

**Planning Commission Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Minutes – Wednesday, May 3, 2017 – 6:30 p.m.**

- 1 **1. Call to Order**
2 Chair Murphy called to order the regular meeting of the Planning Commission meeting at
3 approximately 6:30 p.m. and reviewed its role and purpose.
4 Chair Murphy announced one vacancy on the commission, with applications accepted
5 through May 10th and interviews scheduled with the City Council on May 15, 2017.
6 Chair Murphy also announced the third Imagine Roseville meeting occurring tonight at
7 the Ramsey Area High School auditorium, with another session scheduled tomorrow
8 night at the Roseville Skating Center, and encouraged residents to attend.
- 9 **2. Roll Call**
10 At the request of Chair Murphy, City Planner Thomas Paschke called the Roll.
11 **Members Present:** Chair Robert Murphy; and Commissioners Chuck Gitzen, James
12 Daire, Julie Kimble, James Bull, and Pete Sparby
13 **Staff Present:** Community Development Director Kari Collins, City Planner
14 Thomas Paschke and Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd
- 15 **3. Review of Minutes**
16 **a. April 5, 2017 Regular Meeting Minutes**
17 **MOTION**
18 **Member Kimble moved, seconded by Member Daire to approve the April 5,**
19 **2017 meeting minutes as presented.**
20 **Ayes: 6**
21 **Nays: 0**
22 **Motion carried.**
- 23 **4. Communications and Recognitions:**
24 **a. From the Public: Public Comment to land use on issues not on the agenda this**
25 **agenda, including the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update**
26 None.
27 **b. From the Commission or Staff: Information about assorted business not already**
28 **on this agenda, including a brief update on the 2040 Comprehensive Plan**
29 **Update process.**
30 Mr. Lloyd provided a brief update on the comprehensive plan process and schedule;
31 reviewing public input opportunities and how they fit into the draft decision-making
32 rubric of measurables and guided additional feedback between meetings. Mr. Lloyd
33 anticipated the Commission’s May 24, 2017 meeting to focus on land use planning
34 for the process, specifically redevelopment and some sites that may be the focus of
35 better uses and/or some that may be under-utilized at this time. Before that meeting,
36 Mr. Lloyd advised that the Commission would receive homework to engage in and
37 provide feedback to inform that next discussion on May 24th. Mr. Lloyd advised that
38 ongoing community engagement opportunities and stakeholder interviews would

Regular Planning Commission Meeting

Minutes – Wednesday, May 3, 2017

Page 2

39 proceed in June, with economic development aspects of the plan scheduled in July
40 with a quarterly meeting with the Roseville Economic Development Authority
41 (REDA).

42 At the request of Member Sparby, Mr. Lloyd advised that the location and time of
43 stakeholder interviews had yet to be set up; and in some cases would be by phone or
44 at the business of a stakeholder. Mr. Lloyd advised that as the process proceeds,
45 better information of who, what and when will be made public on the website.

46 At the request of Member Daire, Mr. Lloyd clarified that all meetings were open to
47 the public, but whether or not there would be value for commissioners to attend the
48 stakeholder meetings may not be as informative as other community engagement
49 opportunities. Mr. Lloyd advised that he would defer to the consultant as that became
50 more firm.

51 In an effort to retain transparency of the process, Member Sparby asked if a list would
52 be published of everyone considered for stakeholder interviews, the date they were
53 approached, and date of interview or whether they declined or agreed to be
54 interviewed.

55 Mr. Lloyd advised that the comments would all be published, but otherwise he wasn't
56 sure if the intent was to track things in that much detail; and again advised that he
57 would defer to the consultant for a response.

58 Member Murphy emphasized that after Mr. Lloyd meets with the consultant, the
59 Planning Consultant will then be informed of the process moving forward (e.g.
60 rubric).

61 **5. Public Hearing (New)**

62 **a. PLANNING FILE 17-006: Request by Java Capital Partners for**
63 **PRELIMINARY PLAT consideration to split Lot 2, Block 1, Cleveland Club,**
64 **into two separate lots**

65 Chair Murphy opened and continued the public hearing for Planning File 17-006 at
66 approximately 6:40 p.m.

67 City Planner Thomas Paschke summarized the request as detailed in the staff report
68 dated May 3, 2017 (lines 27 – 43). Mr. Paschke explained that the purpose was to
69 split off the Denny's site for separate ownership; and create two lots out of the current
70 single lot. Mr. Paschke advised that there were no minimum standards for lot size that
71 applied with the plat design already approved and under construction on the site
72 under the developer's previous plat submission and approval.

73 The applicant representative was present in the audience, but at the invitation of Chair
74 Murphy, offered no additional comments and there were no questions by the
75 commission to the developer.

76 With no one coming forward to speak for or against this request, Chair Murphy
77 closed the public hearing at approximately 6:43 p.m.

78 **MOTION**

79 **Member Bull moved, seconded by Member Gitzen, to recommend to the City**
80 **Council approval of the PRELIMINARY PLAT for Cleveland Club, Second**

81 **Addition; based any input offered at the public hearing, and on the comments**
82 **and findings as detailed in the staff report dated May 3, 2017 as presented.**

83 **Ayes: 6**

84 **Nays: 0**

85 **Motion carried.**

86 At the request of Chair Murphy, staff advised that this item was tentatively scheduled
87 for the May 22, 2017 City Council meeting.

88 **6. Public Hearings (Continued)**

89 **a. PROJF0042: Request by the City of Roseville to approve a comprehensive**
90 **technical update to the requirements and procedures for processing subdivision**
91 **proposals as regulated in City Code Title 11 (Subdivisions)**

92 Chair Murphy continued the public hearing for Project File 0042 at approximately
93 6:45 p.m. held over from the April 5, 2017 meeting.

94 Community Development Director Kari Collins introduced Leila Bunge, consultant
95 with Michael Lamb of the Kimley-Horn team to guide tonight's discussion of these
96 proposed revisions. Ms. Collins noted that the first portion of proposed subdivision
97 ordinance, as reviewed by the Planning Commission at their last meeting, would be
98 reviewed by the City Council at their May 8, 2017 meeting.

99 Member Gitzen asked staff to provide a draft preliminary clean copy for further
100 review of the actual proposed code at a later meeting; with concurrence by the
101 remainder of the commission.

102 After the May 8th City Council meeting, Ms. Collins advised that City Council
103 comment would also be incorporated into the next iteration and could be sent out to
104 the commission via email for them to provide their feedback to the City Council for
105 anticipated ordinance enactment at the May 22nd City Council meeting to meet the
106 deadline of the moratorium expiring May 31, 2017.

107 Mr. Lloyd noted that the City Council's review had been delayed as there was
108 insufficient time on their last meeting schedule; with the new timeframe for review at
109 the May 8th and 15th meetings, and enactment at the May 22nd meeting.

110 Chair Murphy asked when the commission would receive an update from last night's
111 review of the document (e.g. park dedication fees) by the Parks & Recreation
112 Commission.

113 Mr. Lloyd advised that the meeting minutes and comments were still being assembled
114 by Parks & Recreation Department staff today; but he would insert the more obvious
115 items of their review at that point in tonight's discussion.

116 Attachment C Document Review (continued)

117 At the commission's last review of the document on April 5th, the last item covered
118 was Page 23, Section 148 that would serve as the intended starting point for tonight's
119 review. However, Mr. Lloyd initiated tonight's review by summarizing the revisions
120 made at that April meeting seeking confirmation or additional feedback before
121 proceeding to the later sections.

Regular Planning Commission Meeting

Minutes – Wednesday, May 3, 2017

Page 4

122 In his review of the subdivision code earlier today, Mr. Lloyd advised that he could
123 find no reference to “corner lots” anywhere else in the subdivision code and therefore,
124 may not be needed even though it was referenced as a definition in accordance with
125 the updated zoning code.

126 Based on tonight’s Variance Board discussion, Member Kimble asked if there was
127 anywhere else in the subdivision code or other areas of code that addressed corner
128 and reverse corner lots.

129 Mr. Lloyd advised that it was addressed elsewhere in city code, and had been
130 mentioned in the past when the subdivision code had minimum lot size standards; but
131 as of last year’s revisions had been relegated to the zoning code and therefore no
132 longer defined elsewhere.

133 Page 3, Section 23

134 Member Bull noted that in this section and throughout the document wording had
135 been changed from “applicant” to owner (sole, part or joint owner). However, if a
136 company owns a parcel and they’re located elsewhere in the country, perhaps
137 involving a board of directors of shareholders, Member Bull asked how they could
138 have an agent representative applying on their behalf, opining that this language
139 seemed awkward.

140 Mr. Lloyd responded that the City Attorney had advised that the most important
141 element was to make sure the owner was making the application; with common
142 practice for a local agent or developer to carry that application forward on their
143 behalf. Mr. Lloyd noted that the city had to allow for that and that it could be further
144 clarified in application forms accordingly.

145 Member Bull opined that “owner” seemed to have a lot of references; but stated his
146 preference for a definition of “owner” and “registered agent” or a proper name for
147 that role.

148 Member Kimble questioned that suggestion, noting the difference in identifying the
149 ownership of a lot versus someone else processing the application that wouldn’t
150 change that ownership; and opined that the proposed language seemed appropriate
151 from her perspective. Member Kimble noted the common practice for a local
152 representative to present and process an application on behalf of an owner; noting that
153 the owner had to be the applicant even if they delegated the processing to someone
154 else.

155 Mr. Lloyd suggested that the City Attorney’s recommendation probably recognized
156 that very situation.

157 Member Gitzen agreed, noting that the definition was of “owner” not “applicant.”

158 With confirmation by Member Bull, Member Daire asked if Member Bull’s intent
159 was to revise wording to define sole or joint owners or designated representatives.
160 Member Bull noted that references used to be for “applicant” and “developer” but
161 now had been changed enmass to “owner.”

162 Page 4, Section 24

163 Mr. Lloyd noted the change to facility versus right-of-way, with deference to local

164 and/or state traffic enforcement as allowed to define non-motorized or non-vehicular
165 traffic (e.g. bicyclists) but without need to specifically define in the subdivision code.

166 Page 4, Section 29 and Page 7, Section 50

167 Using the Java request as an example, Member Bull addressed consideration of a
168 preliminary plat as an item rather than a process. As another example in line 50,
169 Member Bull noted that it states "...shall submit a preliminary plat..." noting that
170 you don't submit a process, but instead a packet of documents. Member Bull noted
171 the need for consistency.

172 Mr. Lloyd advised that this was described in the Procedures Chapter; and opined that
173 the suggested language provided sufficient context and definition of preliminary plats
174 as a standalone definition that further definition was not needed specific to
175 preliminary plat documents.

176 Member Gitzen suggested leaving the old definition in place, separating preliminary
177 plats from plats; with concurrence by Members Kimble and Bull.

178 Mr. Lloyd clarified that the rationale was to eliminate preliminary plat by recognizing
179 that it was a preliminary version with the plat serving as the final version.

180 Member Bull suggested differentiating pre and final versions of the plat.

181 Member Kimble suggested the commission may be getting too detailed on language
182 specifics.

183 Page 5, Sections 32, 33 and 34

184 Mr. Lloyd and Ms. Bunge addressed the definition of "street" to "public way" to
185 incorporate what was involved without defining in this document and encompassing
186 all types of public ways and facilities.

187 Member Gitzen stated that he was not comfortable with this proposed language; and
188 instead suggested "public passageway, such as...designed for travel by pedestrians or
189 vehicles." Member Gitzen further suggested removing the right-of-way language
190 (Section 33). When thinking of a public or private right-of-way, Member Gitzen
191 opined that most people think of an easement; where in this case it was referring to a
192 physical street, creating confusion when later on in the document rights-of-way area
193 referred to as an easement. Member Gitzen suggested changing language accordingly
194 in Section 32 and removing Section 33 in its entirety.

195 By consensus, Sections 33 and 34 were recommended for removal.

196 Page 8, Section 56, 57

197 Mr. Lloyd advised that application instructions were made more consistent with other
198 plat applications.

199 If the intent is to remove archaic language, Member Daire suggested changing
200 "utilized" to "used" or "using;" with Mr. Lloyd suggesting "...are alternatives to plat
201 procedures."

202 Chair Murphy asked staff to review April meeting minutes to review if "common
203 wall" had been removed or not; however Member Gitzen noted that the City Council
204 in their review could make the decision whether or not to remove it.

Regular Planning Commission Meeting

Minutes – Wednesday, May 3, 2017

Page 6

205 Mr. Lloyd concurred, advising that this marked up version had been provided to the
206 City Council for their review and deliberation.

207 Page 9, Section 58

208 As with Section 57, Mr. Lloyd advised that the approval could be by the City
209 Manager as consistent with other zoning applications; with proposed language to
210 strike that involvement in the process and refer to administrative approval by the
211 Community Development Department.

212 In the previous definition, Member Gitzen noted that it asked for a survey for
213 recombinations; with Mr. Lloyd responding that after approval, submission of a
214 survey was required to ensure consistency, while applications only require a sketch
215 plan format.

216 At the request of Member Gitzen, Mr. Lloyd advised that he had discussed a timeline
217 with the City Attorney and his suggestion was to provide one even if city staff was
218 unable to control it at all times. Mr. Lloyd advised that the City Attorney had pointed
219 out that there are times when it could be enforced, such as by withholding a building
220 permit until completion of the process. Mr. Lloyd suggested adding language in, with
221 that timeframe pending, in Sections 57, 58 and 60, establishing a timeline for
222 recording a plat.

223 As an example, Member Kimble referenced a recent alternate plat project she was
224 involved with in the City of St. Paul and their requirement for recording within two
225 years, with a one year extension possible before having to go through the process
226 again.

227 Chair Murphy stated that sounded beyond reasonable from his perspective.

228 Mr. Lloyd clarified that a longer timeline makes sense from his perspective if the
229 Planning Commission and City Council were making decisions intended to be in
230 place for perpetuity; and as time changes things there would be occasions that it
231 would be prudent to have an expiration for approvals.

232 Member Bull stated that he was reluctant to specify anything that might give anyone
233 the idea that that had two years to record a plat.

234 Member Gitzen suggested deferring to the City Attorney for the timeline.

235 Chair Murphy suggested, with consensus of the body, a one year timeline for
236 recording ALL plat, or to seek an extension.

237 Page 9-10, Section 59 (Consolidations)

238 Mr. Lloyd suggested language changes for minor plats when discussing their purpose,
239 with draft language talking about subdivisions or a consolidation of lots. As discussed
240 last time, Mr. Lloyd suggested it would be prudent to regulate lot sizes and with
241 consolidations a platting of underlying lot boundaries that they be addressed
242 accordingly.

243 Member Gitzen noted that you couldn't get rid of underlying lot boundaries.

244 Mr. Lloyd provided an example of consolidating adjoining lots for tax purposes, but
245 if a house was built across those adjacent lots it could create future problems. Mr.
246 Lloyd advised that the intent was to take a more explicit approach to regulate

247 development according to platted versus tax parcels to avoid development on top of
248 parcel lot lines, making consolidations no longer a platting alternative.

249 At the request of Member Gitzen, Mr. Paschke confirmed that in some cases, a
250 property owner was required to replat such lots now.

251 For tracts of land that are under common ownership and involving several platted lots
252 with a few tax parcels, Mr. Lloyd advised that there was a need to make sure those
253 parcels area platted in such a away to remove property ownership boundaries. If
254 development doesn't violate those boundaries, Mr. Lloyd advised that an owner
255 hadn't been required to replat them to-date, but in the future would be required to do
256 so; and opined that reconsolidation of platted lots served as a plat even if a simple plat
257 versus a platting alternative.

258 Mr. Lloyd noted that Item #4 would remain and be further edited based on City
259 Attorney advice, and to eliminate the City Manager involvement as with other areas
260 of the subdivision code.

261 Pages 11-12, Section 61

262 At the request of Chair Murphy specific to park dedication (Item B.V Minor Plats)
263 Mr. Lloyd reviewed proposed language intended to subdivide parcels as noted.

264 As a general question, Member Daire asked if this revised subdivision ordinance
265 would prohibit the creation of flag lots.

266 Mr. Lloyd responded that he thought so, but they were regulated in a later chapter yet
267 to be discussed by the commission; but as a subdivision standard would specifically
268 be prohibited other than on a case-by-case variance review.

269 Page 12, Section 62

270 Specific to Item 2.ii, Mr. Lloyd addressed rational to protect time and resources
271 involved with repetitive inquiries. At the request of Member Sparby, Mr. Lloyd
272 clarified that if an application came forward under changed circumstances, it would
273 be seen as a new application process in the regulatory framework and would not bar
274 an owner from coming forward with an application.

275 Member Sparby stated that he would prefer putting such a bar in the language for the
276 submission process rather than relying on a one year ban.

277 Member Bull agreed with Member Sparby, opining that he didn't like things that
278 limited the ability of citizens to seek relief if there was a process in place to
279 administer and recognize differences in applications.

280 Chair Murphy stated that he was unsure if he agreed with Member Sparby as long as
281 the Board of Adjustments (City Council) was available for that review, this provision
282 also served to protect the city's staff time and resources with repeat applications.
283 With an appeal process to the Board of Adjustments, Chair Murphy opined that it
284 accomplished the goal and a safety net for citizens to be heard.

285 Member Bull referenced a development proposal that was submitted many different
286 times from 2007 through 2016 substantially the same thing and requiring
287 considerable review time.

Regular Planning Commission Meeting

Minutes – Wednesday, May 3, 2017

Page 8

288 Member Sparby suggested lowering the submission application to six months rather
289 than one year, noting that the application’s composition or staff may change and free
290 an applicant to move forward.

291 Specific to submitting substantially the same application, Members Kimble, Bull and
292 Gitzen, along with Chair Murphy agreed with the one year provision; with Member
293 Sparby deferring to his colleagues.

294 Mr. Lloyd advised that the intent was to avoid serial applications when the ultimate
295 goal is turning one lot into two via this subdivision ordinance; thus staff’s
296 recommendation for five years unless submitting the application as a major plat
297 process, but not for minor plats.

298 In Section 63 , Mr. Lloyd again addressed the time limitation.

299 In this section, as well as in Chapter 1102.05 (page 24), Member Gitzen referenced
300 that necessary data for a final plat (major or minor) and Ramsey County
301 requirements; and suggested language as previously noted for a review process at a
302 surveyor’s office.

303 Mr. Lloyd concurred, noting that would be addressed in the next iteration as it was
304 changed to ordinance formatting rather than this side-by-side comparison; and to
305 track changes from a global perspective.

306 Member Gitzen stated that his concern was that an ordinary citizen if not familiar
307 with development projects may not be aware of the filing process.

308 As the global process for preliminary plat review and approval proceeds, Mr. Lloyd
309 suggested deletion of Section 120. However, Mr. Lloyd agreed that the expanded
310 context needed to consider the process and filing with Ramsey County and how the
311 applicant could be informed of that process, probably in the application form itself.

312 Member Gitzen reiterated the need in the subdivision ordinance to inform applicants
313 of the process beyond just filing the final plat; with Member Kimble suggesting an
314 overview of steps to be followed, including timelines and fees either in the
315 application form or subdivision code itself.

316 Mr. Lloyd stated that he envisioned the application materials would describe the
317 process more fully and provide the applicant with a timeline.

318 Member Gitzen asked that staff refer to that process in this subdivision code so
319 applicants understand the process.

320 At the request of Member Kimble, Mr. Lloyd confirmed that staff was running a
321 parallel path in developing application forms and once the new ordinance is in place
322 would inform applications of what was needed.

323 Member Bull asked that staff be consistent in distinguishing the process from the
324 result as it related to the platting process.

325 Page 13, Section 65 (Developer Open House Meeting)

326 Using the recent Minnesota State Fair Interim Use application with many different
327 property owners rather than ownership by the State Fair of those sites, Member Bull
328 noted his concern in using “owner” versus “applicant.”

329 Mr. Paschke reiterated the process involved co-applicants and clarified that the
330 process was different for open houses, with applicants moving forward with an open
331 house without requiring the involvement of the property owner. Mr. Paschke noted
332 that this simply intended as the first touch as to whether or not a project was worth
333 moving forward. Also in the case of the State Fair, Mr. Paschke advised that each
334 property owner provided a letter of support for the State Fair as the applicant.

335 In Section 66, Member Kimble alluded to the developer open house, while Section 65
336 still says that the owner shall hold the open house.

337 Mr. Lloyd duly noted that error and advised it would be changed to be made
338 consistent and would restore it to “applicant.”

339 With Member Bull noting that the next line stated “owner,” and their responsibilities,
340 Member Kimble noted that in some cases, the developer will not close on a property
341 until approvals area received at which time the closing would occur on the land and
342 they would then become the owner.

343 In that circumstance, Member Sparby noted that the applicant needed authority from
344 the owner to move forward with the open house.

345 From a practical standpoint, Mr. Lloyd noted that it would be unwise for an owner to
346 move forward without an agreement in place.

347 In order to ensure that relationship is in place, Member Sparby suggested retaining
348 “applicant” in the new language.

349 Mr. Lloyd advised that the owner would likely be aware of and even involved in the
350 open house process; but from his perspective the distinction was the open house
351 process itself held prior to the city becoming involved in a major way. Mr. Lloyd
352 noted the intent of the open house as a venue for public review of a proposal before
353 an application was made for approvals. If an applicant is seeking approval/denial on a
354 property, Mr. Lloyd opined that it was important for the owner to be explicitly
355 identified.

356 Member Sparby stated that he’d support “owner/applicant.”

357 Member Kimble suggested “applicant and/or owner.”

358 Page 18, Section 83

359 Again, Member Gitzen asked that the applicant be made aware of the process and
360 timeline.

361 Page 19, Sections 84 and 86

362 Member Kimble noted the distinctions in “hardship” and “practical difficulty,” with
363 Mr. Lloyd explaining that they were intentionally different based on State Statute
364 related to land use and zoning and recent revisions to their language from “hardships”
365 to “practical difficulty.” However, Mr. Lloyd advised that State Statutes continue to
366 talk in places about “unusual hardships” making that definition hard to determine in
367 Statute. Mr. Lloyd advised that he had taken this language verbatim from State
368 Statute after his conversation with the City Attorney.

369 Member Gitzen stated that he didn’t think State Statute defined it; and asked staff to
370 confirm that the Statute was still in place or if it had been further amended as they

Regular Planning Commission Meeting

Minutes – Wednesday, May 3, 2017

Page 10

371 had been discussing. Member Gitzen opined that “undue hardship” represented a
372 strict definition, but he thought the legislature’s intent was to revise it to “practical
373 difficulties” in both cases. Member Gitzen opined it was worth verifying whether or
374 not the standards of each were totally different if not.

375 In Section 86, in response to Member Sparby, Mr. Lloyd advised that his
376 understanding was that specific grounds for a variance were not applicable to case
377 law; with Member Sparby suggesting that staff further review whether the four
378 factors were considered in case law as factors to consider.

379 Mr. Lloyd clarified that the City Attorney had been supportive of those four factors as
380 viable, specific grounds as long as the city was certain nothing else was being left out
381 of that consideration.

382 Page 21, Sections 88, 89 and through Section 113

383 Again, as previously noted, Mr. Lloyd reiterated that the ordinance formatting would
384 provide a sense of how everything fit together globally and with necessary data for
385 preliminary plats included in the major plat process, noted that this provision was no
386 longer needed.

387 Page 23, Chapter 1102.03, Section 114 (Requirements governing approval of
388 Preliminary plats)

389 While a discussion with city the City Attorney and Public Works staff was indicated,
390 from a global perspective, Mr. Lloyd suggested these items made more sense in
391 Chapter 1102.01 related to processing of any subdivision. However, Mr. Lloyd
392 opined that it made sense to retain Section 115 to apply conditions of approval as
393 noted, with further review to edit out any remaining redundancies.

394 To make an area completely safe, Member Gitzen suggested changing the wording if
395 it remained to a different standard than “adequate drainage.”

396 Mr. Lloyd confirmed that he proposed to move that to Chapter 1102.01.

397 Page 24, Section 120

398 Mr. Lloyd noted removal as it was discussed in the procedures section for final plats.

399 Page 26, Section 134

400 While this may seem like an archaic section, Mr. Lloyd clarified that “streets” are not
401 automatically accepted as a public street until staff ensures they meet city standards
402 and requirements.

403 In talking about developer agreements, Member Gitzen asked how or whether this
404 applied.

405 Mr. Lloyd opined that this applied more broadly, such as public streets obtained
406 through annexation, but for practical purposes, neither he nor the City Attorney could
407 see any reason to retain it.

408 With Member Kimble asking if it could occur as private roads became public, Mr.
409 Lloyd agreed that could be addressed in the development agreement; but under those
410 circumstances, it may be prudent to retain it.

411 Chapter 1102.06, Page 27, Section 137 and Page 29, Section 147 (Required Land
412 Improvements)

413 Mr. Lloyd noted the intent to remove these sections for inclusion in the Public Works
414 design standard manual without further specificity in the subdivision code.

415 **Recess**

416 Chair Murphy recessed the meeting at approximately 8:07 p.m. and reconvened at approximately
417 8:12 p.m.

418 Attachment C Document Review (new)

419 Section 137, Chapter 1102.07 – (Chapter 1102.06 of current code)

420 Page 30, Section 153, Item #7

421 Since there is no definition of “parkways,” Member Kimble asked if that was clear to
422 everyone.

423 Mr. Lloyd advised that this was an error in tracking changes, and advised that the
424 intent was to use “boulevard.”

425 In Section 155, Mr. Lloyd suggested, as previously suggested by the commission, to
426 allow for rain gardens and natural stormwater features if and when they make design-
427 sense rather than requiring turf grass or sod, as long as they stabilized soils and met
428 Public Works design requirements.

429 Member Daire asked if an abutting property owner on a street was allowed to plant
430 decorative grasses or blooming boulevards.

431 Mr. Lloyd responded that there was no codified position on that, and if and when
432 property owners are interested in these front yard and/or public right-of-way areas,
433 they could work with the Public Works Department to seek their approval of their
434 intended plantings, as this was their domain.

435 Page 31, Sections 153 (page 30) and 157

436 Member Gitzen opined that these sections appeared to be the same and questioned
437 whether both were needed.

438 Mr. Lloyd responded that Section 153 was under the category of street improvements,
439 but offered to talk more with the Public Works Department as to whether the
440 reference should be “parkway” indicating a grass area between driving lanes (e.g.
441 Wheelock and Lexington Parkways).

442 If so, Member Gitzen noted the need for a definition for “parkway”.

443 In Section 157, discussion ensued about the intent and definition of a “boulevard” as
444 a non-paved part of a right-of-way (except for driveways, pathways or walkways) and
445 therefore was distinct or if it needed to be distinguished or removed.

446 Member Kimble suggested this be given further consideration.

447 In Section 160 related to public utilities, Member Gitzen suggested this section was
448 more applicable to the Public Works Department than the Planning Commission.

449 On the flip side, Chair Murphy noted that this may still include a requirement for
450 public comment at the commission or City Council level even if the Public Works
451 Department served as the presenter based on their technical skills to make a
452 recommendation to the commission.

Regular Planning Commission Meeting

Minutes – Wednesday, May 3, 2017

Page 12

453 Member Gitzen opined that the Planning Commission wouldn't need to review it;
454 with Member Sparby recommended language such as, "...suggested after study by
455 the Public Works Department and recommendation by the Planning Commission;"
456 agreeing that study seemed out of the commission's jurisdiction. Mr. Lloyd noted that
457 a public hearing could be held at the City Council meeting, with the consensus of the
458 body being for the Public Works Department to provide a report to the Planning
459 Commission for recommendation to the City Council.

460 In Section 156, Mr. Lloyd noted the recommended changes were from the Public
461 Works Department for a "licensed" rather than a "registered" professional engineer.

462 Page 35, Line 161

463 At the request of Chair Murphy, Mr. Lloyd reviewed the rationale for leaving this
464 door open for occupancy with the potential for homes being completed prior to final
465 paving of a street, with possibly only the first lift applied.

466 Page 36, Chapter 1103 (Design Standards)

467 After minimal discussion, the consensus of the body was to remove Chapters 1103.01
468 (Street Plan) and 1103.02 (Streets) and refer to the Public Works design standards
469 manual.

470 Mr. Lloyd noted there were some areas with distinction despite the chapter name of
471 "streets," and the application of physical facilities and rights-of way widths required
472 for functional classifications in residential subdivisions or commercial plats, that may
473 provide relevant information for someone layout out a plat.

474 However, Member Gitzen noted that curvatures, horizontal street lines and other
475 items were design standards.

476 With further discussion, Mr. Lloyd advised that the Public Works Department had
477 supported moving physical facility requirements into their design standards, but
478 information guiding layout of a plat document they had felt some value in preserving
479 it here. However, Mr. Lloyd advised that he would further consult with them for the
480 next iteration of the code.

481 Members Gitzen and Kimble noted the preference to have information in only one
482 place to avoid redundancies as well as inconsistencies.

483 Mr. Lloyd agreed, but noted the need for balancing where that most current
484 information should be located and suggested it may be helpful to have those
485 parameters listed here without going into too much detail.

486 Member Gitzen suggested having them in one place or the other, but if included in
487 both documents, they needed to match; but stated his preference for references in
488 code to the manual.

489 Member Kimble suggested the categories could remain in the subdivision code by
490 reference guiding people to the Public Works design manual.

491 Chair Murphy advised staff to make the City Council aware of their strong
492 recommendation without significant review of Chapters 1102.01 and 1102.02 was for
493 the subdivision code to recognize the categories while referring to the Public Works
494 design manual to avoid duplication or errors.

495
496
497

498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510

511
512
513
514

515

516
517

518
519
520
521

522
523
524

525
526

527
528
529
530

531
532

533
534
535
536

Page 38, Sections 194 – 197

Mr. Lloyd advised that he needed to revisit street widths with the Public Works staff, but thought it was helpful to leave street widths in the subdivision code.

In reflecting on his experience as a transportation planner with the City of Minneapolis, Member Daire noted the relationship with street width, snow accumulation and placement of mailboxes. As he had shared with Community Development Director Collins earlier for her in turn sharing his comments with the Public Works Department, Member Daire suggested some consideration should be given parking control with vehicle and street access, especially with the advent of more on-street bike lanes and what standards should apply for them. Member Daire noted the correlation with various street widths and types when considering their location to ensure the safety of cyclists. Since this is an area of considerable concern for him, Member Daire suggested city street width standards be raised; including how to deal with three lane streets and turn lanes to keep traffic moving smoothly as well as bike lanes. Therefore, Member Daire advised that his suggestion had been for the Public Works Department to consider more specificity in its design standards.

Since this is the way of the future, Member Kimble offered her agreement, noting that it wasn't addressed now (e.g. Ramsey County roadways) and noted a number of items in the current subdivision code that are not yet addressed in Public Works design standards at this point.

In summary, Chair Murphy directed staff to migrate as appropriate.

Page 39

Member Gitzen suggested these also be included in Public Works design standards.

Page 40, Chapter 1103-04 (Easements), Section 209

Member Gitzen suggested revised language to read.” Easements at least a total of 10’ wide along the front and side, and corner lot lines as well as centered on rear and side lot lines.”

At the request of Member Gitzen, Mr. Lloyd advised that he would consult with the Public Works Department whether a statement was still needed about reflection or anchor points.

In Section 210, Member Gitzen suggested rewording “drainage easements” to allow stormwater easements on platted land.

Page 41, Chapter 1103.05 (Block Standards), Section 213

With Roseville being a fully-developed community, Mr. Lloyd advised that the Public Works Department’s suggestion was to remove the upper boundary and use the more realistic 900’ long block as the upper boundary.

In Section 215, Member Gitzen questioned how and what was being designated or what plan was referenced.

Page 42, Section 226

At the request of Member Daire, Mr. Lloyd noted this was referring to private streets and their physical requirements the same as that of a public street in case they should eventually become public versus private.

**Regular Planning Commission Meeting
Minutes – Wednesday, May 3, 2017
Page 14**

537 As discussion ensued, staff was directed to clarify that any references to 20' width for
538 private streets should be corrected to ensure they were a minimum of 24' to
539 accommodate emergency vehicles.

540 Page 43, Section 229

541 Member Gitzen noted that side lot lines were “perpendicular” to front lot lines.

542 Page 43, Section 233

543 As previously noted, flag lots are no longer allowed unless considered on a case-by-
544 case basis under a variance.

545 In Section 235, Member Daire sought clarification of the definition for “major
546 thoroughfares.”

547 Mr. Lloyd noted this was a topic from the Variance Board meeting, and addressing
548 single-family homes versus parking lots and circulation for turnarounds, especially
549 related to county roadways; and current requirements for a turnaround area to avoid
550 backing out directly into the roadway. Mr. Lloyd advised that the definition of “major
551 thoroughfare” is yet to be determined.

552 At the request of Member Gitzen as to whether or not the comprehensive plan defined
553 types of streets, Mr. Lloyd clarified that as it applied in the past, it was specific to
554 county roadways, but advised that he would continue to work with the Public Works
555 staff to determine the appropriate level tied to functional classifications for definition
556 or description in some other way.

557 Page 44, Section 237

558 Mr. Lloyd advised that shoreland lots were not referenced in Chapter 1017 of the
559 shoreland zoning code.

560 Page 45, Chapter 1103.07 (Park Dedication), Section 242

561 Noting reference to “city” at its discretion, Member Sparby asked if this should be
562 defined as the “City Council” instead; with Mr. Lloyd clarifying that ultimately it did
563 mean the City Council upon recommendation by the Parks & Recreation
564 Commission, but ultimately a decision for the City Council. Mr. Lloyd advised that
565 the only reason “city” was used rather than specifying the “City Council,” was that
566 other participants were involved in the process.

567 Member Sparby stated his preference for more specificity to indicate the City Council
568 rather than suggesting city staff made that determination.

569 Pages 45-46, Section 243

570 Mr. Lloyd asked that the commission disregard italicized text intended for last night’s
571 Parks & Recreation Commission discussion.

572 At the request of Member Daire, Mr. Lloyd clarified that the trigger involved the net
573 increase in development sites and land area of at least one acre or more. Mr. Lloyd
574 further clarified the current process versus the proposed process for minor plat
575 processes that now would require a public hearing before the City Council took action
576 on a park dedication. With concerns raised by Member Daire on impacts to
577 homeowners attempting to subdivide their property and being subject to a park
578 dedication fee, Mr. Lloyd put the conditions of approval in context in a practical
579 sense of most of those situations falling below the threshold of one acre that would

580 trigger this provision. On the flip side, Mr. Lloyd noted that a minor plat process
581 could be used in a large commercial plat if no new infrastructure or rezoning was
582 required, with such a sizable development potential then exempted from park
583 dedication requirements if following Member Daire’s logic.

584 Referencing last night’s Parks & Recreation Commission meeting, Chair Murphy
585 asked how the Planning Commission could be aware of the results of their meeting
586 specific to the subdivision code and whether or not the Planning Commission agreed
587 with their recommendations short of individual comments to the City Council.

588 Ms. Collins advised that staff could provide that feedback to the Planning
589 Commission via email as soon as it became available, at which time if there was
590 anything drastic, individual commissioners could advise staff accordingly. While
591 recognizing the timing conflicts, Ms. Collins noted that the meetings are archived on
592 the city website for optional viewing by the commission as well.

593 Noting that meeting minutes were not posted on the website until approved, Chair
594 Murphy expressed interest in getting something similar to meeting minutes from last
595 nights Parks & Recreation Commission meeting for review as soon as possible in
596 order to review them and provide comment to the City Council.

597 Mr. Lloyd advised that he anticipated having a distilled version at a minimum
598 included in the next iteration of the draft subdivision code.

599 Chair Murphy asked that, upon receipt of that information by individual Planning
600 Commissioners, they communicate their feedback directly to Community
601 Development Department for forwarding to or directly to the City Council.

602 In Section 244, Mr. Lloyd briefly summarized the bulk of his conversations with
603 Parks & Recreation staff earlier today related land area or fees in lieu of park
604 dedication. Whatever the results, Mr. Lloyd opined that it was important that the
605 subdivision code still reference land for dedication and advised that it would not be
606 removed in new language, but still tie land dedication with cash dedication as
607 approved in the city’s fee schedule annually.

608 In Section 245, Item C, at the request of Member Kimble, Mr. Lloyd advised that
609 State Statute dictated a nexus or connection between what was being required as park
610 land or fee dedications and what it was intended for, previously at 7% and now
611 increased to 10%.

612 Page 47, Section 247

613 Should this section survive, Chair Murphy noted an error in still referencing the HRA
614 rather than the EDA.

615 Member Kimble opined that it seemed that Roseville didn’t want to encourage
616 development, especially in the City Council not supporting waiving park dedication
617 fees or any permit fees for affordable housing projects that typically have huge
618 funding gaps.

619 Ms. Collins advised that in 2016, the EDA had adopted a policy, with their
620 determination that the only fee they’d consider waiving would be Sewer Access
621 Charges (SAC) credits, but had stated loud and clear that that waiving any other fees
622 would not be considered under their policy.

Regular Planning Commission Meeting

Minutes – Wednesday, May 3, 2017

Page 16

623 Given that strong agreement by the City Council, Mr. Lloyd advised that the language
624 was being removed from the revised subdivision code.

625 General Discussion

626 At the request of Chair Murphy, Mr. Lloyd reviewed the next steps and inclusion of
627 Parks & Recreation Commission comments on park dedication and other pertinent
628 areas; reconciling Public Works standards and any potential conflicts on a staff level;
629 City Attorney recommendations; and tonight’s comments of the Planning
630 Commission in the next iteration into a regular text version of the subdivision code to
631 see how provisions now flow.

632 Member Daire advised Mr. Lloyd that he found reference to “private streets” on page
633 13 of Attachment D, Item 10; with Mr. Lloyd advising that he would make sure this
634 was not an oversight in the Public Works design standards. Mr. Lloyd assured
635 Member Daire that a minimum street width of 24’ for private streets was considered
636 standard, and was supported by the Fire Marshal too.

637 Discussion ensued as to whether the Planning Commission was prepared to make a
638 recommendation to the City Council tonight on a revised subdivision code given the
639 tight timeframe; and whether or not to conclude the public hearing tonight.

640 Ms. Collins recommended recommendation for approval contingent on further City
641 Attorney review and review by the Public Works Department for redundancies or
642 inconsistencies and additional feedback from the Parks & Recreation Commission.
643 Ms. Collins advised that another option would be to schedule a special Planning
644 Commission meeting to meet the May 31, 2017 moratorium deadline.

645 Chair Murphy stated that he was not comfortable recommending approval to the City
646 Council of a document the Planning Commission had yet to see or review in its
647 entirety. Chair Murphy recognized the goal, but questioned if that would create
648 significant problems if that goal wasn’t met.

649 Further discussion ensued related to timing, including receipt of City Council
650 feedback in addition to those others noted.

651 Member Bull opined that the Commission had to have time to perform their role
652 before making a recommendation.

653 Member Daire noted the considerable time spent on this project, expressing his
654 interest in seeing it through.

655 If another session was needed, Ms. Collins asked individual commissioners to submit
656 their comments to staff before the meeting to allow time for a more judicious review
657 by staff.

658 While that usually worked, Member Bull opined that sometimes those individual
659 suggestions were interpreted by staff into text but didn’t necessarily reflect what had
660 been recommended.

661 Ms. Collins suggested comment sections from individual commissioners so the
662 suggestions wouldn’t be incorporated into text until they received a collective review
663 and consensus.

664 Chair Murphy suggested waiting to discuss this until all written items were available
665 and then project a timeframe from there.

666 Ms. Collins noted that the City Council would want the commission to feel
667 comfortable with their recommendation.

668 Chair Murphy opined that he didn't see the train going off the track if the moratorium
669 was suspended on May 31st before the Planning Commission made their
670 recommendation to the City Council in early June if delayed to their next regular
671 commission meeting.

672 **MOTION**

673 **Member Daire moved, seconded by Chair Murphy, to continue the public**
674 **hearing until the next scheduled regular Planning Commission meeting of June**
675 **5, 2017.**

676 **Ayes: 6**

677 **Nays: 0**

678 **Motion carried.**

679 Chair Murphy thanked Mr. Lloyd and Ms. Bunge for facilitating tonight's discussion.

680 **7. Adjourn**

681 **MOTION**

682 **Member Gitzen moved, seconded by Member Murphy, to adjourn the meeting at**
683 **approximately 9:40 p.m.**

684 **Ayes: 6**

685 **Nays: 0**

686 **Motion carried.**