



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting  
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive  
Minutes – Wednesday, June 7, 2023 – 6:30 p.m.**

**1. Call to Order**

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

**Members Present:** Chair Michelle Pribyl, Vice-Chair Karen Schaffhausen, and Commissioners Michelle Kruzel, Tammy McGehee, Pamela Aspnes, and Erik Bjorum.

**Members Absent:** Matthew Bauer.

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

**3. Approve Agenda**

**MOTION**

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

**Ayes: 6**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

**4. Review of Minutes**

**a. April 5, 2023 Planning Commission Regular Meeting**

**MOTION**

**Member Schaffhausen moved, seconded by Member Kruzel, to approve the April 5, 2023 meeting minutes.**

**Ayes: 6**

**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. **Request by LHB and Ramsey County Property Management to Consider a Zoning Code Text Amendment to §1001.10, Definitions, and the Table of Allowed Uses (1007-2) of the Institutional District, and to Consider a Conditional Use, all in Support of an Environmental Service Center at 1725 Kent Street (PF23-005)**

Chair Pribyl opened the public hearing for PF23-005 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 on July 10, 2023.

Chair Pribyl indicated she was going to recuse herself and turn over the management of this item to Vice-Chair Schaffhausen. She indicated she works for the firm that is doing the design on this building but is not personally involved.

City Planner Paschke summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated June 7, 2023.

Member McGehee asked if there was a specific reason why staff chose to make this a conditional use rather than permitted.

Mr. Paschke indicated the main reason for the conditional use over a permitted use was when the initial discussion was brought to the Planning Commission there were potential concerns or issues that were raised by Commissioners as it related to an environmental service center and the number of uses. Staff chose to require the conditional use because that is what the Planning Commission had recommended back in 2022. He noted from his perspective it could have gone either way as it related to being permitted but staff felt this was the best path to move forward.

Member McGehee noticed that the Director of Public Works had asked for the traffic study, and she wondered if he was privy to the comments that have come in regarding traffic.

Mr. Paschke explained he sent the Public Works Director the comments and he is the one that forwarded those to the Ramsey County Traffic Engineer and received the reply that is in the packet.

Vice-Chair Schaffhausen asked if this site is currently being used for this purpose.

Mr. Paschke explained it is on an annual basis. For a certain number of days there is an interim use permit to allow for the household hazardous waste.

Vice-Chair Schaffhausen thought that was reason why the Planning Commission wanted the conditional use for this site.

Vice-Chair Schaffhausen invited the applicant to come up to speak .

Ms. Lydia Major, Landscape Architect with LHB explained she was at the meeting on behalf of Ramsey County. She added that Ramsey County has done extensive community engagement around both the idea of having an environmental service center and specifically having one at this site and the response has been very positive. This is a facility that will be an amenity to the community, that will help residents of Roseville and beyond and believe this location is very well intended to serve that. She indicated the traffic has increased in the area but does not seem to have a detrimental impact on Larpenteur and to the surrounding intersections. Landscaping will be done and will protect the park and the amenities in the park. The areas will be complimented with extensive native landscaping, pollinators, and other things that the community feels are very desired on this space. Ramsey County will also be doing its best with LHB to try to protect as many trees as possible in the front facing lot. In addition to that, the building space itself has the warehouse functions and collection functions that are expected but also has some community room and a reuse of free retail space where people can come and get paints and other materials that they would have otherwise go out and buy and they plan to incorporate the building design with the stormwater and other landscape so it is an integral indoor and outdoor space that is really a great amenity to Roseville and Ramsey County.

### **Public Comment**

No one came forward to speak for or against this request. Vice-Chair Schaffhausen closed the public hearing.

### **MOTION**

**Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Bjorum, to recommend to the City Council approval of a Zoning Code Text Amendment to §1001.10, Definitions, and the Table of Allowed Uses (1007-2) of the Institutional District, and to Consider a Conditional Use, all in Support of an Environmental Service Center at 1725 Kent Street (PF23-005).**

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0**

**Abstain: 1 (Pribyl)**

**Motion carried.**

**b. Request for Approval of a Preliminary Plat of Two Parcels as Six Lots with an Existing Home Remaining on One of the Lots (PF23-001)**

Chair Pribyl opened the public hearing for PF23-001 at approximately 6:54 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing.

Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated June 7, 2023.

Member McGehee wanted to be very clear with looking at the drawing and what Mr. Lloyd has on the screen because when they are overlapped on the map the middle area has no trees. This will be will be the stormwater area and all of the trees on the boundary will be removed.

Mr. Lloyd explained there are several trees in different areas that will be preserved but with any redevelopment of a sight there will be a significant loss of existing tree cover. The Zoning Code allows for that and requires replacement based on a certain calculation that is established in the Zoning requirements. It is not without impact but is allowed to proceed according to the normal standards. He explained he has had a couple of conversations with some residents, and one was opposed to seeing new homes, especially along the Skillman side. The other person he spoke with asked more questions about the process and what is allowed and expressed some disappointment.

Chair Pribyl asked if the applicant would like to add to the presentation.

Mr. Sean Keatts, Cara Builders, provided a presentation to the Planning Commission.

**Public Comment**

Mr. Mike Beers, 608 Shryer, explained he has lived at his home for eighteen years and he wondered how this is improving the quiet neighborhood. The five or six homes being added do not really fit in the neighborhood scenario. Every house on the north side of Shryer has the long yards and there is no access outside of Dale Street. He wondered if there would be enough power for more homes. There are storm sewer concerns, neighborhood concerns, increased traffic, he wondered how this is all going to fit and how will it benefit the current neighbors. He wondered what this would do to their taxes and is all of the concerns addressed being addressed in this plan or just an opportunity for someone to make a bunch of money.

Ms. Jan Brudvig, 677 Shryer, explained she had some concerns because this is a very quiet residential neighborhood and leads into Reservoir Park. This is not a thorough street so bringing more traffic into the area really causes a lot of safety concerns for her. There are a lot of beautiful trees that add to the neighborhood. She thought this is a traffic concern.

Mr. Derek Hinrichs, 696 Shryer, asked what version of the City Code is being used to get the 9,350-foot minimum for a lot. He also wondered regarding the two lots on the

far east side are approximately 9,350 feet, the absolute minimum and he thought the builder could do better than the absolute minimum required by code.

Mr. Dave Kautz, 683 Shryer, indicated the owner at 691 Shryer recently tried to sell his house and was not able to sell it and currently has a renter there and there are a couple of other houses in the area where the same thing has happened. His concern is if these houses do not sell, will there be a variety of renters in the neighborhood. The other concern he has is how this will affect their tax base.

Ms. Roxanne Schultz, 702 Shryer, explained she lives on the reservoir side of Shryer and wondered if there was a possibility that houses could be proposed to be put behind her house on a reservoir property to change it since it is now called Reservoir Woods Park.

Mr. Mike Collins, 2043 Alameda, explained his only concern was when he went to the meeting to discuss the initial proposal the things, he took away from the meeting were the developer was going to try to stick as close to the neighborhood that they already have, and he thought this was as far away from the neighborhood that is there right now. He enjoys looking at the property the way it is now because there are trees all over and the deer are always there. It is a natural piece of land in the middle of the City. He did not necessarily think having new houses in the neighborhood is a bad thing, he just thinks the way it is setup is a little excessive. He thought two or three lots would be a perfect scenario with keeping the backyard in line with the rest of the streets or the houses on that street. He was not against improvement in the neighborhood but something to consider.

Ms. Marlene Bartell, 683 Shryer, indicated her concern is she has a nice large lot in the back and if this goes through there will be a large house right next to her. She wondered how much of it would be by her property and would she be able to see the trees and the deer.

Ms. Schultz stated when the developer had the first meeting the neighborhood was under the impression that most of the trees would stay and if looking at the plans it looks like all of the trees will be gone.

Mr. Lloyd answered resident questions regarding the Zoning Code. He also addressed the concern about homes going in on the southside of Shryer, he indicated in all likelihood there would not be any homes built in that area due to the Zoning being Park and Recreation District and a lot of changes would need to occur for that to happen.

Mr. Keatts explained at the open house there was discussion about tentative plans for specific houses that would be on each lot. He did not have the exact plans yet because it costs money to do those plans and his company is not at that stage yet. His intention is to do the type of houses that closely match the area. At the open house he pointed out trees that he thought would have to be removed but upon further discussions with Mr. Lloyd and the Watershed District, that somewhat expanded and

at that time he did not have the Watershed District's reviewal and what they wanted with their diagrams. It does not behoove him to remove trees. He has done developments in the past and his goal is to keep as many trees as he can. He was also happy with the tree replacement program because he does not like driving through new developments and seeing zero trees. This plan is a pretty aggressive plan, in his opinion, he foresees not as many trees being removed. They are keeping as many trees as possible along the western side as well as along the eastern side and as many as possible on the Shryer Avenue side. Along Skillman there will be some trees removed but if the Watershed District says the trees do not need to be removed in northwest corner, for example, his company will not remove them. This is an aggressive plan for removal, and he hoped that not as many trees would be removed.

Member McGehee noted the residents need to address the tax concerns to Ramsey County because Roseville itself does not handle the taxes at all.

No one else wished to address the Commission. Chair Pribyl closed the public hearing.

### **Commission Deliberation**

Member Aspnes asked if 711 Shryer actually three platted lots.

Mr. Lloyd explained that was correct. All three are the same size as each of the other lots in the row and he believed all were seventy-five feet wide.

Member Aspnes asked if the existing house there now was across the plat lines and if that house is being removed.

Mr. Lloyd explained that was all correct.

Member Aspnes asked if someone wanted to build three houses on the three lots would they need to come to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Lloyd indicated the person would not, the fact that these three platted lots are within one tax parcel is the result of a homeowner buying those three lots and asking Ramsey County to combine them only for tax purposes, then instead of being taxed for three separate lots the owner is taxed for only one parcel.

Member Bjorum indicated there was a question about utilities, he assumed that given the power and sewer that would have supplied the three homes that could have been built here, that the existing system could still handle five homes.

Mr. Lloyd indicated he expected that whatever is necessary to provide service will have to be met but he was not sure what that would be.

Member McGehee thought the issue the people are bringing forward is one that the Planning Commission has seen many times before where there are people with long

yards and suddenly a house is going against their backyard, in their backyard or so close along the sides that it really changes the nature of the neighborhood and the nature of what the homeowner had when the lot was purchased and it is not a matter of something that the resident did, it is Zoning that the resident relied on. She thought it is something worth looking at moving forward because there have been quite a few of these types of issues before.

The Commission asked staff about traffic concerns.

Member Bjorum added that this is a preliminary plat hearing, and he did not see anything from a legal standpoint that would allow the Planning Commission to deny moving this forward in the process.

#### **MOTION**

**Member Bjorum moved, seconded by Member Schaffhausen, to recommend to the City Council approval of a Preliminary Plat of Two Parcels as Six Lots with an Existing Home Remaining on One of the Lots. (PF23-001).**

**Ayes: 6**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

Chair Pribyl advised this item will be before the City Council on July 10, 2023.

**c. Request for Approval of a Preliminary Plat of an Existing Parcel as Ten Lots for Single-Family Attached Homes (Twinhomes) (PF23-002)**

Chair Pribyl opened the public hearing for PF23-002 at approximately 8:00 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing.

Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated June 7, 2023.

Member Aspnes indicated she drove around this parcel and had some concerns about the private drive only because of the amount of snow there was this past year, she wondered where all of the snow will go.

Mr. Lloyd indicated he did not know the answer but suggested there are large side yards adjacent to Fry Street and maybe the owner would not be able to pile snow in their drainage outlot but is a place where he would put it. Whatever provisions are in the maintenance code, even though it is not a City street it still has similar sorts of requirements for the maintenance and that sort of thing.

Member Aspnes asked if the units will be rental units or owner-occupied dwellings.

Mr. Lloyd explained that is not a question staff considers in subdivision requests. A dwelling unit is a dwelling unit, a lot is a lot. In a subdivision like this the separate parcels, the separate lots facilitates separate owners but does not prevent someone

from buying one or more of them and renting it rather than occupying it. The transition from doing the development in a single parcel with the ten dwellings, which in his mind would more likely be rentals, proceeding through the plat process like the applicant is doing suggests the intent to sell them and purchased then by either residents or someone who would rent them out.

Member McGehee explained since the City might require a homeowner's association, she has seen homeowners' associations that specifically specify that the homes cannot be rented for more than a year. This is a condition that the City could apply, if the City is the one requiring the homeowner's association.

Mr. Lloyd explained he was not sure that the City could require some tenancy provisions in a homeowner's association. The City can regulate rentals through the City's Rental Registration program of Rental Licensing program, but he did not believe that the City has the ability to prohibit them.

Member McGehee indicated she was probably going to object to this on the basis of traffic because there is the dense neighborhood that is very much landlocked, particularly with the changes now on Snelling and only two exits coming out onto Fairview. She thought both exits were very dangerous for access to this neighborhood. The other thing is the City just added approximately four hundred units just across from this and this is one of the parks that is expected to take some of the influx of new people in the community. This particular park seems to her to be an ideal space to add a little land rather than add more houses in an area that already has a severe traffic access and exit problem and is quite a densely populated area now.

Mr. Lloyd explained in the process of reviewing this project the Parks and Recreation Director indicated recently that the Parks Department did have the opportunity to consider purchasing the entire parcel for additional park space and they declined to do that at the time and there was serious consideration of acquiring dedication of land on the northern side of this parcel to expand the park a little bit and the Parks and Recreation Commission declined that as well. The final decision about land or cash dedication lies with the City Council and can still make that choice. As far as what the City Council has decided beyond that, the only thing that comes to his mind is during the Zoning update process of a couple three years ago, he believed this was one of the sites that got special focus on whether the zoning should be high density as the adjacent assisted living facility is medium density or something else and the ultimate decision at that point was for the medium density zoning that is in place today.

Member McGehee did not think that was a problem but what she thought was a problem was if the City polls its residents and the residents ask for something and when the City has the opportunity to act on it, they don't. She opined this was particularly egregious where the residents really value the parks and the City touts its parks system. She thought it was unfortunate that a single person or a small group of people could decide what is and isn't added the park system when adding adjacent



land was specified as an idea that people would really like in the Park's Department own survey.

Member Schaffhausen indicated when she thinks about traffic in particular, Fairview is also within the purview of Ramsey County.

Mr. Lloyd indicated that was correct. He reviewed the traffic patterns and volumes with the Commission.

Member Aspnes explained she walked around the park today and noticed there is park access from southbound Snelling. She wondered about, in general, parking at the ball area in the park and she wondered where everyone can park. There are a few parking lots in the park and this particular site abuts the pool in the park. She noted the elevation of the site is higher than the park land to the north of it. There are some scruffy looking pine trees and wondered about screening from the backyards of the two proposed twinhomes on the north side. She would like to see some nice screening, so these homes do not look directly into the pool area. She also wondered about the outlot. She assumed any water runoff will not go down from the development into the park and that any access water from developing this will be controlled by the stormwater management.

Mr. Lloyd explained how stormwater management will work to control the water runoff.

Chair Pribyl asked if the applicant would like to come forward to answer questions.

Mr. Barry O'Meara came forward to answer questions.

Member Aspnes wondered where the snow will be stored if there is a lot of snow in the winter.

Mr. O'Meara explained they have taken snow removal into account when the land was developed. He noted by Code there could be fourteen to fifteen units on this land but because of the possibility of snow storage the units were cut back to ten. Snow should be able to be handled onsite and if not, the development will need to pay to remove it.

Chair Pribyl wondered if the townhomes will be sold or be rental units.

Mr. O'Meara explained the development was created in such a way that either having the townhomes as rentals or sold could be done. He stated the intent is to be flexible.

### **Public Comment**

Mr. Arthur McWilliams, 2571 Fry Street, explained he lives by the kiddie pool and suspected this development will be good for the neighborhood overall. There will be nice new buildings in the neighborhood and in the long run might have a ripple effect

and will be an improvement from what was previously there. Parking came up, which is his sole concern. He noted the parks gets a lot of use as well.

No one else wished to address the Commission. Chair Pribyl closed the public hearing.

### **Commission Deliberation**

Member Aspnes indicated she did not object to the twinhomes by themselves. Her concern is the City lost an opportunity to add to the park land, to this park which is really lovely. She can see some trees that have been planted in the park. She thought the park could use more parking so there is not so much traffic and parking on Fry Street.

Member Kruzal asked if staff knew why the Parks and Recreation Commission decided not to further investigate this or is that something that could be public knowledge.

Mr. Paschke thought when this property first went up for sale many years ago the Parks Department had a chance to buy it and chose not to and he believed the City was a part of that discussion.

Member McGehee indicated she personally would make findings that this plan has potentially very negative impact on the park because of the location, the proximity to the kiddie pool and the fact that people will be viewing this activity from their homes as well as the parking for the complex. She asserted that in her opinion the entire development is a problem, and the proximity to the park simply adds to it. She thought everything from snow removal to parking for those specific homes was inadequate. Specifying that the homes have sprinkling system because there is not the kind of access for emergency vehicles that the City would normally require and the fact that this is a landlocked area with a very busy, highly used park with some amenities that are particular to this park make this a very poor site for this proposal. The adjacent park has amenities that the City does not have anywhere else and there are already parking problems around the parks, especially in the summer, and this is another example of this issue. She could not see in good conscious, herself in particular, could vote to support this proposal based on the issues that have been raised and to which there are not any reasonable solutions. She would personally send this to the Council with those preliminary findings of hers as to why this particular proposal should not move forward.

Member Bjorum agreed with some of that. He did not want to penalize the developer for doing a nice job of developing this property. Doing what he deems best for the property, not going to the max density. He did not want to penalize him for planning this because there is a parking problem that he is trying to plan for and has said so and putting the burden of the neighborhood parking issue on his shoulders and this development, he thought this was set up as medium density development and he did not see an issue with what is on the plan and he did not see any legal ramification for

the Planning Commission to deny moving this forward. He understood this is next to a very busy park and a very busy neighborhood, but he did not see the reason to penalize the developer for those issues on this.

Member Aspnes thanked Member Bjorum for stating his reasons, there really is no legal reason.

Member Bjorum explained acknowledged all of the residents in the neighborhood that wrote in about parking issues and traffic issues but at the same time there is a containment design here for those units and development.

### **MOTION**

**Member Bjorum moved, seconded by Member Schaffhausen, to recommend to the City Council approval of a Preliminary Plat of an Existing Parcel as Ten Lots for Single-Family Attached Homes (Twinhomes) (PF23-002).**

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 1 (McGehee)**

Member McGehee explained she would state again the reason that she stated previously as findings, and she believed that the City might want to revisit this at the Council level as a purchase to add to the park. In that regard she did not believe that the developer should be penalized financially for clearing the site, but she thought the City Council should review this as something that they might want to consider as a purchase.

**Motion carried.**

Chair Pribyl advised this item will be before the City Council on July 10, 2023.

## **7. Other Business Heading Information**

### **a. City Council Request for Commissions**

Councilmember Etten was at the meeting to talk about a review that the City Council is asking all of the Commissions to do of their purpose, scope, and duties, understanding that this Commission is different so a lot of this Commission's duties is laid out in State Statute and that is about all this Commission can do. He reviewed what the Council would like the Planning Commission to discuss and review over the next couple of months and bring back to the City Council.

Member McGehee indicated tonight she made some suggestions to go forward to the City Council and she asked what the best way is to get big picture things to transmit those to the City Council.

Councilmember Etten thought to start that it is a part of the Commission's job, part of the advisory role to bring those issues forward to the City Council through

a majority vote things the Commission feels the City Council should think about or address.

**8. Adjourn**

**MOTION**

**Member Aspnes, seconded by Member Bjorum, to adjourn the meeting at 8:38 p.m.**

**Ayes: 6**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**