



## Planning Commission Agenda

Wednesday, October 4, 2023

6:30 PM

City Council Chambers

*Members of the public who wish speak during public comment or an agenda item during this meeting can do so virtually by registering at [www.cityofroseville.com/attendmeeting](http://www.cityofroseville.com/attendmeeting)*

*(Any times listed are approximate – please note that items may be earlier or later than listed on the agenda)*

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Roll Call**
- 3. Approval of Agenda**
- 4. Review of Minutes**
  - a. Review August 2, 2023 Minutes
- 5. Communications and Recognitions**
- 6. Public Hearing**
  - a. Text Amendment: The City of Roseville requests a text amendment to Zoning Code §1001.10, Definitions, to include "Micro-Unit" and "Sacred Community" definitions and an amendment to §1011.12 (Additional Standards for Specific Uses in All Districts) to include "Micro-Unit Dwellings in Sacred Communities" subject to requirements outlined in Minnesota State Statutes 327.30.
- 7. Business**
  - a. Discussion regarding joint meeting with the City Council
- 8. Adjourn**

  
**REQUEST FOR COMMISSION ACTION**

Date: **10/4/2023**  
Item No.: **4.a.**

---

Department Approval

Agenda Section  
Review of Minutes

---

**Item Description:** Review August 2, 2023 Minutes

---

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

**Application Information**

N/A

**Background**

N/A

**Staff Recommendation**

N/A

**Requested Planning Commission Action**

Review August 2, 2023 minutes and make a motion to approve subject to requested corrections.

**Alternative Actions**

N/A

**Prepared by:**

**Attachments:**     1.     August 2, 2023 Minutes



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting  
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive  
Draft Minutes – Wednesday, August 2, 2023 – 6:30 p.m.**

- 1 **1. Call to Order**  
2 Chair Pribyl 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 Pribyl, City Planner Thomas Paschke called the Roll.  
7
- 8 **Members Present:** Chair Michelle Pribyl, Vice-Chair Karen Schaffhausen, and  
9 Commissioners Michelle Kruzel, Tammy McGehee, Pamela  
10 Aspnes, and Matthew Bauer.  
11
- 12 **Members Absent:** Erik Bjorum  
13
- 14 **Staff Present:** City Planner Thomas Paschke, and Community Development  
15 Director Janice Gundlach  
16
- 17 **3. Approve Agenda**  
18
- 19 **MOTION**  
20 **Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Kruzel, to approve the agenda as**  
21 **presented.**  
22
- 23 **Ayes: 6**  
24 **Nays: 0**  
25 **Motion carried.**  
26
- 27 **4. Review of Minutes**  
28
- 29 **a. July 5, 2023 Planning Commission Regular Meeting**  
30 Chair Pribyl noted Members McGehee and Bjorum sent in some changes to the  
31 minutes.  
32
- 33 Chair Pribyl indicated on lines 543 and 547, referred to the City of St. Paul and  
34 should be City of Minneapolis.  
35
- 36 **MOTION**  
37 **Member Aspnes moved, seconded by Member McGehee, to approve the July 5,**  
38 **2023 meeting minutes.**  
39

40            **Ayes: 6**  
41            **Nays: 0**  
42            **Motion carried.**

43  
44    **5.    Communications and Recognitions:**

45  
46    **a.    From the Public:** *Public comment pertaining to general land use issues not on this*  
47            *agenda, including the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update.*

48  
49            None.

50  
51    **b.    From the Commission or Staff:** *Information about assorted business not already on*  
52            *this agenda, including a brief update on the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update*  
53            *process.*

54  
55            None.

56  
57    **6.    Public Hearing**

58            None.

59  
60    **7.    Other Business Heading Information**

61  
62    **a.    City Council Request for Commissions**

63            Community Development Director Janice Gundlach reviewed the City Council  
64            request regarding the Scope and Purpose update for the Planning Commission.

65  
66            Chair Pribyl reviewed the items staff included in the packet for discussion. She asked  
67            the Commission if there was anything else to discuss.

68  
69            Member Aspnes asked staff to remind her of what the sketch plan process could be  
70            like for the Planning Commission including timelines for the applicant.

71  
72            Ms. Gundlach reviewed the sketch plan process other cities use that could be  
73            implemented in Roseville. She thought the sketch plan review would probably come  
74            before the open house to allow it to be reviewed by the public and then questions  
75            could be answered at the open house.

76  
77            Chair Pribyl noted her experience with the sketch plan process in other cities is that  
78            not every project has this. She thought some discussion could be regarding what  
79            would trigger the sketch plan process to come forward. She explained regarding the  
80            list, these are just ideas that were put out there that the Commission discussed, and  
81            she did not know if a formal vote was needed but she thought overall agreement that  
82            these things are things that the Commission wants to take to the City Council for  
83            consideration. She wondered if anyone had concerns about the first item to propose  
84            to the City Council that some language be added to the beginning of the meeting,  
85            perhaps something similar to what is in the reports the Commission gets about their  
86            quasi-judicial role, explaining that more clearly to the public.

87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131

The Commission concurred.

Ms. Gundlach explained staff wants to look at the language that is in their reports and the notices too because staff thought there was an opportunity to improve that.

Chair Pribyl thought it would be nice if it was all cohesive and potentially repeated in different instances.

Member McGee thought as a part of that the Commission could run an education piece with some more time and effort into that in the newsletter that the City mails out. There is not a terrible rush for this to go out but that would ensure that it would be done as an educational piece that everybody in the City would at least be apprised of some of the zoning issues that are coming up and how the process works and what the Planning Commission's role is and what the City Council's role is.

Ms. Gundlach explained the discussion staff has had about looking at the way the City is communicating with the public on these public hearing notices is sort of incorporating the level of input spectrum under the International Association of Public Participation. She reviewed what the input spectrum does and the reason why she brought it up is because City staff is trying to re-evaluate those communications and those communications will in and of itself have an educational component to it.

Member Aspnes indicated she liked the idea of a bar graph with a continuum of informed to approval or engaged, whatever the two end points are. She noted she really liked that and thought the visual is really easy to see and then the key words at the points. She wondered if this type of language is going to be used in other parts of City government.

Ms. Gundlach explained she knew as a senior leadership team they have talked about trying to use those types of words with the public when communicating with them in terms of what type of feedback staff is trying to get. How that is actually being pushed out, she cannot address and did not know the answer to that yet.

Chair Pribyl thought the Commission was in concurrence with item one on the list. The second item is possible consider having an opportunity for more than one joint meeting per year to discuss topics. She wondered if anyone had concerns, comments, or questions about bringing that forward as a suggestion.

Member Kruzel wondered if the meetings would be as needed or scheduled twice a year.

Chair Pribyl thought that was one of the discussion points to discuss with the City Council, but her thought was the meetings would be as needed when issues come up.

**Regular Planning Commission Meeting**

**Minutes – Wednesday, August 2, 2023**

**Page 4**

132 Member Bauer thought it made sense to have more than one meeting a year with the  
133 City Council. His only concern is what the Commission is tasked with is adding  
134 something or modifying the City Code.

135  
136 Member Aspnes asked if the Planning Commission has ever had a meeting with the  
137 Parks and Recreation Commission.

138  
139 Ms. Gundlach indicated the two Commissions have not had a joint meeting since she  
140 has been with the City. Other Commissions have not typically met together, it has  
141 just been the individual Commissions meeting jointly with the City Council.

142  
143 Chair Pribyl asked if anyone had concerns, comments, or questions about adding a  
144 sketch plan process.

145  
146 Member Schaffhausen wondered for the conversation if it would be beneficial to kind  
147 of rough up a plan or would it be easier to talk about it in concept.

148  
149 Ms. Gundlach recommended at this point to take about it in concept and then it will  
150 likely be something that is incorporated into the Zoning Code and then the Planning  
151 Commission will have lots of time to get into the details. She noted she did not want  
152 the Planning Commission to spend too much time on this in case the City Council is  
153 not interested in adding it.

154  
155 Member McGee asked if the Commission could have a list of the items going forward  
156 to the City Council for consideration.

157  
158 Ms. Gundlach indicated she would be able to do that.

159  
160 Member Bauer thought since there is a joint meeting with the City Council coming  
161 up, he wondered if it made sense, in anticipation that the Commission bring forward  
162 to the City Council zoning issues that the Commission has seen from the community,  
163 and if so, should the Commission have a meeting in September to discuss those topics  
164 so then the Commission is prepared for the joint meeting.

165  
166 Ms. Gundlach indicated that always gets put on the Commission agenda before a joint  
167 meeting for discussion.

168  
169 Member McGehee asked if the Commission should assume it can use  
170 communications. If there is something any of the Commission wish to discuss as a  
171 part of this and is not on the agenda, then there really is not a mechanism to get it on  
172 the agenda that she knows of. If there is a mechanism, she would like it to be  
173 explained to her and if not then she did not know if anyone wants it. She wondered if  
174 there should be a place at the end of the meeting for the Commission to bring up  
175 discussion items for future meetings, like the City Council does.

176  
177 Chair Pribyl thought the communications section of their regular agenda that the item  
178 could be brought up there at that point or via email to Ms. Gundlach as a suggestion

179 for a future meeting or if that point in the agenda is not meant for that purpose the  
180 Commission could discuss adding something else to specifically address that.

181

182 Ms. Gundlach thought that was the purpose of the joint meeting with the City Council  
183 is for the Commission to bring items forward to the City Council that the Commission  
184 would like to work on in the upcoming year. The last thing she wants to do it have  
185 the Commissioners bring issues up during the year, spend a bunch of time working on  
186 them and then those things go to the City Council and the Council is not interested.  
187 Typically, the Planning Commission takes their direction from the City Council, not  
188 the other way around.

189

190 Member McGehee understood that but she had a little different take on the direction  
191 in attachment one where it says “strengthen information coming to the City Council.”  
192 She did not see this as something that would come to the Council randomly, but more  
193 that there would be something that had enough following here to actually say  
194 something about it and ask staff to run it up the flag pole, if it was something the  
195 Commission thought needed to be changed or something the Commission was  
196 thinking about rather than having individual Commission members say something to  
197 the Council. She was looking for a way that the Commission could have some  
198 consensus at the Commission level on a particular item. She did not have anything in  
199 mind, certainly the tree thing came up out of this and there may be other things that  
200 come up in the future. But, she was thinking the Commission does not have a formal  
201 process and typically she thinks of the communications and recognitions are  
202 something that the Commission knows is going on in the community that is said, and  
203 it is not a request for something. This would be a more formal thing where the Chair  
204 would decide, or the Commission would have a process to decide, whether there was  
205 enough interest to even discuss the item.

206

207 Chair Pribyl understood and explained it would be something the Commission would  
208 discuss at the Commission level and then add to the list of things to discuss with the  
209 City Council at the joint meeting.

210

211 Member McGehee indicated that was correct.

212

213 Chair Pribyl thought this would give the Commission the opportunity to collect those  
214 discussion points as the Commission met.

215

216 Member McGehee agreed.

217

218 Member Kruzal indicated other boards she sits on have something at the end of the  
219 meeting where the members are asked if there are any agenda items for the next  
220 month to be considered and at that point, a general consensus is made to go ahead  
221 with it or not. She was not sure if that would be ok with the City or not.

222

223 Chair Pribyl asked Ms. Gundlach if there were any issues with that, to add that as a  
224 standing piece of the business.

225

226 Ms. Paschke was not sure it would be an issue, but the question would be how the  
227 item goes from the Commission to the Council because it is not like the Council has  
228 an agenda section that has communications from the Planning Commission for staff  
229 to advocate for the Commission items on the Council docket. This would have to be  
230 broached with the City Council as to what the Planning Commission is thinking about  
231 as a whole of changing or researching because that is typically what the Commission  
232 is doing, modifying something, or seeking an amendment to something.

233  
234 Chair Pribyl thought the idea was that those items would become a part of the  
235 Commissions list for discussion at the joint meeting if it would go that far.

236  
237 Chair Pribyl thought it was a good idea to have a running list of items done  
238 throughout the year to discuss with the City Council at the joint meeting.

239  
240 Ms. Gundlach indicated she will add this item to the list as item four, but staff would  
241 not be providing research support for items the Commission would bring forward  
242 during the year unless the City Council agreed the items brought forward would be  
243 items the Council would want the Planning Commission to discuss further and at that  
244 point staff would start research on those items.

245  
246 **8. Adjourn**

247  
248 **MOTION**

249 **Member Bauer, seconded by Member McGehee, to adjourn the meeting at 7:15**  
250 **p.m.**

251  
252 **Ayes: 6**

253 **Nays: 0**

254 **Motion carried.**

255  
256

**ROSEVILLE**  
**REQUEST FOR COMMISSION ACTION**

Date: **10/4/2023**  
Item No.: **6.a.**

Department Approval

Agenda Section

*Janice Gundlach*

Public Hearing

---

**Item Description:** Text Amendment: The City of Roseville requests a text amendment to Zoning Code §1001.10, Definitions, to include “Micro-Unit” and “Sacred Community” definitions and an amendment to §1011.12 (Additional Standards for Specific Uses in All Districts) to include “Micro-Unit Dwellings in Sacred Communities” subject to requirements outlined in Minnesota State Statutes 327.30.

---

1  
2 **Application Information**

3 Applicant: City of Roseville - Community Development Department

4 Location: NA

5 Application Submission: NA

6 City Action Deadline: NA

7 Zoning: NA

8  
9 **Background**

10 This past legislative session, the Minnesota Legislature adopted a Sacred Communities and Micro-  
11 Unit Dwelling law (Attachment 1) whereby municipalities must allow sacred communities and  
12 micro-unit dwellings that conform to the regulations set forth in the law. The law specifically states:  
13 “Unless the municipality has designated sacred communities meeting the requirements of this  
14 section as a permitted use, a sacred community meeting the requirements of this section shall be  
15 approved and regulated as a conditional use without the application of additional standards not  
16 included in this section. When approved, additional permitting is not required for individual micro  
17 units.”

18 On August 21, 2023, the Planning Division appeared before the City Council seeking direction on  
19 the need to adopt regulations into the Roseville Zoning Code. Specifically, the City Council was  
20 asked whether they desired to address this use as a permitted or a conditional use. After some  
21 questions and discussion, the City Council directed the Planning Division to amend the zoning code  
22 in support of a sacred community as a permitted accessory use.

23 One of the discussion points centered around Table 1009-1 (below), which is the dimensional  
24 standards for a manufactured home park. This is relevant only in the sense that the State legislation  
25 states the setbacks applicable to micro-unit dwellings within sacred communities must be the same  
26 as those that apply to manufactured/mobile homes, unless such standards don’t exist where the  
27 setback would be ten feet.

28  

Table 1009-1
--------------

Lot area	5,000 Square feet
Lot width	50 Feet
Lot depth	100 Feet
Front yard setback	20 Feet
Side yard	10 Feet
Rear yard	15 Feet
Setback from public right-of-way	50 Feet
Setback from exterior boundary	25 Feet
Distance between mobile homes	20 Feet
Setback from permanent ponding area	75 Feet

The Council’s discussion centered around whether the table should be amended in order to clarify that it applies to “units” as opposed to “mobile homes”. Planning Division staff have discussed the issue with the City Attorney and believe amendments to the table are not necessary. This is because a reasonable interpretation suggests that homes and units mean the same thing and the setbacks outlined in the table would apply to a sacred community and its micro-unit dwellings.

**Staff Recommendation**

In an effort to advance the City Council’s direction to amend the Zoning Code to permit micro-unit dwellings within sacred communities as permitted accessory uses, the following amendments to the Zoning Code are recommended:

1. Add the definition of “Micro Unit” to Section 1001.10 (Definitions) as defined in Minnesota State Statutes 327.30;

*Micro Unit – a mobile residential dwelling providing permanent housing within a sacred community that meets the requirements of Minnesota State Statutes 327.30, subdivision 4.*

2. Add the definition of “Sacred Community” to Section 1001.10 (Definitions) as defined in Minnesota State Statutes 327.30; *Sacred Community – a residential settlement established on or contiguous to the grounds of a religious institution’s primary worship location primarily for the purpose of providing permanent housing for chronically homeless persons, extremely low-income persons, and designated volunteers that meet the requirements of Minnesota State Statutes 327.30, subdivision 3.*

3. Add to paragraph G (Accessory Uses and Structures) in Section 1011.12 (Additional Standards for

54 Specific Uses in All Districts) that states: “*Micro-Unit Dwellings in Sacred Communities subject to*  
55 *requirements outlined in Minnesota State Statutes 327.30.*”  
56

57 As outlined above, micro-unit dwellings as part of a sacred community are considered permitted  
58 accessory uses (not principal uses) because they require a religious institution to support the  
59 community. While the State legislation does not refer to the use as accessory, after discussions with  
60 the City Attorney, it is believed this is a rational approach to addressing the zoning responsibility of  
61 the City. These amendments were outlined to the City Council as a part of the August 21<sup>st</sup>  
62 discussion, where the Council signaled support as outlined above. Any amendments to the Zoning  
63 Code require consideration and a recommendation from the Planning Commission following a  
64 public hearing.  
65

### 66 **Requested Planning Commission Action**

67 Hold the duly noticed public hearing.  
68

### 69 **By motion, make the following recommendations:**

70 A. By motion, recommend approval of the following Micro Unit definition amending §1001.10  
71 (Definitions) of the Roseville City Code:

- 72 1. Micro Unit – a mobile residential dwelling providing permanent housing within a sacred  
73 community that meets the requirements of Minnesota State Statutes 327.30, subdivision 4.

74  
75 B. By motion, recommend approval of the following Sacred Community definition amending  
76 §1001.10 (Definitions) of the Roseville City Code:

- 77 1. Sacred Community – a residential settlement established on or contiguous to the grounds of a  
78 religious institution’s primary worship location primarily for the purpose of providing  
79 permanent housing for chronically homeless persons, extremely low-income persons, and  
80 designated volunteers that meet the requirements of Minnesota State Statutes 327.30,  
81 subdivision 3.

82  
83 C. By motion, recommend approval of the following addition to Section 1011.12 (G.2) to include  
84 micro-unit dwellings in a sacred community being a permitted accessory use in all districts:  
85

86 1011.12.G.2 Micro-Unit Dwellings in Sacred Communities

87 2. Micro-unit dwellings are permitted accessory uses in all zoning districts, consistent with the  
88 requirements of Minnesota State Statutes 327.30.  
89

### 90 **Alternative Actions**

- 91 1. Pass a motion to table the item for future action. An action to table must be tied to the need for  
92 clarity, analysis, and/or information necessary to make a recommendation on the request.  
93 2. Pass a motion recommending denial of the proposal. A motion to deny must include findings of  
94 fact germane to the request.

95  
96 **Prepared by:** Thomas Paschke, City Planner

**Attachments:**

1. Micro Unit Dwellings on Sacred Settlement Language

**SACRED COMMUNITIES AND MICRO-UNIT DWELLINGS.**

Subdivision 1.

**Definitions.**

(a) For the purposes of this section, the following terms have the meanings given.

(b) Chronically homeless" means an individual who:

(1) is homeless and lives or resides in a place not meant for human habitation, a safe haven, or in an emergency shelter;

(2) has been homeless and living or residing in a place not meant for human habitation, a safe haven, or in an emergency shelter continuously for at least one year or on at least four separate occasions in the last three years; and

(3) has an adult head of household, or a minor head-of-household if no adult is present in the household, with a diagnosable substance use disorder, serious mental illness, developmental disability, post-traumatic stress disorder, cognitive impairments resulting from a brain injury, or chronic physical illness or disability, including the co-occurrence of two or more of those conditions.

(c) "Designated volunteers" means persons who have not experienced homelessness and have been approved by the religious institution to live in a sacred community as their sole form of housing.

(d) "Extremely low income" means an income that is equal to or less than 30 percent of the area median income, adjusted for family size, as estimated by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

(e) "Micro unit" means a mobile residential dwelling providing permanent housing within a sacred community that meets the requirements of subdivision 4.

(f) "Religious institution" means a church, synagogue, mosque, or other religious organization organized under chapter 315.

(g) "Sacred community" means a residential settlement established on or contiguous to the grounds of a religious institution's primary worship location primarily for the purpose of providing permanent housing for chronically homeless persons, extremely low-income persons, and designated volunteers that meets the requirements of subdivision 3. Subd. 2.

**Dwelling in micro units in sacred communities authorized.**

Religious institutions are authorized to provide permanent housing to people who are chronically homeless, extremely low-income, or designated volunteers, in sacred communities composed of micro units subject to the provisions of this section. Each religious institution that has sited a sacred community must annually certify to the local unit of

government that it has complied with the eligibility requirements for residents of a sacred community in this section.

Subd. 3.

### **Sacred community requirements.**

(a) A sacred community must provide residents of micro units access to water and electric utilities either by connecting the micro units to the utilities that are serving the principal building on the lot or by other comparable means, or by providing the residents access to permanent common kitchen facilities and common facilities for toilet, bathing, and laundry with the number and type of fixtures required for an R-2 boarding house under Minnesota Rules, part 1305.2902. Any units that are plumbed shall not be included in determining the minimum number of fixtures required for the common facilities.

(b) A sacred community under this section must:

(1) be appropriately insured;

(2) have between one-third and 40 percent of the micro units occupied by designated volunteers; and

(3) provide the municipality with a written plan approved by the religious institution's governing board that outlines:

(i) disposal of water and sewage from micro units if not plumbed;

(ii) septic tank drainage if plumbed units are not hooked up to the primary worship location's system;

(iii) adequate parking, lighting, and access to units by emergency vehicles;

(iv) protocols for security and addressing conduct within the settlement; and

(v) safety protocols for severe weather.

(c) Unless the municipality has designated sacred communities meeting the requirements of this section as permitted uses, a sacred community meeting the requirements of this section shall be approved and regulated as a conditional use without the application of additional standards not included in this section. When approved, additional permitting is not required for individual micro units.

(d) Sacred communities are subject to the laws governing landlords and tenants under chapter 504B.

Subd. 4.

### **Micro unit requirements.**

(a) In order to be eligible to be placed within a sacred community, a micro unit must be built to the requirements of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) Code 119.5, which includes standards for heating, electrical systems, and fire and life safety. A micro unit must also meet the following technical requirements:

(1) be no more than 400 gross square feet;

(2) be built on a permanent chassis and anchored to pin foundations with engineered fasteners;

(3) have exterior materials that are compatible in composition, appearance, and durability to the exterior materials used in standard residential construction;

(4) have a minimum insulation rating of R-20 in walls, R-30 in floors, and R-38 in ceilings, as well as residential grade insulated doors and windows;

(5) have a dry, compostable, or plumbed toilet or other system meeting the requirements of the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, Chapters 7035, 7040, 7049, and 7080, or other applicable rules;

(6) have either an electrical system that meets NFPA 70 NEC, section 551 or 552 as applicable or a low voltage electrical system that meets ANSI/RVIA Low Voltage Standard, current edition;

(7) have minimum wall framing with two inch by four inch wood or metal studs with framing of 16 inches to 24 inches on center, or the equivalent in structural insulated panels, with a floor load of 40 pounds per square foot and a roof live load of 42 pounds per square foot; and

(8) have smoke and carbon monoxide detectors installed.

(b) All micro units, including their anchoring, must be inspected and certified for compliance with these requirements by a licensed Minnesota professional engineer or qualified third-party inspector for ANSI compliance accredited pursuant to either the American Society for Testing and Materials Appendix E541 or ISO/IEC 17020.

(c) Micro units that connect to utilities such as water, sewer, gas, or electric, must obtain any permits or inspections required by the municipality or utility company for that connection.

(d) Micro units must comply with municipal setback requirements established by ordinance for manufactured homes. If a municipality does not have such an ordinance, micro units must be set back on all sides by at least ten feet.

**EFFECTIVE DATE.**

This section is effective January 1, 2024.

  
**REQUEST FOR COMMISSION ACTION**

Date: **10/4/2023**  
Item No.: **7.a.**

---

Department Approval

Agenda Section

*Janice Gundlach*

Business

---

**Item Description:** Discussion regarding joint meeting with the City Council

---

1  
2 **Application Information**

3 Applicant: NA

4 Location: NA

5 Application Submission: NA

6 City Action Deadline: NA

7 Zoning: NA

8  
9 **Background**

10 Each year, the Planning Commission meets with the City Council to review activities and  
11 accomplishments and to discuss the upcoming year's work plan and issues that may be  
12 considered. The last joint meeting between the Planning Commission and City Council was on  
13 January 31, 2022 where the focus was on the second phase of the Zoning Code update. The Zoning  
14 Code update has concluded, so it's appropriate to hold another joint meeting to discuss other topics  
15 of focus for the Commission. The Planning Commission's main role is to process land use  
16 applications, in accordance with the Zoning Code and Comprehensive Plan, duties which are  
17 assigned to the Planning Commission under State law.

18  
19 Additionally, the joint meeting will be an opportunity to present to the City Council the four items  
20 the Commission is requesting the City Council consider adding to the Planning Commission's  
21 purpose, scope, duties, and functions. These four items have been summarized in Attachment 1,  
22 which was previously emailed to the full Commission on August 18, 2023. No additional comments  
23 or concerns have been forwarded to City staff since that time.

24  
25 The information below is what is customarily forwarded to the City Council during joint commission  
26 meetings. Staff has offered information below each topic, which represents the Commission's work  
27 since the last joint meeting in January of 2022. The Commission should engage in a discussion to  
28 determine what additional information should be included/presented to the City Council, particularly  
29 under the Questions and Concerns paragraph. The joint meeting is scheduled for October 16, 2023.

30  
31 Activities and accomplishments since the last joint meeting:

- 32     ○ Held 17 meetings, cancelled five meetings  
33     ○ Phase II Zoning Code Update project, which consisted of an updated Shoreland Ordinance  
34     and sustainability incentives for new development (six meetings were held regarding this  
35     effort)

- 36 ○ Four preliminary plat requests (Twin Lakes Station, Brama Vistas, Villas of Reservoir
- 37 Woods, and Danny Boy Estates)
- 38 ○ Seven conditional use requests for drive-through facilities (Take 5 Car Wash, Starbucks,
- 39 Bank of America, Taco Bell, Chase Bank, Panera Bread, and Shake Shack)
- 40 ○ Interim Use extension for the State Fair park-and-ride facilities
- 41 ○ Land use requests related to Ramsey County's Household Hazardous Waste facility on Kent
- 42 Street (IU extension, Zoning Code amendment, conditional use)
- 43 ○ Conditional use for increased density for a market rate apartment project at 1415 County
- 44 Road B
- 45 ○ Conditional use to allow a surface parking lot as a permitted use for Fed Ex on County Road
- 46 C2
- 47 ○ Interim use for Prince of Peace Lutheran Church to allow two micro-unit dwellings within an
- 48 interim Sacred Community

49  
50 Work Plan items for the upcoming year:

- 51 ○ Process routine land use applications in accordance with the City's Zoning Code and
- 52 Comprehensive Plan (such as in-fill plats, conditional uses, variances)
- 53 ○ Process potential land use applications for Twin Lakes (vacant PIK property)
- 54 ○ Process potential land use applications for Rosedale Center (outlot development)
- 55 ○ Process potential land use applications for Centre Pointe (vacant Veritas site)

56  
57 Questions or Concerns for the City Council:

- 58 ○ X
- 59 ○ X
- 60 ○ X

61  
62  
63 **Staff Recommendation**

64 Engage in a discussion in preparation for the joint meeting with the City Council. Provide

65 feedback to staff regarding the conclusions on the roles and responsibility discussion

66 (Attachment 1), the Commission's Activities and Accomplishments, Work Plan for upcoming

67 year, and Questions or Concerns to be forwarded to the City Council.

68  
69 **Requested Planning Commission Action**

70 Provide feedback to staff on the information contained herein.

71  
72 **Alternative Actions**

73 None

74 **Prepared by:** Janice Gundlach, Community Development Director

**Attachments:** 1. Memorandum from Commission to CC RE Roles discussion

75

## MEMORANDUM



---

**Date:**

**To:** Mayor Roe  
Members of the City Council

**From:** Planning Commission

**RE:** Review of Planning Commission's Purpose, Scope, Duties and Functions

---

At the request of the City Council, the Commission has discussed our purpose, scope, duties and functions to determine if changes could be made to improve the Commission experience. This topic was introduced to the Commission by Council member Etten on June 7<sup>th</sup>, then discussed by the Commission on three additional occasions, including meetings on July 5<sup>th</sup>, August 2<sup>nd</sup>, and October 4<sup>th</sup>. After thoughtful conversation, and recognition of the statutory role the Planning Commission is required to fulfill, the Commission built consensus surrounding the following four items the Commission is requesting the City Council consider adding to the Planning Commission's purpose, scope, duties, and functions:

1. Adjust/amend the announcement at Planning Commission meetings to better explain the Commission's limited role in specific applications and the level of influence afforded to the Commission during the public hearing/meeting process.
2. Consider having an opportunity for more than one joint meeting per year to discuss topics that may arise during the course of conducting regular commission business.
3. Consider adding a 'sketch plan' process to allow for informal Planning Commission input on projects before applications are submitted.
4. Allow Commission members to add discussion items to Planning Commission agendas to determine if a majority of the Commission is interested in exploring the topic further. Items whereby a majority of the Commission agree needs examining will be brought forward to the City Council for direction.

The Commission collectively finds that implementation of the above noted items would enhance the quality of work conducted by the Commission and serve to better engage Commissioners and the community in the work of the Planning Commission. Thank you.