

Wednesday, April 2, 2025 6:30 PM City Council Chambers

(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. Organizational Business
 - a. Swear In New Members
- 5. Review of Minutes
 - a. Reveiw March 5, 2025 Minutes
- 6. Communications and Recognitions
- 7. Business
 - a. Annual Organizational Business
- 8. Commission Direction on Commission Member Initiated Agenda Items
- 9. Adjourn

R®SEVILLE REQUEST FOR COMMISSION ACTION

Date: 4/2/2025 Item No.: 4.a.

Department Approval

Janue Gundrach

Agenda Section **Organizational Business**

Item Description: Swear In New Members

Ap	plication	Inform	ation
	pheation		auon

n/a

1 2

3 4

Background 5

In accordance with City Code Section 201.02.C, every appointed member, before beginning his or her 6 duties shall take an oath stating that he or she will faithfully discharge the duties of the commission. At 7 the March 3, 2025 City Council meeting, the Council appointed Allison Campbell Jensen, Erin Lynch, 8 Jon Barstad and Steve Cyra to the Planning Commission. New Commissioners Jensen, Barstad and 9 Cyra shall be sworn in at the April 2, 2025 meeting. Commissioner Lynch will be sworn in at the May 7, 10 2025 meeting. 11 12

Staff Recommendation 13

The chair shall swear in new Commissioners Allison Campbell Jensen, Jon Barstad and Steve Cyra. 14

Requested Planning Commission Action 16

The chair shall swear in New Commissioners Allison Campbell Jensen, Jon Barstad and Steve Cyra. 17

18

21

15

Alternative Actions 19

n/a 20

> Prepared by: Janice Gundlach, Community Development Director

None Attachments:

22

Request for commission action

Date: 4/2/2025 Item No.: 5.a.

Department Approval

Agenda Section **Review of Minutes**

Item Description: Reveiw March 5, 2025 Minutes

1 2 3	Application Information N/A
4 5 6	Background N/A
7 8 9	Staff Recommendation N/A
10 11 12 13 14	Requested Planning Commission Action Review the March 5, 2025 minutes and make a motion to approve subject to requested corrections.
15 16	Alternative Actions N/A
17	Prepared by:
18	Attachments: 1. March 5, 2025 Minutes



Planning Commission Regular Meeting City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive Draft Minutes – Wednesday, March 5, 2025 – 6:30 p.m.

1 2 3	1.	Call to Order Chair Pribyl called to order the regular meeting of the Planning Commission at approximately 6:30 p.m. and reviewed the commission's role and purpose.			
4 5 6	2.	Roll Call At the request of Cha	air Pribyl, City Planner Thomas Paschke called the Roll.		
7 8 9		Members Present:	Chair Michelle Pribyl, Commissioners Tammy McGehee, Pamela Aspnes, and Erik Bjorum.		
10 11		Members Absent:	Michelle Kruzel and Vice-Chair Karen Schaffhausen		
12 13 14		Staff Present:	City Planner Thomas Paschke, Community Development Director Janice Gundlach, and Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd		
15 16	3.	Approve Agenda			
17					
18		MOTION			
19		Member Bjorum moved, seconded by Member Aspnes, to approve the agenda as			
20		presented.			
21					
22		Ayes: 4			
23		Nays: 0			
24		Motion carried.			
25	4				
26	4.	Review of Minutes			
27		a January 9 2025	Planning Commission Degular Masting		
28		a. January 0, 2025	, Planning Commission Regular Meeting		
29 30		Member McGeb	ee indicated she sent corrections to City Staff before the meeting.		
31			te indicated she sent corrections to City Starr before the incerning.		
32		Member Asnnes	explained she had a minor correction to lines 225 and 227. The word		
33			e changed to "grade".		
34		great should be	changed to grade .		
35		MOTION			
36			nee moved, seconded by Member Bjorum, to approve the		
37			ry 8, 2025, meeting minutes.		
38					
39		Ayes: 4			
40		Nays: 0			
41		Motion carried.			

Regular Planning Commission Meeting Minutes – Wednesday, March 5, 2025 Page 2

42			
43	5.	Co	ommunications and Recognitions:
44			
45		a.	From the Public: Public comment pertaining to general land use issues <u>not</u> on this
46			agenda, including the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update.
47			
48			None.
49		_	
50		b.	From the Commission or Staff: Information about assorted business not already on
51			this agenda, including a brief update on the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update
52			process.
53			
54			City Planner Thomas Paschke thanked Chair Pribyl and Commissioners Schaffhausen
55			and Kruzel for their work on the Planning Commission.
56			
57			Chair Pribyl thanked the Commissioners and staff. She felt that the commission was a
58			respectful body even though they did not always agree on everything, and she
59			appreciated all of their time together.
60		р	
61	6.	Pu	blic Hearing
62		_	Consider a Demonstration Louis Deve Americanta LLC to Allow Devidential
63		а.	Consider a Request by Lydia Rose Apartments LLC to Allow Residential
64 65			Density in a Proposed Apartment Building Greater than 24 Dwellings per Acre as a Conditional Use (PF25-001)
65 66			Chair Pribyl opened the public hearing for PF25-001 at approximately 6:38 p.m. and
66 67			reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing. She advised this item would
68			be before the City Council on March 24, 2025.
69			
70			Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd summarized the request in detail in the March 5, 2025
71			staff report.
72			1
73			Mr. Lloyd explained the site was located at 2490 Snelling Avenue, a former medical
74			office that has been vacant since the 1960s. The proposal included an 18-unit
75			apartment with a one-way drive aisle and shared parking with the neighboring
76			property. The applicant was seeking approval to allow up to thirty-six units per acre,
77			with the current proposal being twenty-eight units per acre.
78			
79			Member McGehee questioned the lack of a public meeting for this change.
80			
81			Mr. Lloyd explained that open house meetings were not required for conditional use
82			applications.
83			Marchard American Institute of the second of
84			Member Aspnes asked Mr. Lloyd for more information on the pathway the city has
85			asked the developer to add. She thought it was odd because it would only be for one building. She also questioned the adequacy of parking for on 18 unit building pating
86 07			building. She also questioned the adequacy of parking for an 18-unit building, noting only thirty sayon parking stalls being shown
87			only thirty-seven parking stalls being shown.
88			

Regular Planning Commission Meeting Minutes – Wednesday, March 5, 2025 Page 3

property owner, the applicant, install a pathway, but rather reserve space in an 90 easement so that as the city acquires more easements over time in that area, the city 91 can build a pathway. He also noted that the zoning code allowed for shared parking 92 with neighboring properties, and the current proposal met those standards. 93 94 Chair Pribyl inquired about the site's screening requirements. 95 96 Mr. Lloyd confirmed that fencing or opaque landscaping must meet setback and 97 screening requirements. 98 99 Member McGehee indicated she also had some concerns with parking due to current 100 headlight problems. Since this was a conditional use, she wondered what the 101 conditions were. She thought that with buildings in a new building, underground 102 parking could avoid this problem, which did not exist in the traffic patterns around 103 the other two buildings owned by the same person. 104 105 Mr. Lloyd reviewed the conditional use with the Commission. He explained that the 106 approval being requested concerned the fact that this could one day become an 107 apartment with a busier parking area. He noted that underground parking was not a 108 requirement, and he did not know the logistics or feasibility of having underground 109 parking in a building of that size. 110 111 Member McGehee understood but disagreed because there would be more light than 112 the people were used to. She indicated it was not the cars coming in but the headlights 113 coming in at all different times of night, so she thought some screening would be 114 needed to block the light from the headlights. She thought that was a problem 115 throughout the city. 116 117 Mr. Paschke and Ms. Gundlach reviewed the City Code and landscaping 118 requirements with screening sections and buffers. 119 120 The building designer, Mr. Matt Fauber, addressed the Commission and answered its 121 questions regarding density, underground parking, and screening. 122 123 **Public Comment** 124 125 Ms. Brenda Hartman, Resident, co-owner of 2939 Asbury 126 Ms. Harman indicated she was at the meeting with her brother and sister, who also 127 wanted to address the Commission. 128 129 Ms. Hartman presented concerns about increased traffic, noise, and the current 130 condition of the existing property. 131 132 133 Mr. Bryan Hartman and Ms. Barb Hartman, co-owner of 2939 Asbury Ms. Harman indicated she had the same concern as her sister about the lights and the 134 upkeep of the fence. 135

Mr. Lloyd explained that staff was not recommending a condition of approval that the

89

Minutes – Wednesday, March 5, 2025

Page 4

136 Mr. Brian Harman, co-owner of 2939 Asbury 137 Mr. Harman expressed similar concerns about the impact on their property and the 138 need for better maintenance of the existing property. 139 140 Mr. Shawn Adsitt, co-owner of the dental office at 2960 Snelling Avenue 141 Mr. Shawn raised concerns about overflow parking and the current condition of the 142 vacant property. 143 144 Chair Pribyl acknowledged the concerns of the public. 145 146 **Commission Deliberation** 147 148 Member McGehee suggested conducting a neighborhood meeting and a shadow study 149 to understand the proposed development's impact better. 150 151 Member Aspnes questioned the adequacy of the site to support 18 units without 152 borrowing parking from the neighboring property. 153 154 Mr. Lloyd explained that the zoning code allowed shared parking, and the current 155 proposal met those standards. 156 157 Member Bjorum expressed a desire for the building to be dense and to have more 158 green space but acknowledged that the current proposal met the required standards. 159 160 Member Aspnes raised concerns about the shared parking arrangement and the lack 161 of improvements to the existing property. 162 163 Mr. Lloyd explained that the city cannot obligate the owner to improve other 164 properties, but the Planning Commission can request them. 165 166 MOTION 167 Member Bjorum moved, seconded by Member McGehee, to recommend to the 168 City Council approval of the request to allow an increase in density from the 169 standard limit of 24 units per acre to 28 units per acre, based on the content of 170 this RPCA, public input, and Planning Commission deliberation, with the 171 condition that a pathway easement be dedicated along the westernmost 5 feet of 172 the property (PF25-001). 173 174 Aves: 3 175 Nays: 1 (Aspnes) 176 Motion carried. 177 178 Member Aspnes expressed concerns about runoff entering a neighbor's backyard, the 179 driveway, parking lot, and fence condition. Despite the neighbor's issues, she 180 emphasized the importance of property rights and the legal allowance for the 181 proposed use. She advised neighbors to raise their concerns with the city if they have 182

183 184		not already done so. The obligation of the Planning Commission was to focus on the proposal before them, ensuring it was a permitted use.
185		
186		Chair Pribyl agreed with Member Aspnes and found the proposal for 18 units on the
187		site reasonable. However, she indicated she was frustrated that the property owner did
188		not attend the meeting to address the neighbors' questions directly.
189		
190		Member McGehee highlighted the value of the Commissioners' opinions, especially
191		since two were architects. She suggested that neighbors should continue to raise their
192		issues with the city to hold the property owners accountable. She discussed potential
193		solutions for the runoff problem, suggesting involvement from the engineering
194		department or the Watershed District. She mentioned that drive-through parking
195		might be fixed with a curb and well-placed boulders. She acknowledged the
196		limitations of the Planning Commission's ability to resolve the issues and noted
197		efforts to improve the code.
198		
199		Chair Pribyl suggested the designer and developer discuss green space and talk to
200		neighbors.
201		
202		Community Development Director Gundlach mentioned sending a nuisance inspector
203		to address maintenance issues.
204		
205	7.	Other Business
206	•	
207	8.	Commission Direction on Commission Member Initiated Agenda Items
208	0	Adious
209	9.	Adjourn
210 211		MOTION
211		Morrison Member Aspnes, seconded by Member McGehee, to adjourn the meeting at 8:12
212		
213 214		p.m.
214		Ayes: 4
215		Nays: 0
210		Motion carried.
217		
210		

REQUEST FOR COMMISSION ACTION

Date: 4/2/2025 Item No.: 7.a.

Department Approval

Janue Gundiach

Agenda Section Business

Item Description: Annual Organizational Business

Application Information

n/a

1

2

3

⁴ 5 Background

Background
In accordance with City Code Section 201.03.A, each advisory commission shall elect a chair and vice-

7 chair from among its appointed members for a term of one-year, as well as appoint a member to serve

8 on the Ethics Commission. The Planning Commission shall also appoint three members, and one

⁹ alternate, to serve on the Variance Board.

11 Staff Recommendation

12 Elect members to serve as chair and vice-chair of the Planning Commission, appoint one member to

13 serve on the Ethics Commission, and appoint three members and one alternate to the Variance Board.

14

10

15 Requested Planning Commission Action

By motion, elect members to serve as chair and vice-chair of the Planning Commission, appoint one

member to serve on the Ethics Commission, and appoint three members and one alternate to the

- 18 Variance Board.
- 19

20 Alternative Actions

21 **n/a**

22

Prepared by: Janice Gundlach, Community Development Director

Attachments: None

23

Page 1 of 1