Family, Detached Townhome Development (PF20-002)

Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated July 1, 2020.

Member Pribyl indicated she received some emails from residents that were really concerned about the park issue. She understood the city has had conversations with the seller in the past about dedicating this land for a potential park. She wondered if staff had any additional information or history on that and why that has not occurred. It seemed like the demand for a park in this particular area of the city is pretty strong and she did not see any other areas that would be available for a park this size. She thought that hearing other resident concerns and echoing those, she wondered what the history was on the efforts.

Mr. Lloyd explained he did not have any more complete information than what he responded to in the emails which is the city has been in some discussions over time with the owner of this property but he did not know for sure if there was any formal offer to purchase this property or if it was more of an informal conversation about the transfer of the land through some sale or something. Even while he did not know the details of those conversations or the exact nature of the events, he gathered that the high cost of the land is the primary impediment from the city's perspective.

Member Schaffhausen really appreciated the thorough presentation by staff. She indicated in the staff report, line 145, it talks specifically about the rezoning and as far as what would happen if not, she asked for more information on that and was looking for more clarity on the staff reports lines 145-150. She asked if potentially this could go through anyway but would look differently under the low-density residential moniker.

Mr. Lloyd indicated that was not the case and nothing is the given, especially when a plat is needed to subdivide the land, even if there is not a rezoning request. The low-density guidance of the Comprehensive Plan coincides with both the LDR-1, the normal single-family zoning district that applies to this property and many of its surrounding neighbors and the LDR-2 District which applies now to one of the parcels across Eustice Street. With those two zoning districts available in the low-density designation in the Comprehensive Plan there is two possible zoning districts to consider when looking at a redevelopment or a development proposal. In his own study of the lot and what might be possible, he did not think there would be any way to get more than four or five single family lots in the LDR-1 District arranged around the sides just because access into that more eastern part or this is more difficult

without having a road and private streets that would be supported by a great number of residences. Without changing the Comprehensive Plan, which is requested in this proposal, a rezoning could be applied for, could be approved for the LDR-2 District to be applied for this property and in that district the nature for the minimum lot width and overall density could allow for a twin home development easily at or above this same number of units. That rezoning would still have to be approved in this same kind of a process, but it would not require the Comprehensive Plan to be amended as well.

Member Kimble asked without a Comp Plan change but with a rezoning, the site could support approximately thirty units.

Mr. Lloyd indicated he was not sure but he thought with a little rearranging of the property boundaries along the new private street that is being proposed, it would be easy to see that at least thirty twin home units could be done across the site with very little adjustment to the plat being proposed.

Member Kimble indicated in the report there is a request for nineteen lots. She wondered how many units for the nineteen lots did that equate for.

Mr. Lloyd explained because this is proposed in a detached single-family development, the nineteen lots would be for nineteen residential homes.

Member Kimble asked if the project were approved with the green space in the southwest corner how would it change the lot or unit count.

Mr. Lloyd thought it depended on a couple of things, one of those being exactly which lots would be selected. This is not something staff has talked with the applicant about so he thought the applicant may be able to shed some light on it as well. His thought is that there are four or five lots in the southwest area corner, particularly lots 12-15 that really are only proposed lots in the plat by virtue of the developers proposal to relocate the existing public street and to regrade the land there to make a more typical, ninety degree intersection in alignment with Eustice Street to the west. If that is the land that the city ultimately determines will be good land for park dedication, he did not think the land would look the same without the city's dollars being put into regrade and to relocate that roadway. He expect that is the land that would ultimately be identified as park dedication, probably lots 12-15 would go away because the developer would not be relocating that street and perhaps lot 16 is far enough north that it would not be affected by that dedication, unless lot 16 were identified for the land dedication. It is difficult to answer exactly because there are a couple of moving parts to it.

Member Kimble explained there are twin home development in this same neighborhood, and she thought there seemed to exist some product that is denser than single family and she wondered how that density of that development compares to the one being proposed.

Mr. Lloyd thought it was similar. He noted he has not looked at the exact numbers, but he thought that was a little larger land area overall. He thought the density would be similar.

Member Kimble recognized how important open space and parks are in the city and Roseville certainly does have a stellar system of green space. The only thing that she does not know or understand is how does a density of population relate to the placement and creation of parks. She wondered if the population density in this area of the city similar to other areas of the city.

Mr. Lloyd was not sure how much of that he could respond to but even with the existing twin home development a little further east along County Road B and the yet to be developed twin homes that were approved last year on the west side of Eustice near this proposed development, that kind of increased the density somewhat overall, but elsewhere in the area there are still some rather large lots that have a density lowering effect on average. Without any research he thought it was certainly possible that the average of this southwestern part of the community is similar elsewhere even with the proposed higher density areas in it.

Member Sparby was curious if there is an overview of the land densities in that area because he knew there is a multi-family apartment style building at the end with possibly some townhomes along County Road B.

Mr. Lloyd indicated the area is predominately low density. He thought that the existing twin home development that came up a little while ago on County Road B is in a medium density zoning district. He noted the existing apartment building is zoned high density but is a small apartment as apartments go with not a tremendous number of units.

Member Sparby explained he was also curious because there will be nineteen lots and units on this project and in walking the neighborhood it seemed like there will be a lot of units on a small area. He noted that the wetland takes up a lot of area on the property and he wondered how staff felt about nineteen units fitting into this area because it looked pretty tight from what he was seeing along with a lot of single family nearby and he asked if it would clash with the area.

Mr. Lloyd explained it will be a dramatic change from what the property is today and what it historically has been. He reviewed the city requirements for the size of the lot that is there. He thought this discussion illustrates that by changing the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning to the Medium Zoning District the city would not be objectively increasing the density that is popular in that area.

Member McGehee indicated that not only in the southwest part of the city is there not much parkland but the city does not have any natural areas either. She did find out for those interested that the wetland was delineated and approved by Ramsey County in June of 2019 and the major wetland was at .78 acre and the smaller one was .03. There is already a fifty-foot City setback for protection for wetland which is

consistent with State Law. The total acreage with the setback of the wetland becomes 2.3 acres. That is approximately half of this site and an interesting figure when talking about park land and wetlands. She opined wetlands are important ecologically and is not generally in favor of filling in wetlands. This wetland is serving a community with actually some considerable density around it already and the wetland is doing nicely as there appear to be no flooding problems in this area. For these reasons, she was a little reluctant to support putting more stress on this particular wetland and adding more impervious surfaces to the area. She noted it is clear from the comments received that this wetland is a vital part of this community and that parkland is desired by the community as evidenced by some of the surveys that have been done.

Member Kruzal indicated she had some concerns about the wetland, park dedication, the green space, and the size of the area to have that many houses built. The infrastructure of the roads are also a concern.

Member Schaffhausen indicated her questions are specific to looking at the Comp Plan and city code. She thought it was interesting that there was a little bit of tension in the Comp Plan with regard to this type of property and looking at the rezoning and the changing of the Comp Plan. Staff identified in the staff report, lines 89-94, a couple of really great examples of why this would be good. She noted in the Comp Plan there is a section about housing that meets community needs. It is talking about trying to create something that is really more inclusive and when looking at the type of housing and the cost for this, it fits with the vision and mission, as well as the land use within the Chapter 4. When looking at the survey one of the highest requirements the residents had was protecting wetlands, rivers, and green spaces, and becoming more walkable and pedestrian was number two. When looking at the information there are two opposing views dealing with specifically this kind of land. She also looked at the Zoning Code and in Section 1004.8, Low-Density Residential-One Family, describing what it is, she was interested in the sentence regarding natural resources. She asked how does the city come to some sort of conclusion with the fact that there really is an apparent tension here and that there is also a gap in any sort of park service in this part of the city and even another Commission has identified this as a gap.

Ms. Lloyd thought having these conversations and input from the community is an important part of the process. He thought with respect to the zoning requirements and the language in there about protecting natural amenities is partly a function of the much larger lot sizes in the LDR-1 Zoning District. There are provisions built into that Zoning District that with a larger lot provides more potential yard space. In the context of rezoning away from the LDR-1, as much as there is value in what the LDR-1 District is for, if the city is considering changing from that District to something else, in looking at the other Zoning District and what its goals are is maybe part of the process as well. There is also the question of what the city does for the park space needs of the nearby residents. To deny a proposal like this because the city needs more park land, certainly does not obligate the city to turn around and buy the property for park land but it also calls into question what the existing

homeowners' options are if development proposals are not approved. He thought it is a big complicated question and hard to answer.

Member Schaffhausen explained as she was reading through the Comp Plan land use she felt the tension and that the city needed to choose between one or the other even though the Comp Plan is asking the city to do both. She was trying to figure out how to take all of it into consideration. She has heard Mr. Lloyd state this has met the criteria for the Comp Plan, and she was concerned.

Member Kimble indicated she read all of the posts and emails everyone sent in and was a little perplexed. She indicated the road used to go through to another road and now it dead ends so she was surprised by the traffic comments because she would suspect that the traffic was much less then it was in years past.

Mr. Lloyd indicated he was not sure about what has been done in terms of the enforcement of the speed limit that is there. He gathered there has been some concerted effort in the past. He pointed out that the Police Chief is among city staff that would use development proposals like this and did not have any concerns about developing this number of homes at the end of the street. That seems to be a separate issue from the rate in which people travel. This was a through street connection to Hwy 280 up until 2007 or 2009 when it was permanently closed, and traffic went down dramatically. That lower traffic count was normal for the neighborhood and any increase in traffic is evident with new developments. The other thing to point out is the city's engineer did provide a memo regarding traffic and the condition of County Road B in this area and noted in the next few years the city is planning to redesign and rebuild that section of the street. The engineering changes should also contribute to lowering people's speed driving through there.

Member Kimble noted she was on the Commission when it reviewed the Comp Plan, which took a few years to do and it may appear there is tension but like every city across the Twin Cities, Roseville struggled with community participation and it is not surprising what people wanted. Also, when thinking about the Comp Plan it is impossible to get all of the attributes of the vision on one site or in one small area so while the Comp Plan looks at the vision for Roseville it naturally cannot do everything everywhere, it has to do the best it can.

Community Development Director Gundlach commented on the things Commissioners Schaffhausen and Kimble brought up. She noted the tension piece is part of the public process. The Commission's role is to discuss those issues and determine which ones are most important to them and then articulating those as part of the recommendation made.

Member Pribyl asked how people will turn around on County Road B, when realigned, once it is realized that there is not an exit.

Mr. Lloyd indicated that is something he felt the applicant could answer.

Mr. Todd Ganz, applicant, addressed the Commission.

Member Sparby understood nineteen units is possible but given the character of the area with single family homes on larger lots, he was concerned with the density of this project abutting single family with large lots and how the neighborhood flows and links together. He asked if Mr. Ganz considered any less dense single unit structures on the property or would there be any consideration for blending it more with what is in the neighborhood now.

Mr. Ganz indicated initially when the parcel was looked it there was thought of twenty-one units on it but because of the area surrounding it and the single family around it the amount was cut down so it would be more fitting into the neighborhood the way it is designed. He noted his plan for the east side of the private street is to put in numerous trees and if the city or neighborhood would like he could build a privacy fence along there so the neighbors are not dealing with the amount of people driving in and out of there. The other thing that is true about the people that are coming in there is that most of the people coming to him are fifty-five and older. There is not going to be a lot more traffic coming into this neighborhood and a lot of the residents would be spending their winters in the southern states. There will be limited winter people living in those homes.

Member Pribyl asked if for some reason, some part of the plan was not recommended by the Commission, what would be Mr. Ganz's step. Would he look for an alternative to the site or is nineteen units the minimum he could put on the site.

Mr. Ganz explained he would probably come back and propose and LDR-2 and turn it into a simple twin home project. He mentioned that the park area that was brought up on the southeast corner, lots 12-15, if the city approved that Mr. Lloyd indicated there would be more expense to the city but the biggest thing is the elevations there drops down fast there so in order to put a park in there a retaining wall and thousands of yards of dirt would need to be brought to that area in order to make it flat and safe to use as a park.

Mr. Lloyd showed a contour map to the Commission.

Chair Gitzen invited residents to speak to the Commission.

Ms. Rachael Ostrom, 2223 St. Croix Street, indicated her property is adjacent to the north end of the property and she and her family have lived in the area for fifteen years. She did understand the developer is looking at medium density however there is a reason that the Comp Plan left this as single-family low density because of the area and the integrity of the area. She indicated the developer and city have heard from over 2,400 people that have signed a petition with over a hundred emails that were received. She wanted to stress that this southwest side of Roseville needs to protect the wildlife and the residents are worried about noise pollution, property values but this natural habitat that exists on the property is so intrinsic to the area and on her property alone there is an oak tree that is over 250 years old and the same

conditions exist on the five acre lot. Once nature is destroyed, once that goes away this decision would do that. She asked the city to consider the permanency of this decision and to explore all options.

It is noted that Ms. Ostrom emailed the city as shown in the meeting packet.

Mr. Cal Ross, 2189 St. Croix St, indicated he was stunned that the city would allow approximately a seventy percent increase in density at the end of a three quarter of a mile-long cul-de-sac. He brought up safety issues before and the density added is a safety issue. He bought is property that abuts this property and put a pool in his backyard because of the LDR-1 that was slated for the property there and he was afraid that his property value will go down with the addition of nine townhomes that will be across from his home. He indicated if this project goes through he will have a street on the front and back of his house and the street will be twenty-five feet from his pool. He noted that no one from the Parks Department talked to the Shannon family. He read the Comp Plan and City Codes. The delineated wetland is what everyone in the neighborhood has appreciated since moving to the area. These house wildlife and vegetation that is not allowed to be changed. He thought the entire proposal was not consistent with the 2040 Comp Plan. He asked the Commission to enforce the spirit and the letter of the City Code and of the 2040 Comp Plan.

It was noted that Mr. Ross also wrote an open letter to the city as shown in the meeting packet.

Ms. Skye Cook, 2281 Murray Road West, indicated this neighborhood has many small children and her family is in love with the area. She thought considering this land for a park makes a lot of sense for a lot of people. She asked what the approval of this project would do to affect the city's current tax base, what would be the income generated by that. She also asked how this proposed development is going to affect the wildlife in the immediate vicinity. She was also concerned with increased traffic to the area especially with all of the small children in the area.

Ms. Cook noted she emailed the city with questions related to this proposed development.

Chair Gitzen thought the zoning questions have been addressed in the report. He was not sure about the wildlife or the tax base question.

Mr. Lloyd indicated in regard to the tax impact, it is not something to consider with these requests. He thought in Roseville the commercial retail area is a substantial amount of the weight in terms of revenues for the city to help keep taxes down for residential owners. He did not think it was a question of how much more tax revenue can the city get by subdividing a parcel.

Ms. Nancy Nelson, 2151 Fulham Street, indicated she did not receive initial notification of this because she lives further than 500 feet away, but it affects her with traffic that goes up and down County Road B. She indicated one of the reasons she

moved to Roseville was because of the parks and green space and from the Comprehensive Plan, that is the number two reason why people want to live in Roseville. Building nineteen homes, cutting down the old trees and shrinking the wetlands, which is what the developer wants to do, is not right. The trees provide a noise buffer from 280 and Hwy 36 and enhance the neighborhood. She understood that southwest Roseville should have some parks, but all of the large pieces of land is gone now. She thought it would be ok to put LDR-1 housing on the parcel she would be ok with it but not these nineteen or thirty townhomes on the piece of property. She thought it would change the whole nature of the neighborhood. She wondered who would determine the area of the two wetlands to be preserved. Filling in one of the wetlands and getting a credit someplace else does not enhance Roseville. She also wondered who would make sure the developer stays fifty feet away from the designated wetlands when building. She thought more needed to be done to try to get a piece of that property for the neighborhood since there are no parks in the next neighborhood.

It was noted that Miss Nelson also wrote a letter to the city as shown in the meeting packet.

Mr. Lloyd indicated city staff and the engineering office makes sure that structures being proposed conform to all applicable setbacks and other parameters. He noted the Watershed District will also be checking on the delineation of wetlands in the area.

Mr. Paul Wallace, 2169 Pulham Street, appreciated the discussion. He noted he has lived in the neighborhood nearly eighteen years and he thought the priorities the city is trying to balance really needs to listen to the community and when things are intentioned, this is an opportunity to listen to the community. Many people in the area are against this project and do not match the priorities of the community. He thought this neighborhood has changed and balancing out the safety and vibrancy of the community should be valued. Adding a project like this with vehicles and residents with such a tight project does not make sense at all. He hoped the Commission makes the decision to not move the project forward.

Chair Gitzen reminded the public that the Commission makes a recommendation to the city Council who makes the decisions.

Mr. John Lomnicki, 2190 St. Croix Street, indicated he has never been to the property until recently and he thought the area was spectacular with wildlife and nature. He indicated he was opposing to the zoning change because of the position of the road, distance between homes and he believed a better use of this land is a park.

It was noted that Mr. Lomnicki also wrote an email to the city as shown in the meeting packet.

Ms. Margaret McNeely, 2377 West County Road B, indicated she lives next to this property and knew Ms. Shannon and knew that eventually the property would go up

for sale, but she did not think nineteen homes would go into the property. She thought four or five homes would be ok but not as many as nineteen. She did see the value of a park in the area and thought the city needed to preserve the wildlife area. Her concern was also with the added traffic and headlights that will affect both the front and back of her property.

It was noted that Ms. McNeely also sent an email to the city as shown in the meeting packet.

Ms. Kathy Nockleby, 2171 St. Croix Street, explained she has lived on her property for twenty-eight years and is a retired nurse. She indicated she sees the nineteen units as part one of a phased development with more property being purchased in the future. She asked the developer if there were plans for future expansion and if so, what were the plans. She indicated she was strongly opposed to this or any other proposal that would lead to environmental, social and property degradation.

It was noted that Ms. Nockleby also sent an email to the city as shown in the meeting packet.

Chair Gitzen thought the discussion needed to be held to what is currently happening and not what could happen to the area in the future.

Mr. Lloyd indicated the issue before them is this particular proposal needs to be responded to and future proposals need to be reviewed on their own merit.

Ms. Mary Lou Wiley, 2195 St. Croix Street, indicated she agreed with her neighbors' input and purchased their property because of the wildlife, the quietness and are also facing the possibility of a road behind their backyard with headlights shining in their windows along with the noise issue. She indicated she were also opposed to this.

It was noted that Ms. Wiley also sent an email to the city as shown in the meeting packet.

Mr. Bruce Nelson indicated he married into the Shannon Family and has been involved in this property. The family has loved the property and have taken good care of the property and wildlife. The Shannon Family has never been against the sale of this property for park land. The family was approached approximately ten years ago by the City of Roseville to discuss the donation of the property. He indicated the family could not do that and is the only time he was aware of the city asking about the property. If the neighborhood had approached the family with the park idea his family would have been happy to consider the purchase at fair market value as a part of that discussion but for the past four years that property has been on the market and no one other than developers have ever talked to the family. He explained now there is a firm, legitimate offer that his family has accepted and now the residents around the property start talking. He asked where the city and neighborhood have been over the last four years. His family had no idea. For clarity, on the wetland delineation, it was done by his family but in looking at staff's report,

that outlet on the north end of the property was set a foot and a half high and the silt has built in another foot and a half which is three feet of extra water that has collected in that property. He noted his family has lost land because of someone's mistake, whether it was Roseville, the County or Rice Creek, he wondered who compensates his family for that loss of saleable land. He indicated Ms. Gundlach had a traffic report, also in the staff report, the traffic counts keeps falling since 2005.

Ms. Kevin Prettyman, 2194 St. Croix Street, explained the house has been in his family for three generations since the forties. Their family has seen the neighborhood change over the years and are opposed to this development. He indicated there is concern about safety and the emergency exit or outlet. He noted the neighbors really want and need a park in the neighborhood for the kids to play in. He indicated he does not see a benefit that this plan gives to the neighborhood.

It was noted that Mr. Prettyman also sent an email to the city as shown in the meeting packet.

Ms. Anna Landsverk, 2200 Lexington Avenue North, indicated one of the main reasons she moved to Roseville was the park system. She noted she and many other people seek out the more natural areas to walk their pets because it is so valuable to them she hated to see that taken out by this development.

Mr. Steve Martineau indicated he was a thirty-year resident with twenty-two years on St. Croix Street. He noted the developer did make some accommodations to move a drive that would shine into his home, which he appreciated. He knew the city has spent a lot of time developing the Comp Plan and thought that was more of a guide that could be tuned and tweaked as it went along. He was upset that the Comp Plan is not being used as intended.

Mr. Paul Nockleby echoed what his wife spoke about and he also asked about the midpoint between St. Croix Street and Eustice Street and if Mr. Lloyd were to design this street as a planner, where would the street be located. He also thought there was a discrepancy between what he was hearing from the developer and a photo of 1937 that was not referenced, showing a wetland of considerably more than one acre and he thought the city needed to be looking at historic photos. He noted there is universal opposition to this proposal. The area does not have a park and is something that is needed, and the residents are entitled to it.

Mr. Tom Dunwell, 2253 St. Croix Street, indicated he has lived in the area for close to forty-five years and he has met the Shannon's and talked to them about the beautiful piece of property. The residents are looking at this parcel being destroyed by development and will eventually lose the wetland which could lead to more development of the property. This is just the beginning of higher density development. He noted this is a single-family area that the Comp Plan and 2040 plan shows. The zoning is for single-family housing. He thought this was the worst plan he has ever seen for a development and should never have been considered. He indicated he was opposed to this development.

Ms. Karen Meile, (Bella), 9421 St. Croix Street, indicated she was calling for her grandma who was sick and not well enough to speak. She is opposed to this plan and would like a place for her grandchildren to play, such as a park.

Ms. Sue Dunwell, 2253 St. Croix Street, indicated this is the last chance for any park in the southwest corner of the city. The residents have paid their taxes and have been waiting for a park and need the city support now.

Ms. Kelly Prettyman, agreed with the neighbors. She was really caught up on the fact that 141 of 181 trees will be cut down which is a huge issue to her. The trees are extremely old and mature and if new trees are planted in their place it is not the same and there is a lot of history on this land.

Chair Gitzen closed the public comment.

MOTION

Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Schaffhausen, to recommend denial of the requested Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map Change from Low-Density Residential to Medium-Density Residential, and based on the comments made which are primarily around health, safety and welfare of this community and their need for the trees, to mitigate the light, air and noise pollution from the surrounding highways. She added that since residents are invited to be active participants in neighborhood decisions, she thought as a premier city known for its parks this is likely the last opportunity to get a unique and desired park in this area of Roseville.

Member Schaffhausen indicated there is a little bit of tension between the approval versus the space. At the end of the day, goals and strategies within land use, she did not believe the city has fully embodied being able to define and meet the standard of a new development and enhancing the desired community character and the city is not continuing to maintain the parks and greenspaces. She also thought the city was not meeting the measure of the Comprehensive Plan with regard to the strategies.

Member Pribyl concurred. She thought there was a lack for parks in the southwest part of the city and this may be the last opportunity of getting a park in that area.

Member Sparby supported the motion for denial because he thought the city needed to pay attention to the health safety and welfare standard the city has. He personally did not find this consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, mainly for the land use, Chapter 4 item. He thought the Commission heard from the residents that the city is not protecting and enhancing the character, stability, and vitality of residential neighborhoods. It does need to be weighed against the other initiatives of the Comp Plan and through that balancing test he came out with the decision that this did not enhance the character, stability, and vitality of the neighborhood that it is a part of. He thought the city needed to move away from the park issue and thought that is a separate issue, whether the city wants to create this as a park. He thought the

development needed to be the focus and whether it meets the criteria of the Comp Plan. He also thought the city cannot rule out the future development of this site, if the city elects not to make this parcel a park and something comes back for development on the parcel that protects the character, stability and vitality of the neighborhood, that may be supported by the residents. He thought the real issue was the density of the proposal and packing these units into a small area that is not consistent with how the area is being operated. He thought the city needed to be open for future development.

Member Kruzel agreed with what the Commissioners have said and agreed that there are two separate issues. A park is needed in that quadrant but needed to be looked at separately.

Member Kimble supported the motion and agreed with Commissioner Sparby in the fact that the parcel is for sale and may be developed with some level of density it can support and that the park is a separate issue and should not be a consideration for denial.

Chair Gitzen indicated he would support the motion and what it came down for him was the neighborhood, which is the big issue for him. He did not think that the current proposal fits into the character of the existing neighborhood.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

Member Sparby moved, seconded by Member Pribyl, to recommend denial of the requested Zoning Map Change from Low-Density Residential 1 to Medium-Density Residential, based on the content of this RPCA, public input, and Planning Commission deliberation.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

Member Gitzen moved, seconded by Member McGehee, to recommend denial of the proposed Midland Legacy Estate 2nd Addition Preliminary Plat, based on not meeting the current zoning in place.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

7. Adjourn

MOTION

Member Kimble, seconded by Member Sparby, to adjourn the meeting at 10:05 p.m.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.