


<p>Commissioners: Julie Kimble Michelle Kruzal Tammy McGehee Michelle Pribyl Karen Schaffhausen Erik Bjorum Emily Leutgeb</p>	 <p>Planning Commission Agenda Wednesday, September 1, 2021 6:30pm</p> <p>Members of the public who wish to speak during public comment or on an agenda item may do so in person during this meeting or virtually by registering at www.cityofroseville.com/attendmeeting.</p>	<p>Address: 2660 Civic Center Dr. Roseville, MN 55113</p> <p>Phone: 651-792-7080</p> <p>Website: www.cityofroseville.com/pc</p>
---	---	--

1. Call To Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval Of Agenda
4. Review Of Minutes

Documents:

[AUGUST 4, 2021 MINUTES.PDF](#)

5. Communications And Recognitions
 - 5.A. From The Public:
Public comment pertaining to general land use issues not on this agenda.
 - 5.B. From The Commission Or Staff:
As part of the City's Strategic Racial Equity Action Plan, the Planning Commissioners are reminded to complete the Commissioner Demographic Survey. The purpose of this survey is to allow the City to begin to establish a baseline for future goals and measurement on board and commission diversity
6. Other Business
 - 6.A. Preliminary Discussion Regarding Section Two Zoning Code Updates

Documents:

[6A REPORT AND ATTACHMENTS.PDF](#)

7. Adjourn



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Draft Minutes – Wednesday, August 4, 2021 – 6:30 p.m.**

Members of the public may have participated in this meeting electronically due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

- 1 **1. Call to Order**
2 Chair Kimble called to order the regular meeting of the Planning Commission meeting at
3 approximately 6:30 p.m. and reviewed the role and purpose of the Planning Commission.
4
- 5 **2. Roll Call**
6 At the request of Chair Kimble, City Planner Thomas Paschke called the Roll.
7
- 8 **Members Present:** Chair Kimble; Vice Chair Michell Pribyl, and Commissioners
9 Michelle Kruzel, Tammy McGehee, Karen Schaffhausen, Erik
10 Bjorum and Emily Leutgeb.
11
- 12 **Members Absent:** None.
13
- 14 **Staff Present:** City Planner Thomas Paschke, Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd and
15 Community Development Director Janice Gundlach
16
- 17 **3. Approve Agenda**
18
- 19 **MOTION**
20 **Member Schaffhausen moved, seconded by Member McGehee, to approve the**
21 **agenda as presented.**
22
- 23 **Ayes: 7**
24 **Nays: 0**
25 **Motion carried.**
26
- 27 **4. Review of Minutes**
28
- 29 **a. July 7, 2021 Planning Commission Regular Meeting**
30
- 31 **MOTION**
32 **Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Kruzel, to approve the July 7,**
33 **2021 meeting minutes.**
34
- 35 **Ayes: 7**
36 **Nays: 0**
37 **Motion carried.**
38
- 39 **5. Communications and Recognitions:**

40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86

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. **Request for Preliminary Approval of a Major Plat to Subdivide the Development Site into Nine Lots for Single-Family, Detached Homes (PF21-003)**
Chair Kimble opened the public hearing for PF21-003 at approximately 6:35 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing. He advised this item will be before the City Council on August 23, 2021.

Senior Planner Lloyd summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated August 4, 2021.

Member Pribyl indicated her concerns specifically about lots 2, 3 and 4, their orientation to the public right-of-way. She understood that this is a difficult site to develop because of the limitations of street access and the wetland and park but looking at Roseville in general and standard development in general, typically home space of public right-of-way in the front yard is towards the street and given the constraints with the shared driveway, it seems to be a very awkward relationship between those homes and the street. Looking at this without a home on there, she would not know which is meant to be the front yard and which is meant to be the backyard. The placement of the driveway also fabricates those lots and leaves a portion of those lots of sort of in no man’s land. She asked Mr. Lloyd to speak to why those lots are not oriented towards the public right-of-way. She understood neighbors still have concerns about the shared driveway and lights shining in their yards. If those homes could be oriented toward the cul-de-sac, for example, she thought that even if there were still a shared driveway, that would potentially help with some of those concerns.

Mr. Lloyd reviewed the plat and indicated the street is not public, it is a private street. There are several lots being proposed, not directly addressing a public street. There is sort of an a-typical arrangement here because the northern end of these lots do not directly address or reach that cul-de-sac. He indicated he did not have a lot to say about that. He gathered because of the presence of the wetlands and the scale of the setback requirements for structures from it, there is not an opportunity to shift these lots in such a way that they do all address it. He thought if the wetland was not there the homes could all come off of the cul-de-sac. There is not anything within the

87 Zoning or Subdivision Codes that directly says homes must be facing a street frontage
88 of some kind.

89
90 Member Pribyl explained even if other Commissioners felt that the arrangement is
91 acceptable as staff does, she thought that just functionally the placement of the lot
92 line between lot 1 and those three other lots, for the people that live there, this piece
93 of land would be better suited to be a part of lot 1 then of lots 2, 3 and 4 because that
94 other side of the driveway does not seem like it belongs to those three lots. She noted
95 if this moves forward it is something she would like the developer to consider.

96
97 Member McGehee indicated that as interesting as this is, whether they agree or not,
98 the plat before them ought to be considered because this is not a design process. This
99 is what is being presented and she did not think the Commission should be correcting
100 it and altering it. She really appreciated Commissioner Pribyl's comments, but she
101 thought the Commission should discuss what was presented which design is not a part
102 of it.

103
104 Member Bjorum asked what still needed to be worked through on the stormwater
105 plan to be finalized.

106
107 Mr. Lloyd indicated he was not sure, but all of the plans are considered preliminary at
108 this point, and it is not unusual to continue to be working through them at this stage in
109 the process.

110
111 Member McGehee indicated she talked to Rice Creek Watershed District and also to
112 Mark Culver, Director of Public Works for the City, and he said that they are not
113 close on the storm water management program and what the applicant has now is not
114 satisfactory and incomplete and there is no application of completed material before
115 Rice Creek Watershed District at this time.

116
117 Member Leutgeb indicated with these conditions, a concern the Commission had
118 when this proposal was before them in June was that the proposal that was presented
119 did not seem integral in its odd shape lot outlines and the finding of loopholes in the
120 Code and with all of these conditions attached, her concern is who follows up on that
121 because there is a time crunch between now and the City Council meeting. She
122 wondered what the next steps will be.

123
124 Mr. Lloyd explained the shapes and sizes of the lots is entirely a function of this
125 review, conditions of approval and the City Council's action on that. His
126 understanding from the development review committee, meetings at which this has
127 been a topic of conversation several times, there is not much to doubt that a
128 satisfactory stormwater management plan can be engineered and is a very solvable
129 problem for a subdivision like this. If a suitable, manageable plan is not produces
130 than there will not be any development of these lots until such time that there is an
131 approved stormwater management plan. These plans are required elements of a plat
132 application so that the City can see that work is being done on that front.

133

134 Member McGehee thought the problem she is having since being on the Commission
135 is that the Commission is constantly being asked to approve things before the permits
136 are in and before it is considered whether things are going to work or not and she
137 thought it would be nice to have a process in place at some point.

138
139 Member Schaffhausen asked if the Commission chooses to go forward with the
140 motion, what happens if there is a point where the builder and the City cannot come
141 to an agreement and all of sudden there is this weird chunk of land that might actually
142 fit a house, what would the City do then.

143
144 Mr. Lloyd explained how the City would deal with a possible problem.

145
146 Chair Kimble agreed with Commissioner McGee and thought it would be nice to see
147 things further along.

148
149 Mr. Paschke indicated it is also uncommon that a developer would get a Watershed
150 permit before a final plat or a preliminary plat because the developer is going through
151 the process of determining whether the City is going to allow them to draw the lines
152 that are lots on a plat which is the sole purpose of a preliminary plat. The other
153 information is very helpful to understand how a lot is going to be graded, whether
154 utilities can be brought to it, how stormwater management will be handled, as well as
155 what trees are going to stay and go as a part of that to help look at things in a more
156 holistic way.

157
158 Mr. Todd Ganz, Integrity Land Development, addressed the Commission.

159
160 Chair Kimble asked what Mr. Ganz meant by stating that the lots will be ok if the
161 City does not purchase the additional park land.

162
163 Mr. Ganz reviewed the plan that showed the smaller park and explained lots three and
164 four get bigger.

165
166 Member McGehee asked if Mr. Ganz would be interested in negotiating with the City
167 for more land than that.

168
169 Mr. Ganz did not think they could meet code for the driveways and the houses being
170 built if more land were sold.

171
172 Member McGehee indicated she understood that, but she presumed the developer
173 would ask for some compensation.

174

175 **Public Comment**

176

177 Mr. Cal Ross, 2189 St. Croix, reviewed the history of the area by his house. He noted
178 there is virtually no one who is in favor of this plat in his neighborhood. He
179 explained this does not make a lot of sense to him and is not the standard
180 development seen in Roseville. He indicated he talked to Rice Creek Watershed

181 District about the drainage plan, and they did not know if the drainage would be
182 going to east because nothing has been done on the permit since April 2020. He
183 explained that is a big concern to him because of the wildlife that resides in the area.
184 He did not think it would be allowed to drain any of the lots to the wetland area. He
185 noted he has never seen a development like this with a shared driveway.

186
187 Mr. Kevin Prettyman, 2194 St. Croix Street, asked that the Planning Commission
188 deny this request. His objections to the proposed plan are similar to all of the rest of
189 the neighbors which is the three properties with the shared driveway. There is no
190 other development like this in the area. He was worried what will happen to all the
191 trees that the developer said he would preserve.

192
193 Ms. & Mrs. Macalby. Mr. Macalby indicated the woods mean a lot to them and are
194 opposed to the development.

195
196 Ms. Nancy Nelson, 2151 Fulham Street, indicated she had a couple of concerns with
197 the added lots to the development since the City Council meeting as well as the ones
198 with the shared driveways. She thought the two homes further from the street would
199 need to have sprinkler systems installed because she did not know if a fire truck
200 would be able to access them if there was a fire. Her other concern was if the
201 developer takes out the turn around where all of the semi's turn around from County
202 Road B. There would not be enough room there for the trucks to turn around. She
203 also thought the development traffic would be a lot for a long period of time. There
204 will be more litter flying around with the construction. She indicated she was not
205 against building on the property, but she did not think this was the correct plan.

206
207 Mr. Tim Lundin, 2151 Fairways Lane, explained where he lives, he sees a lot of the
208 traffic that comes and goes, and he does understand that the developer has purchased
209 the land and it seems that it will be developed. He thought the neighborhood will
210 have to accept some things with that, but they were concerned about the turn around
211 and how the semi's, school buses, trash vehicles as well as cars will be able to get out
212 of the neighborhood. He was not sure how that became a part of the development
213 property. He did not think it made sense to take that turn around out.

214
215 Chair Kimble closed the public hearing at 7:30 p.m.

216
217 **Commission Deliberation**

218
219 Chair Kimble recapped some of the questions made by the residents.

220
221 Mr. Lloyd reviewed the shape of the existing parcel and indicated it will become a
222 rectangle by including more land. He reviewed how the turn around has become a
223 part of the development due to a current right-of-way and how vehicles will be able to
224 turn around in the future. He noted the City can determine if a right-of-way should be
225 turned back to the owner if the City deems the property is not being used anymore as
226 a right-of-way.

227

228 Member Schaffhausen asked how the City takes in the anecdotal data. She thought
229 this was a fair concern and wondered if the City could possibly divert all of the traffic
230 that is led to this area elsewhere, so the residents did not need to worry about it.

231
232 Mr. Lloyd explained that just because someone asks for the land back from the City,
233 it does not mean that the City has to conclude that it is not needed and has to be given
234 back but if someone asks and the City concludes the land is not needed than the City
235 is obligated to return the land and remove the right-of-way. He indicated there has
236 never been any uncertainty that he has seen from the Public Works staff about
237 whether that is a workable idea to remove the cul-de-sac and realign the roadway. He
238 did not know how the anecdotal data might be compared to the traffic data from the
239 counting apparatus the Department has. He indicated County Road B going east to
240 Cleveland Avenue is scheduled to be reconstructed in the next two to three years and
241 seems entirely likely, at that time, even though it is presently signed as a dead end
242 that there may be design improvements that could further communicate to drivers that
243 this is not a way to go to get somewhere and is not a through street when there are
244 other roadways around. He did not think that this was a traffic volume issue.

245
246 Ms. Gundlach explained a public hearing is required for vacation of a roadway. This
247 plat is dependent on that vacation going through. The neighbors will likely be invited
248 to a public hearing regarding the roadway vacation.

249
250 Member McGehee indicated if the City left the roadway alone, using what is right
251 before them and leaving the road where it is but allowing the two lots that are on the
252 Eustace side, put the cul-de-sac in to the north and give the developer three lots to the
253 north side of the upper cul-de-sac that would open onto the street. She reviewed her
254 thought on the drawing with Mr. Lloyd. She thought as the development stands right
255 now, she would move to deny.

256
257 **MOTION**
258 **Member McGehee moved to recommend to the City Council denial of the**
259 **proposed Midland Legacy Estate 3rd Addition Preliminary Plat, based on the**
260 **content of the RPCA, Public Input, and Planning Commission Deliberation, with**
261 **the conditions listed in the RPCA. (PF21-003).**

262
263 Motion failed for lack of second.

264
265 Member McGehee thought the Commission should deny this based on the irregularity
266 of the lots and to establish a precedence of lots shaped like this when talking about
267 shoreland is very dangerous because the shoreland ordinances do not want to have
268 lots that are narrow at one end and narrow at the other. She did not think that this was
269 reasonable access, and she did not think they should be allowing homes that are built
270 in such a way that they have to require sprinkling systems inside the homes so that
271 they can get adequate protection. She agreed with all of the residents who said that
272 not having a turn around where it is, is ok. There is not other place for a semi to turn
273 around and Eustice Street is not adequate for a turn around of a vehicle that big. She
274 thought that the problem with the lot layout is really serious, and she thought the

275 other serious thing is that it is not just these people, but the City paid a contractor to
276 ask people to pay nineteen million dollars and one million of that was specifically
277 designated for southwest apartments and what many people have asked for is a
278 natural area which is the only natural area left. The City is not being stewards of its
279 natural areas. She thought the City should actually pay attention to that. The
280 proposal she made actually preserves what the people want and gives the developer
281 eight potential lots which she thought would be highly valued and highly profitable.
282 She supposed she could move this to table to take it to the Council, but tabling does
283 not take it to the Council. She thought the major decision that has to be made here is
284 one by the Council. She thought if the Commission were to deny this, it would go to
285 the Council, and they would have the opportunity to negotiate some different plan.
286

287 Chair Kimble asked if staff had any comment on the statement from Commissioner
288 McGehee regarding the Shoreland Ordinance.
289

290 Member McGehee recapped the reason for the Shoreland Ordinance.
291

292 Ms. Gundlach explained the DNR's request for the narrow at the bottom, wide at the
293 top or vice versa relates to riparian lots where the lot width requirement also has to be
294 at the lakeshore. These are not lakeshore lots, these are in the shoreland because they
295 have a wetland and there is a certain distance from the wetland that places them in the
296 shoreland which makes them subject to stricter impervious surface requirements but
297 the narrow at the top, wide at the bottom, vice versa does not apply to these.
298

299 Chair Kimble indicated the whole idea of promising nineteen million in the budget,
300 neighborhoods promised a million, she would like staff to respond on.
301

302 Mr. Paschke was not sure there were specific promises made per say. There is a Park
303 Masterplan that does advocate for having park land in the southwest area of Roseville
304 and when certain areas come up, the City will perhaps consider them. The City had
305 an opportunity to consider this property when it was for sale and chose not to for
306 whatever reason. Someone else now controls the property and wants to develop it and
307 the Parks Commission recommended that park dedication take place to get what they
308 felt was appropriate and necessary for their park in the southwest area. He indicated
309 it is not the Commissions job to craft a development plan.
310

311 Member Schaffhausen asked if the Commission wanted to approve this with a
312 condition that the City Council review the placement of the driveway, which could
313 potentially alter the shape, which is a potential condition the Commission could add
314 into the motion.
315

316 Mr. Paschke indicated he believed that to be correct.
317

318 **Member Kruzel moved, seconded by Member Schaffhausen, to recommend to**
319 **the City Council approval of the proposed Midland Legacy Estate 3rd Addition**
320 **Preliminary Plat, based on the content of the RPCA, Public Input, and Planning**

321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364

Commission Deliberation, with the conditions listed in the RPCA as well as including:

Additional Condition 5. The applicant shall reconfigure Lots 1-4 (and the location of the shared driveway easement, if necessary) such that the land area northeast of the shared driveway is allocated to Lot 1 and not divided among the lots on the opposite side of the shared driveway.

Additional Condition 6. The City Council shall consider preserving a turn-around near the current cul-de-sac in the southern portion of the site along County Road B in accordance with the future right-of-way vacation request. (PF21-003).

Councilmember McGehee asked Commissioner Kruzel and Commissioner Schaffhausen if they would accept a friendly amendment for the City to consider the purchase of additional parkland as possibly some of the wetland to preserve.

Member Kruzel indicated she would be open to that amendment.

Ms. Gundlach suggested that be a separate motion because it does not affect the plat.

**Ayes: 5
Nays: 2 (McGehee, Leutgeb)
Motion carried.**

Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Pribyl, to recommend to the City Council to have the City consider additional parkland by purchase from the builder that might include a portion of the wetland but certainly the additional piece shown on the map (she pointed to the map), but in addition, there could be negotiation with the owner for some kind of a pathway around the edge of the wetland that would be natural.

**Ayes: 7
Nays: 0
Motion carried.**

Recess

Chair Kimble recessed the meeting at approximately 8:04 p.m., and reconvened at approximately 8:10 p.m.

- b. Consider a Request by Genisys Credit Union for a Conditional Use to Allow a Drive-Through for a Proposed New Bank Branch at 2501 Fairview Avenue (PF21-009)**

365 Chair Kimble opened the public hearing for PF21-009 at approximately 8:11 p.m. and
366 reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing. He advised this item will be
367 before the City Council on August 23, 2021
368

369 City Planner Paschke summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated
370 August 4, 2021.
371

372 Ms. Megan Huber, Welsh Construction, addressed the Commission.
373

374 **Public Comment**

375
376 No one came forward to speak for or against this request.
377

378 Chair Kimble closed the public hearing at 8:20 p.m.
379

380 **Commission Deliberation**

381
382 None.
383

384 **MOTION**

385 **Member Pribyl moved, seconded by Member Schaffhausen, to recommend to**
386 **the City Council approval of Conditional Use to allow Genisys Credit Union a**
387 **drive-through at 2501 Fairview Avenue, based on the submitted site and**
388 **developments plans and subject to the conditions in the RPCA. (PF21-009).**
389

390 Member McGehee indicated she had a conversation with Mr. Culver about this
391 particular site, wondering why the City could not get into the party central site and
392 that might be something coming later. She wanted to point out that although this was
393 not listed as something that is a problem, Mr. Culver did acknowledge that the City
394 does have a congestion of access along that road at the crest of the hill and may need
395 to have some left turn and right turn only access and something that the City might
396 want to think about in the future because it could become something that is more of a
397 safety hazard with this. She agreed with what the Commission is doing.
398

399 **Ayes: 7**

400 **Nays: 0**

401 **Motion carried.**
402

403 **c. Consider Approval of Zoning Map and Zoning Code Text Amendments to Align**
404 **with the City's 2040 Comprehensive Plan**

405 Chair Kimble opened the public hearing for PF17-020 at approximately 8:22 p.m. and
406 reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing. He advised this item will be
407 before the City Council August 23, 2021.
408

409 Community Development Director Gundlach summarized the request as detailed in
410 the staff report dated August 4, 2021.
411

412 Mr. Jeff Miller, HKGi, and Ms. Rita Trapp reviewed the proposed changes to the
413 Zoning Map and Zoning Code Text Amendments with the Commission.

414
415 Member McGehee asked for clarification because this is the Comprehensive Plan,
416 and it can be changed so to tell the people that this is the Comprehensive Plan, and
417 that plan has been decided is to deny the opportunity for people to really participate in
418 a meaningful way in the hearing. She would really give kudos to the staff and this
419 team for their outreach on this. She indicated the group that did the outreach for the
420 Comprehensive Plan was not as thorough as this team, so she did believe that there
421 are elements in the Comprehensive Plan that this is designed to meet, and the
422 Comprehensive Plan did not have a proper hearing when the materials came to the
423 Planning Commission in the previous iteration.

424
425 Chair Kimble noted for a point of clarification, what the Planning Commission has
426 before them is the rezoning. The Comprehensive Plan has, in fact, been approved by
427 the City Council and by the Met Council and can be changed but the City has to go
428 through a process with numerous compliance issues embedded in the requirement of
429 the Met Council, so it is not always an easy thing to change. She explained she was
430 on the Planning Commission during the Comprehensive Plan process and attended
431 many of the meetings. She thought there was considerable attempt for outreach and
432 public engagement. There is a responsibility on the citizens to show up for those
433 meetings as well.

434
435 **Public Comment**

436
437 Ms. Annie Seefeldt, 1700 Hamline Avenue N., explained the place they just
438 purchased, the existing zoning is listed as Low Density Residential, and the proposed
439 zoning is Neighborhood Mixed Use. She indicated this site has been a commercial
440 property for the last two owners and she thought this is one of those clean up things
441 that is happening as a part of the Comprehensive Plan. She noted having just
442 purchased a commercial property and seeing that it is under a rezoning consideration
443 made them a little nervous, so they decided to show up and indicate their desire to
444 have the rezoning of this particular address to happen as proposed, Neighborhood
445 Mixed Use.

446
447 Mr. Mark Armchide, Midland Grove Condominium Board Member, explained he
448 was representing Midland Grove Condominium Association. He indicated he wanted
449 to express the concerns of the owners of the 174 units to the proposed rezoning of
450 2025 County Road B West from Low Density to Medium Density Housing. He noted
451 this zoning change appears in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. He reviewed the 2025
452 County Road B West property history with the Commission and explained there is
453 historical significance associated with it.

454
455 Mr. Armchide explained 2025 County Road B West is nestled between the south side
456 of Midland Grove Condominiums, the west side of a private house at the top of a hill
457 and bordered on the south side by County Road B. The entrance to the property is in
458 the middle of a downhill slope on County Road B which ends at the Cleveland

459 Avenue intersection. The property has the same slope as County Road B and the
460 lowest southwest portion of that property appears to be a wetland although he did not
461 think it was designated as such. The Midland Grover property is also a low area and
462 they have been affected by water in wet years. If there is development on the
463 neighboring property the residents would have a concern that the water would be sent
464 in their direction due to the lowness of their land. He stated their entrance to County
465 Road B is very close to the intersection of County Road B and Cleveland, which has a
466 significant amount of traffic at the intersection and being at the bottom of the hill, it is
467 somewhat hazardous to cross the eastbound lane, even to take a simple right turn
468 toward Cleveland. It is also somewhat hazardous for pedestrians to cross County
469 Road B to get to the new Midland Gardens Park across the street. On the other side,
470 approaching County Road B southbound on Cleveland, someone exiting from
471 Highway 36 needs to cross three lanes to get to the County Road B turn lane to get
472 into the Midland Grove development. Midland Grove Condominiums is mostly
473 owned by older residents. He indicated in the past few years Roseville has received a
474 number of proposals to develop the property to higher density housing, which would
475 be dependent upon changing the zoning of this parcel.
476

477 Mr. Armchide explained when the City of Roseville conducted the meetings in 2017,
478 Midland Grove residents came out publicly against the zoning change and their
479 dissenting comments are documented in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. He noted
480 they are not aware of any community engagement that occurred after that, so he was
481 surprised to hear the earlier comment that there were a lot of meetings that took place
482 during COVID. He stated they were completely unaware of those meetings, but they
483 have participated in 2017. The 2040 Comprehensive Plan does not document any
484 reasoning or justification for a zoning change to this specific parcel and there does not
485 appear to be any reasoning why this parcel would have a change in zoning. After the
486 meetings were held in 2017, the property was sold to a holding company in 2018 and
487 rented back to the previous owner. As mentioned earlier the City approved the 2040
488 Comprehensive Plan in April 2020, which included the zoning plan change over the
489 objections of the residents who would be affected by it. The intention of the plan and
490 the zoning change is that the densification of housing allowed by the zoning change
491 would actually take place. If the Commission and the City Council move ahead with
492 the zoning change, the residents of Midland Grove will continue to express concern.
493 He stated this small parcel of land in this specific location is a poor target for
494 increased housing density. It should be easy enough to find another 2.27 acres in
495 Roseville that would be a better candidate for increasing housing density, if that kind
496 of substitution is required to satisfy changes in the plan. He explained the residents
497 urge the Commission to update the 2040 Comprehensive Plan to maintain the current
498 zoning of this parcel to prevent the increase in population of this area, which would
499 only increase the driver and pedestrian hazards that already exist.
500

501 Ms. Pat Kelly, Midland Grove Condominiums, asked if the higher density zoning is
502 approved, the residents will still have an opportunity to review any proposal from the
503 developer.
504

505 Mr. Paschke explained it would depend on how big that project is and whether it
506 triggers Planning Commission consideration of it.

507
508 Mr. Endler explained he was the single resident next to Midland Grove
509 Condominiums on the hill. When the City made the move from single residence to
510 medium density, the old standards were still in place. What has changed is what the
511 standard for low density is. He explained with the new low density he thought it
512 would be 8 to 10 units. When the zoning happened, the current zoning rules were in
513 place. He thought the City figured it should be reconsidered in light of the changes
514 that are currently in front of them or what Low Density Residential means. That
515 aside, they support the goal and what the City is doing. He explained when the
516 Comp. Plan is changed, the time between approval of the Comp. Plan and changing
517 the zoning is entirely too long. He would like the City to try to figure out how to
518 solve that problem. Once a Comp. Plan is changed, he would like the City to have the
519 urgency to notify people immediately and possibly create an ordinance that states if
520 the resident is in one of the residences and someone sells it, they would be required to
521 let the new buyer know there is that difference because no one should be surprised
522 when they purchase a property.

523
524 Mr. Carl Albing, 2020 West County Road B, explained he lived across the street from
525 this parcel. He stated there have been several attempts to change the parcel of land
526 and it has been voted down every time. It is frustrating to see this come up once
527 again and this time as a part of a larger plan that feels like it has more momentum
528 against them, after it had been defeated two or three times in the past. He really
529 appreciated the concern from Midland Grove residents. He wondered why the City
530 could not do something different with this little piece of property. He would ask the
531 Commission to deny the zoning change on 2025 West County Road B.

532
533 Ms. Lucy Botzek, Ferriswood Homeowners Association president, explained this is a
534 pretty contentious parcel for a variety of reasons and a lot of history. She indicated
535 they are not necessarily opposed to redevelopment or development, but she urged the
536 Commission to reconsider the zoning change to this parcel.

537
538 Mr. Dave Polson, Midland Grove Condominium resident, asked the Commission to
539 drive by 2025 County Road B west and take a look at the property. Summary of City
540 Zoning District's as it is today, "The District is established to stabilize and protect the
541 essential characteristics of existing residential areas and to protect, maintain and
542 enhance wooded areas, wetlands, wildlife and plant resources and other sensitive
543 natural resources.", if that property does not describe that in perfect detail, he did not
544 know what does.

545
546 Mr. Steven Ring, 1455 Rose Place, indicated he sent out some comments to questions
547 earlier in the day to the Planning Commission. Since then, he talked briefly with one
548 of the Commissioners who clarified some stuff and he also talked to Mr. Paschke who
549 was very helpful in answering some questions. He stated they are in favor of the
550 proposed changes for Medium Density Residential to Low Density Residential along
551 the west side of Snelling Curve. The entrances and exists to this neighborhood

552 severely constrain the amount of traffic that can be handled. Regarding the lots on
553 the south side of County Road C, between Snelling and Hamline, south of the railroad
554 tracks on County Road C, many of the lots are adjacent to the backyards of the
555 properties on the north side of Rose Place. His lot is one of them. From their
556 perspective, change from High Density Residential to Employment One would likely
557 be a good thing but they have a history of many issues with the businesses on the
558 north side of their property and are concerned about exactly what this would mean.
559 He indicated he still had some questions about noise requirements and some of the
560 businesses, even now, inflict noise on their properties at 6:00 am and other times. He
561 would like to know if there are any decibel limits or actual noise or hours of operation
562 that would be in place for E1-Employment Zoning. He wondered how high the
563 buildings could be, from the table it looked like the buildings could be sixty feet high,
564 which would be a dramatic change from what they are seeing with the businesses
565 right now. He explained they are also concerned about the lights from the businesses
566 shining on their property.

567
568 Ms. Gundlach directed Mr. Ring to contact staff regarding current business concerns.
569 She also explained there are some buffer and screening requirements for those E1,
570 Employment District, uses when adjacent to residential. The rezoning of these
571 parcels is to reflect what is actually there today.

572
573 Mr. John Garrigues, 2520 Simpson Street, explained he has lived on the property for
574 thirteen years and was excited the City is going to consider developing that row
575 where the greenhouses are. His concern is that when he read it moved to lower
576 density, which he thought was great, it looks like there could be between 1.5 and 8
577 units per acre, which worried him because every developer that comes in wants to
578 maximize everything and his concern is that a developer will try to put in 8 units per
579 acre and that is a lot of acreage there which will result in many homes and a lot of
580 traffic. When he looked at some of the old residential, there was actually a time when
581 lower density residential was single family homes. His concern is that on one side of
582 the street there will be single family homes and on the other side it will be totally
583 developed out. He wondered if this is something he should be worried about. He
584 appreciated the fact that the City wants to add more housing, but his concern is that it
585 seems like an opportunity for a developer to come in and really turn that side of the
586 street into one large development.

587
588 Ms. Christine Soma, 3076 Shorewood Lane, indicated she was in support of this plan.
589 She was thankful for all of the work the Commission has done. She liked the
590 direction and a good step forward for the City with great diversity for people.

591
592 Mr. Lee Sarin, 1880 Lexington, explained his property is going to change from High
593 Density Residential to Low Density Residential and will have an adverse effect on
594 him. He indicated he has an acre of land as well as an adjacent lot and all of it will
595 change to low density. He stated he was frustrated because he did not know when he
596 purchased the properties that the zoning was going to change from High Density to
597 Low Density.

598

599 Mr. Brian Ash and Mrs. Jill Ash, 2550 Snelling Curve, explained he came to the
600 meeting because they wondered what might happen with the land across the street.

601
602 Chair Kimble closed the public hearing at 9:52 p.m.

603
604 **Commission Deliberation**

605
606 Member Pribyl indicated she felt a little out of her element because she was not
607 involved in the Comp. Plan process and hearing that there are at least a couple of lots
608 where the community is saying they did not want the change and do not support the
609 change. She thought at the time there clearly was support of the change in order for
610 the City to have made the change to the Comprehensive Plan.

611
612 Member McGehee agreed. She indicated she was involved but thought the City
613 needed to make a point of at the Council level and in the newsletter is this change to
614 LDR, the change in the density to LDR because that is really significant. Each of
615 these density and zoning things have been increased. The intensity has been
616 increased so what was something previously now is denser, and she did not think that
617 was widely understood in the community. She did not know what the City can do
618 about the places in front of Midland Grove because they have to the City several
619 times and have been repeatedly supported by the Council and Planning Commission
620 not to increase that and she was surprised and shocked to find that it had been
621 changed. She did not know how that changed and did not know about Snelling Curve
622 either.

623
624 Chair Kimble thought as it related to the County Road B development, they saw a
625 couple different things come through and she thought one was for high density and
626 she believed there were some specifics to these development proposals that the
627 Planning Commission recommended approval, but the City Council denied them.
628 She did know that these were high density, and the site is surrounded by medium and
629 high density. This is not an illogical rezoning to consider. She recapped the different
630 zoning changes.

631
632 **MOTION**

633 **Member McGehee moved, to recommend to the City Council approval of the**
634 **Zoning Map and Zoning Code Text Amendments as Outlined in Attachments A**
635 **Thru E of the RPCA to Align with the City's 2040 Comprehensive Plan and**
636 **have the City Council reconsider the rezoning the Midland Grove parcel to**
637 **LDR.**

638
639 Member Bjorum wondered if there should be two motions.

640
641 Mr. Paschke thought the best would be to adopt the document and then to have an
642 additional motion for consideration of the Comp. Plan change.

643
644 Member Bjorum indicated he did not necessarily see the Midland Grove parcel as a
645 single-family, low-density lot. He thought the lot is beautiful, but it sounds like the

646 bad vibes from everything came from a developer who tried to do a pretty bad plan.
647 If zoned as medium density he actually could see this as a buffer to the business
648 intersection to the west and he also saw it as a continuation of the community that is
649 on that corner.

650
651 Chair Kimble noted the meeting is past the 10:00 p.m. end time and asked for a
652 motion to extend the meeting.

653

654

MOTION

655 **Member McGehee moved, seconded by Pribyl, to extend the meeting until this**
656 **item is done or until 11:00 p.m.**

657

658

Ayes: 7

659

Nays: 0

660

Motion carried.

661

662

Chair Kimble explained she was a part of this for the entire time and she felt the same way as Commission Bjorum and thought the parcel on Midland Grove make sense to be a medium density zoned parcel.

663

664

665

666

There was not a second for the motion made by Commission McGehee, so motion failed for lack of second.

667

668

669

Member Schaffhausen moved, seconded by Member Bjorum, to recommend to the City Council approval of the Zoning Map and Zoning Code Text Amendments as Outlined in Attachments A Thru E of the RPCA to Align with the City's 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

670

671

672

673

674

Member Schaffhausen thought staff did an excellent job on this with all of their hard work and long hours. She also thanked all of the residents for showing up and expressing their thoughts and being engaged.

675

676

677

678

Ayes: 6

679

Nays: 0

680

Abstain: 1 (McGehee)

681

Motion carried.

682

683

MOTION

684

Member McGehee moved, seconded by Pribyl, to have the City Council reconsider the Comp. Plan Designation from Medium Density to Low Density of the 2025 Midland Grove parcel.

685

686

687

688

Member Pribyl agreed to second the motion on the caveat that she agreed with Chair Kimble and Commissioner Bjorum that it does make sense the way it is guided but hearing from the community, she thought the City Council needed to hear from the community as well.

689

690

691

692

693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727

Ayes: 7
Nays: 0
Motion carried.

Mr. Lloyd noted because it was similar in nature to the 2025 parcel, he wanted to remind the Commission about the 1880 Lexington Avenue parcel and was not sure if the Commission wanted to consider that one as well.

Member Schaffhausen thought there were a couple of individual parcels that have some history to them and wondered if that is the way the motion should be worded.

Chair Kimble indicated it is the same. It is because it is already in the Comp. Plan that has been approved and would be the same thing to ask.

MOTION
Member Schaffhausen moved, seconded by Leutgeb, to have the City Council reconsider the Comp. Plan Designation of the 1880 Lexington parcel.

The Commission debated the designation consideration.

Ayes: 7
Nays: 0
Motion carried.

7. Adjourn

MOTION
Member Kruzel, seconded by Member Schaffhausen, to adjourn the meeting at 10:21 p.m.

Ayes: 7
Nays: 0
Motion carried.



REQUEST FOR PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

Date: Sept. 1, 2021
Item No.: 6A

Department Approval

Agenda Section

Janice Gundlach

Other Business

Item Description: Preliminary discussion regarding section two Zoning Code updates

BACKGROUND

Since the Planning Commission has concluded their work on the section one updates to the Zoning Code, staff wanted to begin discussions on the section two updates. This discussion is considered preliminary in that the City Council has not yet acted on the section one updates and final action by the Council is likely to take several weeks, or a month or more. Depending on what the City Council approves for section one, the priorities for section two may change.

Attachment A is the Scope of Work for the overall Zoning Code Update project. This scope has been shared with the Commission and Council several times, both before it was used to solicit proposals from consultants and after HKGi was brought on to the project. The section two updates begin on page two of the document. Please be advised the Scope of Work and proposal by HKGi did not include a commitment to address every item, rather, this was a list of items that “could” be considered.

In addition to the Scope of Work, during the course of the section one updates a few items were discussed for inclusion in the section two updates. HKGi tracked these and provided a list to staff. Attachment B includes the items from the Scope of Work, as well as any additional items that were added since the project began. Any items that were accomplished in section one have been removed from the list provided as Attachment B.

The purpose of the Commission’s discussion is to begin to build consensus surrounding 3-5 priority topics for the section two phase of the Zoning Code Update project. Once priority topics are selected, the Commission would present these topics to the City Council during a joint meeting (date to be determined). Depending on the time it takes to work through these topics, budget will ultimately drive what is able to be fully completed. This will become more known as the priority topics are selected, at which point staff and HKGi can determine how much budget is needed and if the current available budget is sufficient. Staff would also note there are a few items within the section two list that staff could advance without the expertise of HKGi.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the following five priority topics, listed from highest priority to lowest priority, for section two of the Zoning Code Update project. Items 1 and 2 below were used in the scoring process for selection of a consultant, so it seems most reasonable for these items to maintain a high priority.

- 1) **Sustainability** – zoning requirements and/or incentives for zero-net energy buildings, electric charging stations, etc., landscaping requirements (prioritize use of natives) and tree

32 preservation and/or diversity, screening regulations for solar arrays, revise minimum tree
33 requirement for multi-family housing (current = 1/unit)

- 34 2) **Racial equity and inclusion*** – definition of family/household/housekeeping unit, lot area, lot
35 width, housing types, Subdivision Code barriers, expand LMDR (formerly LDR-2) areas
- 36 3) **Chapter 1017** – shoreland, wetland, and storm water management regulations
- 37 4) **Conditional Uses** – create criteria for newly established CU’s for density, building height,
38 ensure general CU criteria are still valid/appropriate
- 39 5) **General housekeeping items**** – revise definitions of fence, bed and breakfast, lodging,
40 assisted living and/or memory care, address institutional housing types (convent, rectory,
41 housing affiliated with religious institutions)

42 *the priority of this topic, or overall scope of topic, may change depending on the City Council’s
43 advancement of several amendments the Commission forwarded for section one updates.

44 **staff could address these following completion of the section two updates as HKGi’s expertise
45 wouldn’t necessarily be needed to accomplish these amendments.

46 Prepared by: Janice Gundlach, Community Development Director, 651-792-7071

- 47 Attachments:
- 48 A. Scope of Work
 - 49 B. Section two list
- 50

SCOPE OF WORK: Zoning Code Update – summary of revisions and/or requested actions

The City of Roseville’s 2040 Comprehensive Plan was authorized by the Metropolitan Council on April 22, 2020 and subsequently adopted by the Roseville City Council on May 4, 2020. In order to ensure consistency between its 2040 Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code, the City must now undertake certain amendments to its Zoning Code. The purpose of this document is to identify the range of Zoning Code actions that are *required* to ensure consistency with the 2040 Comprehensive Plan, as well as various revisions that *could* be undertaken as part of the larger update, but are not necessarily required.

SECTION ONE: The following outlines revisions that are *required* in order to ensure consistency with 2040 Comprehensive Plan:

- Develop a BRT (bus rapid transit) overlay zoning district to allow density increases within one (1) mile of Roseville’s two BRT stations (Rosedale Center & Har Mar Mall).
- Ensure the density ranges (minimum/maximum densities) within residential zoning districts is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
- Convert and/or rename several existing zoning districts to 1) comply with the mixed use allowances outlined in the Comprehensive Plan, and 2) to re-describe uses focusing on scale and intensity within employment areas, including:
 - Regional Business 1 & 2 (RB) zoning designation to “Core Mixed Use 1 & 2”.
 - Neighborhood Business (NB) zoning designation to “Neighborhood Mixed Use”.
 - Community Business (CB) zoning designation to “Corridor Mixed Use”.
 - Office/Business Park (O/BP) zoning designation to “Employment”.
 - Office/Business Park – 1 (O/BP) zoning designation to “Employment Center”.
 - Formally rezone all affected parcels to the new Zoning District*

<i>Parcel</i>	<i>Existing Zoning District</i>	<i>Proposed Converted Zoning District</i>
Many	Regional Business (RB 1)	Core Mixed Use 1
Many	Regional Business (RB 2)	Core Mixed Use 2
Many	Community Business (CB)	Corridor Mixed Use
Many	Neighborhood Business (NB)	Neighborhood Mixed Use
Many	Office/Business Park	Employment
Many	Office/Business Park -1	Employment Center

- Beyond the rezonings identified in the preceding table, initiate individual parcel rezonings (identified herein as an Attachment) to ensure consistency between the 2040 Comprehensive Plan and the City’s official Zoning Map.*

* It shall be recognized open house discussions on these rezonings occurred during the comprehensive planning process and will not occur again as part of the rezoning actions identified in this Scope of Work as the City is now obligated to proceed. The customary Planning Commission public hearing will be necessary, including mailed public hearing notifications/invitations.

SECTION TWO: The following outlines revisions that *could* be considered as part of the Zoning Code update but are not necessarily needed to ensure consistency with the 2040 Comprehensive Plan:

- Identify incentives for incorporating sustainability measures
- Identify items related to racial equity and inclusion issues
- Address pronoun use throughout Title 10
- Allow increased MDR density by conditional use, like what is allowed in the HDR districts
- Require covered parking for multi-family housing (For example: .5-1 stall / dwelling unit)
- Landscaping & Screening in All Districts (1011.03) – reduce tree requirements for multi-family residential (one tree/dwelling unit too many – multiple variances granted)
- Chapter 1017 (shoreland, wetland and storm water management)
 - Revise wetland setbacks to align with Rice Creek Watershed District regulations
 - Update shoreland ordinance to comply with state/DNR model ordinance – at a minimum we need to add language concerning Shoreland Alteration & Vegetation Alterations in Shoreland Areas, which was inadvertently deleted some time ago
- Definitions – what’s missing/needs revision? Refer to use tables of all zoning districts. Example: “Bed and Breakfast Establishment” definition needs revision so as not to be confused/conflicted with a rental home and/or rental bedroom that is otherwise governed under Title 9 of the City Code. May also need to add a lodging use and/or revise the lodging definition to address home rentals, including prohibition on commercial events within home rentals.
- Consider revising the Conditional Use requirement in the Community Mixed Use Districts regarding multi-family uses of 3 units/building or greater to a higher density threshold
- From the Council’s list of “Items for Future Scheduling”:
 - Consider increased green space requirements for MDR and HDR (caution: must consider balance between the need for green space, its impact on lower overall densities, density commitments made within the Comprehensive Plan, and the demand and affordability of housing units)
 - Are the current minimum residential lot sizes appropriate in all districts?
 - Screening requirements for solar arrays
 - Institutional zoning district amendments to address existing and potential range of housing types (i.e. convent, rectory, day care/Montessori schools, affordable housing)

PROCESS: The City of Roseville’s Community Development Department seeks interested consultants to work collaboratively with City staff to accomplish the above list of Zoning Code Amendments.

The intent under this Scope of Work is for the consultant to research and prepare the necessary code amendment language, with input and feedback provided by City staff, and for City staff to manage/oversee the process and advance such code amendments through the Planning Commission and City Council approval processes. Responses to this Scope of Work should include coordination with City staff for public engagement efforts, including online engagement should in-person meetings not be practical due to the ongoing pandemic. The estimated cost to complete the work outlined herein should be provided in two parts: 1) Section One, and 2) Section Two. The items outlined in Section One are to

ATTACHMENT A

be completed first, recognizing there may be some overlap between the amendments in both sections. The timeframe for completion of Section One is May 31, 2021 and Section Two is December 31, 2021.

Questions should be directed to Community Development Director Janice Gundlach at 651-792-7071 or via email to Janice.Gundlach@CityofRoseville.com. Responses to this Scope of Work should be submitted to the City of Roseville, Community Development Department, Attn: Janice Gundlach, 2660 Civic Center Drive, Roseville, MN 55113, **by 4:30pm on Friday, November 6, 2020.**

ATTACHMENTS: Individual Parcel Rezoning
City Code, Title 10, [Zoning](#)
2040 Comprehensive, [Land Use Chapter](#)

ATTACHMENT A

Individual Parcel Rezoning (that are not rezonings solely due to a converted Zoning District)

<i>Parcel</i>	<i>Existing Zoning</i>	<i>Proposed Rezoning</i>
2025 County RD B West	LDR-1	MDR
2533, 2599 & 2609 Snelling Curve	MDR	LDR-1 or LDR-2
1880 Lexington AVE	HDR-1	LDR-1
3040 Old Highway 8	HDR-1	LDR-1
2134 Cleveland AVE N (Midland Gardens Park)	LDR-1	PR
2560 Fry ST	NB	MDR
1380, 1480, 1454, 1450, 1430, 1408 County RD C West	HDR-1	Employment (E-1)
2940 & 2960 East Snelling Service DR	Office	Neighborhood Mixed Use (MU-1)
2797 & 2845 Hamline AVE	HDR-1 & NB	Community Mixed Use (CMU-2)
2959 Hamline AVE & PID 13-29-23-24-0025 (unaddressed parcel off N McCarrons)	LDR-1	PR
3205, 3207, 3209, 3211, 3213, 3215, 3217, 3219, 3221, 3223 Old 8 NW	HDR-1	MDR
2417, 2405, 2395, 2373, and unaddressed parcel ID's #'s 05-29-23-23-0064 & 05-29-23-24-0015 County RD C2 West	HDR-1	Corridor Mixed Use (CMU-3)
161 Elmer ST (only that part E of undeveloped Albemarle ROW)	CB	MDR
2237 & 2245 Dale ST	Institutional	MDR
2360 Lexington AVE N	HDR-1	Neighborhood Mixed Use (MU-1)
2112 Dale ST N	LDR-1	Neighborhood Mixed Use (MU-1)
1700 Hamline AVE N	LDR-1	Neighborhood Mixed Use (MU-1)
1716 Marion ST	HDR-1	PR

Topic #	Topic Description
1	Identify incentives for incorporating sustainability measures
1.1	Landscaping and screening in All Districts (1011.03) – reduce tree requirements for multi-family residential (one tree/dwelling unit too many – multiple variances
1.2	<i>Council’s List</i> – Screening requirements for solar arrays
1.3	Consider allowing tiny houses
1.4	Rezone additional areas to LMDR district
1.5	Trees – should there be a different ratio between the greenway, urban and flexible frontages in MU-2 districts?
1.6	Trees – need for tree diversity standards
1.7	Evaluate improvement area/impervious surface coverage standards from a sustainability perspective
2	Identify items related to racial equity and inclusion issues
2.1	<i>Council’s List</i> – Are the current minimum residential lot sizes appropriate in all districts?
2.2	Identify Subdivision Code barriers to development/Allow for a minor subdivision process in Subdivision Code
2.3	Allow for flag lots or some other way to access excess lot area behind existing homes
2.4	Reduce lot width minimums/Reduce minimum lot sizes – could there be incentives added to zoning districts?
2.5	Remove things like "protect property value" and "neighborhood character"
3	Definitions – what’s missing/needs revision? Refer to use tables of all zoning districts.
3.1	Address “family” terminology in dwelling definitions – consider “household” or “housekeeping unit”
3.2	Per recent City Council direction, “fence” might need to be revised like “...erected for decoration or to enclose, screen, or separate areas.”
4	Consider increased green space requirements for MDR and HDR (caution: must consider balance between the need for green space, its impact on lower overall densities, density commitments made within the Comprehensive Plan, and the demand and affordability of housing units)
4.1	Consider establishing usable open space or designed outdoor recreation area standards for medium and high density residential
	Assorted
5	Address pronoun use throughout Title 10
6	Require covered parking for multi-family housing (for example: 0.5-1 stall/dwelling unit
7	Chapter 1017 (shoreland, wetland, and storm water management)
8	<i>Council’s List</i> – Institutional zoning district amendments to address existing and potential range of housing types (i.e. convent, rectory, day care/Montessori schools, affordable housing)
9	Establish an alternative density calculation for Assisted Living in MDR/HDR
10	Accessory buildings standards – impacts from adding housing types, reducing lot sizes?
11	General review of CU use for higher intensity development in various districts, including a review of criteria (general and use specific)
12	MU-2 regulating plans evaluation?
13	Address PUD inconsistencies for E-1 and E-2 districts
14	Evaluate need for buffer/transition standards between new higher density residential and existing lower density residential development