



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting  
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive  
Minutes – Wednesday, December 7, 2022 – 6:30 p.m.**

**1. Call to Order**

Chair Kimble called to order the regular meeting of the Planning Commission meeting at approximately 6:30 p.m. and reviewed the role and purpose of the Planning Commission.

**2. Roll Call**

At the request of Chair Kimble, City Planner Thomas Paschke called the Roll.

**Members Present:** Chair Julie Kimble, and Commissioners Tammy McGehee, Karen Schaffhausen, Pamela Aspnes and Erik Bjorum.

**Members Absent:** Vice Chair Michelle Pribyl and Commissioner Michelle Kruzel.

**Staff Present:** City Planner Thomas Paschke, Community Development Director Janice Gundlach and Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd.

**3. Approve Agenda**

**MOTION**

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

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

**4. Review of Minutes**

**a. November 2, 2022 Planning Commission Regular Meeting**

Chair Kimble indicated there were some changes made that were sent to staff as well as her name was misspelled in a few places.

**MOTION**

**Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Bjorum, to approve the November 2, 2022 meeting minutes.**

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

**5. Communications and Recognitions:**

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

None.

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

None.

## 6. Public Hearing

- a. **Hold a Public Hearing and Make A Recommendation Regarding Phase Two Zoning Code Amendments**

Chair Kimble opened the public hearing for Phase Two Zoning Code Amendments at approximately 6:34 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing. She advised this item will be before the City Council January 30, 2023.

Community Development Director Gundlach summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated December 7, 2022. She introduced the Jeff Miller and Rita Trapp from HKGI Consulting.

Mr. Miller and Ms. Trapp highlighted the Phase Two Zoning Code Amendments with the Commission.

Chair Kimble thanked staff, the Commission, and the consultants for everything that has been done and discussed.

Member McGehee wondered if there could be an addition made to the impervious surface section because there was a huge issue a while ago that swimming pools were not impervious surface. They are impervious surface and the DNR agrees but this is not in the listed items. She asked if anything was done with wetlands or if they were something separate from this shoreland work because she did not see anything regarding DNR regulated wetlands.

Ms. Gundlach knew there were some wetland regulations in the existing Shoreland Ordinance which is being pulled out and putting into a different section of City Code which is not under the purview of the Planning Commission, which is why it is not being seen in this information.

Ms. Trapp explained in the Public Works area where all of the ponding and stormwater management is listed there will be a new section added. The best practices from the Watershed District were taken and will continue to be a part of it.

Member McGehee explained she did not know if the gross square footage of a building was the amount of first floor coverage, or it based on how many floors. She wondered how gross square footage for a building is computed.

Chair Kimble explained gross square footage is everything and is specific to where it is measured on the exterior of the wall. She indicated there are very specific calculations done to figure it out.

Member McGehee indicated she would like an example of a building that is built to the current requirements of Roseville, how much open square footage there typically is.

Ms. Gundlach indicated staff would have to go back to one of the first meetings to get that information because Mr. Paschke did go and do some examples of what the City actually did recently with some of the newer apartment-built sites to see if that made sense based on what was actually happening. This information was previously provided to the Commission.

Member McGehee brought up one other thing in the table of points, and the Shoreland Ordinance. She questioned why restoring the shoreland only got one point when it seemed fairly important to her in terms of protection of public waters. She asked if staff felt it was sufficiently covered in the materials being put in Code. She thought it seemed a little low unless staff felt it is unnecessary because it is so rarely done. She opined that unless someone asks for a permit or variance there is no particular motivation for restoration.

Chair Kimble felt like where the City landed on the chart and points was that because this can be changed, she thought everyone agreed to leave the points as they are and test it. She thought quite a few changes were made prior to what is being presented for approval now.

Ms. Gundlach explained the number of points assigned; staff tried to correlate to the actual cost that the developer would incur in order to do that. The shoreland restoration, depending on how it is done might not be as costly, but in addition to cost is the ease of being able to do it, and these reasons deserved larger points. She noted that is what she recalled the Commission discussion being surrounding the point values. Obviously, the Planning Commission can make a decision of what that number should be but that was the decision that was made at previous discussions.

The Commission discussed with staff the definition of swimming pools and thought the definition should include “in ground swimming pools”.

Member McGehee asked what the City wanted to do as a sustainability effort because a tree has a big definition. There is everything from a Columnar Oak to an actual Savannah Tree. What is it that the City is really aiming for when asking for a tree or trees?

Ms. Gundlach thought what the City was aiming for is a good balance between how many trees are suitable to be planted on a site based on how the Zoning Code allows that site to be developed. If the Zoning Code allows a multi-family property of a certain number of units and a certain amount of parking stalls once it is put on a site, there is only so much space left to plant trees. Staff was trying to come up with a reasonable standard for how many trees could fit in that space left to be planted. That is where staff came up with what is in the amendment based on review of what other cities had done, based on what the City Forester felt was reasonable, and then just to make sure Mr. Paschke went and looked at some multi-family properties that the City recently developed to see if things were sort of in line and she thought what Mr. Paschke was saying is those sites generally shoved more trees than probably will be able to thrive just because the development needed a variance and were trying to get them as close to compliance as possible so the standard staff came up with was kind of striking the right balance.

Member McGehee wondered if staff wanted to look at the broader sustainability picture, the shade, the canopy of the City and so on and how much impervious surface the City Code actually allows for commercial and multi-family developments. Apart from this specific topic of trees, Member McGehee raised the separate question of the issues involved as the City moves toward reviewing sustainability and environmental issues in general.

Ms. Gundlach noted on the Phase One amendments the City decreased the amount of improvement area for E-1 zoned properties and one could argue there is a sustainability element to that because they decreased how much a site could be covered. This was done to address the intensity across the commercial/industrial uses.

Member Schaffhausen indicated regarding equitability, she wondered that because this is innovative with not a lot of a benchmark with regard to how the City is going to apply this, how can the City create some sort of a rubric or because it is not included in the Zoning Code, how does the City make sure that the rules are applied equitably and that the changes are made in a way so that if the City decides to change the points available and what sits in the points, that it is clear and there is some degree of consistency to the people that are applying and asking for this. She thought it is an imperfect approach because this is new and she thought it was appropriate to keep it out of the Zoning Code for that exact reason, which means the City needs to be able to be flexible with it and both being flexible as well as equitable. She did not know if there was thought regarding how to apply this so that for each person that shows up it is fair.

Chair Kimble indicated staff has noted that any changes made will come back to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Gundlach indicated if staff were to make changes in the worksheet, because the worksheet is referenced in the Zoning Code the Planning Commission would get to weigh in and the Planning Commission cannot make any decision on its own so the

City Council would be involved as well. She thought she understood the concern about making sure the standards are applied equitably across various projects, but every project is unique and almost impossible to achieve. She noted that this is also a voluntary process, and the developer understands going into it that this is a little bit of a negotiation based on the specific characteristics of their project. What the developer is proposing to do and the incentives that the developer will be unlocking. The other thing she thought was important is the City Manager and City Council funded a full-time sustainability specialist beginning in 2023 and that person will have the primary responsibility, working with the planners, to review what is being proposed to make sure that the City is maximizing whatever it can, and the decisions being made are reasonable based on the specific characteristics of the project, but it is not a perfect system.

Chair Kimble noted when she looked at this it is very quantitative and is not a very subjective list so she did not know how it could be applied inequitably.

Commissioner Aspnes asked how the City will know this is worthwhile or whether it is achieving its purpose. Is there a process in place for this?

Ms. Gundlach explained it is going to take a project or two to see if it is worth their while and if people are not using it then there is no harm in it being in the Code. If people are using it, theoretically the sustainability specialist and the City planners, in working through the worksheet have found value otherwise the worksheet will not be approved.

### **Public Comment**

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

### **MOTION**

**Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Aspnes, to recommend to the City Council approval of the Shoreland Overlay District, Repeal Chapter 1017 and replace into Chapter 1012, EV Charging Standards, amend Section 1019.04, new and revised definitions. Amend Section 1001.10, revise landscaping standards. Amend Section 1011.03, and add an amendment to create the sustainability incentives, Section 1001.13.**

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

## **7. Other Business**

- a. Consider 2023 Variance Board and Planning Commission Meeting Calendar**  
Community Development Director Janice Gundlach presented the 2023 Variance Board and Planning Commission meeting calendar.

The Commission reviewed the meeting dates.

**8. Adjourn**

**MOTION**

**Member McGehee, seconded by Member Bjorum, to adjourn the meeting at 7:26 p.m.**

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**